

COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.213
19 April 1983
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 19 April 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. F. van Dongen

(Netherlands)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. OULD-ROUIS

Mr. A. TAFFAR

Argentina:

Mr. J.C. CARASALES

Mr. R. VILLAMBROSA

Australia:

Mr. R. STEELE

Mr. T. FINDLAY

Belgium:

Ms. C. FUNES-NOPPEN

Brazil:

Mr. C.A. DE SOUZA E SILVA

Mr. S. QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. TELLALOV

Mr. B. GRINBERG

Mr. P. POPTCHEV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

U TIN KYAW HLAING

U THAN TUN

Canada:

Mr. G.R. SKINNER

Mr. M.C. HAMBLIN

Miss C. de VARENNES

China:

Mr. LI LUYE

Mr. TIAN JIN

Mrs. GE YUYUN

Cuba:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA

Mr. P. NÚÑEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. VEJVODA

Mr. A. CIMA

Mr. J. JIRUSEK

<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. I.A. HASSAN Mr. A.M. ABBAS Miss. W. BASSIM
<u>Ethiopia:</u>	Miss K. SINEGIORGIS
<u>France:</u>	Mr. F. DE LA GORCE Mr. B. D'ABOVILLE Mr. J. DE BEAUSSE
<u>German Democratic Republic:</u>	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. H. THIELICKE Mr. M. NOTZEL
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. F. ELBE Mr. W. ROHR
<u>Hungary:</u>	Mr. T. TOTH
<u>India:</u>	Mr. M. DUBEY Mr. S. SARAN
<u>Indonesia:</u>	Mr. B. DARMOSUTANTO Mr. N. WISNOEMERTI Mrs. P. RAMADHAN Mr. I.H. WIRAATMADJA
<u>Iran:</u>	Mr. F. SHAHABI SIRJANI
<u>Italy:</u>	Mr. M. ALESSI Mr. C.M. OLIVA Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI
<u>Japan:</u>	Mr. R. IMAI Mr. M. KONISHI Mr. K. TANAKA
<u>Kenya:</u>	Mr. D.D.C. DON NANJIRA

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. S.O. BOLD
Mr. O. CHIMIDREGZEN

Morocco:

Mr. A. SKALLI
Mr. M. CHRAIBI
Mr. O. HILALE

Netherlands:

Mr. F. VAN DONGEN
Mr. J. RAMAKER
Mr. R.J. AKKERMAN

Nigeria:

Mr. A.N.C. NWAQZOMUDOH
Mr. J.O. OBOH
Mr. L.O. AKINDELE
Mr. I.E.C. UKEJE

Pakistan:

Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Mr. P. CANNOCK
Mr. V. ROJAS

Poland:

Mr. ZAWALONKA
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
Mr. T. STROJWAS
Mr. G. CZEMPINSKI

Romania:

Mr. T. MELESCANU
Mr. L. TOADER

Sri Lanka:

Mr. H.M.G.S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden:

Mr. C.M. HYLTIENIUS
Mr. H. BERGLUND
Mr. J. LUNDIN
Mrs. I. SUNDBERG

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. V.F. PRIAKHIN
Mr. G.N. VASHADZE
Mr. V.A. EVDOKOUSHIN

United Kingdom

Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE
Mr. B.P. NOBLE
Mrs. J.I. LINK
Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. L. FIELDS
Mr. M. BUSBY
Mr. P. CORDEN
Mr. W. HECKROTTE
Mr. R.L. HORNE
Mr. R. MIKULAK
Mr. J. HOGAN
Mr. J. MARTIN
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER

Venezuela:

Mr. A. LOPEZ OLIVER
Mr. T. LABRADOR RUBIO

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire:

Mrs. ESAKI-EKANGA KABEYA

NON-MEMBER STATES

Viet Nam:

Mr. NGUYEN THUONG

Secretary of the Committee on
Disarmament and Personal
Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN: I declare open the 213th plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Committee starts today its consideration of item 7 of its agenda, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". As usual, members of the Committee wishing to do so may make statements on any other subject relevant to the work of the Committee.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, Sweden, Kenya, Algeria and Mongolia.

In accordance with the decision taken by the Committee at its 212th plenary meeting, I shall presently give the floor to the representative of Viet Nam, Ambassador Nguyen Thuong. But before we start the meeting may I, from the Chair, express my sympathy to the delegation of the United States of America, whose Mission in Beirut was the victim of an act of indiscriminate terrorism resulting in a heavy loss of life. I think we can all agree that such acts of terror are to be condemned and can in no way contribute to the pursuit of peace, a cause to which we, as diplomats, are all dedicated. May I also ask the distinguished representative of the United States to convey my condolences to the families of the victims of that attempt. May I now, in accordance with the decision taken at the 212th plenary meeting, invite the representative of Viet Nam, Ambassador Nguyen Thuong, to take the floor.

Mr. NGUYEN THUONG (Viet Nam) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to offer you my congratulations on your accession to the chairmanship of the Committee. I am certain that, thanks to your experience and your diplomatic skill, you will be able to guide the work of this Committee to the hoped-for results. I should also like to express my deep gratitude to the distinguished members of the Committee on Disarmament for granting me the possibility of speaking at this plenary meeting. For reasons which you know, my delegation was unfortunately deprived of that possibility during the years 1980-1982. Nevertheless, we have always followed with great interest the discussions taking place in this room and the multifaceted work of the Committee, which is of the utmost importance for peace and for the present and the future of all mankind.

The agenda of the Committee on Disarmament contains many important questions. However, as the countries of the non-aligned movement, of which Viet Nam has the honour to be an active member, stated at their last summit meeting, which was held in New Delhi: "... while nuclear disarmament has the highest priority, efforts should be made to conclude without further delay a treaty banning chemical weapons". Viet Nam is convinced that the question of the prevention of a nuclear war is at the centre of the work of this important multilateral negotiating body: it is clearly the most urgent of all the world problems of the present time, a problem common to all peoples regardless of differences of social systems, way of life or ideology. All States Members of the United Nations ought to respond to the appeal of the United Nations General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament and take, as soon as possible, adequate measures for the prevention of war, and in particular nuclear war, thereby safeguarding from that danger the very existence of mankind. The Committee on Disarmament ought to spare no effort to reach an agreement on the practical measures to be taken towards that end.

At the same time, the Committee also has before it a question to which the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, like all the non-aligned countries and many other countries, pays very close and sustained attention, namely, the question of the

(Mr. Nguyen Thuong, Viet Nam)

prohibition of chemical weapons. No other people in the world in recent decades has suffered as much as the people of Viet Nam the horrible and lasting consequences of the use of toxic chemical substances in war. This barbarous weapon of mass extermination ought to be prohibited as soon as possible.

In connection with this urgent need for a strict prohibition of chemical weapons, I feel it to be my duty, as the representative of the people of Viet Nam and of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to present to this Committee in this statement some additional information concerning Viet Nam's experience, which is still continuing, of the long-term consequences of the massive and repeated use of chemical substances in the war in Viet Nam during the years 1961 to 1971. I am doing so in the fervent hope that after hearing me the Committee and the countries represented here will be even more determined to spare no effort to accelerate the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons, so that the tragedy which struck my country may never be repeated anywhere, against any people.

As you know, an International Symposium on Herbicides and Defoliants in War: The Long-Term Effects on Man and Nature, was held in Ho Chi Minh City at the beginning of this year. The symposium dealt with a subject which is far from being an outmoded theoretical exercise. The emotion caused in recent months in many European countries by the transfer of toxic wastes from the Seveso factory, and the apprehensions of countless veterans of the Indo-Chinese war in America and Australia are evidence of the present-day relevance of the problem. The Ho Chi Minh City symposium was attended by more than 160 scientists and experts, nearly half of whom came from 21 foreign countries, including the United States of America, Canada, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Sweden, India, the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Mongolia, to mention only those countries that are members of this Committee, and in one week the participants heard 72 scientific reports and papers and held very frank exchanges of views, both at plenary meetings and in working groups the rapporteurs of which were all well-known foreign scientists, American, English and Dutch. The symposium was strictly a working conference of scientists whose object was not only to make an objective assessment of existing scientific information but also to identify and encourage the research-work needed and to promote international co-operation to that end. The final summary report of the symposium, which was adopted unanimously, was put before the Committee on 21 February 1983, and shortly thereafter, in order to take advantage of the presence in Geneva of a well-known scientist from my country, Professor Dr. Ton Duc Lang, a meeting was arranged between him and the experts in this Committee, during which he presented additional information on the results of the symposium. In that connection, I should like to say that we are very grateful to the delegations which took part in that meeting, and we should also like to thank the secretariat of the Committee for its help in organizing the meeting.

As was indicated at the symposium, various compounds of toxic chemical substances were used in Viet Nam, including in particular dioxin, a substance known for its great toxicity. The total quantity of all these herbicides and defoliants used against my country is estimated by different scientific authorities at some 100,000 tons. According to the United States biologist, Arthur H. Westing, this total included 57,000 tons of the famous agent orange, containing up to 170 kg of the terrible dioxin. Other authorities even put forward the figure of 500 kg.

(Mr. Nguyen Thuong, Viet Nam)

These toxic chemical products which were sprayed on a vast scale, in strong concentrations and in large quantities, have caused serious damage to the environment of South Viet Nam: 43 per cent of the forests were destroyed, including 70 per cent of the coconut groves and 150,000 hectares of tropical forests, and 13 per cent of the agricultural land, which it has not yet been possible to restore in spite of the passage of 10 years. Ecological systems were seriously damaged. The systematic sprayings over vast areas of South Viet Nam totally or in large part destroyed extensive areas of forests in the provinces of Tien Giang, Ben Tre, Cau Long, Hau Giang and Minh Hai and in the environs of Ho Chi Minh City. This fact was already noted in 1974 by a group of American scientists from the Academy of Sciences who considered that, as a result of the extensive damage caused to the forests, the process of natural recovery could take 100 years and even more in certain regions.

The massive and repeated sprayings over large areas changed the structure of the soil, reduced its fertility and caused a decline in agricultural production, aggravating the difficulties of feeding the population. Many areas, such as the valley of A Sau, formerly populated with an abundant and varied fauna and covered with rich forests and other useful vegetation, were transformed into infertile savannahs covered with wild grasses and secondary vegetation of little economic value, as a result of which many species of animals, both large and small have completely disappeared and there remain only hordes of small rodents, which are disease-carriers.

Thus, the tropical forests in the areas heavily sprayed with herbicides are on the point of disappearing. The destruction of foliage, the considerable reduction in the country's forest areas and the contamination of the soil have caused changes in the water run-off system, aggravating further the periods of flood and drought.

Considerable damage, difficult to remedy, has also been caused to the river, maritime and coastal ecological systems. Certain types of aquatic animals have disappeared and reserves of sea and river fish have been considerably reduced.

As a result of all these harmful effects of toxic substances on nature, Viet Nam is at present confronted with an extremely difficult task, that is, how to restore the fertility of the soils and transform these dead savannahs into crop-growing areas or to repopulate them with animal species and useful plants.

The famous operation known as the chemical clean-up of the jungle, through the use of herbicides containing a high proportion of dioxin, also had harmful effects, which are still continuing, on the health of the Vietnamese people: 2 million Vietnamese have been victims, of whom 3,500 have died and the rest are still today suffering their consequences. Professor Ton Duc Lang gave a scientifically detailed report on this subject during his meeting with the distinguished experts from delegations; I shall therefore be brief in this connection.

Numerous investigations and tests by Vietnamese scientists confirm that the massive use of these toxic substances containing dioxin has had extremely harmful

(Mr. Nguyen Thuong, Viet Nam)

effects on the genes of the population inhabiting the regions concerned, including the children born there. Even a number of years after contamination, genetic aberrations and abnormalities have been found among the victims.

At the Symposium, 12 reports were submitted giving strong evidence of a direct link between the use of chemical substances and the increased number of congenital abnormalities, monstrosities and malformations among children born in the areas that were sprayed with such substances.

Thus investigations in the province of Ben Tre, which was subjected to massive and repeated sprayings, show that in comparison with the pre-war years, the number of extra-uterine pregnancies has increased six to eight times, the number of sterile marriages eight times, and the number of congenital abnormalities and monsters among new-born children 10-15 times. These are terrible figures.

In the opinion of our experts, the use of chemical substances has also caused an increase in the frequency of cases of cancer of the liver. In a Hanoi hospital it has been noted that between the period 1955-1961 and the period 1962-1968, the incidence of cancer of the liver among persons subjected to those sprayings increased from 2.89 per cent to 9.07 per cent. Furthermore, many statistical investigations carried out in different countries have shown the carcinogenic effect of dioxin in minute doses (in particular the work done on behalf of the Dow Chemical Company and the work of the cancer research group of the Environmental Protection Agency). Studies made in recent years in Viet Nam have also shown that the incidence of primary cancer of the liver among subjects exposed to sprayings with defoliants is five times higher than among subjects not so exposed.

These facts represent only a small part of the information contained in the reports submitted at the Ho Chi Minh City Symposium. While further research is still needed on certain aspects, at the conclusion of the Symposium everyone was agreed that the use of herbicides and defoliants in the Vietnamese war had resulted in grave and harmful long-term consequences for man, nature and the economy of Viet Nam. Professor Arthur W. Galston of the United States said so as long ago as on 9 February 1977 at a Congressional hearing, when he stated that he was convinced that the destructive effects of toxic chemical products on Viet Nam, including the environment and the country's entire civilization, were unforeseeable.

The International Symposium held at Ho Chi Minh City, nearly half of the participants in which came from foreign countries, in its conclusions appealed to the international community to take urgent measures to help the Vietnamese people to eliminate the terrible consequences of the use in war of herbicides and defoliants. We believe that we can count on international co-operation in the solution of this problem, a very difficult one and extremely costly in material and financial resources, clearly far beyond the possibilities of our country. We believe that this will be for the benefit both of the Vietnamese people and of mankind as a whole.

(Mr. Nguyen Thuong, Viet Nam)

To come now to the work of the Committee on Disarmament, I should like to emphasize how much these preliminary results of the Symposium underline the importance and urgency of finding a successful solution to the problems posed in this sphere of chemical weapons.

It seems to me that at the present time a sound basis exists for the speedy drafting of a convention prohibiting chemical weapons: a number of important documents and concrete and practical proposals have been submitted, including in particular the document entitled "Basic provisions of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction", presented by the Soviet Union, a document rich in constructive ideas for solutions to the specific problems connected with the prohibition of such weapons. Many countries among the Group of 21 have also put forward useful ideas.

Allow me, on the basis of the results of the Symposium, to put certain thoughts before the Committee. In my view, the prohibition of chemical weapons should be universal; each State party to the convention should undertake never and in no circumstances to develop, produce, acquire in any way, retain, transfer or use chemical weapons, and to destroy its stocks of them or redirect them into authorized purposes as well as to destroy or dismantle facilities for the production of chemical weapons.

As regards the question of what chemical substances should be prohibited, my delegation considers that the future convention should prohibit all chemical substances for purposes of war without, however, placing unnecessary difficulties in the way of the development of the chemical industry for peaceful purposes.

Certainly, the future convention ought to contain provisions giving an assurance of its strict application. As regards the question of what specific methods of verification should be used with respect to the various aspects of the activities prohibited, my delegation is of the view that verification measures should be effective but should not be such as to lead to interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States or the creation of obstacles to the development of the chemical industry for peaceful purposes; in other words, they should be very carefully thought out from every point of view. Thus what is needed is a rational and effective combination of national and international means of verification.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that all the States members of the Committee on Disarmament, through their distinguished representatives here present, will make greater efforts in order to complete as soon as possible the elaboration of an international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, which is urgently called for both by the lesson of the tragedy of the Vietnamese people and by the interests of all mankind.

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, for its part, would like to be able to take a more active part in the drafting of this future convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. We could thus make available to the Committee the knowledge we have acquired and the results of the research being carried out by our Vietnamese experts, among others, on the basis of the experience suffered by the Vietnamese people, the harmful consequences of which are still being felt even today in the lives of our people.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair thanks Ambassador Nguyen Thuong for his contribution and for the kind words addressed to the Committee and to the secretariat. The next speaker on my list is the distinguished delegate of Sweden, Mr. Hyltenius, to whom I now give the floor.

Mr. HYLTIENIUS (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, the agenda of this Committee may be seen as a reflection of the most urgent problems in the field of disarmament. It contains a number of items which have been with us for many years and which still await a solution. It would seem that the longer an item has to wait for real negotiations the harder it is to come to grips with it. Few would deny that the technical problems and complexities of disarmament questions have become greater over the years.

It is against this background that one should see the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Today I shall devote my statement to that item. It has been referred to the Committee on Disarmament by overwhelming majorities in the United Nations General Assembly. The support for the request to the Committee on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc working group to deal with this matter comes from all political quarters. It was, furthermore, clear at the UNISPACE Conference last summer that the question of the increasing militarization of outer space was a major concern for the participating countries. This was clearly expressed in the final report of the Conference, in which it was recommended that this Committee give high priority to this grave concern.

The Committee on Disarmament should take concrete action on this item in accordance with the relevant General Assembly resolutions and with the Committee's role as the single multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament.

It is in the interest of maintaining stability and preventing the unleashing of another round of the arms race that the Swedish delegation urges that an ad hoc working group be established without delay. We cannot accept the assertion that negotiations on this matter would be to the disadvantage of any country. On the contrary, we are convinced that further delays will complicate an already very complex problem to the disadvantage of us all.

The 1967 Outer Space Treaty prohibits the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the earth and the stationing of such weapons in outer space or on celestial bodies. Several other treaties limit or prohibit various other military uses of outer space, for instance, the 1963 Partial Test-Ban Treaty, the SALT I Agreement and the ABM Treaty. Nevertheless, it is obvious that a number of conceivable

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

military uses of outer space, which are likely to have destabilizing or otherwise threatening effects, are not covered by existing international legal instruments. There is, therefore, a need to identify areas and activities which so far have not been covered, in order to consider to what extent there exists a need for international agreements aiming at the prevention of undesirable developments in this field.

There is, in the opinion of the Swedish delegation, still a good chance to tackle these problems, but time is quickly running out. Rapid technological developments do not wait. As in so many areas, disarmament negotiations are likely to become more complicated for every lost month. Action must be taken before financial and political investments in new weapons systems become so important that the process becomes irreversible.

It is an understatement to say that the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space is a complex one. Apart from the many technical intricacies, there are the problems of distinguishing between civilian and military applications and between the stabilizing and destabilizing effects of various military space functions.

Another dimension is the distinction between whether a spacecraft is geared to "active" or "passive" military use. So-called "killer satellites" and space-based ABM or BMD systems are examples of devices which are designed actively to interfere with the adversary's military capabilities.

Obviously there are important military applications of space technology which contribute to a more stable military balance and a lower risk of war, in particular between the two major alliances. I have in mind, for example, military satellites, which are used to provide early warning of missile launches, and satellites for verification of arms control agreements and for fast and reliable communications. There are, however, certain developments which give cause for particular concern. One such trend is that of efforts to acquire or improve the capability to destroy one another's satellites. Another concern is that an increased launching capacity, for instance in the form of re-usable space vehicles, may also be used for the further militarization of outer space.

As the military balance is becoming increasingly dependent on satellites for communications, command, control and intelligence, the ability of such functions to survive is also becoming increasingly threatened by the development of anti-satellite weapons systems. The Soviet Union has launched a number of interceptor/destroyer satellites during the last several years and, in earlier years, also fractional orbital bombardment systems (FOBS), and the United States is planning to begin operational testing of its ASAT system in 1983. Moreover, both Superpowers are investigating the possibility of using high-energy laser and particle beams for ASAT applications.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

I have already mentioned the problem of lacunae in existing international agreements regarding the prohibition of military uses of outer space. It seems natural that one of the first tasks of an ad hoc working group in the Committee on Disarmament should be to analyse such gaps in present treaties against the background of existing and conceivable military applications of space technology. The next step may be to determine which of the space systems or activities should be prohibited or subject to regulations. It would seem natural to the Swedish delegation that, for example, anti-satellite weapons systems should be banned. Perhaps, as a complement to such a prohibition, in order to exclude the possibility of the military use of otherwise legitimate civilian space vehicles, it might also be desirable to ban certain activities, for example, the destruction of satellites of other countries. We have noted with interest what the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, Mr. van den Broek, said in this context in his statement in this Committee on 29 March, and we will carefully consider it.

My delegation has taken note with great interest of the Soviet draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. However, the draft gives rise to some important questions, such as, for instance, how to define the concept of "weapon" in this context. This issue would obviously have to be tackled at an early stage.

As is well known, many satellites form integral parts of weapons systems which are not themselves stationed in outer space. Perhaps, for practical reasons, we may have to focus on such systems or "weapons" as are intended for warfare exclusively in outer space. Such weapons, as we know them today, are based on the earth. The discussion must, therefore, encompass all weapons which are meant to be used in outer space and not only those which are stationed there.

As long as the leading military powers build their security on a precarious nuclear balance and hold the rest of the world hostage, it is vitally important that nothing should upset this balance. The peoples of the world demand serious disarmament proposals from the Superpowers in order to reach a balance at lower levels of armaments. Instead we have learned with grave concern that the United States plans to embark upon a research and development programme with the ultimate goal of obtaining the capability of destroying ballistic missiles launched by the adversary. The only safe way of avoiding the nuclear threat is to abolish the nuclear weapons. To develop and deploy weapons for the purpose of obtaining the capability of destroying the adversary's strategic missiles while keeping one's own strike capability intact, would create a dangerously unstable situation. This would be the case at least as long as only one party has such a capability. It should also be

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

noted in this context that such a major undertaking would entail the spending of enormous funds and a waste of precious scientific resources. The initiation of such a research and development process will be destabilizing in itself and increase the level of nervousness and tension. It would also initiate research for similar weapons in other States and lead to countermeasures, and hence give rise to a new cycle in the senseless arms race.

The SALT I and II agreements between the Superpowers acknowledged the right of the parties to use national technical means to verify compliance with their provisions. In addition the Soviet draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space refers exclusively to national technical means of verification. However, it is hardly likely that such a limitation would be accepted by the international community. If a treaty on the prevention of an arms race in outer space is to stand a chance of being universally adhered to, it must have a system of international verification. A first step in this direction was taken by France in advancing the idea of an international satellite monitoring agency. This is a matter of principle to many countries. Moreover, it must also be realized that the present virtual duopoly of the two Superpowers in this technology is about to be broken.

The further development of anti-satellite weapons is a most threatening perspective. The Swedish Government, therefore, attaches great importance to the early initiation of negotiations with a view to prohibiting the establishment of such systems and the dismantling of existing ones in order to preclude such a new phase of the arms race. We cannot share the view that if one of the Superpowers has acquired a certain lead in one area, the other should be entitled to catch up before any negotiations can be embarked upon in that field. The experiences so far of "the bargaining from strength" philosophy are anything but encouraging. My Government acknowledges the need for an over-all balance in the military field, but that balance must be sought and achieved at lower and not higher levels of armaments. If one Power or a few Powers have achieved a certain capability, which may become threatening to others, negotiations should start without delay in order to do away with such unilateral advantages. As we all know, experience shows that once a new military technology has become established, the temptation to exploit it in

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

the form of the production and deployment of new weapons in most cases becomes irresistible. The case of anti-satellite weapons is not likely to be any exception.

Although there is clearly a need for multilateral negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, this, of course, does not exclude the possibility of the two leading space Powers negotiating between them on matters of particular bilateral interest in this field. This view is consistent with the opinion my delegation and many others have expressed regarding other disarmament questions also, such as a nuclear test ban and the prohibition of chemical weapons. Sweden, therefore strongly urges the United States and the Soviet Union to resume their bilateral talks with a view to finding solutions to some of the most pressing problems in the field of space warfare, notably the prevention of anti-satellite warfare.

Sweden was able to co-sponsor both General Assembly resolutions last autumn on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Resolution 37/83, submitted by non-aligned and socialist countries, contained, inter alia, a clear request for the establishment of an ad hoc working group in the Committee on Disarmament with the task of opening multilateral negotiations on this item. This is important. Negotiations must no longer be delayed. Resolution 37/99 D, adopted on the initiative of western countries, put special emphasis on the need to tackle the problem of an emerging race in anti-satellite weapons. This seems to us to be the most immediate concern. Both resolutions, therefore, had merits which we considered important. The distinguished Ambassador of Sri Lanka, in his statement of 14 April, made a clear presentation of the possible approaches to the decision now facing the Committee on this matter. As far as the Swedish delegation is concerned, it is flexible on the organization of a forthcoming negotiation within an ad hoc working group in this Committee. A constructive proposal regarding the establishment of such a working group has been made in document CD/329, submitted by the Group of 21.

Security is basically a political concept. Security problems must, therefore, be solved not by increased armaments or confrontation between adversaries but in co-operation and negotiations between parties for their mutual advantage and our common security. Time is getting short, but it is still possible to prevent an arms race in outer space if negotiations start now. If this fails, all countries will suffer. All countries thus have a legitimate interest in this matter. An overwhelming majority among them demand negotiations in this Committee before it is too late. Such a demand must not pass unheeded.

Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, it would not be an understatement to say that the words "peace" and "security" have the widest usage in contemporary inter-State relations. And yet the principles which should govern peaceful relations among nations enjoy the widest disregard, the widest violation within the community of nations. The talk about disarmament and international security is not novel either, but one wonders whether and where a line can be drawn in reality between disarmament and international security on the one hand, and armament and international insecurity on the other!

On several occasions already, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, has expressed his serious concern about the paying of lip-service to issues of the greatest importance to the survival of mankind. In the statement he delivered to this Committee on 15 February last, for instance, the Secretary-General re-emphasized the point he had made in his first annual report dated 7 September 1982, namely, that the escalation in the arms race was and is guaranteed by the lack of a credible and effective system of international peace and security. What was essential, he stressed, was "to find ways to enhance the collective security machinery afforded by the United Nations Charter and by the Security Council in particular". We could not agree more with the Secretary-General. The fact is that the League of Nations had to collapse the way it did precisely because it had not been founded on a sound and solid system of collective security. Any architect who starts with, and aims at, constructing what he believes to be a strong and durable roof for a house but neglects to lay the required solid foundation for it engages in a futile construction exercise. No wonder, then, that the Second World War, like the First World War before it, could not be prevented.

Most regrettably, the United Nations, like the League of Nations before it, also lacks an effective collective system of international security. No wonder, then, that the United Nations has not succeeded in its primary responsibility of preventing all kinds of war and assuring enduring peace and security. As Keeper of the Peace, the United Nations is still to evolve an effective machinery for the peaceful resolution of international disputes and for the effective governance of the behaviour of sovereign States in their relations with one another. The structure and system of the United Nations are such that only some of its Members bear the primary task of maintaining international peace and security. The argument, then, that the United Nations has failed as Keeper of the Peace because of the behaviour of certain of its Members, who have not discharged their responsibilities the way they should, is not only logical; it is indeed sound and credible.

In short, the system of international peace and security envisaged in the United Nations Charter has not been fully and successfully applied primarily because the provisions of the Charter have not been strictly adhered to. Thus, as it has been argued time and again, the Second World War resulted from the lack of a system capable of ensuring lasting peace and security. We, like the other Members of the international community, are charged with the responsibility of making the system work and thereby preventing a third world war from erupting. The First World War was a European war and we all know the reasons that led to it. The Second World War was broader in character and scope than World War I, but the main war stage still remained Europe, and we all know the reasons that led to that war. But we all know that a third world war would not be limited to one region. We all know that the battleground for such a war would be every inch of our earth, and its victims would be mankind itself. We all know that World War III would not only result from "grave reasons"; it would not only result from politico-military and security reasons. Such a war would result from a combination of factors, a combination of reasons, some of which would be simple and honest mistakes; others would even be irrational, trivial and ridiculous, such as mere suspicion and mistrust; mere miscalculation among the supposed custodians of world peace and security; mere misuse of scientific and technological achievements of our day, and the mere arrogance of power by certain States members of the international community, and of course, the resulting arms race and violations of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

Other factors and reasons of a more serious nature from which a new world war could result would certainly include the existing economic imbalances and inequities between the rich and the poor; between armament and underdevelopment; between the "haves" and the "have-nots" of the North and South; between the evolutionary and the revolutionary; and, of course, the East-West conflict in the third world -- the sole battleground for all the 140 or so armed conflicts and wars which have occurred since the end of the Second World War.

Dag Hammarskjöld was right when he expressed his strong conviction that a third world war could very easily have started in the Congo, now Zaire, in 1960. One thing is certain, however, and is universally recognized: World War II was fought for six years; World War III would last for less than six days, and it would annihilate the greatest and most precious gift of all time -- our very life!

If, then, one talks about the relationship among disarmament, development and international security, what exactly does one mean? Well, the answer to this question is necessarily complex because the question itself is a complex one. First, we must establish what these expressions actually mean. What is disarmament? What is development? What do we mean by "security" or "national interests"?

In my intervention of 14 April 1983, I dwelt at length on the close interconnection that exists between disarmament and development. Today, I wish to address myself to the question of the international system of security and how it is closely interconnected with the questions of disarmament and development. These interconnections are better described as a "triangular relationship".

For all practical purposes, disarmament is the process of reduction in the size of, and expenditures on, armed forces; of the destruction or dismantling of weapons, whether deployed or stockpiled; of the progressive elimination of the capacity to produce new weapons, and of the release and integration into civilian life of military personnel. The ultimate objective in this process is, of course, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Development is, on the other hand, a multidimensional process involving the reorganization and reorientation of entire economic and social systems. It aims at attaining improvements in incomes and output. It involves radical changes in social, institutional and administrative structures, as well as in popular attitudes and even in customs and beliefs. It also aims at the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality (in the distribution of income and wealth as well as of status and power), and the eradication of absolute poverty. Poverty is part of inequality because poverty and wealth are the two extreme positions of income distribution in society. And as I have said before, no contemporary society, irrespective of its economic development, social situation, political system, or anything else, is free of inequality.

My understanding of "national interest" is that it is whatever a nation feels to be essential to its security and well-being. National interests are thus national goals, the first among them being the maintenance and protection of national security.

National security refers, as we all know, both to physical and to psychological security, which security may be subject to threats, both internal and external. The constituent elements of national security include: the promotion and maintenance of national economic and social welfare, the preservation of national health and safety; the promotion and maintenance of national integrity, national independence and the liberty of peoples to choose their own economic and political destiny and their cultures, and to exist with others; freedom from the fact and menace of military attack and freedom from the fact of menace.

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

Thus, for any system of international security to be viable, it must recognize, and adhere to the aforementioned constituent elements of national security. It must also recognize and respect the right of all to exist in freedom and stability, justice and equity, and in safety. Genuine and lasting international peace and security thus essentially means equitable socio-economic development and survival, as well as recognition of the multidimensional interdependence which must exist between and among nations. This fact was recognized by the international community when it agreed to the following paragraph in the Second United Nations Development Strategy for the 1970s:

"(6) In the conviction that development is the essential path to peace and justice, Governments reaffirm their common and unswerving resolve to seek a better and more effective system of international co-operation whereby the prevailing disparities in the world may be banished and prosperity secured for all."

In summary, then, disarmament is a means to an end, the end being lasting world peace and security; but disarmament must be attained first and disarmament will never be an effective vehicle to that end unless the unavoidable triangular relationship existing among disarmament, development and security, i.e. survival, is fully and unreservedly recognized and promoted by all. Disarmament must also be recognized as a vehicle for attaining the New International Economic Order, since the latter is the instrument whose main objective is to bring about structural changes in inter-State relations, with a view to eliminating the inequities existing in the current international economic relations. Continued disagreement on disarmament, as indeed on development issues, can only intensify the arms race and the conflicts so dominant these days in inter-State relations, and thereby render impossible the attainment not only of the New International Economic Order, but in particular of a lasting world peace and security.

Development is a process which entails social and economic changes in society, and the ultimate goal of development is to attain justice through an improvement in the quality of life for all; the provision of the basic material requirements for a productive and dignified existence for all; and the granting to everyone of equal opportunities fully and effectively to participate in the economic and social progress and to share in its benefits. Development is, hence, by definition, a global necessity and possession unlimited to any region or some regions of the world. Development of the poorer countries of the South, through disarmament, will certainly bring benefits to the North as well, whereas an arms escalation will bring social misery to all nations and peoples. Development represents the entire gamut of changes by which an entire social system, tuned to the diverse basic needs and desires of individuals and social groups within that system, moves away from a condition of life widely perceived as unsatisfactory, and towards a situation or condition of life regarded as materially and spiritually "better".

What, then, must be done to attain, promote and maintain an enduring system of international peace and security? What sacrifices must be made for this cause? There is a lot that can and must be done to attain this goal. We need, all of us, first and foremost, to develop a sense of genuine belonging to the disarmament process; a sense of duty to this process; a sense of commitment to disarmament negotiations; a sense of urgency in the disarmament process; a sense of hatred for the arms race, and a sense of survival through disarmament. We need, all of us, to recognize the close relationship existing between disarmament, development and survival. We need to abide strictly by the United Nations Charter provisions. No system of durable international peace and security is possible without the genuine co-operation in the establishment of such a system and the positive involvement of the United States and the USSR and their respective military alliances. Of the 50,000 or so nuclear weapons existing in the world today, 95 per cent belong to the United States and the USSR. These weapons have the power of some 1 million Hiroshima

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

bombs. Ten thousand of these are deployed for use in Europe. Sixteen thousand of them are strategic, capable of crossing the globe in only 30 minutes and landing within a few hundred yards of their intended targets. Of course, all the facts are not easy to determine, because they are not freely accessible. But we know what the consequences would be, if an accident, or a miscalculation, or even a deliberate pressing of the war button were to occur in the nuclear field.

Thus, no system of world peace and security can last for long if it does not recognize the important role which disarmament must play as the fundamental means to over-all human survival, and if the super Powers and the other militarily significant Powers refuse to undertake serious and genuine negotiations leading to the conclusion, as soon as possible, of binding international legal instruments in the field of disarmament. The "linkage" approach, whereby progress on one disarmament aspect, for example in a limited forum, is conditioned by the results of the talks on another aspect of the disarmament process, has so far proved to be very obstructive to progress in general. The terms of reference of the various negotiating forums should provide the sole necessary guidelines for such negotiations.

Our talk about security should not be limited to the military aspects of security. The fact is that military aspects are but a small fraction of over-all security. As I have stated before, no arms escalation can or will ever lead to genuine and enduring security. The non-military aspects of security entail the provision of the basic conditions for peaceful relations between and among States: global co-operation leads to global economic stability and welfare and that means global security; global equitable distribution of resources, and global co-operation on safeguarding the environment. We cannot afford to ignore all these factors.

Perhaps there is no better measure in the global quest for peace than through the enhancing of the effectiveness of the United Nations as Keeper of the Peace. It has been estimated that more than 120 wars were fought in 71 States between 1945 and 1971 and that since the Second World War, 30 million or so people have died in armed conflicts, and all this during the time that the United Nations has existed as a political organization charged with the primary responsibility of keeping the peace. Making the United Nations effective essentially means stopping all wars and conflicts from occurring. It means enforcing and applying the original security role given to the United Nations in Chapter VII of its Charter, under which the United Nations must take action with respect to "any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression". It means applying the "enforcement" provisions of Articles 12, 26 and 39-51 of the United Nations Charter, which require the Security Council to take action.

Enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations as Keeper of the Peace also means that the General Assembly must be given and must play an increasing role in the maintenance of international peace and security as envisaged in Article 11 of the Charter, and in numerous resolutions of the General Assembly. Let me refer to only three of them. In its resolution 290(IV), adopted in 1949, and entitled, "Essentials of peace", the General Assembly stated that disregard of the Principles of the Charter of the United Nations "is primarily responsible for the continuance of international tension ...".

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

In its resolution 380(V), adopted at its 308th plenary meeting on 17 November 1950, and entitled, "Peace through deeds", the General Assembly declared that all goals for lasting peace and security were attainable, provided all Governments and members of the United Nations strictly observe their obligations under the Charter, and demonstrate by their deeds their will to achieve peace. In the same resolution also, the General Assembly reaffirmed that, whatever the weapons used, any aggression, whether committed openly, or by fomenting civil strife in the interest of a foreign Power, or otherwise, "is the greatest of all crimes against peace and security throughout the world".

Of particular importance, and relevant to my argument for enhancing the role of the United Nations in keeping the peace, is resolution 377(V), adopted by the General Assembly at its 302nd plenary meeting on 3 November 1950, and entitled "Uniting for peace". We all know the circumstances that led to the adoption of that resolution. Many have argued that the United Nations Security Council lacks the power to act, that it lacks the teeth to bite with, or even gnaw wars and conflicts in the world, precisely because of the use of the veto. The "Uniting for peace" resolution was thus designed to enable the United Nations to act by getting around the stultification of the veto power. The relevant paragraph of the resolution provides that:

"The General Assembly, ...

A.

1. Resolves that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace or security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within twenty-four hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the Members of the United Nations;".

This is one of the most meaningful resolutions the General Assembly has ever adopted. The misuse and abuse of the veto power has grown with time. The right application of the "Uniting for peace" resolution would contribute to the enhancement of the effectiveness of the United Nations in its peace-keeping duties. Similarly, the original mandate of the Military Staff Committee should be restored, and the Committee's role in the maintenance of international peace and security, as envisaged in Articles 26 and 47 of the Charter, should be enhanced. Unless, therefore, the United Nations is given the central authority of deterring conflicts and wars through the enforcement of the Charter provisions, the achievement of a viable system of international peace and security will continue to be remote. Many good resolutions have been adopted, and good statements delivered on the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument of peace. The problem, however, has been in their application.

In June 1963, for instance, President John F. Kennedy had the following to say about the United Nations at the American University in Washington, D.C.:

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

"We seek to strengthen the United Nations, to help solve its financial problems, to make it a more effective instrument of peace, to develop it into a genuine world security system ... capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law, of insuring the security of the large and the small, of creating conditions under which arms can finally be abolished ... This will require a new effort to achieve world law ...".

President Kennedy had been even more explicit in his belief and trust in the United Nations, when he delivered his inaugural address in January 1961. He said:

"To that world assembly of sovereign States, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support -- to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective -- to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak -- and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run ...

So let us begin anew -- remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belabouring those problems which divide us. Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms -- and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations ...

And if the beachhead of co-operation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in a new endeavour, creating, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved. In your hand, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course".

That was a mighty statement, and President Kennedy must be very uncomfortable in his grave with the present performance of "that world assembly of sovereign States", as keeper of world peace and security.

The talk about disarmament, development and international security is incomplete if it does not include the role of the non-aligned movement in that triangular relationship. As I have indicated on other occasions, neo-colonialism and neo-imperialism have always attributed the existence of "underdevelopment" and the dependence of the South primarily to the historical evolution of a highly unequal international capitalist system of poor country-rich country relationships. The co-existence of the rich and poor nations in an international system dominated by such unequal power relationships between the rich and the poor renders all efforts by the poor nations to be self-reliant and independent in their development efforts not only difficult but almost impossible.

The non-aligned movement is 22 years old. But at its first summit meeting held in Belgrade in 1961, the movement declared, inter alia, that:

"War has never threatened mankind with greater consequences than today. On the other hand, never before has mankind had at its disposal stronger forces for eliminating war as an instrument of policy in international relations".

Thus, from its very inception, the non-aligned movement did see a clear relationship between disarmament and international security on the one hand, and between these and socio-economic development on the other. The Belgrade declaration stressed the top priority the movement attached, as it is now, to the necessity of preventing nuclear war, and the arms race in general. By deciding to send an official

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

representation to the capitals of the Superpowers -- Moscow and Washington, D.C. -- to urge them to cease nuclear testing, the non-aligned movement thus took the first step ever towards a world-wide nuclear disarmament. The movement's very birth was, in fact, a rebellion against the arms race instituted by the world war in East-West relations.

Already in 1940, Jawaharlal Nehru talked about complete disarmament and its relationship to development and international security. He said, inter alia: "Disarmament ultimately depends on far-reaching changes in the political and economic structure of the world leading to a removal of the basic causes of war". Nehru continued with his tireless campaign for peace throughout the 1950s. In 1954, for instance, he wrote in National Herald about the arms race which he described as "the way to madness, and the great men who contest our destinies are dangerous self-centred lunatics, who ... will rather rain death and destruction all over the world than give up their petty opinions and think and act aright ... Peace and co-operation and well-being for all the peoples of the world were well within grasp. But the gods perhaps envied the lot of man and drove him mad ...". Thus, the topic of disarmament has been on the agenda of practically every non-aligned summit meeting since the birth of the movement. And we are all familiar with the pronouncements on this subject of the recently concluded seventh non-aligned summit meeting.

The third world is right to be articulate on the question of disarmament because the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the very survival of mankind so require, and because, as is very well known, the third world has been the battleground of all wars waged since 1945. We all have a stake in disarmament and common security entails collective responsibility.

From the foregoing, it is evident that security cannot be guaranteed either by the use of force or by military preparedness. Security can never and will never be bought by military hardware, by billions of dollars, or by mere advanced technological attainment. The very notion of security means that excessive and extravagant military spending is not only a waste of scarce resources in the midst of an ever-deteriorating global economic crisis -- resources which are so very badly needed for productive social and economic purposes -- but such spending merely enhances insecurity, and all the chances of war. And this is the paradox, years ago, military spending on armaments was much less than it is today; and yet the world was a safer place to live in. Now, military expenditures have reached insane proportions, and yet the world is a much more dangerous place to live in than it was then!

Let us, then, all work for the translation of the Final Document provisions into concrete action. Let us all work for the progressive strengthening of the peace-keeping role and machinery of the United Nations. Let us all work for the removal of local and global tensions in relations among nations. Let us all work for the eradication of poverty and deprivation, and inequality and hunger and malnutrition and ill-health, and under-development. Let us all work for the establishment of national and regional security arrangements and assurances; for the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones. Let us all work for the political and economic security of every nation. Let us all work for our common survival in dignity through our common disarmament, our common development, and our common security. Permit me now, Mr. Chairman, to express the deep and sincere gratitude of my delegation to Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal, the distinguished Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament, for the constant assistance and advice he has given us during our deliberations. And I would also like to express my appreciation to his deputy, Mr. Berasategui, and all the other members of the secretariat for the great devotion and patience which they have demonstrated in rendering services to this Committee. My delegation is fully appreciative of all these valuable services. I also wish to thank the interpreters, the engineers and everybody else who has participated in the provision of valuable services to us. I want them all to know that we do not at all forget what they are doing; we do not take for granted what they are doing. We value their services very much.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman thanks Mr. Don Nanjira for his statement, for his kind words addressed to the Chair and for his very generous words of thanks to the secretariat, the interpreters, the technicians and all members of the staff servicing this Committee. May I now call upon the next speaker on the list, the distinguished representative of Algeria, Ambassador Oul Rouis. You have the floor, Sir.

Mr. OUL ROUIS (Algeria) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of this session the Algerian delegation has had the opportunity to express its views on the various items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament. I shall confine myself today to offering some comments on the subject of item 7 of our agenda, namely, the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Recent years have been marked by the appearance of signs foreshadowing a new phase in the militarization of outer space.

The extension of the logic of conflict to outer space, now considered by the strategists of the major powers as a potential battlefield, could not but engender a race in the development of space weapon systems.

The current programmes of research and development relating to anti-satellite interceptor systems, laser weapons and particle-beam weapon systems are all part of this perpetual endeavour to secure military superiority.

The integration of outer space into the strategic concepts of the major powers greatly reduces the distance between the fictional "star wars" scenario and the sphere of reality.

These dangerous shifts further complicate the disarmament equation. There is no doubt that an arms race in outer space will have unforeseeable consequences for the security of the world, unless the international community, in a healthy reaction, succeeds in preserving outer space, and the peaceful activities for which it provides support, from the warlike antagonisms of the major powers.

This is still possible, for, unlike nuclear disarmament, where the goal is to eliminate weapons which unfortunately exist, it would seem that space weapons are not yet operational.

We therefore consider that it is neither naive nor idealistic to believe that there is still time to prevent the conversion of outer space into a future battlefield.

It is still possible, if the powers in question show political will and embark upon a process of negotiation with a view to the adoption of concrete measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

This task is urgent, for experience in disarmament matters shows that, once it has been started, the arms race in a given sphere develops in an action-reaction spiral and makes it all the more difficult to adopt measures to stop the escalation and reverse the trend.

The injunctions of the international community in favour of this objective are numerous.

Almost five years ago the General Assembly, meeting at its first special session devoted to disarmament, stated in its Programme of Action, which was adopted by consensus, that further measures should be taken and appropriate international negotiations held in order to prevent an arms race in outer space.

(Mr. Oul Rouis, Algeria)

In its resolutions 36/99 and 36/97 C, the General Assembly requested the Committee on Disarmament to undertake negotiations on this question. That request was, moreover, reiterated by the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, in its resolutions 37/83 and 37/99 D.

Speaking at the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, held at Vienna last August, the Secretary-General of the United Nations echoed the concerns of the international community in declaring that the growing militarization of outer space was alarming and inviting the forces of reason and peace to oppose what would be a dangerous escalation of the arms race.

The same Conference adopted by consensus a report which places the emphasis on the maintenance of peace and security in outer space, and in which it urgently recommends the competent bodies of the United Nations, and in particular the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament, to give this matter the requisite attention and high priority.

Apart from the fact that it runs counter to the efforts being made by the international community to put an end to the arms race and to prevent nuclear war, the extension of the arms race to outer space can and should be avoided for certain very obvious reasons.

It ought to be avoided in the first instance because it is likely to increase the risks of the breakdown of international peace and security.

It ought to be avoided, secondly, because it is unacceptable that a small number of States should not merely cause danger to all mankind by reason of the huge nuclear arsenals they hold but in addition place the security of all States at risk by converting the common heritage of mankind into an advanced defence position for their own security.

It ought also to be avoided because that is an essential precondition for the development and continuation of international co-operation in the sphere of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

Lastly, it is no secret to anyone that space programmes for military purposes absorb vast resources whose size is in shocking contrast with the meagreness of the financial flows devoted to what is known as development aid.

There can be no doubt that the Committee on Disarmament, the only multilateral disarmament negotiating body, is the proper place for multilateral negotiations on the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The discussions which took place in this Committee on this question at the last session had the merit of showing the interest that exists in achieving the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Delegations were able to conduct a very broad exchange of views on the substance of the question as well as on the structural framework for dealing with item 7 of the agenda.

Almost all delegations stressed the need to set up a working group on this item; unfortunately, differences of views about its mandate prevented the establishment of such a group at the last session.

(Mr. Oul Rouis, Algeria)

Anxious to help promote disarmament in all possible ways, the Group of 21, in document CD/329, submitted a draft mandate for an ad hoc working group on this question.

Basing itself on the principle that outer space, which is recognized as the common heritage of mankind, ought to be preserved exclusively for peaceful purposes, the Group of 21 proposed a mandate which favours a global approach designed to prevent an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

The Algerian delegation, for its part, continues to support that proposal, which it recommends anew.

On the eve of the unleashing of an arms race in outer space which would assuredly be as dangerous as it would be costly, it seems to us that the best way of eliminating this danger is the global approach, which recognizes the interdependence of all aspects of this question and takes into account the interests of all parties to the negotiations.

While we do not wish to minimize the difficulties of the task confronting the Committee on Disarmament, we nevertheless find some of the arguments that have been advanced for putting off the negotiation of an international instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects unconvincing.

It has first of all been claimed that this is only a theoretical possibility because the weapons in question do not yet exist. It is surely hardly necessary to point out that in matters of arms, the temptation to convert theoretical possibilities into reality is great because it is inherent in the dynamics of the search for military superiority.

The argument has been put forward of the complexity of the issue and the lack of experience in this field. This should in no way prevent the Committee from embarking on negotiations on this matter, taking advantage of all the experience gained in this sphere, particularly during the bilateral negotiations, as well as calling upon all the requisite expertise. It is, moreover, to be noted that putting off the negotiations because of the complexity of the question would mean deferring the solution of this matter indefinitely, because it is obvious that these problems become more complex as time passes.

The argument of complexity and technical difficulties is very often used to cover the unwillingness of certain powers to engage in negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament.

As to the Algerian delegation, we are firmly convinced that the will to negotiate is primarily something political. Although technical difficulties may possibly explain the slowness of a given negotiating process, they cannot affect the essentially political nature of the process itself.

In establishing a working group with a global mandate, the Committee on Disarmament would be responding to the appeals of the United Nations General Assembly as well as to the demands of our peoples, who insist that measures should be taken to prevent outer space becoming a battlefield endangering the very survival of mankind.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, my statement today will be devoted to the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, the item the Committee is to discuss this week in accordance with its programme of work. It is to be noted that the problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is becoming all the more urgent and pressing in view of the dangerous trend towards the conversion of outer space into a theatre for such a race.

If we look at history and turn some of its pages, we shall be convinced anew of the importance and timeliness of the efforts that have been made to prevent outer space being used for military purposes.

Three months after the beginning of the space era in the history of mankind, which was opened by the launching of the first Soviet satellite in March 1958, the USSR put before the United Nations General Assembly at its thirteenth session a proposal on the prevention of the use of outer space for military purposes and on international co-operation in the matter of the exploration of outer space. That was the first proposal in the history of mankind for the limitation of military activity in outer space. With the active participation and significant contribution of the socialist States and other peace-loving countries, certain international legal instruments now in force, limiting the use of outer space for hostile purposes, were worked out and concluded, for example, the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, of 1963, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, of 1967, the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, of 1979, and others.

Important provisions aimed at limiting military activity in outer space were included in the strategic arms limitation agreements reached between the USSR and the United States in the 1970s -- the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the Salt-I Agreement. These constituted an impressive achievement in this sphere, substantially limiting the use of outer space for military purposes. The agreements contained qualitative limitations concerning specific military space systems. Thus, for example, in the United States -- USSR ABM Treaty of 26 May 1972, the parties undertook "not to develop, test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based".

The conclusion of these agreements constituted real steps forward in the demilitarization of the celestial bodies and a positive limitation of the use of space for military purposes. However, the existing limitation measures are not complete, because there is no effective international instrument placing a reliable barrier in the way of attempts to extend the arms race to outer space.

It has unfortunately to be observed that those who want to militarize outer space in order to secure absolute supremacy are hastening to take advantage of the absence of such measures of prohibition. It is no secret that the United States has prepared a vast programme in this sphere the basic principles of which have been confirmed by a special presidential directive. In this programme, outer space is regarded as a theatre for military activities and a special military space command has been set up to take charge of operations there.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

A particular danger resides in the preparation of innumerable projects for the development of space weapons designed to attack targets in outer space, in air space and on the earth. Among these, special priority has been given to the development and deployment in space of anti-ballistic missile defence systems, based in particular on the use of the latest scientific and technological achievements in the sphere of laser and charged particle technology.

As you know, the Washington administration has announced the start of work on a large-scale and highly effective anti-missile defence system using military vehicles in space. This programme of extensive military preparations in outer space provides for the establishment of 100 military orbital stations equipped with laser and particle-beam weapons and also sensors for detecting ballistic missiles. It is planned to spend \$500 billion on these purposes. We believe that if the United States carries out these plans that will mean in fact the deployment in space of anti-ballistic missile defence systems for the purpose of destroying the strategic weapons of the other side, that is, depriving it of the possibility of taking retaliatory measures. In essence what this amounts to is the intention to create a strategic first-strike potential.

A large part is also played in these plans by various manned spacecraft capable of carrying out purely military tasks in the placing in orbit of space-earth strike systems, anti-satellite systems and reconnaissance, navigation and other types of satellite for military purposes under the orders of the United States military space command. As has been stated in the Western press, out of 331 planned flights of such craft, more than a third will be destined for military tasks.

The idea of the militarization of outer space in violation of the agreements existing in this sphere did not come from the minds of contemporary science-fiction writers but originated in the highest military and political circles of the United States. For example, it has been said more than once in American military circles that, depending on the results of its work in the sphere of anti-ballistic missile defence systems, the United States might ask for the revision or even the renunciation of the Soviet-American treaty of 1972 that was concluded at the same time as the SALT-I Agreement. As we understand it, both sides legally recognized at that time that mutual restraint in the development of anti-missile defence systems would permit progress to be made in the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons as a whole. Thus there is now in effect a threat to remove one of the cornerstones of the entire strategic arms limitation process.

I should like to add that the carrying out of a programme for the development of a "perfect" ABM system in space would constitute a violation of the Soviet-American ABM Treaty of 1972. Under article V of that Treaty, the parties undertook not to develop, test or deploy in space ABM systems or components. Furthermore, the distinguished representative of the United States confirmed this in his statement to the Committee on 2 September 1982.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

We also wonder how such actions can be in conformity with the provisions of other important international treaties and agreements. As is stated in the United States press with reference to such authorities as the "father" of the hydrogen bomb, the physicist Edward Teller, the provision of the energy for the powerful X-ray lasers necessary for the proposed ABM system is possible only through nuclear explosions in space. The magazine Newsweek, in its issue of 4 April 1983, in particular states: "Although information on the X-ray laser remains classified, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory reportedly created an X-ray pulse with the system in a recent underground test in Nevada".

Thus, questions are now being raised about the fulfilment of obligations assumed under two important international legal instruments, namely, the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in three environments, including outer space, and the 1967 Treaty on the non-deployment in outer space of weapons of mass destruction.

We believe that any violation of generally recognized international legal norms will entail far-reaching consequences.

What dangers do we see in the arms race in outer space?

In the first place, military space vehicles would cause extreme destabilization of the strategic situation. Plans for the development of so-called "perfect" defence systems against strategic missiles are nothing but a screen covering the real intentions of the authors of these plans. Talk about their defensive purpose is deliberately designed to deceive public opinion.

In the second place, the deployment of military vehicles in space would lead to the creation of yet another type of global weapon, the creation of an excessive military first-strike potential which would inevitably increase the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war.

In the third place, as I have already said, an arms race in outer space would entail colossal material expenditures.

Fourthly, and this should be particularly emphasized, the new programme for the development of a "defensive" ABM system violates the specific system of international legal norms to which I referred earlier.

The Mongolian delegation, like the majority of other delegations in the Committee, is firmly in favour of the adoption of constructive measures aimed at the prevention of the extension of the arms race to outer space. There are on the negotiating table in the Committee on Disarmament a number of documents which could serve as the basis for the detailed consideration of and the conduct of negotiations on the substance of the issue. In particular, the Soviet delegation submitted a draft treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space (document CD/274). The Mongolian delegation

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

submitted a proposal on the establishment of an ad hoc working group on this subject (document CD/272); the group of delegations of the non-aligned and neutral States put before the Committee a draft mandate for the ad hoc working group (document CD/329); a document on arms control and outer space (CD/320) was submitted by the delegation of Canada.

We believe that towards the end of the second part of its 1982 session the Committee was very near to the achievement of a consensus on the setting of an ad hoc working group to discuss questions connected with the prevention of an arms race in outer space on a solid basis, with the participation of qualified experts. This did not happen, however. Certain delegations, and more precisely one delegation, blocked the setting up of an ad hoc working group, declaring that it was necessary to hold an exhaustive discussion of the views of all delegations and to carry out extensive preparatory work of substance. The Mongolian delegation, like many other delegations, is in favour of the practical consideration of the substance of the issue, that is to say, the conduct of genuine negotiations. All the necessary prerequisites exist for this. Apart from the working papers containing specific proposals to which I have already referred, the Committee has been considering item 7 of its agenda from every point of view for more than two years now, both at plenary meetings and at informal meetings. We believe that the majority of delegations have expressed their views on the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In this connection I should like particularly to draw attention to the statement made by Ambassador Jayakoddy of Sri Lanka at our last plenary meeting, which contained a whole series of practical and useful suggestions which could form the subject of careful study and further consideration in the initial phase of practical negotiations in the Committee.

The Mongolian delegation, which is in favour of the speediest possible starting of actual negotiations, hopes that the Committee will soon agree on a mandate for the ad hoc working group. The wording of the mandate should, in our view, be based on the provisions of resolution 37/83, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session. In the course of the negotiations, all existing proposals and possible future initiatives should undoubtedly be taken into account.

At the same time we consider that the main object should be a comprehensive solution of the problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. This does not mean that we wish to leave to one side the question of the prohibition of anti-satellite systems.

To conclude, I should like to make some comments on item 4 of the agenda.

By contrast with the consideration of other substantive issues, the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons in this Committee have made considerable headway as far as the scope of the work done is concerned. Like many other delegations we believe that if all participants in the negotiations were prepared to contribute to the successful completion of the work on a convention prohibiting chemical weapons this year, that would be a completely attainable objective.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The important thing, as we see it, is that the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons should be conducted in a practical way. In this connection we wish fully to support the proposal made by a number of delegations for a parallel approach consisting, on the one hand, of the formulation of those key provisions of the future convention on which there is a coincidence or similarity of views and, on the other hand, in close connection with this work, the continuation of the search for mutually acceptable solutions to questions on which there are still divergencies of views. We think that such an approach will speed up and bring us significantly nearer to agreement on the final text of a convention.

As regards questions of substance, the Mongolian delegation would like particularly to note certain constructive proposals that have been made during the present session. I am thinking primarily of the support given by the Soviet delegation to the proposal of a number of non-aligned and neutral States for the inclusion in the future convention of a provision prohibiting the use of chemical weapons, of the Soviet proposal for a renunciation of the production of chemicals with the methy-phosphorus bond, and of the proposal of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic for the declaration and liquidation of stocks of binary weapons during the initial phase after the entry into force of the convention. These proposals are undoubtedly extremely important from the point of view of facilitating the negotiations on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons.

After the prolonged interval between the end of January of this year and last week, the Ad hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons has at last managed to resume its work. The Mongolian delegation would like to express the hope that under the chairmanship of Ambassador McPhail of Canada this Working Group will be able to complete the task before it.

The Committee on Disarmament has today heard the important statement of Comrade Nguyen Thuong, the Ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam. In that statement he dwelt in detail on the results of the International Symposium on Herbicides and Defoliants in War: The Long-Term Effects on Man and Nature, which was held in Ho Chi Minh City from 13 to 20 January 1983. The Mongolian delegation wishes to express its gratitude to the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam for its noble efforts and its great contribution to the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

We consider that the statement by the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam usefully supplements the document which was distributed in the Committee at this session (CD/349), and will serve an important source of information in the consideration of questions of substance in the Ad hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman thanks Ambassador Erdembileg for his contribution, and his statement concludes the list of speakers for today. Is there any other delegation that wishes to take the floor?

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for your words of condolence addressed to the United States delegation for the heavy loss of life in the terrorist bomb explosion at our Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. I shall convey them to the bereaved families and to my colleagues in the Department of State.

It is a tragedy of our time that diplomatic personnel and establishments have become the target of terrorists. This reflects the callous and cynical disdain which terrorists have for those who are the conduits of international dialogue, who seek solutions to the problems which those same terrorists cite as the reasons for their acts. Civilized people everywhere must reject such mindless acts.

May I also, through you, Sir, extend the heartfelt appreciation of my delegation to the many other colleagues who have similarly expressed their shock and sympathy over this vicious and cowardly act. Let me assure you, Sir, and the Committee, that, as President Reagan said, this criminal act against a diplomatic establishment will not deter us from our goals of peace in the region.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman thanks Ambassador Fields for his statement and will be glad to comply with his request.

Is there any other delegation that wishes to take the floor? If not, I may recall that we have already agreed, at our 207th plenary meeting, when the programme of work of the Committee was adopted, to close the first part of the session on 29 April. The Chair has been holding consultations with the co-ordinators of the various groups and with individual delegations concerning the opening date for the second part of the 1983 session. As a result, a consensus seems to be emerging in favour of 14 June as the most appropriate date to start the second part of the annual session. If there are no objections, may the Chair take it that the Committee agrees to that opening date?

It was so decided

The CHAIRMAN: Concerning the closing date of the 1983 session, the general feeling seems to be that this question should be decided during the second half of July, when we shall have a better idea of how the work of the Committee is proceeding.

Before we adjourn this plenary meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that, in consultation with the co-ordinators as well as individual delegations, it has been agreed to devote an informal meeting, on Monday, 25 April, at 3 p.m., to consideration of the question of the establishment of working groups under item 2 of the agenda. If there is no objection, I will take it that the Committee agrees to that informal meeting.

It was so decided

The CHAIRMAN: In connection with item 7, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", the Chair has also been conducting consultations on how best to consider this item, taking into account the limitations of time and the large number of meetings requested by the various working groups. After careful consideration of all possible alternatives, it has been agreed with the co-ordinators and other interested delegations that, after listening to the members listed to speak at our plenary meeting on Thursday next, we will suspend the plenary meeting and continue in an informal meeting to examine how best to consider item 7. After an exchange of views on that question, we could then resume the plenary meeting in order to give members an opportunity to express views for the record, in the light of the discussion held at the informal meeting. Since we may need to devote some time to the item under consideration, the secretariat will also make arrangements to provide for an extended meeting of the Contact Group on Principles of the Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which was originally scheduled to meet at 3 p.m. As the new arrangements concerning item 7 might take additional time, that Contact Group would meet immediately after the plenary adjourns.

The Group of 21 contact group on chemical weapons will meet on Wednesday, 20 April, at 9.45 a.m., in Room C.108.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 21 April, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting stands adjourned

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.