

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**FORTIETH SESSION**

**Official Records\***



MAY 19 1987

UN/DA. 75 1 ON

FIRST COMMITTEE  
25th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 4 November 1985  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

**CONTENTS**

**STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE**  
**(continued)**

Statements were made by:

Mr. Papuciu (Albania)  
Mrs. Tnani (Tunisia)  
Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland)  
Mr. Batiouk (Ukrainian SSR)  
Mr. Comissario (Mozambique)  
Mr. Alzamora (Peru)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/40/PV.25  
5 November 1985  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PAPUCIU (Albania) (interpretation from French): The concern expressed for years by world public opinion, by the peoples of the world and in this Committee by many delegations at the militarization of outer space by the super-Powers is legitimate and real - a concern which foretells new dangers threatening mankind, the peoples, their freedom and independence as a result of a stepped up arms race in space also. The potential danger of the past is now a real threat. The militarization of outer space has become one of the main components in the arsenals of American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism and constitutes a strategy for their military preparations.

(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

It would be superfluous to describe the intensive efforts made in the field of space weapons. What in the past was science fiction is now being put into practice. Results obtained in the field and future plans are widely publicized. There is not even any hesitation in discussing plans and tactics involving the following subjects: how the so-called "star wars" will be developed; how space military systems will function; who will be the victor; who will be the vanquished. In this respect we must not minimize the idea of blackmail through propaganda, which is more deliberate than it seems. A whole army of the most skilled scientists and a military industry are enlisted for the implementation of the arms race in space, while colossal sums are allocated for that purpose and increase faster every year.

The intensification of the militarization of outer space is in itself a new extension of the arms race between the two super-Powers; it is a sign of their arrogance and their determination to achieve their hegemonic goals through force of arms. By that means, they strive to attain political and military supremacy over each other with a view to world domination.

"Star wars" is one more means for the super-Powers to accelerate the arms race, above all at a time when the general crisis is becoming more acute. The development of space weapons programmes is of great interest to the military-industrial complex and guarantees it enormous profits, because this is a new field in which Americans and Soviets can compete at a faster pace. This is due to the fact that the number of imperialist Powers that have become producers of and dealers in conventional weapons has increased. The list of nuclear weapons producers is also increasing. Thus space weapons provide a new field in which they can achieve a monopoly by excluding others for a relatively longer period.

The intense efforts by the super-Powers to militarize outer space are also related to their desire to ensure themselves a permanent monopoly in the field of

(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

weaponry. Now that the "nuclear club" has widened its ranks, the "nuclear umbrella" of the super-Powers has to some extent lost its initial value as an unassailable means of blackmail. Thus, they are attempting to replace that "umbrella" with space weapons which, hanging over our planet like the sword of Damocles, will further increase the dependence and subservience of allies and can, at the same time, be used to blackmail the peoples. The "space umbrella" is intended as a chosen means of further consolidating control of allies that have unfailingly expressed their concern at being thus made vulnerable to nuclear attack. This is the reason for the American tactic of involving its allies in the plan. This is aimed at calming them and at persuading them to pay part of the cost of a project which is in itself American.

As at every stage of the imperialist arms race, "star wars" is exploited to the utmost in order to play on the hopes and desires of peoples for peace and disarmament and on their legitimate anxiety to avoid new and greater massacres. At present the hypocrisy of the super-Powers has gone even further than it had in the past: they are attempting to present "star wars" as the saviour of mankind and as an effective means of saving the world from nuclear disaster. But the following question has rightly been raised: since Washington and Moscow are enormously interested in peace and in avoiding that disaster, then why should they extend it into outer space? Both of them have nuclear weapons, the weapons that would be the source of such a disaster, and have placed them here on Earth and not in outer space. It is the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, that have threatened and continue to threaten the world and mankind, and not the peoples of the world. At the present time, they are feverishly engaged in the production of new weapons; hence, the dangers constantly increase. With utmost cynicism this new and monstrous threat is presented as a means of avoiding nuclear disaster. And those who would give a "guarantee" against nuclear disaster are Washington and

(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

Moscow, which already have in their hands the detonator, and now also have this sword of Damocles. This is deeply ironic; it makes a mockery of the fate of peoples and the experience of mankind.

The magnitude of the arms race in outer space demonstrates the hypocritical nature of the outcry of the super-Powers for disarmament, the hypocrisy of the treaties and agreements they have thus far concluded, and the distrust that characterizes inter-imperialist relations. At the present time, when the militarization of outer space has ceased to be merely a subject of discussion and military programmes on those lines have begun to be applied on a wide scale, the super-Powers, disregarding the slogans which they broadcast, are in the process of undermining the treaties on the prohibition of the militarization of outer space that they have signed in the past. Both of them have begun the same refrain by accusing each other of not respecting agreements and of having violated the articles of those agreements. All this in fact demonstrates the real value of imperialist treaties and agreements, above all those concluded between the two super-Powers that are merely temporary accommodations between the United States and the Soviet Union to keep their rivalry under control, always in accordance with their interests. In that context, they may conclude new agreements with each other, whether secret or public, but those agreements, just like earlier ones, do not constitute genuine disarmament, but rather a controlled form of arming, in order to keep ahead of the rest and in order to maintain their diktat.

The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania has already spoken of the dangers of the arms race in outer space. It has clearly and unequivocally expressed its Government's attitude to this problem and has warned of the dangers of the insane plans of the super-Powers for the peoples of the world.

We wish to reiterate forcefully that the two militarist super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are to blame for this new spiral in the arms

(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

race as well as for the race in other nuclear and conventional weapons. They have the greatest responsibility for the consequences of that unbridled arms race, which is not being conducted for its own sake, nor for the sake of applying scientific advances for the good of the peoples and of mankind, but solely for the purpose of ensuring a monopoly over advanced technology to use as a means of pressure and blackmail not only against the peoples of the world but also against their allies, when that serves their interests.

(Mr. Papuciu, Albania)

The spiralling arms race in outer space is yet another threat to peace in the world and to the freedom and independence of peoples. It thwarts the aspiration of peoples for real disarmament and that is why we vigorously condemn it. At the same time we cannot accept the demagogy of the super-Powers just because by resorting to it they claim to be attempting to make a war of nuclear rockets and weapons ineffective. That is why, believing in the demagogy of the super-Powers means not only deceiving oneself but also to some extent becoming an accomplice to their space-war adventures, a hostage to a new form of blackmail, this time one in outer space.

It is impossible to avoid the blackmail of the American imperialist and the Soviet social imperialists that threaten the world of outer space by making requests of them, by bowing to them, and even by applauding them when they say that they will negotiate in order to reach agreement for the good of international peace and security. The history of imperialist agreements and bargaining does not allow for such illusions. Our opinion is that only firm opposition to American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism and their military policies and instruments, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the unveiling of their plans and their clumsy plots, and their total isolation can help to save mankind from the disasters threatening it on earth and in outer space.

Mrs. TNANI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, speaking for the first time in this Committee I should like to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of our Committee. We have no doubt that under your leadership and because of your great competence, the Committee will conclude the work on its agenda efficiently and speedily. Besides your personal qualities you belong to a fraternal country which so often and in various fields had brought to bear conciliation where confrontation was threatening or had become a

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

reality. So for all these reasons the work of our Committee is taking place under the best possible auspices and we take great pleasure at this. I should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee and assure you of our whole-hearted co-operation.

On this fortieth anniversary we are bound to recognize that in spite of the inadequacies with which the United Nations has been charged, it is thanks to our Organization that a generalized confrontation has been avoided so far. Nevertheless, the fact remains that today a world confrontation is less than ever just a figment of the imagination because even the negotiations under way in 1985, both multilateral and bilateral, are not taking place in a climate of real détente, which would suggest that the results are going to be good. The nuclear Powers, particularly the two super-Powers, are engaged in an arms race of uncontrollable and unforeseeable consequences. There is no doubt that the consequences of a large-scale nuclear attack - 5,000 to 10,000 megatons - would be catastrophic and would cause about 300 million to a billion dead, and as many wounded virtually sentenced to death, according to the best estimates of scientists.

This frenzied race between the two super-Powers has been made clear particularly in the course of the debates on the militarization of space. In 1972 the two super-Powers had the wisdom to sign the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM), virtually prohibiting anti-missile weapons on earth, and at whatever cost, to preserve world peace which rested at that time on the balance of nuclear power. Today we are talking about anti-missile and anti-satellite weapons which will be placed in outer space, the ultimate goal of which would be to create anti-missile shields. The militarization of space would thus lead to an unbridled arms race, a defensive arms race, to make one's anti-missile shield as invulnerable as possible and an offensive weapons race to reduce the resistance and effectiveness of the



(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

opponent's anti-missile shield. Thus the risks of destabilization and world conflagration would be much greater than they are at present. Mankind should not embark on such a qualitative mutation in the arms race, the consequences of which would be irreversible. What we actually need are measures to ensure the non-militarization of space and to put into effect the limitation and reduction of nuclear, conventional and chemical weapons.

In this connection we reaffirm our attachment to the Treaty of 10 October 1967 on the principles governing activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space. That Treaty means, let us remind the Committee, that the States parties undertake not to put into orbit around the earth any device bearing nuclear weapons or any other kind of weapons of mass destruction and not to install such weapons on celestial bodies, and not to place such weapons in outer space in any other way.

We support, furthermore, all initiatives designed to limit nuclear weapons. We think that the best way of achieving that is to halt and prohibit nuclear tests because in so doing we would be halting all technological innovations which in the nuclear field lend the arms race an ever more formidable qualitative dimension. States which ratified or acceded to the Treaty of 5 August 1953 prohibiting nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water, should extend this prohibition to underground testing. The great Powers which signed it were able in 1974 and 1976 to reach agreement on banning underground tests. But, unfortunately, they did not go so far as to implement it. Hence the need to verify the prohibition of nuclear tests by all the parties concerned, but this need should not be allowed to serve as a pretext for any delaying or blocking tactics. In the specific case of nuclear tests it would appear that existing scientific or technological means are adequate to record or detect any nuclear explosion even of low yield.

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

We should like now to turn to the question of reducing the arms race. Following the SALT I Treaty in 1972 and SALT II in 1979 and the START and IMF negotiations in Geneva which were aborted in November 1983, the two nuclear super-Powers last March embarked on negotiations to reduce strategic and medium-range weapons and on the non-militarization of space, negotiations which are mutually interdependent, in the sense that agreement in one field would only become final if the parties succeeded subsequently in reaching agreement in the other areas. In other words, an agreement on the reduction of strategic weapons would not be enough if certain weapons considered as strategic by one party, because they posed a direct threat to its territory, would be considered by the other party to be medium-range nuclear weapons. That is merely one aspect of the interdependence of those two forms of nuclear weapons.

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

As to the militarization of space, it is only too obvious. Clearly, one cannot at the same time slow down the nuclear-arms race and, by preparing programmes for the militarization of space, open the way to a new, much more dangerous type of arms race, as we emphasized at the beginning of our statement.

Although we wish to base our analysis only on precise and unchallengeable facts, we cannot but feel encouraged by the news that the two super-Powers appear to be ready to accept, within the framework of their Geneva negotiations, substantial reductions in their nuclear weapons. We hope that they will succeed in agreeing to reduce their nuclear weapons, both qualitatively and quantitatively. That would be the biggest step since the Second World War towards disarmament, particularly if at the same time the multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament led to agreements on the prevention of nuclear war, the limitation of conventional weapons and the banning of chemical weapons. In that regard, we would point out that the arsenals of chemical weapons are growing quantitatively and qualitatively, particularly as a result of the development of the so-called binary chemical weapons.

In the case of conventional weapons, we are dealing with a new generation of so-called smart weapons, the product of emerging technologies, that will have extremely destabilizing effects on all theatres of operation, of which there have been no fewer than 150 since the last World War. Those theatres mainly affect the countries of the third world, and there is a danger that they could extend to other sensitive regions, such as Europe, and regions whose security is closely linked with it, such as the Mediterranean. It is also time for us to give serious thought to the limitation of conventional weapons, having regard, of course, to the legitimate security needs of each country.

The Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in Geneva from 27 August to 21 September

last, made it clear that the nuclear-weapon Powers had aggravated what has become known as vertical proliferation, by the qualitative and quantitative strengthening of their nuclear arsenals. It also made it clear that horizontal proliferation is itself spreading. In that regard, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world seems to us capable of strengthening non-proliferation and contributing to disarmament. The proclamation on 6 August this year of a denuclearized zone in the South Pacific is encouraging. That example should be followed in other parts of the world - in Africa, the Middle East and Latin America.

I should like to take this opportunity to draw attention to one of the most ominous aspects of horizontal proliferation - that relating to the nuclear capacity that Israel and South Africa have been able to acquire with foreign assistance, both in the past and recently. It is impossible to overestimate the danger of that situation, for these two States have been constantly condemned by the Security Council for 40 years for their flagrant acts of aggression, the two most recent being the Israeli aggression against my country, Tunisia, and South Africa's aggression against Angola. Israel and South Africa are using increasingly sophisticated and dangerous conventional weapons, made available to them within the framework of strategic alliances. In that context, who can guarantee that Israeli or South African aggression will not one day take the form of a nuclear attack? Anything is possible from régimes that seek to guarantee their security through the insecurity of others.

In that regard, we wish to recall what the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, said in his latest report on the work of the Organization. He warned that mankind was at the mercy of an

"accident, misapprehension or an unexpected concatenation of events involving the nuclear Powers in a way which they cannot evade. This latter situation could most likely develop from the escalation of a regional conflict."

(Mrs. Tnani, Tunisia)

It is very much to be feared that the Middle East conflict and repeated Israeli acts of aggression, including the most recent one against Tunisia, extending the battlefield to cover the entire Mediterranean, may be the forerunner of the nuclear escalation described by the Secretary-General. That is why we - the Mediterranean non-aligned countries - are determined to combine our efforts with those of the other peace-loving Mediterranean countries to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation.

What conclusion is to be drawn from all this other than that the difficult problems I have just mentioned would benefit from a climate of confidence? We should create and nurture this climate, for it would facilitate the search for solutions, including that to the question of the relationship between disarmament and development, which is particularly important to us.

We have already stated many times how much Tunisia believes in the close link between disarmament and development and how much it wishes to emphasize the negative impact of the arms race on the world economy, and particularly on the growth and development efforts of the countries of the third world. The arms race is undoubtedly one of the obstacles to the creation of a new international economic order.

However it is with great satisfaction that we note that an International Conference will be held in 1986 to discuss those problems, and we thank France for having offered to act as its host. We hope the Conference will help to reduce the considerable imbalance between the resources now available and the economic and social needs of the developing countries, because today it is no longer necessary to prove the interrelationship between disarmament, security and development, and everyone must bear it in mind in order to help establish a better world within the framework of our Organization.

Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland): First, Sir, I should like to congratulate you on your well-deserved election as Chairman of the First Committee. You may rest assured that you and your colleagues - the officers of the Committee - will always have the support of the delegation of the Kingdom of Swaziland, so that remarkable progress may be made in the Committee's work.

This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the beginning of the atomic age. The horrendous events which occurred in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, resulting in the death of millions of people and the massive destruction of property, will go down in the annals of history. Mankind now faces the enormous production of far more sophisticated nuclear weapons, which can destroy mankind many, many times over.

My delegation views with the utmost concern the currently escalating arms race, which must of necessity be stopped in order to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. What kind of world can mankind hope to live in tomorrow if today the global situation is characterized by fear, suspicion, tension and the rapid manufacture of both conventional and nuclear weapons? It is vital, therefore, that the outbreak of another world war, which would lead to a nuclear holocaust, meaning unprecedented disaster for mankind, be totally avoided.

It has been stated over and over again, and rightly so, that since mankind cannot under any circumstances tolerate any form of nuclear war, the world should move, effectively and without any waste of time, in unison in the direction of disarmament. Such concrete action would promote peace and security, for without those two elements global development and co-operation would be non-existent.

(Mr. Dlamini, Swaziland)

With specific regard to Africa, my delegation affirms that peace and security have been and still are severely threatened, in part by such factors as continued drought, terrible cyclones and increasing desertification. This has resulted in widespread famine, which has claimed the lives of millions of people.

Moreover, it must be pointed out that this same lack of peace and security has, unfortunately, compelled numerous African States to spend large sums of money on military weapons in order to eliminate internal instability and to defend their national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Most regrettably, though, these prescriptions by the African States have not always worked, for the reason that certain foreign Powers have taken unfair advantage of unstable situations in weak States, by secretly funding and providing military equipment to rebel forces in African States, in the name of Western democracy or democratic socialism.

My delegation strongly underscores the relationship between world disarmament and development. It must be pointed out that mankind can facilitate the arms race and waste enormous sums of money in the process. Yet it must be emphasized too that States have a big responsibility to reduce their military budgets and spend the money in a responsible manner so as to sustain the international economic and political order. In the world today, at least 800 million people are strife-torn by problems of poverty, destitution and social conflict, which directly or potentially pose a threat to international peace and security. Instead of concentrating their efforts on the improvement of their economies and economic futures for the sake of social and economic development, many developing countries are currently committed to building up modern armies, which are often financed and trained by certain powerful nations, principally for their own individual strategic reasons.

(Mr. Dlamini, Swaziland)

It must be reiterated that the risk of nuclear war must be totally avoided, for if mankind fails to do this such a war would undoubtedly lead to the annihilation and disappearance from the face of the earth of all mankind. The seriousness of this state of affairs was made clear by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their seventh summit, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, when they stated that

"the greatest peril facing the world today is the threat to the survival of mankind from a nuclear war. Disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, is no longer a moral issue; it is an issue of human survival.... Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass annihilation". (A/38/132, annex, political declaration, para. 28)

Certainly, no normal human being can stand idle while this unprecedented peril to all nations increases. Mankind learned a bitter lesson from the horrendous effects of the two world wars and from the use of the first atomic weapons, in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The sin must not be repeated. It must always be remembered that the climatic effects of a nuclear war could lead to a nuclear winter. Any sensible person would shudder when reading the following, based on recent atmospheric and biological studies on this subject:

"there have been new findings which indicate that in addition to blast, heat and radiation, nuclear war, even on a limited scale, would produce smoke, soot and dust of sufficient magnitude as to trigger an arctic nuclear winter which may transform the Earth into a darkened, frozen planet where conditions would be conducive to mass extinction". (resolution 39/148 F, third preambular para.)

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to sound this note of advice, which must always be remembered: it is the responsibility of each State Member of the United Nations to make a solid contribution to world peace and security by adopting a



(Mr. Dlamini, Swaziland)

genuine and practical approach to curbing the growth of nuclear weapons and by seriously embarking on a campaign of disarmament. The tendency merely to exchange ideas on this issue by simply making statements and adopting impractical resolutions in Committee sessions must come to an end. The United Nations

"remains the appropriate forum for global common endeavours towards a new world order free from war and want, more just and equitable, and hence, more peaceful". (A/40/761, annex, para. 7)

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The continuing discussion in the First Committee of a wide and multifarious range of problems relating to arms limitation and disarmament, and the multiplicity of views and opinions that have been expressed, clearly show the universal concern at the dangerous developments in the world situation. The overwhelming majority of States agree that among outstanding global problems particular concern has been aroused by the unceasing nuclear arms race, by attempts to extend that race to outer space, and by the growing threat of nuclear war, which calls into question the very future of mankind.

Unfortunately, the very dangerous view prevails in certain quarters that the security of peoples can be strengthened by the manufacture and stockpiling of ever newer and more destructive weapons, both on earth and in outer space. We believe, moreover, that the very actions of imperialist circles are dangerous. These actions amount in essence to attempting a kind of social revenge through achieving military supremacy over socialism. Those circles are trying to maintain international tension at such a level as to justify the implementation of their aggressive plans.

EMS/7

A/C.1/40/PV.25  
24-25

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

International relations have deteriorated; that deterioration can be checked only by the common effort of all States, through the adoption of decisions which would halt the turning wheel of the arms race and eliminate the threat of nuclear annihilation. As was stated by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, such decisions:

"cannot be postponed without the risk of losing control over dangerous processes which pose a threat to the very existence of mankind. Reining in the forces of militarism and war and ensuring lasting peace and reliable security constitute the cardinal problem of today".

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

The solution of this universal problem would be facilitated by the concrete programme of a series of constructive measures put forward by the Soviet Union for a radical improvement of the international situation, winding down the arms race and preventing the militarization of outer space. It contains a proposal to the United States Government to work for agreement to prohibit entirely for both parties space strike weapons and drastically to slash by 50 per cent the nuclear weapons of both sides capable of reaching each other's territory. This would be cogently demonstrating a political determination and a sincere desire to achieve mutually acceptable agreements at the Geneva talks on the whole range of nuclear and space weapons. The international community is entitled to expect from the other side a positive response to these proposals which, in turn, undoubtedly would bring the world closer to the desired objective, namely, the total elimination of nuclear weapons once and for all.

Among the problems of the day whose solution would do a great deal to limit the nuclear-arms race and reduce the risk of nuclear war, one of the most urgent is the problem of prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons.

In April 1954 an eminent international statesman, the Prime Minister of Independent India, Jawahar Lal Nehru, proposed the conclusion of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests. Thirty years later the same problem remains a high priority on the agenda of international meetings on problems of limiting armaments and disarmament. It is illuminating that India's initiative from the very beginning won a positive response from the socialist countries. As long ago as 1955 the USSR put forward a concrete proposal for States possessing the atom and hydrogen bomb to assume obligations to cease testing this kind of weapon. Unfortunately, because of the negative attitude of Western countries this proposal was not implemented.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

The importance of an immediate solution for the problem of prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons has become particularly great in the current tense international circumstances. Many see in the prevention of tests a concrete measure that would sharply break the whole process of the nuclear-arms race. In this regard we should like to state that we share the authoritative view expressed in the course of the discussion in the First Committee by the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Theorin, when she said that the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty

"... would stop not only the development of new nuclear weapons but over time also render obsolete existing weapons. A test ban would therefore in practice lead to reductions of nuclear arsenals. It would also degrade the reliability of existing warheads and thus render any first-strike calculations even more uncertain. A test ban would therefore significantly reduce the risk of nuclear war." (A/C.1/40/PV.4, p. 7)

Of all the problems of disarmament, the question of banning nuclear-weapons tests has been worked on the most and is the most highly developed. Its active consideration over many years has achieved a measure of success. Suffice it to recall that the Moscow Treaty on the banning of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water was concluded in 1963. This is one of the most important elements in the existing system of agreements in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. In this regard I should like to stress that even at that time the socialist countries believed that all tests should be stopped, including underground tests. But the United States and its closest allies were unwilling to agree to this. Therefore the problem of the total cessation of nuclear-weapons testing still remains unresolved to this day.

It appeared that a certain amount of progress had been made in this matter when, in 1974, the USSR and the United States signed a Treaty whereby the yield of

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

underground nuclear-weapons tests was limited to 150 kilotons and when, in 1976, they signed a Treaty regulating peaceful nuclear explosions. However, the unwillingness of the United States to ratify these extremely important international agreements prevented them from entering into force.

I wish to stress once again that even in those years the USSR was in favour of the total and general cessation of nuclear-weapons testing. Thus in 1975 a wide-ranging draft treaty was placed before the General Assembly for the total prohibition of nuclear tests. The overwhelming majority of States supported this proposal, except those upon whom depended, above all, the implementation of such a proposal.

We would also remind members of the hopes that were aroused in the international community in connection with the considerable progress achieved at the tripartite negotiations in which the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain took part with a view to producing a treaty on the total and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons testing. Subsequently, the United States was unwilling to conclude these negotiations.

In the view of the Ukrainian delegation there is but one explanation here: the ambition of the United States Administration to disrupt the existing balance of forces and win a position of military supremacy. This is the goal also of the new American programmes for the creation and perfecting of conventional nuclear weapons and, ultimately, space nuclear weapons. As has been cogently revealed by the discussion in the First Committee, the continuation of the arms race and attempts to find military and technological solutions to political problems is a dangerous and unpromising course. It can lead only to the destabilization of the situation, an insensate waste of resources and a stepping up of the threat of war for all, even for those who initiated it.

RG/8

A/C.1/40/PV.25  
29-30

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

The depressing state of contemporary international relations makes it indispensable to take urgent practical measures to break the vicious circle of the arms race. It requires the demonstration of political will to find a way out of the current deadlock.

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

The Soviet Union's declaration of a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions to take effect from 6 August 1985 was a bold step taken with the idea that other nuclear-weapon States, primarily the United States, would follow its example. Indeed, if the United States were to accept that proposal and respond to it positively, it would be possible to keep the moratorium in force even after 1 January 1986.

However, that is precisely what the United States does not want. The statements of United States officials are extremely frank on this subject. Militarist circles find it necessary to continue nuclear-weapon testing in order to develop the nuclear-powered X-ray laser, which is one of the key elements of the so-called strategic defence initiative, to investigate all aspects of the waging of a protracted nuclear war, to develop new nuclear warheads, and to test the combat effectiveness of the nuclear arsenals they have built up.

The Director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory in the United States, Mr. Kerr, at a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, stated quite frankly:

"As long as the United States relies on nuclear weapons, they must be tested, because there are no ways of modelling experimentally all the processes involved in the action of new nuclear weapons."

In an attempt somehow or other to justify its reluctance to halt the further improvement of its nuclear potential, the United States has asserted that the moratorium is something that cannot be verified. The weakness of that argument has long been demonstrated by the unanimous evidence of authoritative scientists, including scientists in the United States itself. As was pointed out by the eminent American seismologist, Mr. Evernden, all Soviet tests are being registered and recorded by the United States system for the detection of nuclear explosions which comprises seismic observatories in 35 countries. Another expert, a scientist from Munich, Heinrich Zoffel, also notes that:

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

"Given the present level of technology, we will be able to demonstrate that an explosion with a yield of one kiloton or even lower has taken place."

The Soviet Union, of course, also possesses adequate means of detecting nuclear explosions. For example, data from Soviet sources indicated that on 17 August 1985, in a mine shaft 330 metres deep and situated 120 kilometres northwest of Las Vegas, an explosion with a yield of less than 20 kilotons was carried out. It is clear, therefore, that assertions by the United States side about the ineffectiveness of national means of verification are nothing but an attempt to evade any serious consideration of the question of prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. In actual fact, it is an attempt to avoid banning those tests.

In this regard I should like to refer to the evidence of Mr. Colby, former Director of the CIA, who stated outright that the observance of the moratorium on nuclear explosions "could undoubtedly be monitored by means of existing national technical means of verification". I do not think there is any need to cite any further statements.

Nor should we forget that when we speak of verification of, for example, the two Soviet Union and United States agreements on banning nuclear-weapon tests, which I have already mentioned, the parties were able to work out a system of verification adequate for the purposes of the treaties in question. Therefore, if there was a genuine willingness to solve the problem of ending tests, agreement on the question of verification could be achieved.

The socialist countries are doing their utmost to translate into practical terms a solution to this problem, which affects the interests of all peoples. This, in particular, was mentioned in the Declaration on the Elimination of the Nuclear Threat and a change for the better in European and World Affairs, adopted recently at the meeting of the Political Advisory Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty. It was on this basis that the socialist countries presented



(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

to the Conference on Disarmament their views on the mandate of the Special Committee on this subject, which provides for the holding of concrete negotiations with a view to the earliest possible conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The aim of the proposals submitted by the Group of non-aligned and neutral countries was to achieve agreement as soon as possible on ending nuclear-weapon testing.

I should also like to remind members that only recently the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden produced a new proposal which contains a specific appeal to the United States and the Soviet Union to halt all nuclear tests for 12 months. As is stressed in the joint declaration by the leaders of those six States, that step would considerably improve prospects for the conclusion of agreements in this field and would slow down the development of new and more sophisticated types of armament. The initiative of the leaders of those six countries was undoubtedly dictated by their wish to contribute to the earliest possible achievement of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing. However, as I have attempted to demonstrate in this statement, the practical implementation of any proposals for the cessation of tests is being blocked by the reluctance of the United States to give up its programmes for the further improvement of nuclear weapons. It would be unfortunate if, for the same reason, the constructive proposal of the six States were to be rejected as a propaganda exercise or, for some untenable reason, not given full consideration.

In the view of the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, it is the duty of the General Assembly to give effective support to the efforts of States that want to break the deadlock reached in negotiations on this problem and to provide an objective appraisal of the actions of those who in practice are blocking a decision on the question of the general and complete banning of nuclear-weapon testing.

Mr. COMISSARIO (Mozambique): On behalf of the Mozambican delegation and on my own behalf, I extend to you, Sir, our congratulations on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of the First Committee at this historic session of the United Nations General Assembly. Our felicitations are extended also to the other officers of the Committee. My delegation wishes to assure you of its full co-operation in the discharge of your responsibilities.

Our Committee has been entrusted with a heavy responsibility - that of discussing the issues relating to general and complete disarmament, that is, the problems concerning international peace and security. We are confronted with matters that concern the very destiny of humankind. Indeed, these issues constitute the first priority on our Organization's agenda.

This deep concern for humankind has been correctly expressed in the United Nations Charter where, in its very first words, is stated the determination of the peoples "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

Forty years have elapsed since the United Nation was founded. As a matter of fact, we have just solemnly celebrated that event. We believe it is only appropriate that we should devote some time to reflection on and assessment of what we have achieved in the course of those four decades in the field of disarmament, peace and international security.

It is our belief that, following the Second World War and the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, our planet has experienced a period of relative peace. This has been a positive trend in international relations in so far as it shows the positive role played by our Organization and bears testimony to what men and women can achieve if they pool all their efforts for the sake of their survival.

(Mr. Commissario, Mozambique)

Nevertheless, we cannot help but acknowledge the fact that, despite all the Organization's commendable efforts, the world has not yet been freed from international tensions and conflicts. Indeed, since the end of the Second World War man has conceived and built up stockpiles of the most deadly weapons that human beings have ever known.

Although nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945, the world has not been spared the devastating consequences of conventional wars, which have claimed more than 20 million human lives. This situation is still prevailing in our day. Most of those wars result from the existence of colonialism, apartheid, Zionism and other systems based on exploitation, domination and expansionism.

In my own country, the people had to wage a bloody war for national liberation and independence. However, that war did not end with the proclamation of our independence, for armed aggression perpetrated by both the Rhodesian and South African régimes forced our people to take up arms and defend our national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The war of aggression waged by the South African racist régime against Mozambique and other countries in the region still continues. The existence of the apartheid régime in southern Africa represents a serious threat to peace and security. It is also an obstacle to the triumph of the ideals of general and complete disarmament.

The criminal collaboration of some Western Powers with South Africa has encouraged and promoted the strengthening of the military capability of that régime, particularly in the nuclear field. That collaboration constitutes a violation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and of the relevant United Nations resolutions. It is due to that collaboration that the Pretoria régime has now acquired the technical and technological capability that enables it to commit acts of violence within its own territory and carry out acts of

destabilization and aggression against the neighbouring countries. Those criminal acts by the racist régime have forced the countries of the region to strengthen their defence capability in the exercise of their legitimate right of self-defence. This is a move that has the support of the entire international community if it falls within the provisions of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

It is in this context that we have advocated that disarmament in Africa demands support for, and the success of, the causes of the national liberation movements. The triumph of the ideals of disarmament requires the eradication of colonialism and apartheid and an end to foreign and neo-colonialist interference.

We therefore address an appeal to the international community to commit itself to the struggle for the total elimination of those evil policies. We believe that world peace demands that specific and collective measures be adopted by the international community to bring about the full realization of the disarmament objectives.

It is with deep concern that we have been following the escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. Today humankind is confronted with the greatest challenge of all times - the struggle for survival in a world overloaded with arms of mass destruction. To save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe has thus become an issue of paramount importance. It is our understanding that it is only through the involvement of the international community that this objective can be attained.

Indeed, the fate of everyone is at stake. All countries and peoples are entitled to live in peace and security and to struggle for the promotion of a climate of understanding and mutual confidence. This struggle should take many forms and be waged on the bilateral, regional and international levels. It is in this context that the summit meeting between the President of the United States of America and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is of

(Mr. Comissario, Mozambique)

great importance. We are hopeful that that meeting will be a step forward in the long process of disarmament. All peace-loving countries hope that that meeting will result in the adoption of concrete measures that will benefit the international community.

In the same spirit, the People's Republic of Mozambique firmly supports the efforts undertaken by the United Nations for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. We consider that the conclusion of such a treaty and its subsequent implementation would constitute an important step towards halting the ever-growing manufacture of nuclear weapons.

Those steps should be complemented by other measures directed towards building confidence among States. Such measures should comprise, inter alia, the following: a commitment by States not to be the first to resort to the use of nuclear weapons; a commitment not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States; and the establishment of more nuclear-free zones.

Among the disarmament issues that constitute a matter of great concern to my country is the militarization of outer space - an issue that deserves particular consideration. The delegations which have spoken in the debate before me have underlined the dangers posed by that undertaking. It is a matter that has destabilizing effects in the disarmament process and contributes to the aggravation of the nuclear arms race.

the subsequent reduction of military expenditures in order to promote our economic and social development process.

My delegation makes a special appeal to the members of this Committee to give their invaluable support to a cause which, in the last analysis, is the responsibility of all the Members of the United Nations, because what is at stake is the cause of peace, life and full development of the less endowed countries and a regional impetus for the global process of disarmament.

We are convinced that this draft coincides fully with the principles already formulated in other forums by the developing countries, such as the recent Lomé Declaration of the African countries, and that it also responds to the principles upheld by countries in all parts of the world on the link between disarmament and development, including those countries from the North who have proclaimed themselves champions of that cause.

I would also like to announce that, consistent with its commitment to conventional disarmament, the Peruvian Government decided, a few days ago, to cut back to 12 its original order for 26 supersonic combat aircraft. By that unilateral decision, which is much more than a mere gesture, the Peruvian Government is expressing its firm political will to contribute towards creating a climate conducive to the adoption of measures capable of freeing the region from the costly arms race which so seriously affects and delays its economic and social development - as well as that of other third-world regions. That decision has already received a response and been given a welcome. Therefore the adoption of the draft resolution submitted would, in addition to its global and permanent scope, give added impetus and dynamism to this process, which we have so often recognized and proclaimed as being of special interest to the developing countries and to the international community at large. This is a plan which we are already beginning to implement and which we put before this Committee for its consideration.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.