

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
8th meeting
held on
Friday, 18 October 1985
at 10:30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Maciel (Brazil)
Mr. Froysnes (Norway)
Mr. Kravets (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Penazka (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Qian Jiadong (China)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)
Mr. Osman (Somalia)

*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.8
18 October 1985
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): Once again the international community is undertaking a review of the situation in the field of disarmament and international security, this time on the special occasion of the fortieth session of our General Assembly of the United Nations.

All States Members of this Organization have accepted that disarmament is in the interest of each and the collective responsibility of all. In the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, which remains the most authoritative consensus statement by the United Nations on the crucial questions of disarmament and international security, the nuclear-weapon Powers recognized the special responsibilities incumbent upon them in this regard. This does not mean that the powerful should enjoy a monopoly in decisions that affect the vital interests of all; it means rather, that they have a special obligation to shape their decisions according to the common interest of all humankind. The accumulation of weapons of mass destruction by any individual country on the justification of its need to assure its own security and survival constitutes a threat to the security and survival of all nations. On the day of the opening of the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, 23 September, the President of Brazil, Mr. José Sarney, touched on this point when he said:

"In true democratic spirit, we have campaigned for many years on behalf of disarmament and we have shunned as precarious, violent and irrational the idea of a peace maintained by parity in atomic arsenals." (A/40/PV.4, p. 8)

Peace and security will continue to be in jeopardy as long as the most heavily armed States persist in expanding the means of destruction at their disposal, which far exceed any reasonable defence needs. By the same token, the expansion of their

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

rivalry to ever widening spheres of military confrontation endangers peace and diminishes the prospects of achieving durable security for all nations. Worse still, such developments run counter to the obligations and commitments which were explicitly undertaken by those States in legally binding international instruments and in solemn declarations adopted in multilateral forums.

It is for these reasons that the international community must do its utmost to reinforce its commitment, in solidarity, to stop and reverse the arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect. The world community cannot resign itself to the role of a mere observer of the dealings in restricted centres of power. The acquisition of absolute military might cannot be regarded as a right to be exercised by a selected few that seem to assume that they are placed above and beyond the reach of commitments and obligations based on the legitimate aspirations of mankind as a whole. On the contrary, the very might of their arsenals not only entails the need for absolute respect for their obligations but also determines their accountability before the world community - that is, the General Assembly of the United Nations. Otherwise, faith in the international juridical system painstakingly built up throughout history will be dangerously shaken, and perhaps irretrievably lost.

The nuclear-weapon Powers, and particularly the two super-Powers, which have predicated their security on the insecurity of the rest of the world, are the ones on whose shoulders such special responsibilities lie. They are the ones that must prove to the international community their continued dedication to the principles, the commitments and the obligations that they have accepted and reaffirmed in the field of disarmament; they must shoulder and exercise, in an unselfish and constructive manner, and to the satisfaction of the community of nations to which they belong, the heavy responsibilities which have been placed upon them and which they allege they acknowledge. Their active participation in the common efforts to

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

strengthen the multilateral institutions for security and disarmament is indispensable for the success of such efforts. Their ability to influence and shape the process of arms limitation and disarmament is not exhausted in the restricted sphere of their reciprocal relationship; on the contrary, while their bilateral talks and negotiations, when carried out in good faith, remain an essential element for the achievement of substantive progress, they must take fully into account in such talks and in their general attitudes and policies the commitments and responsibilities they have assumed before the community of nations as a whole. In this way, they will indeed be working constructively for the improvement of the multilateral institutions devoted to disarmament, as well as facilitating the full and proper utilization of the existing international machinery in this field.

The Brazilian delegation attaches the utmost value to the reinforcement of the central role recognized for the United Nations in the common task of reducing, controlling and eliminating armaments, especially those with the highest destructive power. Accordingly, it will examine the current agenda of the First Committee with special emphasis on the questions of the prevention of nuclear war, the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, the prevention of the arms race in outer space and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. We shall also devote particular attention to items bearing on the need to curb the growing proliferation of nuclear weapons in its vertical and geographical dimensions.

On the issues related to the prevention of nuclear war, the Brazilian delegation hopes that the General Assembly will finally be enabled to give clear guidelines for the action of the appropriate negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament. While it would perhaps be unrealistic to expect nuclear war to be prevented by a single agreement, the First Committee is certainly the proper place to achieve the broad political understanding that would permit the Conference to identify the areas where multilateral action is needed.

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

From such a basis, it could proceed to the actual negotiation of specific instruments for the prevention of nuclear war. I believe our approach to this question has been and remains very practical and very clear. We shall therefore not support attempts such as those made in the recent past in this hall to condone and justify the very attitudes and doctrines that have been responsible for the exacerbation of the nuclear arms race and the consequent increase of the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. By the same token, my delegation will not endorse initiatives which, though well-intentioned, result in the shifting of the emphasis from nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war by focusing on other questions and problems, particularly in regions which enjoy a non-nuclear status and are, therefore, unable to deter any nuclear threat coming from the outside.

With regard to the question of the cessation of tests of nuclear weapons, my delegation regrets that this goal, which has long been advocated almost unanimously, seems now to be more distant than ever. Heedless of the urgings of the international community, the nuclear-weapon Powers continue obstinately to test their atomic arms, and even justify their actions through the need to improve or maintain the efficiency of their arsenals. By so doing, they preserve the credibility of the threat they pose. At the same time, they constantly magnify the alleged danger that any other nation might decide to provide for its own security by similar means. The two super-Powers are responsible for the majority of nuclear-weapon tests, and do not show any sign of relenting, thus encouraging the testing carried out by the three other nuclear-weapon States. One of the super-Powers recently started a shift in its approach to the test ban, first by characterizing it as a "long term goal" and now declaring that it would be counter-productive and destabilizing, and therefore dangerous and undesirable. Such views are clearly incompatible with the letter and spirit of commitments

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

assumed in at least two international treaties, and may accelerate the current crisis of confidence in the legal framework in the field of disarmament and international security.

Still on the test ban issue, we have for a long time witnessed a situation in which effective multilateral action has been blocked under the pretext that the solution of academic problems of verification must precede the actual negotiation of a treaty. Furthermore, we are told that the mere possibility of non-nuclear countries acquiring an explosive technological capability is more dangerous than the already existing capability of the nuclear-weapon Powers to blow the world up several times over. Such a line of reasoning really means that nuclear explosives are to be considered in a positive light as long as they are in the exclusive control of the developed nations, many of which already possess the capability to detonate a nuclear device at very short notice. Instead, it is the underdeveloped, unarmed nations that are being presented as culprits, or suspects, for trying to master technologies that others would wish to control for ever.

One final thought suggested by the issue of the nuclear test ban is this. The alleged need for foolproof verification procedures that would ensure confidence in a future treaty has been used, as I have just said, as a pretext for the lack of actual negotiations. Brazil, for its part, believes that it is just as crucial, for instance, to strengthen confidence in the treaties that are already in force in this field, and which enjoin the nuclear-weapon parties to negotiate the cessation of their tests in all environments and for all time. In the existing treaties, however, there are no verification procedures to ensure that the commitments of the nuclear parties are being fulfilled. Apparently, only the non-nuclear-weapon nations are capable of generating suspicion, since it is only they that are subject to verification and control of their activities. Nuclear-weapon status breeds immunity.

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

In the realm of outer space, we have observed the unbridled competition of the two super-Powers to acquire unsurpassed military capabilities in that new frontier of their rivalry. All efforts of the international community to expand the incipient legal régime that declared outer space "the province of mankind" have so far proved incapable of stopping and reversing the deadly race for superiority in space. My delegation hopes that it will be possible at this session to improve upon the agreement reached, despite one absention, at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, which enabled the Conference on Disarmament to establish a subsidiary body on this question. Now is the time for last year's procedural progress to bear substantive fruit.

We also see an urgent need to curb and reverse the current proliferation of nuclear weapons, both in its vertical and in its geographical dimensions. While the bilateral negotiations which were once again started between the super-Powers have yet to produce any tangible measure of nuclear disarmament - as was also the case in the past - we hope that the coming meeting of the leaders of the two most armed nations in the world will provide a long-awaited impulse to their private talks. Meanwhile, the vast majority of mankind should not remain hostage to the logic of confrontation which has been responsible for the dissemination of nuclear weapons all over the earth, be it in the air, on land or in and under the oceans. Brazil is particularly sensitive to the need for strengthening the status of Latin America as a nuclear-weapon-free region. In this connection, we attach particular importance to the preservation of the South Atlantic as a peaceful zone, untouched by the arms race, by the presence of nuclear weapons or by any form of confrontation originating in other regions.

In the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which Brazil signed and ratified, and the provisions of which we vowed to respect even before its full entry into force, the Latin American nations undertook to achieve a forward-looking objective: to utilize nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

To this end, they also decided to prohibit the acquisition of nuclear weapons and their introduction in the zone defined by the Treaty, and they accepted a verification system designed to ensure compliance with their obligations towards one another. Unfortunately, no comparable system exists to verify compliance by the nuclear-weapon Powers with the obligations they assumed toward the Latin American parties. As a result, the countries situated in the zone of application of the instrument are unable to ascertain the fulfilment of those obligations.

The question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, however, has many aspects, of which not the least important is precisely their unchecked proliferation by the nuclear-weapon Powers. Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is too broad and important a question to be used simply as a pretext for the maintenance of technological dependence, or as justification for the over-armament of a few privileged Powers. For developing nations, as well as for the industrially advanced, access to the full range of scientific and technological benefits has now become a crucial question of survival, and all efforts must be made in the United Nations to prevent the fragmentation of the world into closed technological blocs.

Those are the main concerns of the Brazilian delegation, at this fortieth session of the General Assembly, among the issues to be examined by the First Committee. We shall have the opportunity to discuss them further during the course of our work, as well as to present our views on other items of the long agenda before us. Let me close these general remarks by stressing our hope that the opportunity to take meaningful action in the field of disarmament and international security does not slip by once again.

Only by facing squarely the crucial challenge of our time can the United Nations discharge the historic responsibilities placed upon it and fulfil the hopes and aspirations it symbolizes. The prestige and effectiveness of this Organization

(Mr. Maciel, Brazil)

rest ultimately on its ability to cope with the questions before it. But this can only be achieved through the will of its Members to live up to their commitments and obligations. No amount of organizational restructuring, or revamping of the machinery, can substitute for genuine good faith and real determination to solve collectively the problems that affect all of us, large and small, powerful and powerless. Those who bear special responsibilities must necessarily participate in this effort to the full extent of their ability. In the absence of a clear demonstration, on the part of such nations, of their will to honour their commitments in the field of disarmament and international security, all responsible Members of the United Nations have the right and the duty to continue to demand from them respect for the legitimate concerns of the vast majority of mankind.

Mr. FROYSNES (Norway): Anniversaries are often seen as occasions to reflect on the past. And we should indeed learn from the past, so also on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. What we have achieved in the field of disarmament here in the United Nations is not impressive. Therefore, the present challenge is simply to do better as we look to the future. In no other area is this challenge more evident than when it comes to weapons of mass destruction.

This year 40 years have elapsed since the atomic age started. We shall never forget what Hiroshima and Nagasaki mean in the annals of history. More recently the concept of nuclear winter has further underlined the fact that a total global destruction is indeed feasible if a nuclear war breaks out. In my view this was amply underlined by this year's award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Nuclear and chemical weapons continue to play a major role in the arsenals of a number of States. We must realize that nuclear weapons occupy an important role

(Mr. Froyshes, Norway)

in the balance of power but it is my opinion, nevertheless, that the present arms build-up has reached a stage where we are faced with more instability and less security if present developments continue unchecked.

In this situation it is more than ever important that we concentrate all our efforts to reach agreements that can assure substantial, balanced and verifiable reductions in the stocks of weapons of mass destruction. Our aim must be to reduce all weapon systems to the lowest possible level consistent with legitimate defence needs.

In accordance with this policy Norway, along with our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), has actively supported efforts to reduce the dependence upon nuclear weapons. As a unilateral measure NATO has decided to withdraw 2,400 nuclear warheads from Europe in the period 1980 to 1988, thereby reducing the nuclear arsenal in Europe substantially. This commitment is also shown in the decision to remove one nuclear weapon for each intermediate-range nuclear missile deployed in Europe. We call upon other States, when announcing unilateral measures, to make such real and concrete contributions to limit the nuclear arsenals.

It should also be stressed that the NATO countries, on a number of occasions, have declared that none of their weapons, nuclear or conventional, will ever be used except in response to attack. We need to find measures to eliminate the possible first-use of all weapons. That would be consistent with the obligations in the United Nations Charter.

In my opinion, the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America offer the best opportunity for achieving progress in disarmament both regarding offensive and defensive weapon systems. We all carry a responsibility that these negotiations now enter a phase which will produce concrete progress, and I think in fact they will. Norway, for its part, takes this

(Mr. Froysnes, Norway)

challenge very seriously, and we are joining in the intensive NATO consultations, which are now being undertaken, in order to move these negotiations forward. The aim is to achieve significant reductions, thereby enhancing strategic stability on earth and giving tangible proof that an arms race can be prevented in outer space.

(Mr. Froysnes, Norway)

However, it is also my opinion that both the First Committee of the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament should play an important role on these vital issues. The Conference on Disarmament and this Committee should be utilized to a fuller extent in order to promote the nuclear disarmament process. The Final Declaration of the Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons urged the Conference on Disarmament to proceed to early multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. What we need are concrete measures, not declaratory statements, which can only foster illusions about a state of affairs that does not exist. We cannot have one set of standards for bilateral negotiations on disarmament and another for multilateral negotiations.

The Norwegian Government is encouraged by the successful outcome of the third Review Conference. The Final Declaration adopted by consensus served to strengthen the non-proliferation régime. It also underlines the important function of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in halting the spreading of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear test ban issue remains an important - perhaps the most important - question on the international arms-control agenda. The Conference on Disarmament should intensify its efforts in that respect. The Conference did useful work in the field of verification and compliance regarding a nuclear test ban in 1982 and 1983. The Conference should, therefore, resume its work now on specific issues, including the questions of scope, verification and compliance. These three problems need to be solved before further headway can be made towards the conclusion of a test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Froyenes, Norway)

Norway, together with nine other Western countries, submitted a specific programme of work for a subsidiary body on a nuclear-test ban in the Conference on Disarmament in July this year. This programme of work offers the possibility of an in-depth examination of the three problem areas. Because of the significance of these three issues, I should like to make the following brief observations.

First, a test ban must be comprehensive. Thus it must prohibit both nuclear-weapon tests and so-called nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It would be impossible in practice to work out an arrangement for conducting nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes that would preclude acquisition of military benefits.

Secondly, the ban should be applicable to all States in all environments on a permanent basis. Norway welcomes, in this regard, the stated willingness of China to participate in an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban in the Conference on Disarmament and would urge all the nuclear Powers to take part in this work.

Thirdly, in our view, a global seismological network would have to play a central role in verifying a test ban. Such a network should ensure a reliable international data exchange on the basis of the most modern technology. In order to shed further light on how such a network would operate, Norway organized earlier this year a Conference on Disarmament workshop in Oslo on seismological verification of a nuclear-test ban. Our research indicates that some technical problems still remain to be solved. The problems relate in particular to detection and identification of very-low-yield explosions as well as explosions that produce very weak signals.

Before leaving the question of nuclear arms control and disarmament, I should like to state our position regarding a nuclear freeze. Norway will support a freeze on nuclear weapons, on the condition that a nuclear-arms freeze would be

(Mr. Froyshes, Norway)

agreed, balanced and verifiable. Furthermore, it can be meaningful only in the context of negotiations on substantial reductions in nuclear weapons.

Sixty years ago we saw the conclusion of the Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. Today we are faced with the acute danger that that prohibition might be eroded. It is a matter of grave concern - and it must be strongly condemned - that chemical weapons have recently been used in some areas of conflict.

As the Geneva Protocol contains no verification machinery, Norway has supported the development of procedures within the United Nations to investigate possible violations of the Geneva Protocol. Such procedures have now been developed.

The negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament have proved that it is desirable to incorporate a prohibition on use in the new chemical weapons convention. Such a convention would constitute a comprehensive and global ban on chemical weapons and eventually lead to the destruction of existing stocks.

Some countries have also proposed a chemical-weapon-free zone in Europe. In our opinion, however, the logical way to supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol would be a global convention on prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction, because it is a fact that the recently reported use of chemical weapons has occurred in areas outside the European continent.

A global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons is more than ever a priority in multilateral disarmament negotiations. Considerable headway has in fact been made in the Conference on Disarmament since a negotiating mandate was agreed upon in 1982. The consolidated draft text, which is the result of the 1985 session, represents a good basis on which to try to resolve the more difficult outstanding issues, such as specific procedures for on-site inspections on

(Mr. Froytnes, Norway)

challenge. These questions have to be solved on the basis of a compulsory and comprehensive system of on-site inspection without making use of unnecessary intrusiveness. I urge the adoption of strong recommendations by this Committee to the Geneva Conference on the early conclusion of a comprehensive chemical weapons convention. For its part, Norway has sought to contribute to these negotiations, inter alia, by introducing this year in the Conference on Disarmament proposals for procedures to be followed when investigating alleged use of chemical weapons. More comprehensive proposals for such procedures will be submitted to the Conference in 1986.

During the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly Norway introduced a draft resolution concerning the holding next year of the second Review Conference of States Parties to the Convention on biological weapons. It is now for the depositary States to convene the Preparatory Committee.

Little attention has in fact been given to this Convention, but we think it is an important one. First, it represents a total ban on such weapons. Secondly, it is one of the few conventions which have actually resulted in destruction of weapons. Thirdly, the biological weapons Convention in many ways represents the basis for the ongoing negotiations on chemical weapons. So our view is that this treaty régime also must be upheld and, if possible, strengthened.

(Mr. Froysnes, Norway)

According to paragraph 76 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a convention should also be concluded to prohibit radiological weapons. These weapons of mass destruction should be prohibited before they are developed.

Similarly, the question of prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities must find its solution within the negotiations on radiological weapons.

For our own part we had hoped to have been able by 1985 to take an even more active part in multilateral disarmament negotiations by becoming a member of the Conference on Disarmament. From the report of the Conference to this session of the General Assembly we note that its decision to increase its membership by not more than four States has been reconfirmed. Furthermore we are pleased that the Conference will intensify its consultations with a view to taking a positive decision on the selection of new members at its 1986 session. We trust that the Conference will achieve this goal.

The existence of ever increasing powerful weapons of mass destruction is a major challenge in our search for disarmament. Only through determined efforts, while exercising the necessary political will, can we create real security at lower levels of armament. This would also enable us to release more of our limited resources for the purpose of development and in this way we would indeed contribute towards the creation of peace, stability and prosperity on this planet. We should pledge nothing less as we mark the fortieth anniversary of our world Organization.

Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on the occasion of your election as Chairman of the First Committee at the fortieth session of the General Assembly and to wish you all success in this highly responsible and difficult task.

The continued worsening of the international situation and the further escalation in the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, cause serious

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

alarm among peoples of the world for the fate of peace. This has been eloquently shown by the statements of the overwhelming majority of countries in the general debate in plenary Assembly. One can only agree with the Minister of India, Mr. Khan, who stated that:

"there is today a new spectre that haunts our civilization, the spectre of a nuclear catastrophe. ... Survival in this nuclear age has become the key issue of our times." (A/40/PV.10, p. 42)

Not rivalry in the field of military power but co-operation of all States is the condition for achieving genuine international security. The correctness of one's ideology, the advantages of the system chosen by each people must be proved not through force of arms but by example.

In the nuclear-space age there is no other way.

The countries of the socialist community bend every effort to settle the main problems of our times, to end the threat of a thermonuclear war, to stop the arms race, to advance the process of arms limitation, to ensure the return to a peaceful, mutually advantageous co-operation.

Practical expression of these efforts can be found in the constructive and far-reaching initiatives of the Soviet Union whose implementation, in our view, would lead to a true about-turn in the development of international relations.

Suffice it to mention such unilateral actions of the USSR as the non-first-use of nuclear weapons, a moratorium on all nuclear tests, the temporary cessation of the deployment of medium-range and other weapons in Europe and a moratorium on the launching of anti-satellite weapons.

A new and important step aimed at stopping the ruinous course of the arms race can be seen in the Soviet proposals to the United States that there be a total ban by both sides of space weapons and a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear weapons

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

capable of reaching each another's territory. The USSR has also taken realistic initiatives on questions relating to nuclear medium-range rockets.

The international community is entitled to expect that the United States give a positive response to these peace-loving proposals of the USSR.

However, we must note that the military-industrial complex in the United States of America continues to step up production of weapons of mass destruction. The United States continues to deploy first-strike nuclear weapons in Europe, to carry out tests of the Anti-Satellite System (ASAT) and to turn a deaf ear to appeals to ban nuclear tests. These actions can be viewed only as a desire to achieve by all means a military preponderance and to violate the existing strategic balance in the world.

The question of the use of space has acquired a particular significance in today's conditions. If we do not in good time take the necessary measures to exclude the possibility of the militarization of outer space, it could become a source of mortal danger for all mankind.

The time has come to take a clear-cut political decision that would prevent the militarization of outer space and leave it free for peaceful co-operation. As is noted in this connection by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev:

"Now more than ever we need a far-sighted policy based on an understanding of the realities and the dangers that we would inevitably confront tomorrow if today those who can and must take the only correct decisions evade their responsibility".

The urgency of a solution to this task is obvious. It is dictated by the fact that the United States is now fully engaged in carrying out a large-scale, multi-billion dollar programme which was correctly dubbed "star wars".

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

The authors of the so-called strategic defence initiative tried to present the deployment of strike weapons in space as a way towards achieving a lasting peace, leaving allegations as to the effectiveness and impenetrable nature of a "space shield" on the conscience of its apologists. We would only like to say that there was a time when the atomic bomb was advertised as the "weapon of eternal peace"

History convincingly shows that attempts to strengthen peace through the creation of new types of weaponry inevitably led to an escalation in the arms race and a greater military threat.

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

The problem of international security is a political one - and it must be settled by political means, by the concerted efforts of all States.

No matter what is being said about the objectives of the strategic defence initiative, the fact is its implementation would lead to the appearance in space of new and extremely dangerous types of weapons. The arms race would acquire in many ways an uncontrollable and even irreversible nature, and there would be an incalculable increase in the danger of war caused by the unfounded and fatal - by its consequences - attraction of a first strike in the hope of averting a counter-blow.

Looking at the dire consequences of the militarization of space, we are also mindful of the fact that it is accompanied by colossal expenditures of financial, material and human resources.

It is difficult to believe the allegations that the strategic defence initiative would be confined to scientific research and billions of dollars would be expended merely for scientific objectives. What then would be the meaning of the decision taken by the United States of America last year to set up a unified space command of the United States armed forces if not to add actual space weapons to their arsenals? There is also being set up a space centre for directing military activities in space and construction of a special military space arena for multiple-use space ship of the Shuttle type whose flight schedule is practically in the hands of the Pentagon.

The creation of anti-satellite forces would not have any meaning for the United States, unless there were plans of a first strike to start a nuclear war. That has been stated by American military space specialists themselves. The following is another quotation from The New York Times:

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

"The United States is now firmly and openly moving towards a strategic military policy of the first strike."

That was written by a former Deputy of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Herbert Scoville.

A step like that is taken with the clear-cut objective which, with military candour, was expressed by the Deputy Secretary of the United States Air Force, Edward Aldridge, as follows: "The nation which controls space can control the whole world."

That is why we, like many others who have already spoken in the First Committee, consider that so-called research and development under the strategic defence initiative programme conceal plans for the unprecedented mobilization of resources and scientific potential, of incalculable resources for a new qualitative jump in the field of military technology by the United States in all directions: defensive and offensive weapons, nuclear and conventional, space, laser, particle and others - a jump towards new, uncharted dangers that would be much greater than the present dangers of nuclear military technology, despite the fact that mankind has not been able to overcome even those.

The Anti-Satellite System (ASAT) also is an integral part of the United States policy to create space strike systems. There was a first test-firing against a target on 13 September last. It is obvious that behind those tests there lie not only the Pentagon's desire to acquire arms for anti-satellite war but also to work out, under the guise of tests of anti-satellite systems, an anti-missile airborne and other based weapons which are prohibited by the anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

The creation of space strike weapons would lead to serious consequences in the field of international law. It would lead to the demise of the anti-ballistic

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

missile Treaty, which is the base of the whole process of the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons and to the downfall of that whole process. There would be a threat to many other international agreements on matters of arms limitation and disarmament, among others the 1963 Treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in three environments and the 1967 space Treaty.

The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community propose a simple, radical and effective solution of the problem of banning the militarization of space: not to start the race of space weapons, to ban all types of space strike weapons, and to establish immediately a moratorium on their manufacture, testing and deployment. That would be in the interest of all peoples and States.

The implementation of those proposals would create the necessary premises for a radical reduction of nuclear weapons, not only the means of delivery but also nuclear charges, not only strategic weapons but also medium-range nuclear weapons. The close relationship of these questions is stressed in the Soviet-American agreement on the subject and goals of the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. Their success is predicated upon strict adherence to the spirit and letter of the joint agreement in all its parts.

As for the USSR, Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev said the following in a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 15 October:

"We speak openly of the objectives of our international policy and ways of achieving them. In this respect, our policy is completely predictable; there is no mystery or obscurity in it. It is a policy based on the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence of two opposing systems. Our premise is that only a stable and trustworthy policy is worthy of States and Parties conscious of their responsibility for the fate of peace in our thoroughly contradictory century."

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

The Ukrainian SSR thinks that during the current session of the General Assembly a signal contribution could be made to preventing the spread of the arms race to space. There is a concrete approach to the solution of these tasks in the proposals made at various times by the Soviet Union to this international community. At this session of the General Assembly the USSR has taken a new initiative about international co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization, which is being considered in this Committee.

The efforts and resources of States would be concentrated on ensuring that the results of space activities serve not destruction but construction and progress for all peoples of our planet. The united efforts of States in the peaceful exploitation of space would increase mutual understanding, co-operation and the effective use of the material and intellectual resources of mankind. There would thus be a new impetus to the development of science and technology.

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

There would be unlimited prospects for using the achievements in space to further the economic and social progress of peoples; to solve the global problems confronting mankind - among which are such urgent tasks as the elimination of hunger and disease; to overcome economic backwardness in developing countries, and to find a practical solution to the question of co-operation and the peaceful exploitation of space under conditions of its non-militarization. Agreement about the main trends and principles of this co-operation could be achieved at a representative international conference to be called in 1987 at the latest, at which could be considered the question of the creation of a world space organization to ensure, on a mutually advantageous basis, access for all States without discrimination to the results of the peaceful research and exploitation of outer space. Quite understandably, it is possible to obtain the benefits of mutually advantageous co-operation on the peaceful uses of outer space only under conditions of its non-militarization.

Twenty-eight years have elapsed this month since the first artificial earth satellite opened the road to space for mankind. Time has convincingly shown the unlimited possibilities to be derived by the peoples of all continents from the peaceful use of outer space. We remain convinced that space, the legacy of all mankind, must become an arena for constructive activity and not an arena of military opposition and confrontation.

The road to be followed in the further exploration of space depends to a large extent upon the results of this anniversary session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution submitted in the First Committee on this question, which are contained in document A/C.1/40/L.1, gives the possibility of adopting a truly historical decision which would usher in the beginning of the peaceful international exploitation of space through the concerted efforts of all Member States of the United Nations.

Mr. PENAZKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of Czechoslovakia would like to state its views on the question of nuclear disarmament, which, as before, is a most important challenge to the international community. One can justly note that the history of the United Nations is replete with examples of efforts to solve this problem. Our Organization has really become the arena for demands, ideas, and initiatives pointing to the fact that the nuclear-arms race is incompatible with the peace and security of peoples; and yet it has been unable thus far to find a solution. The reasons are as numerous and complex as is the very problem of nuclear disarmament, which involves multilateral and bilateral processes, a large number of problems and concrete moral, political and radical measures. Therefore, our consideration of these problems must be comprehensive and realistic; but it must also go beyond routine statements in order to expand the area of consensus on practical measures for nuclear disarmament.

The delegation of Czechoslovakia has already had an opportunity to stress the close link between the stockpiling of offensive nuclear weapons and plans for the militarization of space, whose goal is the military domination of the world. Although the "star wars" programme is a qualitatively new component of the nuclear-arms race which tends to accelerate it, the philosophy behind it is certainly not new. There is a direct analogy with the stockpiling of nuclear weapons based on land, at sea and in the air, as a result of which international tensions and the nuclear missile threat are continuing to increase.

The conclusion is obvious. A most important condition for halting the nuclear-arms race in our space and nuclear age is to prevent the militarization of space and proceed to a radical reduction of missiles.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

In this context, we consider that the highly constructive proposals of the Soviet Union are extremely important for a mutual reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, in direct relationship with strategic space weapons and the beginning of direct negotiations with the countries concerned. These proposals open the way towards progress. They obviously require the same constructive and objective response on the part of those States to which they are addressed.

Many important and urgent questions concerning the limitation of nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament are on the agenda of our Committee. We are convinced that the United Nations can and must bend every effort for their practical solution. We must unite all Member States. We must encourage political will once and for all to do away with the threat of nuclear war.

We have always been in favour of working out within the framework of the United Nations a large-scale concrete programme of nuclear disarmament which would compel all States to take genuine step-by-step measures to eliminate the nuclear threat leading to the full liquidation of existing stocks of nuclear weapons. We consider such a programme should encompass wide moral, political and legal obligations and, most important, radical, practical measures based on the principles of mutual advantage, equality and equal security. This would be fully consonant with the decisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which demanded, as first steps, that there be a halt in the qualitative improvement and deployment of systems of nuclear weapons and the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and all means of delivery, including production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

The concrete task of working out such measures, including an agreement on the programme of nuclear disarmament, belongs to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We can only deeply regret that the genuine efforts of the socialist and non-aligned countries, which took initiatives to create a special committee to carry out negotiations to put an end to the nuclear-arms race and proceed to nuclear disarmament, were unsuccessful again this year.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

The climate on this matter at the Conference is characteristic of the work of that important organ, the only organ for multilateral disarmament negotiations. The impression is created that, as has been said, the mere word "negotiations" gives rise to horror among the members of a certain group of delegations, which at best engage in very bizarre interpretations of that term.

The same situation prevails in a very important body of the General Assembly, namely, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which for many years has been marking time and has failed to eliminate the many square brackets surrounding every recommendation on the limitation of the nuclear arms race and prevention of the danger of nuclear war. That is why we ask once again: is it not high time, bearing in mind our responsibilities, finally to stop the endless procedural discussions and replace them by genuine negotiations; to stop affirming that one or other aspect of nuclear disarmament is not yet ripe for immediate negotiations, or advancing arguments about the need to reject a freeze on nuclear weapons because it would divert attention from efforts to reduce nuclear arsenals, or trying to justify the doctrine of nuclear deterrence by stating that it has been able to maintain a fragile peace? It is obvious that this kind of discussion, word games of this sort, will not and cannot lead to positive results. The time that is lost cannot be recovered. The situation brooks no further delay.

As stated in the Delhi Declaration, adopted by six countries on 28 January 1985, we could be facing the prologue to an arctic nuclear winter that could transform the earth into a darkened, frozen planet, creating an unprecedented threat to all nations, even those far removed from the nuclear explosions. We strongly favour the immediate movement from general discussions towards true comprehensive negotiations on the whole complex of nuclear problems and we are convinced that a valuable contribution will be made at the present session.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

Another way to exert every effort to ban the nuclear arms race is to formulate a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. In fact, the normal outcome of such a treaty would be to stop the improvement of nuclear weapons and the creation of new and more destructive weapons systems. We believe that the treaty would be a very important political element in strengthening general stability and reducing the level of confrontation, as well as a turning point in efforts to achieve disarmament in all its aspects.

In this connection, we greatly value the decision of the Soviet Union on a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985 to 1 January 1986, with the stipulation that the moratorium will continue if the United States also abstains from carrying out nuclear tests. This decision testifies to a most responsible approach and affords an excellent opportunity for a common solution of the problem of nuclear tests. We believe that the other country must finally respond to this initiative not with a dubious invitation to people to visit it in order to witness explosions but with the total cessation of testing. The future will show which of these two approaches best serves the cause of peace.

With regard to reaching practical agreement at the Conference on Disarmament on the text of an international treaty, this year again the problem has been bogged down in sterile discussions. Some delegations have attempted to replace negotiations with obfuscations, the alleged need to discuss a possible programme of work, and so forth, as if this question had not been on the agenda as a fundamental and very urgent one for more than 30 years, and as if there had not been negotiations between three nuclear States which, before, they were interrupted, had reached a fairly decisive stage.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

The results of 20 sessions of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events and thus nuclear explosions, together with the control measures additionally proposed, would make it possible to verify observance of a treaty. Action on those results has also been postponed because they are claimed to be insufficient. We believe that the General Assembly and our Committee must at this session unanimously confirm the extreme importance of this question and demand that the Conference on Disarmament immediately move on to practical agreement on the text of a treaty.

We continue to attach great importance to the idea of a complete freeze on nuclear weapons, first of all by the Soviet Union and the United States, both qualitatively and quantitatively. This idea is widely supported in the United Nations and by world public opinion. We welcome, in this connection, the readiness of the Soviet Union to agree to some control measures in addition to national measures on a co-operative basis, taking into account previous negotiations to limit nuclear weapons.

We agree that it is essential to take preventive measures to do away for ever with the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons and the launching of a nuclear war. An effective measure in that direction the achievement of which depends entirely on the goodwill of the various States would be an undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is well known that in 1982 the Soviet Union unilaterally undertook such a commitment. The Chinese People's Republic has undertaken a similar commitment. If the other nuclear Powers acted in the same way, the impending nuclear threat would be greatly reduced. There would then be a real possibility of achieving the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons on a treaty basis, as proposed by the non-aligned countries.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We are of the view that non-nuclear-weapon States, when forbidding deployment on their territory, have a legitimate right to reliable international guarantees of their security which would protect them against the use of nuclear weapons. We are also of the opinion that the Conference on Disarmament should speed up its work of drafting relevant international instruments on this subject.

We attach very great importance to the further strengthening and full implementation of the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which, in 15 years, has become one of the cornerstones of international law. That Treaty created a remarkably durable and reliable system of control exercised by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and its experience could also be used in questions of verification in the broader framework of the nuclear disarmament process.

We share the conclusions of the recent Third Review Conference of Parties to the NPT; we are in favour of increasing its effectiveness, as it constitutes the main barrier to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and hope that it will become universal.

An effective measure against the proliferation of nuclear weapons in other parts of the world would be the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The position of Czechoslovakia on this question is that it consistently supports strict respect for the denuclearized status of those zones and the creation of new such zones. We consider that the proposals to create nuclear-free zones in the north of Europe and in the Balkans, and a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe, are very timely. That corridor, passing close to the interface between the two main military-political alliances, would certainly help to reduce the dangerous level of military confrontation in Europe.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We are resolutely in favour of convening a conference - not later than the first half of next year - to make the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and we fully support the efforts of the States of that area successfully to complete preparations for that important measure.

The United Nations plays a central role and bears the main responsibility in questions of disarmament, the co-ordination of efforts of Member States, and the elaboration of a common strategy to solve this key problem of our time. That responsibility is based on the recognition of the priority nature of the problem of nuclear disarmament and of averting the threat of a nuclear war. We hope that, as a result of this session, there will be full confirmation of the fact that we are all aware of this high responsibility.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, allow me, at the outset, to offer you my warm congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. My congratulations also go to the other members of the Bureau. I believe that, under your able guidance, the Committee will achieve satisfactory results. I also wish to take this opportunity to express my thanks to your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador de Souza e Silva of Brazil, for the excellent job he did last year.

It is of special significance that the Committee is meeting at a time when the United Nations is celebrating its fortieth anniversary.

Following the conclusion of the Second World War, the peoples of the world, with their bitter memories of the scourge of war, eagerly desired peace and security in their quest for reconstruction and development. It is precisely for the purpose of maintaining world peace and security that the United Nations was created. The emergence of a vast number of independent and non-aligned countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the 1950s and 1960s has further strengthened

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

this world Organization and enhanced its role in the maintenance of international peace and security. Disarmament is one of its important responsibilities. Thanks to the joint efforts of the international community, the United Nations has achieved certain results in the field of disarmament. The major ones are as follows: A special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the first of its kind, was convened in 1978, and its Final Document was adopted by consensus. The Document sets forth guidelines for a series of major issues, such as the prevention of nuclear war, cessation of the nuclear and conventional arms race, and realization of general and complete disarmament. It calls for joint efforts by all countries to achieve disarmament, and stresses in particular that countries with the largest military arsenals should bear a special responsibility. Four years later, a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament reaffirmed the content of that Final Document. Today it continues to have great significance as a document offering guidance.

Prompted by the first special session devoted to disarmament, the United Nations Disarmament Commission was reactivated. The Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, the sole multilateral body for disarmament negotiations, was also reorganized. New members were added and greater importance was attached to its role. The long-standing situation in which disarmament negotiations were manipulated by a pair of big Powers has changed.

While actively pursuing the goal of general and complete disarmament, the United Nations also spares no effort in seeking partial and regional disarmament measures and has succeeded in some cases.

Co-ordinated by the Department for Disarmament Affairs, a World Disarmament Campaign has been launched in recent years; this Campaign has enhanced the understanding of the disarmament issue and will have a far-reaching significance in

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

promoting a wider participation by the peoples of the world in disarmament endeavours.

However, when we review and affirm the positive results the United Nations has achieved, we must not lose sight of the fact that wars, bloodshed and conflicts have not ceased for a single day in the past 40 years in different areas of the world, and that the peace and security we have now are neither durable nor universal. The realization of the purposes as set forth in the United Nations Charter remains far distant and the principles of the Charter are still being trampled upon. Aggression, expansion and occupation by armed forces have not been effectively checked. The hot spots are still smouldering. The arms race for military supremacy is continuing with full speed.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

Little progress has been made on either nuclear or conventional disarmament, which have been on the agenda of the United Nations ever since its inception. Conventional disarmament remains a thing on paper. Conventional weapons have not only greatly increased in number, but also become much more lethal than ever before. Countless lives are taken daily in conventional wars. According to incomplete statistics, death tolls of conventional wars since the Second World War have exceeded 20 million. In the field of nuclear disarmament, partial measures have failed to bring about an actual reduction of nuclear arms. The nuclear weapons of the two super-Powers have developed so much that both in terms of quantity and quality, they are now in a totally different order of magnitude compared to the earlier weapons. What is more, the arms race is even extending into outer space. Just as the emergence of nuclear weapons has not brought about a reduction or elimination of conventional weapons, the development of space weapons will not lead to a reduction or elimination of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, it will only make disarmament more difficult and complicated. Progress on banning chemical weapons has also been slow. The existence and use of chemical weapons still pose a real threat.

In short, disarmament is still far from gaining any substantive progress, and this can only be attributed to the lack of political will on the part of the countries possessing the largest nuclear arsenals. The total annual military expenditures of the whole world, now reaching almost \$1 trillion, have seriously affected the economic and social developments of various countries. Like the other peace-loving countries of the world, China is deeply concerned about this situation.

We welcome the ongoing negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. But much to our regret, these talks are so far still marking time, and what is more disquieting is that there seem to have been attempts to substitute these talks for the multilateral negotiations and to use the latter only as a forum

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

for propaganda to score points. We hope that the forthcoming summit meeting between the Soviet Union and the United States will help change this course of events.

In view of the present unsatisfactory situation, and in consideration of the strong desire of the peoples of the world to curb the arms race and avert a nuclear war, China's Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Wu Xueqian, put forward a four-point proposal during the general debate of the current session of the General Assembly which I would like to elaborate upon a little further. The four points are as follows:

First, all nuclear States, and the two big nuclear Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - in particular, should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in any circumstances and should unconditionally pledge not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States or nuclear-free zones. Proceeding from such a basis, an international convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons should be concluded with the participation of all nuclear States.

China has always maintained that the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons are essential to the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war. As a practical step to realize this long-term goal, the Soviet Union and the United States should, as we have proposed on many occasions, take the lead to stop the testing, improvement and manufacturing of nuclear weapons and drastically reduce their existing nuclear stockpiles. Thereafter, corresponding measures should be taken by other nuclear countries. We have noted that both the United States and the Soviet Union have put forward proposals with regard to a drastic reduction of nuclear weapons. It is our hope that through earnest negotiations they will reach a practical and effective agreement without prejudice to the interests of other countries.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

However, we should not lose sight of the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union have already acquired nuclear arsenals so huge that even if they could cut down their existing nuclear arsenals by 50 per cent, they would still have enough nuclear weapons to destroy the world several times over. Therefore, in conjunction with the efforts for nuclear arms reduction, other measures must also be taken to reduce the threat of nuclear war. To undertake not to use nuclear weapons is, in our view, one of the most effective and practical of such measures. Not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is a proposal put forward by the Chinese Government as early as 1964, and China was the first to undertake such a commitment.

What should be emphasized is that such a commitment must be unconditional, with no reservations whatsoever. Otherwise, the significance would be lost. To pledge not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States and nuclear-free zones has long been demanded by the non-nuclear States. As the overwhelming majority of non-nuclear States have voluntarily given up their nuclear options, it is highly justified and reasonable for them to demand safety assurances from the nuclear States. Such assurances must also be unconditional, and anything short of that would undermine their significance. As to the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, it would just be the natural and logical outcome when all the nuclear States have undertaken unconditionally not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States and nuclear-free zones. Today, both the American and Soviet leaders have accepted that a nuclear war could not be won and should never be fought. Such being the case, it should not be difficult for them to undertake the above-mentioned commitment.

Secondly, we propose that in order to avert the possible escalation of a conventional war into a nuclear war in areas with a high concentration of nuclear

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

and conventional weapons, the two military blocs, the North Atlantic Treaty organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty organization should reach an agreement as early as possible on the drastic reduction of their conventional armaments.

We have long held that in the nuclear era, there is no insurmountable barrier between a nuclear war and a conventional war. Efforts for nuclear disarmament should therefore be combined with those for conventional disarmament. This will not only be conducive to smooth progress in nuclear disarmament, but also to the lessening of the danger of a war, including a nuclear war. This interrelationship between nuclear and conventional disarmament has been seen by more and more countries as a very important issue. The Secretary-General of the United Nations has also stressed the significance of this question in his Report on the Work of the Organization (A/40/1). People used to place high hopes in the mutual and balanced force reduction negotiations. However, more than 10 years have elapsed and the talks remain stagnant. We hope the two treaty organizations will speed up the process of their negotiations so that confidence-building between the East and West and progress in nuclear disarmament could also be facilitated.

Thirdly, we propose that the United States and the Soviet Union immediately stop the arms race in all its forms in outer space, that all countries with space capabilities refrain from developing, testing or deploying outer space weaponry, and that an international agreement on the prohibition and destruction of outer space weaponry be concluded through negotiations as soon as possible.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

The history of weaponry development has proved that it is impossible to eliminate weapons by developing new types of weapons, or to terminate an arms race by starting a new arms race. An arms race in outer space can only lead to greater instability and increase the danger of a nuclear war. To check the arms race in outer space has become a very pressing issue. At the thirty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Chinese delegation co-sponsored with Sri Lanka, Egypt and other countries resolution 39/59, which received almost universal support. The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has also eventually succeeded in setting up an ad hoc committee last summer on this question, and some preliminary work has been done. All this is gratifying. However, we have to bear clearly in mind that real negotiations are yet to start. It is our hope that the current session of the General Assembly will once again take action to further promote negotiations on this question, both bilateral and multilateral.

Fourthly, we propose that a convention on the complete prohibition and total destruction of chemical weapons be concluded as soon as possible. Pending this, all the countries capable of producing chemical weapons should refrain from testing, producing, transferring and deploying chemical weapons and should pledge never to use such weapons.

As one of the priority items, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has already conducted protected, wide-ranging and in-depth negotiations on the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons. Though consensus has been reached on some of the issues, sharp divergencies still exist on the key issues. However, we are convinced that, given a spirit of co-operation and compromise from all sides, it should be possible to come to an agreement at an early date. On the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Geneva Protocol, we should redouble our efforts to uphold and strictly observe the objectives and

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

principles laid down in that instrument, and to ensure, inter alia, that the chemical weapons shall never be used again.

The above four points do not represent the entire position of my country on disarmament. We lay emphasis on them because of their special significance under the present circumstances. We hope that they will be given serious consideration by all delegations.

China pursues an independent foreign policy of peace in international affairs. As a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, China has consistently observed the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and supported all efforts for world peace, security and disarmament both inside and outside the United Nations. China opposes hegemonism. It does not join any military bloc, nor will it enter into alliance with any big Power. China opposes the arms race. It stations not a single soldier beyond its borders, nor has it deployed weapons of any type on the territory of other countries. Under the present circumstances, China is compelled to maintain a limited number of nuclear weapons, which are solely for the purpose of self-defence. China has long undertaken unilaterally not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances and at any time and committed itself unconditionally not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States and nuclear-free zoneds. China is now engaged in peaceful economic and social development; it does not want to waste its limited resources on military expenditures. In the past few years, China's military budget has been continuously on the decrease. Recently, a decision has been made to cut its conventional forces by 1 million in two years. China does not advocate or encourage nuclear proliferation, nor will it assist any non-nuclear State to develop nuclear weapons. Last month, China announced that it had decided to place part of its civilian nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

Atomic Energy Agency. China maintains that outer space belongs to all mankind and should be used for peaceful purposes only. China notes with interest the efforts by a number of European countries for the promotion of peaceful uses of outer space. It consistently supports the establishment of nuclear-free zones on a voluntary basis in areas where conditions permit. China welcomes the decision to set up a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. China is in favour of the convening of an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development and is ready to make its contributions.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations stated in his report on the work of the Organization that:

"We face today a world of almost infinite promise which is also a world of potentially terminal danger." (A/40/1, p. 2)

He asked us Member States to make a choice. China's choice is clear-cut, that is, to seek development in peace and work for peace through development. China is ready to join all the other countries in the common endeavour for peace and security, and is willing to play its role as a force for peace in the world. Over 2,000 years ago, the Chinese people had built one of the world wonders, the Great Wall, to safeguard its own security. Today, we are willing to join hands with all the other nations to build an even grander Great Wall across the entire globe to safeguard world peace.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, at this critical time, which is also one of great expectations, it is fortunate that a personage of your calibre is presiding over our deliberations on the problem of disarmament. As you have said, there has been no disarmament all these years, and one wonders why we insist on discussing disarmament, something that has never been achieved or never will be achieved.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The world wants disarmament, but disarmament is impossible without international security. Nations cannot disarm in a vacuum. There must be international security in accordance with the system provided for in the Charter if we want disarmament. If we do not care about international security, why should we care about disarmament?

The Prime Minister of Dominica, speaking in the General Assembly, has remarked that her impression of the United Nations is that of an organization in which everyone speaks but nobody listens. Therefore I should be very grateful to those who would care to listen to what I may have to say. I request them to give some attention to a somewhat new approach to the problem of disarmament. This approach is that the Security Council must become involved in disarmament.

The Security Council has never entered into disarmament matters; nor has it ever held a session with regard to disarmament. Yet the Charter specifically provides, in Article 26, that the Security Council should be involved in disarmament. Why in all these years has the Security Council never taken up the question of disarmament? Do its members feel that disarmament is something they do not care about or is it that they think the Council can do nothing about it? For what reason is Article 26 of the Charter violated by the Security Council's never having entered into the question of disarmament? That is a question that should be addressed by the General Assembly to the Security Council.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

As you have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in your statement, there has never been any real disarmament. There is much economic interest in the arms race. The real problem is halting the arms race, and it is our view that there is such economic interest in continuing the arms race that whatever we do we cannot overcome this great interest in the arms race, the dealing in armaments, the great economic business of armaments. How can we ignore all that and say that we decide that there should be disarmament?

Disarmament in itself is a negative concept. There is nothing positive about disarmament; it really means throwing away arms, and what does that do? We do not care about throwing away arms; what we want is to stop the arms race, and we will not halt the arms race by pretending that we are going to throw away arms. The arms race can be halted only by proceeding to apply the system of international security provided for in the Charter and to do so sincerely. If we can rely on this security there is no need to go on with armaments.

But it seems that the major Powers in particular, and the other Governments in general do not very much care about international security. They practically never mention it at all. This Committee is meeting, it is said, for disarmament and international security, and I believe that it allots a set number of days to disarmament and a very few days to international security. But international security is the real problem, and not disarmament. International security is what we need and what might bring about disarmament if it is ever brought about. So why do we forget all about it?

The Final Document adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament clearly spelled out in paragraph 13 that genuine and lasting peace - and that is what we are really seeking through disarmament - can be created only through the effective implementation of the security system

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

provided for in the Charter followed by the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces. Therefore we have it on the highest authority that, if we want a speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, we must proceed to an effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter.

Indeed, it is hardly mentioned that collective security is a matter of real importance. The fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should be the occasion for a basic change in approach away from the extremities of unreason and antagonism of the arms race which have brought us to the very brink of self-destruction to co-operation towards collective security in the common interest of peace and survival. To build collective security, our primary concern should be to restore to the United Nations its intended effectiveness as required by the Charter.

The effectiveness of the Security Council, and therefore the effectiveness of the United Nations as a whole, has to be restored, and this can be done only through compliance with the Charter and giving the Security Council the means rendering effective its decisions.

The Security Council is the only United Nations organ whose decisions are enforceable, but we have arranged it in such a way that they cannot be enforced because we have deprived the United Nations in the Security Council of a United Nations force that would be able to give effectiveness to Security Council decisions. Without a United Nations force there can be no way of enforcing the decisions of the Security Council and therefore they become a pretense and not a reality. We know of many cases where Security Council decisions unanimously arrived at were ignored with impunity by the party against which the decisions were directed because there was no way of enforcing them. Therefore if we want to help the cause of disarmament we have to proceed to international security.

The fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should be the occasion for a basic change in approach. Therefore, in order to build collective security, which

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

should be our primary concern, we must restore to the United Nations its intended effectiveness.

The Charter bases itself on the security system, and the principles of disarmament emerge as arising from that security system and are dependent on it, as appears clearly in Article 11 of the Charter, which speaks of disarmament as part and parcel of international security. In consequence of the failure to proceed to international security, the structure of world security has remained inoperable. As we all know, the significance of the Security Council rests on the fact that its resolutions are meant to be enforceable.

We come to a point that I have already touched upon, namely, that the Security Council must become involved in disarmament. Here I wish to register a question that will be put by the General Assembly to the Security Council: why, a whole year after a resolution was overwhelmingly adopted by a vote of 128 in favour, with none against and a few abstentions that the Security Council become involved in the disarmament process, has it done nothing in this respect, because it is important that the question of disarmament be discussed in the Security Council. Why is it important? Because it has been discussed here in this Committee and in what is now called the Conference on Disarmament, but the latter body operates on the basis of consensus and because of this it produces no results. They say that there is no consensus, and that finishes it. But if the question of disarmament went to the Security Council as it should under Article 26 of the Charter, then those who are obstructing disarmament would be unable to do so simply by not voting in favour and saying that there is no consensus. They would have to veto a decision of the Security Council if that body's majority voted for international security and disarmament. If they voted for disarmament, then those who opposed it would have to use the veto because Security Council decisions are taken by majority.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In the Conference on Disarmament, however, they simply say "there is no consensus", without finding out who has objected but in the Security Council the one who objects to progress towards disarmament and international security would have to veto the resolution. That party would be loath to expose the fact that it was against disarmament and international security by using the veto in the Security Council. That is why I raise this issue as an important one. The question of disarmament should be discussed, in accordance with the resolution to which I have referred, in the Security Council, in which case the whole matter takes on a different colour and becomes a more important subject than is now the case - I shall not say in this Committee, because this is in the General Assembly - in the Conference on Disarmament.

The Conference on Disarmament is not really an official body. It was set up by the major Powers at the beginning, then others were added, and so on. But the Security Council is the official body that should discuss disarmament, in accordance with Article 26 of the Charter.

This is the gist of my submission - and I should like to lay stress on this matter: the General Assembly should call on the Security Council to deal with the question of disarmament, in accordance with the resolution adopted overwhelmingly by the General Assembly.

I shall comment now on the question of nuclear weapons.

The eminent scientist Carl Sagan of the United States and Igor Kapitsa of the Soviet Union have expressly pronounced themselves - and I was present and heard them at a special gathering - to the effect that a nuclear war is out of the question. From the very first blows of nuclear weapons the whole structure of the world would be changed. Sunlight would disappear, there would be darkness, it would be a hell, even with a few blows of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

So why accumulate so many nuclear weapons, for what reason, if they are never going to be used? How could they be used if it would mean destruction for all? And those two great scientists of the two major Powers know what they are talking about.

We, the small countries with a small voice, say "Listen to those scientists. Get rid of the idea of accumulating nuclear weapons. They cannot be used, so why spend billions of dollars on weapons that can never be used?" I think the voice of the General Assembly on this question should induce the major Powers to stop their nuclear preparations for a weapon that can never be used.

Based on a realistic approach, the concept of war itself between nuclear Powers is already obsolete. There can be wars between non-nuclear-weapon Powers, because they would use old weapons, as happens now. But war between nuclear Powers is excluded. Therefore there can never be a war between the United States and the Soviet Union, because they are both nuclear Powers and that would mean such tremendous destruction that they cannot undertake it.

On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the General Assembly must call on the major Powers to outlaw and obliterate the use of nuclear weapons. That must be one outcome of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

The other outcome of this fortieth anniversary is that the United Nations must become effective as intended and meant to be under the Charter by its founders. The Charter provides for an effective United Nations. It does so by requiring an effective Security Council, which is the only organ whose decisions are enforceable. Therefore, the Security Council must be made effective by enforcement of its resolutions through the creation of a United Nations force. There must be a United Nations force to give effect to decisions of the Security Council. If we have the decisions of the Security Council enforced, we can be sure of having an effective United Nations.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The resolution I referred to earlier is General Assembly resolution 39/63 K, adopted overwhelmingly last year, which calls on the Security Council to hold a series of meetings on disarmament. It is also mentioned by the Secretary-General in his report. He also cites Article 26 of the Charter in support of the Security Council's becoming involved in disarmament.

Those two aspects, therefore, are the gist of my statement.

Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): On behalf of my delegation, I congratulate you, Sir, most warmly on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. I know that under your wise direction the Committee's affairs will be guided effectively and constructively. Those of us who know your exemplary personal qualities, diplomatic skill, tact and wealth of experience are quite confident that you will lead this Committee's work to success.

In my delegation's view, the long list of disarmament questions before us takes on added significance from the fact that we are marking the fortieth anniversary of a world Organization dedicated to saving succeeding generations from the source of war. It is certainly cause for satisfaction that a third world war has been avoided during the past four decades. However, the work of this Committee bears eloquent testimony to the fact that in that same period both the quantity and destructive power of armaments have grown exponentially, to the point where they pose an unprecedented threat to world peace and security.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

We are now at the mid-point of a Second Disarmament Decade, but it is difficult for anyone to be optimistic about prospects for implementing the major goals of the Decade and for translating into practical terms the decisions of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament. Regrettably, we must co-exist with certain grim realities - notably the escalating nuclear-arms race which threatens mankind's survival; the continued development of abhorrent chemical weapons and the fear that the super-Powers will add a new dimension of instability to the arms race by extending their military competition to outer space.

This ominous situation calls for the exercise of the highest statesmanship and the clearest sense of responsibility on the part of the nuclear Powers, who hold in their hands the hope of all people for peace and progress.

In this context, my Government welcomes the initiation of a new phase of bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the reduction of nuclear weapons and weapon systems. We join in the universal hope that the negotiations will produce tangible results in the not too distant future.

We also hope to see a renewed political will for multilateral co-operation on the many crucial issues before the Conference on Disarmament. In our view the highest priority must be given to the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Nuclear testing runs counter to the commitments of the nuclear Powers under the Non-Proliferation Treaty and it is, of course, a major impetus to the ever-escalating nuclear arms race. While testing continues, the call of the overwhelming majority of Member States for an immediate freeze in the production, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons will certainly be made in vain.

My Government urges the nuclear Powers to continue the process begun with the partial test-ban Treaty and to enter negotiations on a multilateral or any other

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

basis, in order to bring to an end nuclear-weapon testing in all environments. We know that an effective verification system is an essential accompaniment for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, but it seems clear that the technical and political facilities for an international verification system are well within reach.

We also urge the major Powers to co-operate in achieving a multilateral convention to prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. The continued presence of this question on our agenda certainly indicates that achievements in science and technology have overtaken the ability to preserve truly human and civilized values.

A convention to prohibit the production and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction is also long overdue. We have seen all too clearly the difficulty of trying to put the nuclear-weapons genie back into the bottle. It would be folly of the most dangerous kind if additional sources of horror and destruction were to be let loose upon the world.

The obligation of the nuclear Powers to guarantee that non-nuclear-weapon States will not be threatened or attacked with nuclear weapons remains a strong one. My delegation deplores the delays and obstacles which have impeded negotiations on this question in the past. We trust that there will be good progress during the coming year in efforts to establish effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of nuclear weapons.

My delegation warmly welcomes the proposal to hold an international conference on the relationship between development and disarmament. We trust that the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee will be widely approved. There is mounting evidence of the harmful effects of military expenditures on world economic and social systems. We believe there is an urgent need for a forum in which that evidence can be put under the spotlight of international attention.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The conference would serve both disarmament and development aims if it were to give a new impetus to United Nations efforts to reallocate some of the billions spent each year on weapons. The reallocation of even a modest proportion of armaments expenditures to development programmes would undoubtedly go far towards alleviating the misery caused by hunger, ignorance and disease.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a disarmament measure of particular significance to Somalia, which strongly supports both the denuclearization of Africa and the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian ocean region.

As an African State, we call on the international community to make every effort to assist the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in its resolve to implement the solemn Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. The major obstacle to that goal is, of course, South Africa's acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability. This development is a particularly unwelcome contribution to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, since it makes African States vulnerable to the threat of nuclear blackmail from South Africa's aggressive and racist minority régime. At the present time of grave crisis for the African majority in South Africa, for the oppressed and colonized people of Namibia and for front-line States threatened by repeated acts of military aggression, any form of military or nuclear collaboration with South Africa is clearly inimical to disarmament goals and to the cause of justice and peace.

With regard to the Indian Ocean region, my Government has always supported efforts to implement the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean remains, in our view, an essential step towards achieving the aims of the Declaration.

We deeply regret the repeated postponement of the Indian Ocean conference on the ground that the process of harmonizing views in the Ad Hoc Committee on the

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

Indian Ocean is not complete. In our view, few conferences would ever be convened if all matters at issue had to be settled beforehand. We hope that failure to agree on every point will not delay indefinitely the convening of the Conference at Colombo.

It is clear that the littoral and hinterland States, the super-Powers and the major maritime users all have particular responsibilities for the effective implementation of the Indian Ocean Declaration. We hope that the current impasse can be broken by the exercise of the necessary political will to ensure the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in the political affairs of States, the withdrawal of foreign and mercenary troops from the region and the elimination of the great-Powers presence in the context of their global rivalry.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

The world community is preparing for a third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament which, it is hoped, will lead to better progress on disarmament issues than has been achieved in the past, especially with regard to nuclear disarmament. In the view of my delegation, an essential part of the world community's preparation for a third special session must be increased insistence on the establishment of the climate of confidence which alone can engender significant measures to halt the nuclear arms race. There must be a concerted demand for fuller recognition by the great Powers of the importance of peaceful coexistence, for sincere efforts on their part to defuse the regional tensions which create global instability and for their mutual renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons.

The increasingly prolific transfer of conventional weapons is also cause for international concern. It is particularly regrettable when resources desperately needed for development are diverted to armaments and squandered on militaristic and expansionist policies. In many areas, the lesson is still to be learned that peace and stability cannot be achieved without the abandonment of oppressive policies which violate such fundamental human rights as the right of peoples to self-determination and independence, and without strict observance of such widely accepted principles as those of the non-use of force in international relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

In the case of both nuclear and conventional weapons, the political and psychological climate for disarmament needs to be fostered by the consistent application of the principles of international law which flow from the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Osman, Somalia)

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to state its support for the World Disarmament Campaign, which has had marked success in its efforts to educate world public opinion on disarmament issues. With so little progress evident in other international efforts for disarmament, the continued and effective operation of the Campaign should be ensured and further enhanced. We hope that it will receive the widest financial and moral support from States Members of the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.