



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 6TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHEMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

PROGRAMME OF WORK

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Cesar (Czechoslovakia)  
Mr. Al-Hadawi (Iraq)  
Mr. McDowell (New Zealand)  
Mr. Horn (Hungary)

\*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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform members that the General Assembly, at its 36th plenary meeting, on 14 October 1986, decided to allocate an additional item to the First Committee for consideration, namely item 144, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament", as indicated in document A/C.1/41/1/Add.1. The Committee will discuss that item along with other disarmament agenda items.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): It is traditional in this Committee to recognize the important role played by its Chairman and the other Committee officers. I wish therefore to convey to you, Sir, the special satisfaction of the Czechoslovak delegation at your election to the chairmanship. We assure you and the other officers of our full support and co-operation.

In expressing our views on questions of principle involving disarmament and international security, we are also in effect giving an appraisal of the events of the past year, and we shall attempt to outline an effective plan for the future.

My delegation is convinced that at its current session the First Committee can achieve positive results in limiting the arms race and in achieving disarmament. To do this we need a constructive common effort and political determination to oppose confrontation. We need also to take account of new phenomena and various events that have taken place since our last session. Pride of place among these belongs to the growing awareness of the need in the current circumstances for a new rational approach to the common security of States. This is mainly because the arms race and improvements in military technology no longer serve to strengthen

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

national or international security. On the contrary, they pose an increasingly great threat to all.

Since it is universally recognized that nuclear missiles - whether launched from the air or from land - can provide no protection, we must inevitably conclude that true security can be gained only through political means, with the participation of all States. That is the essence of the new political approach for our new nuclear space age, an approach which must serve the broadest interests of mankind and foster the peaceful development of civilization.

At the current session of the General Assembly the socialist countries have put forward the idea of a comprehensive system of international peace and security, which represents an appeal for action on behalf of our common interests.

General Assembly resolutions and decisions have repeatedly emphasized the special responsibility of the principal nuclear Powers in the maintenance of peace and the achievement of nuclear disarmament, and in that connection we have witnessed many exceptionally important events since our last session.

In November 1985 we had high hopes that a new dialogue between the USSR and the United States of America would begin at a summit meeting in Geneva. We welcomed the joint declaration of principle regarding the inadmissibility of nuclear war and the need to act speedily to prevent an arms race in outer space, and to effect a radical reduction in nuclear weapons on earth and strengthen strategic stability.

We fully support the programme for the step-by-step reduction of nuclear weapons and their elimination by the end of the twentieth century proposed by Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 January 1986, a proposal that testifies to the Soviet Union's dedication to the goals of peace and disarmament. We regard that historic initiative as the most thoughtful and specific platform for progress

(Mr. Cisar, Czechoslovakia)

towards resolving a whole range of issues related to nuclear disarmament, with due regard for the legitimate security interests of all States. It opens up new realistic prospects for far-reaching steps in nuclear disarmament on the basis of reasonable compromise.

Over the past year the Soviet Union, in response to a general appeal to end the development and testing of nuclear weapons, and in spite of a new series of tests in Nevada, has renewed its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests, which has been in effect since 6 August 1985. That constitutes indisputable evidence of a lofty sense of political and moral responsibility and of a readiness to put an end to the arms race which is fully in accordance with the Geneva agreements. We are certain that if the United States and other nuclear-weapon States approached this question in a spirit of mutual interest, greater progress could be made towards formulating and signing a treaty on the total banning of nuclear testing. The readiness of the USSR to sign such a treaty at any time and in any place - as stated at the current session of the General Assembly - should be noted by the other nuclear Powers; it would be a practical step, and it cannot be side-stepped by arguing the need to enhance the reliability of nuclear weapons.

Czechoslovakia welcomes the important initiative taken by the Heads of State or Government of the six countries that signed the Delhi Declaration, and their constructive proposals in the Mexico Declaration of 7 August this year regarding nuclear testing and verification. These proposals open new prospects for a range of measures to strengthen confidence and increase trust regarding compliance with binding obligations.

In the past year, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have made further efforts to reach a turning point in disarmament. At Budapest we put forward a new programme for the reduction of military forces and weapons throughout Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, responding thereby to the concerns of the States members

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) regarding conventional weapons. We proposed the establishment of effective machinery for international monitoring, including on-site inspection, and we showed flexibility regarding medium-range missiles in Europe.

In that same constructive spirit the socialist States, which attach great importance to the successful conclusion of the first stage of the Stockholm Conference, have striven, together with other participants, to promote important agreements to build confidence and increase security, and to lessen the danger of war in Europe.

There was also active participation in the work of the special session of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), where new international conventions on strengthening security in the atomic energy field were adopted.

On the eve of the forty-first session of the General Assembly we welcomed the important initiatives taken by the eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare. These were aimed at reaching significant disarmament agreements. We welcome their determined appeal that the arms race be ended on earth and prevented from spreading to outer space.

Although there have been some favourable developments in the international situation, we must continue to express grave concern at the lack of progress on major security and disarmament issues, as a result in particular of the fact that the Star Wars strategy is being forced forward. There has been no real turn for the better in the tense international situation.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

The Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva dealing with strategic nuclear weapons have not had the desired result. Thus, the work of the Conference on Disarmament is still at a stalemate on certain major issues. We, like all other States, followed with great interest the Soviet-American summit meeting at Reykjavik. We believe it was a major political event, reflecting the gravity of the world situation and the questions raised. We value the constructive proposals put forward by the USSR and we recognize its obvious readiness to make serious and unprecedented concessions and far-reaching compromises to solve this crucial issue, such as, inter alia, a 50 per cent reduction in strategic weapons, the complete elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe and a mutually acceptable approach to the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear testing. The fact that the positions of the USSR and the United States on those questions have come closer together than ever before enables us to say that the meeting in Reykjavik was not a total failure. We find it significant that both sides have expressed a readiness to continue their complex dialogue, and we welcome the statement made by the Soviet side that its public proposals, upon which agreement has in essence already been reached, remain on the table.

However, at the same time we share the feelings of serious disappointment and sadness felt by virtually the entire international community at the fact that the United States side has missed this unique and perhaps isolated opportunity to take major steps towards the elimination of all types of nuclear weapons by the year 1995. Such an action would have opened up a new era in man's history. We deeply regret the fact that the adoption of such agreements was blocked by the United States refusal to reconsider its position on the further development of the so-called strategic defence initiative and to go along with the compromise Soviet proposal on verification of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems for the next ten years. That United States position is

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

unjustified. The question must be considered within the framework of the interests of all mankind, including the countries of Western Europe and of the United States itself. We hope that such a consideration will be made before a new escalation of the highly dangerous arms race occurs. It is required by the facts of contemporary life, as well as by the need for dialogue, realism and a high sense of responsibility.

At this session of the General Assembly the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic spoke of mankind's destiny and noted that nuclear arsenals have achieved such absurd dimensions that they no longer serve their original purpose. He stated:

"Even as they are being accumulated the moment is drawing nearer when strategic parity will cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence,"

(A/41/PV.18, p. 56)

and called for mutual attempts to avoid confrontation and to move beyond the political thinking of the past, which had always involved the further accumulation of nuclear weapons.

Indeed, this Committee's session is being held at a time when inevitable changes are occurring in the old stereotypes based on military strength and attempts to achieve superiority. There is a growing understanding of the need for concrete steps, effective negotiations, practical agreements and co-operation. Disarmament issues require just such an approach, and we, for our part, will staunchly pursue it. We will present our views and submit proposals on specific agenda items at a later stage in our discussions.

Mr. AL-HADAWI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I am pleased to have this opportunity to convey to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I wish you and the other officers of the Committee full success in your important tasks.

(Mr. Al-Hadawi, Iraq)

Several preceding speakers have spoken of the international situation and of the tensions and disruptions throughout the world that make us keenly aware that peace, prosperity and security are matters of great concern and interest to the whole of the international community, notwithstanding the size or geographical location of States.

In spite of the hopes aroused by certain international events, and bearing in mind the discussions held at Stockholm and at the summit meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement countries at Harare, Zimbabwe, which further confirmed the need for increased efforts to achieve success towards disarmament, and in spite of the expectations that had been awakened by the summit meeting at Reykjavik, we are forced to note that all these are but single steps that demonstrate the desire for dialogue and understanding for the benefit of mankind as a whole and for the economic stability and well-being of all.

We do not mean to imply that the underlying causes of tension in the world have been removed, or that the fears of our peoples have been dispelled, because a great rivalry still exists. Acts of intervention in the internal affairs of States are still going on, disrupting the flow of international relations. Similarly, the abhorrent policy of apartheid is a destabilizing element in the African continent and particularly in regard to the front-line States. The Iran-Iraq war also continues to undermine international stability. Indeed, the inequalities present in the world have created one of the greatest crises the world has known since the Second World War.



(Mr. Al-Hadawi, Iraq)

Everyone knows that every day the rich countries are becoming richer and the poor poorer. The persistence of tension and the threat to world security have pushed countries to develop new weapons and stockpile weapons, and this has increased tension. Thus the world finds itself drawn into a vicious circle, which also entails an acute deterioration of the economic situation.

The poorer nations, which were already suffering as a result of their poverty, are now suffering even more. The International Year of Peace is drawing to an end, but the international community has not made much progress towards disarmament, agreement on the cessation of nuclear testing or the diversion of money spent on weapons to better purposes instead of pushing world civilization towards the brink of an abyss.

Efforts should not be limited to a few countries only. War may be unleashed at any moment, anywhere, between any countries. In fact, such a war would involve the entire international community and lead to a nuclear catastrophe much greater than that of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is therefore essential to ensure that the international community is fully aware of the dangers inherent in nuclear weapons. Full use must be made of the opinions of nuclear experts throughout the world. A dialogue between States must be encouraged and promoted - in particular between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. They must be encouraged to reach an agreement prohibiting nuclear testing as a first step towards progressive nuclear disarmament, which would lead to international détente, thus strengthening international confidence and improving the prospects of really effective general and complete disarmament.

Iraq appeals for serious efforts to bring about the necessary political will to achieve both strategic and conventional disarmament. We support every effort made to this end.

(Mr. Al-Hadawi, Iraq)

We deplore the small amount of progress made in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament in 1986. There are many items on its agenda, as may be seen from the report of the Conference (A/41/27). Despite its efforts to achieve positive results that would lead to the final goal of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, and the prohibition of nuclear testing, the Conference on Disarmament was unable successfully to complete its work on several items. I shall, with regret, mention some of those failures.

First, as everyone knows, the First Committee deals with all the different aspects of disarmament, in particular strategic disarmament, efforts to ensure control of the development of weapons, a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and international conferences on these items involving nuclear-weapon States. Neither the General Assembly nor the First Committee was able to change the undemocratic practice adopted within the Conference on Disarmament by a limited number of States with short-term profit in mind, to the detriment of the Conference's long-term goal.

We believe it is essential to improve the working of the Conference on Disarmament to ensure that democratic practices prevail, that there is equality among all the Members of the United Nations and that the principle of universality contained in the Charter is complied with. We believe that this should be possible through one of the following means. First, through the adoption of the principle of rotation among United Nations Members in conformity with geographical distribution so that membership in the Conference is not reserved to a certain number of countries only. There are many countries that could contribute to this overall endeavour, in particular members of the Security Council.

We believe that it is necessary to link the Conference on Disarmament directly to the United Nations and to make it an organ of the General Assembly responsible to the Secretary-General, and to revise the rules of procedure of the Conference to ensure that they are flexible, objective and democratic, while determining the

(Mr. Al-Hadawi, Iraq)

true, practical essence of the consensus principle so that no single member can prevent a consensus.

It is surprising that the Conference has not taken into consideration the recommendations made by the General Assembly aimed at enabling all States not members of the Conference to participate in efforts to bring about disarmament and thus make it possible for the Conference to achieve fruitful results, even though the States that are not members do not have the right to vote.

Secondly, the Conference on Disarmament has totally ignored the question of acts of aggression by the Zionist entity against nuclear plants in Iraq established for peaceful purposes despite the decisions of the United Nations, which is fully aware of the adverse repercussions such acts could have on the international community as a whole, and, in particular, those countries that quite legitimately wish to use that form of technology for peaceful and humanitarian purposes.

The Conference on Disarmament should not ignore that very serious, important issue, but, on the contrary, should give it special attention. It is well known that the leaders of the Zionist entity continue to threaten to attack nuclear installations in Iraq whenever they deem it necessary. Iraq has therefore called on the General Assembly and the International Atomic Energy Agency to shoulder their responsibilities and prevent the Zionist entity from committing yet further crimes and acts of aggression. They should compel the Zionist entity to make an unequivocal commitment not to attack nuclear installations in Iraq or in any other country.

We believe that the Conference on Disarmament, too, should discuss this important question. It must make the Zionist entity give a guarantee that it will commit no further acts of aggression.

(Mr. Al-Hadawi, Iraq)

Everybody, including here at the United Nations, knows that since the 1950s the Zionist entity has pursued nuclear armament, in co-operation with many countries. It has co-operated with the racist régime in Pretoria to develop a nuclear-weapon and uranium enrichment industry. Illegal means have been used to procure nuclear technology. All this means that that entity has such weapons. Several reports have revealed that at present the Zionist entity possesses between 100 and 200 nuclear devices and delivery vehicles, in a region where no one else has such weapons, or even thinks of having them. Moreover, the Zionist entity has refused to abide by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to comply with international safeguards for nuclear installations.

The Middle East aspires to peace, security and stability. Our peoples are working towards development and progress to enhance their social and economic development. But the persistent threat posed by the Zionists has created tension and crisis; the region has become one of the most sensitive and volatile in the world. The Zionist entity continues its threats to the region through its aggressive acts, and has taken action to exacerbate the situation. It has refused to comply with General Assembly decisions, continuing its occupation of Gaza, the Golan Heights and the West Bank, and planning further expansion into and occupation of Arab territories. Should the Zionist entity continue its policy of aggression and expansion, great danger would result for the entire Middle East region. That is the result of the Zionist entity's development of nuclear weapons.

Among the issues raised at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and reflected in the report of the Conference (A/41/27) I wish to highlight the question of a nuclear-test ban. It proved impossible to establish an ad hoc committee to lay the foundation for a comprehensive test ban. This is a matter of great importance for all peoples, but some members of the Conference on Disarmament

(Mr. Al-Hadawi, Iraq)

were inflexible and would not shoulder their international responsibility in this regard. They did not show the requisite political will, and the work of the Conference in this regard was therefore doomed to failure, as it has been in past years. This failure results from the impossibility of reaching consensus.

The report of the Conference on Disarmament reveals very serious differences among members of the Conference. That situation is well known, but it should none the less be possible for the Conference to achieve positive results.

We note the failure of the Conference to agree on concrete ways and means to implement its decision to expand the membership of the Conference. However, the decision to add four new members indicates that further reform in this regard is unnecessary.

The question of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for some 15 years. We always have confronted problems and obstacles created by countries with an important, influential role to play in international relations. These obstacles are, in fact, reflections of the special interests of certain countries and the mistrust between those countries and others. The delegation of Iraq calls upon countries to surmount those obstacles without further delay. The Non-Aligned Movement attaches great hopes to the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean. Iraq is proud to have been among the first to call for the convening of that conference and for the adoption of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): Many of the issues we discuss in the United Nations seem to the general public to have little relevance for them. Rightly or wrongly they see a lot of the work we do in this Organization as being rather remote and as having little application to their daily lives. That is not true of the issues we discuss in this Committee, for people everywhere know about the

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

dangers of war in the nuclear age. They know that stored around the world, and on and under its oceans, are more than enough bombs to destroy life on this planet. They know that even if a small proportion of those bombs was ever exploded life everywhere would be profoundly affected. The possibility of a nuclear winter has only reinforced those concerns. People want an end to the arms race. They want progress towards disarmament. They want their Governments to act.

There is every reason for people and their Governments to be concerned about the nuclear arms race and to be worried about the slow pace of disarmament. Until recently the picture has been one of virtually unrelieved grimness. There has not been a significant arms control agreement between the two super-Powers for nearly eight years. The negotiations in Geneva and elsewhere have not produced tangible results. Meanwhile, the weapons laboratories keep on working; more nuclear weapons are developed; more are produced; more are deployed. The earlier arms control agreements are being called into question. The anti-ballistic missile Treaty is now under threat. Both super-Powers are talking about a time when it will expire. There is a real prospect of the arms race moving into the new environment of outer space. That would be an appalling development.

Last weekend the picture almost changed - and dramatically - when President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev met at Reykjavik. We are told that the two leaders almost reached agreements of breathtaking proportions: the elimination of intermediate-range nuclear missiles from Europe; a 50 per cent reduction in all strategic nuclear weapons within five years; even the elimination of all ballistic nuclear missiles within a 10-year time frame. But they could not clinch the deal.

We sincerely and earnestly hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will quickly get back into negotiations. The achievement of coming so near to closing the gap shows that agreement is indeed possible and need not be far away.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

We know that the process of reaching durable agreements is fraught with difficulty. But nothing could be more reassuring to the international community than for the two super-Powers to agree on deep cuts in their nuclear arsenals, to get rid of whole inventories of weapons, to preserve outer space as an environment for peaceful co-operation and to show that those two great countries are able to work together to reduce the nuclear threat instead of engaging in an ultimately senseless and profitless arms race. The Geneva talks must not fail.

Deep cuts in existing arsenals are vitally important. So too are measures to limit the development of new weapons. They are the necessary complement to weapons-reduction agreements. Foremost among such measures is a comprehensive test ban.

New Zealand has long argued that a comprehensive test-ban banning all nuclear tests in all environments for all time is a most urgent and practical means for halting the nuclear-arms race. As our Minister of Defence and Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Frank O'Flynn, said in the General Assembly a few weeks ago:

"No other single step would do so much to slow the remorseless advance of nuclear-weapons production and experimentation, or to establish confidence in the will of the nuclear Powers to eliminate nuclear weapons from the world's arsenals. It would be a truly universal arms control measure."

(A/41/PV.13, p. 58)

In conjunction with Australia, New Zealand has for many years promoted in the First Committee a draft resolution calling for the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We shall do so again this year.

A test ban is important not only for the brake it would put on the development of new weapons by the existing nuclear Powers: it would also provide valuable support for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We hear too frequently disturbing reports that the so-called nuclear club is already much

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

larger than the five declared nuclear-weapon States. We distrust any finger on a nuclear trigger. The more triggers there are, the less secure we feel. A test-ban treaty, widely adhered to and involving the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, would be a powerful impediment to any country contemplating the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

We recognize that there may be more than one way towards achieving a comprehensive test ban. As our Deputy Foreign Minister stated in the Assembly:

"The end of testing by any State, even temporarily, is a step forward and should be welcomed. A mutual moratorium by two or more [States] would be better still, even if a temporary one. All such steps give time for talk and delay disastrous escalation." (A/41/PV.13, pp. 58, 59-60)

We acknowledge the various initiatives that have been made recently by a number of States, including the unilateral moratorium that has been observed by the Soviet Union for over a year. We also acknowledge the efforts of the leaders of the Five Continent Initiative who, in their meeting in Mexico earlier this year, put forward some very interesting proposals for verifying a testing moratorium. We are pleased that the United States and the Soviet Union have been holding talks on testing questions. We understand that various restraints on testing were also discussed at Reykjavik.

All of those developments reflect a degree of responsiveness to international concern about continued testing. Such provisional measures can help build confidence. But they are not a substitute for a properly negotiated, adequately verifiable test-ban treaty. We are deeply disappointed, therefore, that for the third successive year the Conference on Disarmament has failed even to begin substantive work under its agenda item concerning a test ban. That situation erodes the process of multilateral consideration of disarmament issues. It is very difficult to explain to a disbelieving public. It must not happen again next year.



(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

There are issues that need to be addressed. There are issues that can be addressed even within the constraints of different positions of principle. One of them is the scope of the proposed treaty. Another is the question of verification. To those who argue that verification is a problem, and to those who argue that it is not, we say: For goodness' sake, sit down and get on with discussing the question and see where you get to. Please stop pointless quibbling about the wording of a mandate for an ad hoc committee. It is clear what the objective is: get on with it.

One practical way of sorting out some of the confusion on the verification question would be to set up an international seismic monitoring network. New Zealand, with its network of monitoring stations in the South Pacific, stands ready to contribute from our region to an international network.

In New Zealand the awareness of continued testing and of the threat of nuclear weapons is heightened by the tests carried out by France at Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific. New Zealand joins with all of the countries in the South Pacific Forum in its opposition to those tests. That opposition was restated by the Ambassador of Fiji on behalf of the Forum countries when he addressed the Special Political Committee last week. He said:

"We have repeatedly stated our total opposition to and abhorrence of French testing in the South Pacific. We have called on France to cease immediately its testing programme on Mururoa Atoll. We do so again today. That programme is carried out in defiance of the views of all of the Governments and peoples of the independent and self-governing States of the region. We regard the use of the South Pacific for testing nuclear weapons as an outrage and an affront."

Because of their enormous destructiveness, nuclear weapons are inevitably the primary focus of our attention. We must not ignore, however, the dangers and the

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

insecurity caused by large concentrations of conventional weapons and forces. It is, after all, the perceived imbalance of conventional forces, particularly in Europe, that has led to the reliance on nuclear weapons for security. That is why the conclusions of the Stockholm Conference are important, even for countries as far removed from Europe as New Zealand. The agreement reached there has been widely held by all participants as making a significant contribution to easing tensions in Europe. That benefits all of us. We hope that achievement will lead on to progress in actual reductions in conventional forces in Europe.

We must also register our concern at the tendency of a large number of countries, including countries in the developing world, to turn to large-scale weapons acquisition as a means of enhancing their security. In so doing, they divert scarce resources badly needed in other areas. They pay a high economic and social cost. Often, they fail to achieve any greater security, for themselves or for their neighbours.

One factor in this equation that must be considered by the international community is the continuing growth in the conventional-arms trade - a trade in which a significant number of countries are now involved. It is a deadly trade. Countries that engage in it bear a heavy responsibility. The diversion of resources to large-scale arms acquisition and the continuing growth of the conventional-arms trade are issues that should be addressed at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development scheduled to be held next year.

Chemical weapons remain a serious problem that has not yet been properly dealt with by the international community. Their use was outlawed in 1925 by the Geneva Protocol, but they continue to be stocked in the arsenals of the major military Powers. There are indications that an increasing number of other countries are beginning to develop them. The Secretary-General has confirmed three times in the

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

last three years that such weapons have been used against Iranian soldiers in the Iran-Iraq war, in flagrant violation of international law. New Zealand condemns such use of those pernicious weapons. We support the Secretary-General's efforts to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. We also support efforts to restrict the trade in chemicals that can be used in the manufacture of such weapons. To this end New Zealand has imposed export controls on those chemicals.

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Most of all we urge the Conference on Disarmament to speed up its work on the negotiation of a convention that will rid the world of chemical weapons. We appreciate the efforts that have gone into the negotiations. There have been some encouraging signals that the outstanding problems of verification might soon be resolved. We hope so. The international community cannot afford to wait much longer for a successful outcome from those talks.

In September this year the parties to the biological weapons Convention held a successful review conference on that Treaty. Unlike the first review conference, this year's meeting addressed directly the concerns of a number of countries about the verification and compliance mechanisms of that Convention. We welcome the emphasis in the final document of the review conference on the importance of verification, information exchanges and confidence-building measures. The successful outcome of that meeting is solid testimony to the value of review conferences of disarmament and arms-control agreements.

My remarks so far have concentrated on the efforts being made by the two major Powers and the international community as a whole to deal with questions of disarmament. There are, however, steps that can be taken by individual countries to contribute to the process. It is well known that New Zealand will not permit nuclear weapons in its territory even temporarily, as on visiting ships and aircraft. The Minister of Defence put it this way in his address to the Assembly:

"We intend to keep our land, our waters and our ports, and our airspace, nuclear free." (A/41/PV.13, pp. 59-60)

We know that this policy will not change the balance of terror in the world, but it is one measure that was available to a people and a Government who are convinced that we must all make what contribution we can to a nuclear-free world.

At the regional level New Zealand was pleased to join with its partners in the South Pacific Forum in the adoption last year of the Treaty of Rarotonga. That

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Treaty establishes a South Pacific nuclear-free zone. It prohibits the acquisition, stationing or testing of nuclear weapons. It complements the international non-proliferation régime. It covers a large area of the globe. It links up with the nuclear-free zones established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco and the Antarctic Treaty. Ten countries including New Zealand have signed the Treaty. Four have ratified; we understand a fifth ratification is on the way, and New Zealand also expects to be in a position to ratify shortly. We hope that the Treaty will soon come into effect.

This year's meeting of the Forum at Suva, Fiji, adopted three Protocols to that Treaty. The Protocols call on the nuclear Powers to respect the zone, to provide an assurance to the parties to the Treaty that they will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them and that they will not test nuclear weapons within the zone. One Protocol invites France, the United Kingdom and the United States to apply the provisions of the Treaty to their Territories within the zone. The Forum has expressed its pleasure at the indications from some of the States eligible to sign the Protocols that signature will receive prompt and favourable consideration.

The adoption of the Treaty of Rarotonga and its Protocols gives concrete expression to our region's determination that our security should not be diminished by the introduction of nuclear weapons, that our environment should not be contaminated by the dumping of radioactive wastes at sea and that our part of the world should not be a testing ground for distant nuclear Powers.

So there are indeed things that small countries can do by themselves and in their regions, but if we are ever to break out of the vicious cycle of the arms race the major moves must come from the super-Powers. New Zealand shares the world-wide disappointment at the outcome of the Reykjavik meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. This disappointment is all the

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

more keen because agreement was, we are told, so close. An agreement of the sort that was discussed last Sunday would have brought a new phase not only in the relationship between the two super-Powers but also to the entire fabric of international relations. Reykjavik must not be the final word.

Both sides have said it is not. The proposals each made in Iceland are still on the table. They will be taken up at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms. We urge the United States and the Soviet Union not to let slip the opportunity that was almost realized last weekend.

Smaller countries too have a duty to contribute. Their people expect them to play their part. In New Zealand this was shown up graphically this year in the course of a comprehensive inquiry into public attitudes carried out as part of a review of New Zealand's defence policies. That inquiry showed very clearly that New Zealanders are concerned about the state of the arms race. It showed their general desire that their Government work harder for disarmament. Of particular relevance to us here was the finding that fully 92 per cent of New Zealanders believe that New Zealand should promote disarmament through the United Nations.

Are those figures unique to New Zealand? We do not think so. We think similar results would be obtained in many other countries. This level of concern reflects the conviction that the search for agreements on disarmament and arms control must not be left just to the major Powers who have the power and the primary responsibility to reach agreement. Small countries must make their voices heard. By acting together we can keep reminding the big Powers, and especially the super-Powers, of the responsibility they owe to the rest of humanity. The United Nations, and particularly this Committee, is pre-eminently the place to exercise such political pressure.

Mr. HERN (Hungary) (interpretation from Russian): The statements made last year during the debate in the First Committee were permeated with confidence in the future. That was understandable since the United Nations was celebrating the fortieth anniversary of its establishment, and the favourable events in world politics, particularly the prospects of the long awaited Soviet-American summit, filled us all with hope.

The specific conditions and historical experience of Hungary compel us to show due realism and restraint in the issues of world politics and in our expectations as to ways and means of meeting comprehensive problems. We were guided by those considerations in voicing our cautious hopes in this forum last year.

In our assessment of the present situation we should likewise proceed from the fact that improving the East-West relationship, which is of vital importance to the cause of international peace and security, and seeking mutually acceptable solutions for the problems that have accumulated over past years are extremely complicated tasks and cannot be tackled in the short-run, as became evident at the summit in Reykjavik. All the countries concerned should continue to make strenuous and constructive efforts to cope with the vital issues of that relationship and, in particular, to promote the cause of halting the arms race, achieving disarmament and facilitating détente.

That is why we welcome and support the far-reaching initiatives and proposals of the Soviet Union to rid the world of the threat of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space.

(Mr. Horn, Hungary)

These steps of paramount importance were followed by further initiatives clearly reflecting a fresh way of thinking, one demanded increasingly by our time. Let me note in this connection that the Hungarian People's Republic too has taken an active part in the formulation by the socialist countries of these initiatives.

I believe that our hope that the other side will give a similarly constructive response to our initiatives is completely legitimate and justified, for only a common will and shared intentions can realize the desire of the international community for concrete agreements and effective measures to remove the danger of a world war, which is the greatest threat to the future of mankind.

Such realistic and forward-looking endeavours come from a new mentality, responsive to new requirements resulting from developments in human civilization. We consider that it is fundamentally necessary for all political decision-makers to adopt and act on that mentality. Given the present accumulated capacity for mass destruction, we think that political responsibility must be measured by the extent to which decision-makers are aware of the need - and take practical steps - to reduce armed forces and armaments without delay to the lowest reasonably sufficient level indispensable for the maintenance of security. Thus, the minimum weaponry absolutely necessary for the preservation of common security must determine the scope and extent of arms control and disarmament measures.

Another characteristic of the present situation is that, given the ever closer interrelationship between security and disarmament issues, it is becoming increasingly difficult to deal with, let alone solve, such questions separately and in isolation. The common security of States can hardly be guaranteed if it is approached solely in terms of military measures. Since the state of international security is influenced, not only by military but also political, economic, humanitarian and other factors, we consider it necessary that efforts and measures



(Mr. Horn, Hungary)

aimed at strengthening international security should encompass all those areas. The Hungarian People's Republic is firm in the view that the universal security of the world can be guaranteed only by laying firm foundations and creating the conditions necessary for building peaceful and balanced political relations, multifaceted co-operation and mutual confidence among States.

Such a complex approach is reflected in the initiative of 10 States Members of the United Nations, including Hungary, to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. It was with that in view that we proposed the inclusion of that item on the agenda of the General Assembly at its current session, the thorough discussion of the item and the adoption of a resolution calling for such measures as might be deemed necessary. As one of the sponsors, we thank all those who have supported our proposal. We are confident that the observations, statements of position and proposals on this initiative will lead to active support by a large number of States for efforts to meet the challenge of our time in a realistic and comprehensive way. We hold that in creating a comprehensive system of international peace and security we should rely on all the existing multilateral international agreements adopted within the framework of the United Nations and in other forums.

A noteworthy phenomenon of the year since the last session of the General Assembly is the growing awareness of the dangers inherent in existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Steps and measures to eliminate those dangers are being demanded with increasing insistence by the masses of peoples everywhere, with active participation by individuals of different views and professions.

If we realistically assess the situation that has evolved, we see clearly that the prevention of nuclear war requires numerous transitional and partial measures. But a lasting and universal solution can be reached only by the gradual elimination

(Mr. Horn, Hungary)

of the source of danger: the arsenal of nuclear weapons. Taking full account of the inevitability of interrelationships is the only approach to the extremely complex task of nuclear disarmament. Attempts to remove certain questions from the general context of security policy and military and disarmament aspects can in no way help to find a solution. Attempts to create artificial links between unconnected issues will likewise prove a failure.

That approach should be applied also to ongoing efforts in two broad areas of nuclear disarmament. In our opinion, a significant reduction in the number of strategic nuclear weapons is unimaginable until the fate of the anti-ballistic-missile Treaty is decided in a mutually acceptable and lasting way satisfactory from the standpoint of international security.

As the final elimination of the nuclear threat will be possible only through the liquidation of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, we should also be mindful of the fact that this process too is governed by laws of its own. We maintain that an ongoing process must first be halted if it is to be reversed. As regards the liquidation of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, the first logical, irreplaceable, step is the cessation of nuclear testing. Thus, in our view, a complete and general prohibition of nuclear explosions through the proclamation of a moratorium in order to achieve a comprehensive nuclear-test ban would be an extremely important step towards removing the danger of nuclear war. The attitude displayed to a moratorium by States directly involved is a true reflection of their real approach to ending the nuclear-arms build-up and achieving disarmament.

Therefore, we deem it indispensable for the strengthening of international security and the promotion of disarmament that the other nuclear Powers, primarily the United States, should join in the moratorium unilaterally declared by the

(Mr. Horn, Hungary)

Soviet Union and extended by it several times. Arguments advanced for rejecting the moratorium do not convince us. According to one such argument, there is a need for the undisturbed continuation of military programmes. That, however, prompts us to ask whether it is permissible to let international security and the fate of mankind depend on the particular security considerations of any one country at a time when it has been proven that a country's pursuit of security through an arms build-up can only be to the detriment of the common security interests of all States.

Another argument raises the question whether a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and the moratorium leading to it can effectively curb the nuclear arms race and truly promote nuclear disarmament. That question would be justified if the moratorium had ever been regarded by its proponents simply as an end in itself. But that is not and never has been the case. We consider the cessation and complete prohibition of nuclear tests to be a first step, the indispensable minimum, in the complex, complicated and difficult process of nuclear disarmament. Thus, what we are proposing is but the first step, a step that cannot be evaded and cannot be replaced by anything else.

(Mr. Horn, Hungary)

I have thought it proper to deal at some length with questions of nuclear disarmament, particularly a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, in order to underscore the great importance we attach to finding early solutions to these pressing issues. Similarly, we hope for an early breakthrough in the ongoing negotiations on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. Should they fail, the efforts being exerted at Geneva might easily lose both momentum and credibility. We believe that there is a possibility of an agreement on the general prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons being reached in the near future. Such an agreement would in itself be of great significance, since it would eliminate another weapon of mass destruction from the arsenals while setting an example by indirectly strengthening confidence in disarmament talks and in the possibility of reaching agreement. It would also give an impetus to other bilateral and multilateral arms-control negotiations.

We think that as regards the prohibition of radiological weapons, safeguards for the security of nuclear installations and, in general, the possibility of reaching disarmament agreements, an example has been set by the fact that it was possible to work out in less than a month last summer two international conventions on nuclear security under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. For us, that is clear evidence that even the most intricate technical problems can be tackled and solved if States have the political will to reach an agreement.

There is no doubt that, on the whole, the past 10 years have not produced many spectacular results in the field of disarmament. It is a fact, however, that in the past few years States have come to accept quite a few general and conceptual realities. Thus, it is of particular importance to acknowledge that common security can be created and strengthened only through joint efforts as a result of political talks. While, in light of the realities of our time, the importance

(Mr. Horn, Hungary)

of Soviet-American bilateral talks cannot be overemphasised, we cannot ignore the bilateral and multilateral negotiations of other countries or the effects of their mutual complementarity and instrumentality and their role as catalysts in the strengthening of international peace and security. It is in that context that I wish to stress the significance of the Budapest appeal made by the States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization last June and distributed as annex II to an official document of the General Assembly (A/41/411 and Corr.1 and 2).

The broad and generally favourable response that appeal has received shows that its content has become known beyond the geographical boundaries of the European continent. I shall therefore confine myself to stressing the great importance we attach to the early initiation of negotiations on the proposals contained in the appeal. The Warsaw Treaty States have taken the initiative in an area in which their ideas are shared by numerous other countries. We think that the document is sufficiently flexible to leave scope for the ideas and specific proposals of other States, too, while it can serve as an appropriate and realistic programme for European disarmament efforts in the period ahead.

The Hungarian People's Republic stands ready to continue to do its utmost to promote the cause of comprehensive disarmament as well as good relations, fruitful co-operation and mutual confidence among States.

The CHAIRMAN: I would inform members of the Committee that the following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for this afternoon's meeting: Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, China and Nigeria.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.