

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

**FORTY-FIRST SESSION**

**Official Records\***



**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
**21st meeting**  
**held on**  
**27 October 1986**  
**at 10.30 a.m.**  
**New York**

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 21st MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)**

**CONTENTS**

**STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE**

**Statements were made by:**

Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)  
Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria)  
Mr. Nengrahary (Afghanistan)  
Mr. Rose (German Democratic Republic)  
Mr. Marinescu (Romania)  
Mr. Bayart (Mongolia)

**ORGANIZATION OF WORK**

\*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 Service, room DC2-730, 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.1/41/PV.21**  
**31 October 1986**  
**ENGLISH**

487

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

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): This session of the General Assembly is taking place at a time that is very important for the prospects of limiting armaments and disarmament. The course of the discussion in the First Committee and the very profound and meaningful statements made by most delegations have convincingly demonstrated that there is a strong coincidence of views on the question of the need to overcome the confrontational trends which have emerged in recent years and to bring about a radical change of course towards a more secure world, a world without wars and weapons. It is the profound conviction of the Ukrainian SSR that the main task in this respect is to halt the process of material preparations for a nuclear catastrophe in which everything would be annihilated.

The vicious circle where dangerous tensions lead to a new spiral in the arms race which, in turn, increases tension bodes no good for peace. If we fail to put an end to the arms race at the present time and continue to be guided in questions of security by stereotypes of the past we would be dooming civilization to the agonizing anticipation of nuclear self-annihilation. An obvious question that arises is whether we can reverse these trends. Is there any hope of doing so? Although they are aware of the complexities of the present international situation, the States of the socialist community give a positive answer to this question.

As emphasized by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev: "We cannot take 'no' as an answer to the question whether humankind is or is not to be." Our hopes for the future are based on the growing understanding of peoples of the magnitude and

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

source of the threat and on their readiness, by joint efforts, to put an end to the arms race, embark upon genuine disarmament measures, and to release funds and resources for peaceful development purposes.

Specific ways and means of escaping the nuclear trap are suggested in the bold and sweeping proposals of the socialist States to create a comprehensive system of international peace and security. The authors of these initiatives - which are to be considered in this Committee - base their reasoning on the following fundamental premises.

First, the realities of the nuclear-space age have made it axiomatic that, if we do not manage to avert nuclear war, it will inevitably affect every single State; in other words, genuine security in the nuclear era is possible only through security for all.

Secondly, the nature of modern weapons means that no State can hope to protect itself simply by technical means, even by developing the most powerful and sophisticated type of weaponry. This implies that the problem of ensuring security is of a political nature, and can be resolved only by political means. These various views and convictions are part and parcel of the practical policies of the socialist countries. The key element in the set of broad political initiatives taken by the socialist community is the programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in this century put forward by M. S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 and whole-heartedly supported at the Budapest meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty.

Quite recently the Soviet programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 was regarded by many as an illusion, an impossible dream. However, the meeting in Reykjavik between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

clearly demonstrated the viability of its basic concepts, as well as the comprehensiveness and pragmatism of the Soviet Union's approach to key problems of war and peace.

Being a few steps away from practical agreement on some of the most important problems of nuclear disarmament, we all began to understand much better the danger faced by the world, to have a clearer awareness of the need for immediate decisions and, what is most important of all, to realize that the nuclear threat can be eliminated.

Brimming with new bold ideas which accommodate the positions of the United States and are in accord with the security interests of all States, the basic provisions of the programme form the foundation of a package of major measures which, if adopted, would usher in a new era for mankind and make it genuinely possible to remove the threat of nuclear war.

Above all this relates to strategic offensive weapons. For five years the Soviet Union has been proposing that the number of these most lethal weapons should be reduced by one-half, so that by 1996 they would be completely eliminated. At the same time each component of the basic triad would also be reduced by 50 per cent: strategic land-based missiles, strategic submarine-based missiles and strategic bombers.

The constructive nature of the Soviet approach and its desire to facilitate agreement on a very major issue are revealed by the fact it dropped its demand for the inclusion, in this process of strategic equalization, of United States medium-range missiles capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union and United States forward-based weapons that represent a serious threat to the Soviet Union and its allies. Considerable progress was also achieved on the question of

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

medium-range missiles. In accordance with the programme of 15 January, the Soviet Union proposed the complete elimination of Soviet and United States missiles of that type in Europe.

Of fundamental significance was the fact that the Soviet Union stated that it was prepared not to include the missile potential of Great Britain and France which is closely interwoven with the military structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It should be pointed out in this connection that the United States side was not willing to adopt these radical proposals, despite the fact that at one time the United States position on medium-range missiles was based on this formula.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

Once again, the Soviet Union met the United States half-way by agreeing that both sides should leave 100 medium range missiles equipped with nuclear warheads in their national territories. It was further proposed that negotiations on medium-range missiles in Asia should be embarked upon immediately - a question that has always been part of the United States President's so-called global option.

For ~~was~~ the problem of tactical nuclear weapons - missiles with a range of under 1,000 kilometres - overlooked, for it was referred to in the programme of nuclear disarmament. In view of existing disagreement on this question, the Soviet Union proposed that such weapons should be frozen and that negotiations should be entered into on what was to be done with them. Thus the Soviet Union has demonstrated, not in words, but in deeds, its determination to free the peoples of Europe from the fear of nuclear catastrophe and then to take further steps towards the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The central link in the programme for ridding the earth of nuclear weapons in this century is the ban on any space-strike weapons. That question will become particularly acute and pressing in the post-nuclear era, when nuclear weapons have been considerably reduced and are being eliminated. That is quite understandable, for a State that has decided to eliminate, within a very short period, weapons that had previously constituted the very nucleus of its defences is entitled to call for the elimination of any possibility that new types of weapons ensuring military superiority will be developed. We are deeply convinced that the so-called strategic defence initiative programme, whatever its defensive character may be - and it is as a defensive system that it is packaged for outside consumption - will open the door to an arms race in space and start a new spiral with unforeseeable consequences. By going along with the strategic defence initiative, mankind would be countenancing a Trojan horse that would pose a threat to all life on earth.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR believes that disarmament can be achieved not by doing away with existing curbs on the arms race but rather by reinforcing them in every possible way and guaranteeing the implementation of the principle of equality and equal security for all States. In this connection we find it completely justified and timely that the Soviet Union should call for strict compliance with the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM), which is the cornerstone of the existing system of agreements in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. It is important if the ABM Treaty régime is to be strengthened, that the USSR and the United States undertake not to exercise their right to withdraw from the Treaty for a minimum of 10 years, during which time strategic weapons would be eliminated. Unfortunately, the United States did not agree with that approach, and it thus blocked the achievement of any agreement on key present-day problems.

In this connection, the assessment of the United States position by Senator Edward Kennedy, published in The New York Times of 16 October of this year, is noteworthy. He noted, inter alia:

"Arms control agreements contribute more to our national defence than new, expensive and exotic weapon systems. Our national security would be advanced, not jeopardized, by the mutual dismantling of hundreds of American and Soviet launchers and the destruction of thousands of nuclear warheads. These obvious realities of arms control are worth more than the elusive possibilities of the Strategic Defence Initiative." (The New York Times, 16 October 1986, p. A31)

The United States Administration, however, preferred illusions to reality. Surely in the background we can distinguish the financial interests of the United States military-industrial complex. It has also become abundantly clear that the leadership of that great country is dependent upon the military-industrial complex

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

and on monopolistic groups, which have made a business out of both the nuclear and conventional arm races, using them to reap profits and as a *raison d'être* for their existence.

The time that has elapsed since the Reykjavik meeting has also enabled us to identify another tendency. Militarist circles are clearly upset by the possibility that the cardinal issues of our time might be resolved. That is why they are making every effort to cope with the present situation and co-ordinating their activities to mislead the public. The purpose of these efforts is, basically, to control the mood of world public opinion and stifle the yearning for peace, and to prevent Governments from adopting any clear-cut position at this decisive historical juncture. At the same time, the United States Administration is attempting to distort the meaning of the agreements reached and to revert to previous obviously unacceptable positions on questions of nuclear disarmament. How otherwise can we evaluate the recent comments by Administration officials who have stated that the President of the United States in no way intended to agree to the complete elimination of all strategic offensive weapons without exceptions within the next 10 years.

Questions relating to the nuclear-space complex quite rightly occupy the central place in any programme of overall security through disarmament. Its successful implementation, however, depends upon the solution of other important problems. The Ukrainian SSR, which advocates a comprehensive approach to problems of disarmament, believes that the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction from the arsenals of States should be accompanied by agreed reductions of conventional weapons and armed forces. As things are, that question is becoming particularly acute, especially for the present and future of Europe, because it is there that the two largest groups of armed forces are confronting one another, equipped with the most modern types of weaponry, including certain conventional



(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

weapons systems which, from the standpoint of their operational characteristics, are becoming increasingly akin to means of mass destruction.

In view of these considerations, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty submitted to all the other European States, the United States and Canada major proposals for substantial reductions in conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, together with the most far-reaching verification measures. At the same time, reductions in conventional weapons would be accompanied by reductions in tactical nuclear weapons with a range of up to 1,000 kilometres.

Those proposals constitute an important addition to the programme to do away with weapons of mass destruction. Yet at the same time they are of an independent nature, and their implementation would considerably reduce the military threat in Europe.

The initiative taken by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty would include, as an integral part of the process, their undertaking never, under any circumstances, to initiate military operations against any other State, whether in Europe or in any other part of the world, if they are not themselves the target of aggression.

The approach made by the Warsaw Treaty States to the NATO member States and to all European countries is of a comprehensive nature on several levels. It contains specific proposals on how and in what stages armed forces would be reduced, on exchange of relevant information, on the possible organization of future negotiations and on verification measures.

In the opinion of the Ukrainian SSR, this initiative of the socialist countries provides a sound basis for embarking upon both nuclear and conventional disarmament and is in line with efforts to create a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

An important feature of the programme for a non-nuclear world is that it is aimed at achieving progress in the solution of problems connected with the social and economic development of States through measures for the limitation and reduction of armaments. It is no accident that countries which are trying to overcome their backwardness and to achieve the level of the highly-developed industrialized countries associate prospects of emerging from their indebtedness - which places such a strain on their economies - with the limitation and elimination of weapons and the reduction of military expenditures, so that resources can be released for constructive purposes.

All these questions will no doubt be thoroughly discussed at the Conference on the Interrelationship between Disarmament and Development, which we believe should be held in 1987. In this connection an extremely timely proposal has been made by the Soviet Union for the creation of an international fund to assist the developing countries after agreement has been reached concerning a genuine reduction of military expenditures by States. A proportion of the resources saved by States members of military alliances, as well as by other parties to such agreements among the industrially developed countries, would be paid into the fund.

The implementation of the programme for the reduction and elimination of nuclear arsenals implies that the entire system of negotiations must be set in motion, and that disarmament machinery including that of the United Nations, works at maximum efficiency. Among the most important tasks to be tackled in this area in the near future, priority should be given to the successful holding of a third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which should be held no later than 1988. We believe that such a session could make a major contribution to the solution of problems of disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, and also help to mobilize world public opinion in efforts to avert nuclear war.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The Ukrainian SSR, like many other States, hopes that the forthcoming special session will bring about a further improvement in the effectiveness of the machinery of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, and is prepared to participate actively in a thorough consideration of this matter. As we see it, what is important is that conclusions and recommendations concerning the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament should not be based only on arithmetical calculations, resolutions and the number of agenda items devoted to it; the major consideration is the quantitative aspect - the willingness of States to respect the decisions of the United Nations and to act in accordance with the political commitments they have undertaken.

When we talk about preserving peace and ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear warfare, no one can be left out of account and no one can remain on the sidelines. This is a matter that concerns us all, and the contribution of each State - great or small, socialist or capitalist - is important. As has been convincingly demonstrated by the facts of international life, the socialist States are prepared to engage extensively in give and take with all those who adopt a position of reason and goodwill and are aware of the responsibility to guarantee a peaceful future for mankind.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is convinced that the decisions taken at the present session of the General Assembly will further reinforce the solidarity of all peace-loving forces so that together they can completely extricate mankind from the nuclear trap.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): Together with the overwhelming majority of Member States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria maintains that the implementation of resolute measures for the reduction and total elimination of nuclear weapons offers the most direct method of averting the threat of nuclear war. In the present

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

military-political circumstances, however, the prevention of that danger also requires that steps be taken to foreclose all channels of the arms race. This is particularly true with regard to those aspects of the arms race that threaten to give it new dimensions or to cause a spiralling quantitative accumulation of armaments and their qualitative improvement. The People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches particular importance to the limitation and reduction of conventional arms and armed forces.

Our serious concern regarding the conventional arms race stems from the following basic considerations. First of all, that race is being conducted at the global level and encompasses all countries and regions. The numerous armed conflicts since the Second World War, which have taken the lives of millions of people and inflicted vast material destruction, have all been fought with conventional weapons. Conventional weapons and armed forces consume the better part - more than four-fifths - of the world's military expenditure. The diversion of enormous resources - material, financial and human - from the civilian sector to the military sector of the economy has had grave socio-economic consequences for all States.

Ever more alarming prospects have been created by the qualitative jump in the development of conventional weapons, resulting in their increased sophistication and accuracy and in their destructive power which is approaching that of nuclear arms. Moreover certain types of weapons, though conventional in nature, are now designed to achieve goals that have heretofore been assigned only to nuclear arms. For that purpose, qualitatively new systems of armaments are being developed, such as multipurpose reconnaissance and attack systems, vacuum bombs, the 155-millimetre copperhead shell, the long-range guided anti-tank missile, and so on. The new NATO strategy, known as the Rogers Plan, envisages the use of "smart" munitions capable

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

of striking deep into the territory of the Warsaw Treaty countries. This not only totally unmask the "defensive" strategy of NATO; it also constitutes a real revolution in the instruments for waging conventional war. The new technologies have once again been placed in the service of a destabilizing military doctrine. Last spring, NATO sanctioned for immediate development and delivery a list of six new types of conventional weapons.

The stockpiling of conventional armaments, which has often been presented as being aimed at strengthening stability by raising the nuclear threshold, may on the contrary only serve to increase the danger of a nuclear conflict. The fact that the NATO plans for conventional rearmament have not altered the bloc's nuclear strategy of launching a first nuclear strike under various scenarios speaks clearly for itself.

The replenishment of the arsenals of certain States having qualitatively new and increasingly sophisticated conventional arms has had an exceedingly negative effect on efforts aimed at arms limitation and disarmament. The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it high time that we should proceed from the present very high level of confrontation to a significant reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces to reasonable limits. Generally acceptable solutions to all the problems of conventional disarmament can be arrived at by way of consultations and negotiations on a global, regional or bilateral basis.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The final document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly contained in resolution S-10/2, adopted in 1978, maps out a broad programme of action to achieve progress in this respect. A number of valuable recommendations are also contained in the United Nations Study on Conventional Disarmament (A/39/348). Various proposals to that effect have been made by many States, including the socialist countries. In other words, there is a basis for making headway in this field.

The States with the biggest military arsenals could, in particular, agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments, to reduce them across the board or only in specific areas, qualitatively or quantitatively, or to maintain them within agreed limits. It is also necessary to limit and reduce the deployment of armed forces and armaments, particularly in foreign countries, to reduce military budgets, to curtail international trade in conventional arms and to restrict further those types of conventional weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. The adoption and implementation of confidence-building measures and measures on the non-use of nuclear and conventional weapons and the non-use of force in general, on the non-enlargement of military blocs, and so on, is closely related to the problem of the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional arms. In this connection, the States members of the Warsaw Treaty have proposed radical measures such as the simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO and as a first step the dismantling of their military organizations. The member States of the Warsaw Treaty are ready to begin negotiations with the NATO member States to reach a relevant agreement starting with the question of the mutual reduction of military activities.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

As a European State, Bulgaria is mainly interested in the adoption of disarmament measures and in the strengthening of détente, security and co-operation in Europe. We welcome the results of the Stockholm Conference as a manifestation of the constructive spirit and realism of all participants. It is our belief that the coupling of political and legal obligations with military-technical measures aimed at decreasing military confrontation in Europe should clear the way for the adoption of more substantive disarmament measures. As stated in the communiqué issued by the Bucharest meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the member States of the Warsaw Treaty:

"The agreement in Stockholm appears to be a good start for proceeding to negotiations to reduce armed forces and conventional arms in Europe and, at the same time, to adopt confidence-building measures, including on limiting the scope of military activities".

Confidence and security cannot be divorced from the ongoing accumulation of weapons. In this connection, we cannot but express our regret that for more than 10 years the Vienna negotiations on reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe have been marking time in spite of the fact that the socialist countries have so far submitted more than 20 proposals, the latest of which, dated 20 February 1986, takes largely into consideration the positions of the West and offers compromise solutions in some important areas of disagreement, thus providing favourable opportunities to achieve a mutually acceptable agreement.

Last July the member States of the Warsaw Treaty put forth an appeal to the NATO member States and all European countries to reduce armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. Being autonomous and extremely important in itself, this new wide-ranging proposal is an important addition to the Soviet Programme for nuclear disarmament of 15 January 1986. It demonstrates vividly the

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

all-embracing approach of the socialist countries to the problem of disarmament which takes into account the realities of the age of nuclear missiles. The new proposals of the Warsaw Treaty encompass all components of conventional armed forces and short-range nuclear missiles, ensure the principle of equality and equal security and provide for effective verification. These proposals should satisfy those who have opposed nuclear disarmament on the grounds of some alleged superiority of the Warsaw Treaty in the conventional field. The socialist countries view the reaching of agreement on these proposals as a first step and are ready to negotiate the extension of mutual reductions to the limits of reasonable sufficiency.

Naturally, the implementation of the above-mentioned and other proposals and initiatives is not an easy task. Political realism, a sense of responsibility and renunciation of the traditional approaches and arguments used for rejecting concrete proposals will be decisive for the success of conventional disarmament. The opportunity for reducing armaments, both nuclear and conventional, should not be missed.

The interests of international peace and security require that the dangerous tendency of escalating the naval arms race should be checked. As part of the general arms race, the naval arms race is being pursued globally as well as regionally. It has qualitative as well as quantitative dimensions and includes both the nuclear and the conventional components of naval armaments. The recent dangerous escalation of the naval arms race has prompted a number of States, including the socialist countries, to include this problem as a whole or some of its elements in the spectrum of issues to be addressed by the international community as a matter of urgency. The statements of delegations in the General Assembly and in the Disarmament Commission, their replies to the Secretary-General



(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

in pursuance of the relevant General Assembly resolutions, the United Nations study on this subject-matter and other documents have amply described the new round of the naval arms race. All this has provided a good basis for further intensified work on this issue.

In conformity with General Assembly resolutions 40/94 I and 40/94 F, this question was once again considered by the Disarmament Commission. The discussion indicated that the majority of Member States viewed the problem as a topical one. It was noted that the intensive stockpiling of naval arms and their employment constituted a serious threat to international peace and security and, therefore, the consideration of this problem in a multilateral forum is both timely and necessary. A large number of States - socialist, non-aligned and Western alike - have participated in this discussion.

The report of the consultation group, adopted by the participants in the discussion by consensus, contains the preliminary general positions of the individual countries and some common principles. First, the naval arms race is part of the whole complex process of the arms race but has certain characteristics of its own. Second, the decisions to be made in this respect should recognize this reality by not impairing the security of any single State or affecting the overall strategic balance. Third, the naval arms race and certain naval activities pose a threat to the peace and security of States. And fourth, certain measures for the limitation and reduction of naval activities and naval armaments could be considered and adopted at this stage in spite of the strategic complexity and interdependence of the whole problem.

We note with regret that these conclusions, resulting from the sustained efforts of many delegations, failed to receive their proper treatment from the procedural point of view in the report of the Commission due to the strong

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

opposition of one delegation. We concur that the problem under consideration is complex and that differences exist among the positions and approaches of individual States, but, in our view, the attempts to predetermine the solution of this issue on the basis of its being controversial alone seem to us as an unacceptable approach. Differences should be bridged in a constructive spirit, through discussions and negotiations, rather than by insisting upon removing the issue from the agenda or by blocking the adoption of decisions, including through abuse of the rule of consensus.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

For all that, we regard the substantive consideration of this issue and the adoption of a recommendation to continue work next year as one of the most positive results of the last session of the Disarmament Commission.

The socialist countries have repeatedly declared and demonstrated in practice that there are no types of weapons or military activities that they are not ready to limit and reduce on a basis of mutuality. In so far as the naval arms race is concerned, they have stated on more than one occasion that they do not accept a situation in which the naval fleets of major naval Powers operate for prolonged periods of time far from their own shores, and they have submitted concrete proposals to resolve this problem in the Mediterranean Sea, in the Indian, Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, in the Persian Gulf and, for that matter, in all seas and oceans.

Last March, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, declared that the Soviet Union was prepared to withdraw, along with the United States, its fleet units from the Mediterranean Sea and it proposed to initiate forthwith negotiations on this issue. As a State in close proximity to the Mediterranean region and extensively using its sea lanes, Bulgaria has a particular stake in transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of lasting peace and co-operation. This is the main reason why my country has supported the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union and has urgently called for decreasing the military confrontation and ending acts of aggression in that region.

In his statement of 28 July 1986 in Vladivostok dealing with the situation in Asia and the Pacific region, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the implementation of confidence-building measures and the reduction of naval activities in the Pacific could play a stabilizing role in ensuring the security of the region. We share the

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

view that the time has come to consider this problem and resolve it by way of negotiations and agreements. The efforts being made to turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace also continue to be very timely.

The socialist countries have put forward concrete practical proposals for the limitation and reduction of different types of naval forces and armaments, such as mutual curbs on the patrol areas of missile-carrying submarines, the withdrawal of naval vessels equipped with nuclear weapons from certain areas of the world's seas and oceans, the imposition of limitations on vessels of various classes and on anti-submarine warfare, measures with regard to naval bases on foreign territory, and so on. Regrettably, the West has not responded positively to these proposals, which many States regard as constructive and flexible.

The measures we have proposed are based on the principle of equality and equal security. They provide for fully equal limitations and strict compliance with the universally acknowledged norms of international law. The working document the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have submitted in the Disarmament Commission in document A/CN.10/80 underlines, in particular, that those measures should be elaborated and implemented in accordance with the principle of not impairing the security of anyone while taking due account of all factors determining the correlation of forces at sea.

There is nothing in our proposals that would give advantage to any State or group of States or give rise to inequalities in exercising freedom of navigation, including naval navigation. Our proposals concern only those naval activities that endanger world peace and security and violate the rights and interests of other States.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

We consider that possibilities exist for moving forward in this complex, yet critically important, field. In our view, a first step would be for the Disarmament Commission to give substantive consideration to the presence and activities of naval Powers in areas of conflict or tension, or in regions far from their own shores, and to some confidence-building measures as contained in the proposals of Member States and in the United Nations study on this question. The measures to be identified and agreed upon during that discussion could be considered at various multilateral, regional and bilateral negotiation forums, including consultations at the Conference on Disarmament. These steps would facilitate the identification of possible confidence-building measures and of specific measures for the reduction of naval armaments and for disarmament, which would consequently become the subject-matter of consultations and negotiations, either bilateral or multilateral.

Questions relating to the cessation of the naval arms race are complex indeed, but given a constructive spirit and the will to reach agreement, a common approach can be worked out, including on the modalities for their resolution. The proposals put forward by the socialist countries are sufficiently flexible in this respect. What we cannot subscribe to is the use of the complexity of the issues under consideration as an excuse for inaction or for abandoning the search for practical measures.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan) (interpretation from French): My delegation has asked to speak in order to present its views on questions which, in our view, are of particular importance. Specifically I wish to address item 48, "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", and item 55, "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/88 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests".

(Mr. Nengrahy, Afghanistan)

In circumstances in which mankind continues to face nuclear danger, a danger which threatens human civilization, we must make every effort to save the world from a nuclear holocaust. To achieve this noble aim, agreements on halting the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and on the elimination of nuclear weapons must be concluded without delay.

While the existence of enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons has placed all the peoples of our common home under the threat of annihilation in a nuclear confrontation and while all of us must contribute to extricating mankind from this state of crisis, it is the nuclear-weapon Powers that must first take the initiative for the total elimination of these terrible weapons.

One of the measures conducive to the process of eliminating nuclear weapons would be for those States to refrain from all nuclear testing so as to proceed to serious negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Since the two major Powers possess significant stockpiles of nuclear weapons they bear a heavy responsibility towards mankind, which would be destroyed by their use. Hence both sides must adopt appropriate measures to reach agreement on the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In this context, agreement on a mutual and suitably verifiable moratorium on nuclear explosions would facilitate the negotiations and improve confidence between the two parties.

(Mr. Nengraharay, Afghanistan)

In his report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General warned the international community about the threat posed to us all by the great accumulation of nuclear weapons, and proposed that pending complete elimination of those weapons,

"the risk inherent in the existence of nuclear weapons must be progressively decreased through drastic reduction in the numbers and destructive content of nuclear arms; through limitations on their deployment and further development; and through the complete prohibition of nuclear testing". (A/41/1, p. 8)

At its eighth summit Conference, held at Harare, the Non-Aligned Movement expressed the hope that the two Powers, possessing the greatest number of nuclear-weapons would agree on a moratorium, which would be a first step towards a nuclear-test-ban treaty, as called for by peoples desiring to live in peace and by those who take a highly responsible attitude towards questions of war and peace. That is the urgent need of the day. We attach great importance to that just demand, and we support all measures to that end.

It is in that context that we have continued to support the initiatives and unilateral measures taken by the Soviet Union in response to the demands of mankind. The unilateral moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on 6 August 1985 and extended several times, most recently until 1 January 1987, is an outstanding manifestation of the wisdom and good will of the Soviet leaders and confirms the Soviet Union's unflagging struggle to remove the artificial obstacles erected by imperialist circles, first and foremost by United States imperialism, to the creation of a nuclear-free world. The Soviet position is a constructive and responsible one, responding to the needs of our time. It is no accident that the courageous Soviet initiative was welcomed enthusiastically by the world's political leaders, by social organizations and by various political movements the world over.

(Mr. Nengrahy, Afghanistan)

In its defiance of the legitimate demand of the international community, the United States has not responded in kind to the Soviet initiative; quite the contrary, it has intensified its programme of nuclear explosions and accelerated its well-known strategic defence initiative, known as star wars. The irresponsible and immoral way in which that country has responded to the example of the Soviet Union gives us every reason to believe that the most aggressive and militaristic circles in the United States Administration wish for nothing but to impose their will on other nations and to gain military supremacy over the forces of peace.

Several pretexts have been advanced and many baseless statements have been made in an attempt to reduce the importance of the Soviet initiative in the eyes of world public opinion. For example it was claimed at the outset that the Soviet Union had detonated more nuclear explosions than the United States, that the moratorium had no negative effect on the Soviet Union's nuclear capability, and that for the time being that country had no need to conduct such tests.

But let us be honest. Data published by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) clearly show that it is the United States, not the Soviet Union, that has detonated more nuclear explosions. According to SIPRI figures, through the beginning of 1985, 772 explosions had been detonated by the United States and 556 by the Soviet Union. Thus, the United States had detonated 216 explosions more than the Soviet Union, as of six months before the announcement of the moratorium.

The question of verification has been used as a pretext in this Committee and in the Conference on Disarmament to prevent the conclusion of agreements on a cessation of nuclear testing. But it is no secret that available national and international means have made it possible to detect even the weakest explosions.



(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

Based on its policy of peace, the Soviet Union has made specific proposals to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000; it has addressed this question explicitly and has stated its readiness to engage in negotiations to adopt appropriate measures in this field.

Moreover, the Soviet Government has stated, in its statement of 11 April 1986, that

"For its part the Soviet Union considers that it is extremely important to formulate reliable measures to verify implementation of the agreement banning nuclear tests. It is in favour of the strictest control, including on-site inspections."

It must be noted that the Soviet Union has gone beyond declarations of principle; these have been backed up with practical measures. It invited a group of United States seismologists to install their equipment near the Semipalatinsk nuclear-test site. The United States specialists detected the silence of peace, a silence conveying the message of sincerity and good will. On the other hand, the group detected nuclear explosions detonated in Nevada, United States, of which there have been 22 since the announcement of the Soviet moratorium.

The facts speak for themselves. The justification the United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are attempting to provide for their negative attitude is nothing but an effort to conceal their true intention to continue the nuclear-arms race, which serves only the interests of the nuclear-industrial complex.

The international community hopes that the United States will heed the voice of reason and, in keeping with its responsibility concerning the very survival of mankind, will respond positively to the appeal and join in the Soviet moratorium, which has lasted more than a year so far.

(Mr. Nengrahar, Afghanistan)

The time has come to take political decisions to halt the nuclear-arms race and to give every human being the opportunity to live in peace and security in a world free of these most destructive of weapons

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to make some remarks on the agenda item entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". A general conclusion has been drawn - in this Committee as in other places - from the meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan at Reykjavik: it is necessary considerably to intensify efforts in order to reach, at all negotiating levels, tangible results in the field of reducing and eliminating armaments. Experience and new insights gained during the meeting will have to play an important role in that endeavour. I am thinking here of the following elements:

First, the elimination of nuclear weapons in a relatively short time has become feasible. The Soviet Union's programme, issued on 15 January 1986, for the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century has stood a major test, and has proved to be a guideline towards attainable goals. That is a source of confidence and encouragement, both of which are needed to remove the obstacles standing in the way of substantive results, obstacles we certainly do not underestimate. We share concerns about the campaign waged by one side to distort the results of the meeting.

Secondly, since it is possible in principle to eliminate strategic nuclear weapons within a relatively short period of time and reliably to verify that process, a so-called protective shield becomes superfluous - unless it is intended for other purposes. The arguments in favour of proceeding with the strategic defence initiative despite the feasibility of liquidating strategic nuclear weapons are not convincing. The fact that it is felt necessary to invoke potential actions

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

by madmen and the strange legend of the gas-mask among the reasons for the creation of the star wars programme is not a point in favour of the star wars concept.

Thirdly, Reykjavik has demonstrated in all clarity that comprehensive nuclear disarmament must go hand in hand with measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. There is no other way to attain stable security through disarmament. Even today, preparations for the strategic defence initiative are impeding such things as the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In other words, the prevention of an arms race in outer space is a key issue that must be resolved, so that the world may be rid of nuclear weapons and so that all peoples may live in security. Awareness of that fact guided the Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty States at their recent meeting at Bucharest.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

Judging from previous statements in this Committee, there exists a large measure of agreement as regards the general concern. Prevention of an arms race in outer space means, to put it in a nutshell, not to test and deploy weapons in that environment and to ensure that space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The commitment to keep outer space free of any weapons logically implies rejection of the strategic defence initiative (SDI). There is no way of evading such a conclusion. For whatever arguments the proponents of SDI put forward, what they want in the final analysis is to place weapons in outer space. In our view, it makes no big difference whether those weapons are intended to form part of a nuclear first-strike capability or even to replace nuclear weapons, or they are described as "defensive" or "offensive". In any case, they are designed to destroy objects in space and on Earth and would in any event pose a dangerous threat to the peoples. Since the quest for military superiority cannot be tolerated, fuelling the arms race in all spheres would be inevitable.

An outer space free of weapons is feasible only if the proponents of SDI come to realize that the security of all States on our globe will not be enhanced through the militarization of outer space but, on the contrary, insecurity will be heightened dramatically. It is to be hoped that Reykjavik will foster a process of sober analysis in the United States. At the same time, all the other States should even more vigorously stand up for the right of their peoples to live without any threats from outer space and to share in its peaceful uses. From a practical point of view, efforts should focus in two parallel directions: first, it is essential to observe and comply with treaties relating to outer space and, secondly, further accords should be concluded to strengthen the régime of the peaceful uses of outer space.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic  
Republic)

While the 1967 outer space Treaty needs to be developed further in the light of present conditions, we should bear in mind that that important international instrument already contains universally accepted principles which embody legally binding standards and guidelines for activities in outer space. The fundamental question is the right and the duty of States to utilize space for peaceful purposes. Resolution 40/87, which was adopted by 151 votes, refers specifically to exclusively peaceful uses. In this regard, the co-operation of States is to be promoted and the inclusion of outer space in the arms race should be prevented. That would serve not only the vital security interests of States but also constitute a clear legal right. Attempts to portray the testing and deployment of sophisticated weapons systems in space as peaceful activities can only cause astonishment and opposition.

The 1972 anti-ballistic missile Treaty represents an important cornerstone of the struggle to keep space free of weapons. Direct and indirect attacks against that Treaty have been growing. There have been open calls for its revision, and there is talk of a narrow and a broad, an old and a new interpretation. Arbitrariness in dealing with that significant legal instrument is obvious. That has little to do with the principle of good faith. In this context I should merely like to say the following.

First, it is the treaty text that is authoritative, and that text should be recalled again and again. Allow me to read out once more Article V, paragraph 1:

"Each party undertakes not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based."

Secondly, according to the rules governing the interpretation of international agreements, the general aim or the meaning of the agreement is of great importance.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

The preamble of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty is very clear on this score. It reads, inter alia:

"Considering that effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would be a substantial factor in curbing the race in strategic offensive arms and would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons...".

I underline "to limit anti-ballistic missile systems".

Thirdly, in interpreting the Treaty, other relevant obligations should be taken into account - for instance, the statement at the Geneva summit last November that no side should seek to achieve military superiority.

Finally, attention should again be drawn to the outer space Treaty whose principles should not be overlooked when interpreting a bilateral treaty.

Strict compliance with the relevant international accords would, as has been emphatically demanded also in our Committee, constitute a significant move towards averting the imminent threat of the militarization of outer space. Rather than calling them into question, those treaties should be reinforced. That could be done, for instance, by an understanding between the two sides not to resort to the provisions on withdrawing from the anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

Further agreements are urgently needed to prevent an arms race in outer space. We hope that the Geneva negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States will fully address that task, as stipulated on 8 January 1985, and reach tangible results. Bearing in mind the interrelationship between bilateral and multilateral negotiations, the Geneva Conference on Disarmament too should devote greater attention to the matter. Discussions may be useful, but as a matter of fact they alone do not lead to agreement on practical measures. The Geneva

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic  
Republic)

Conference is, in our view, the body best suited for elaborating a basic treaty on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. That is the idea behind a Soviet proposal submitted a few years ago; regrettably, no concrete negotiations have been undertaken owing to the opposition of a number of States. The Soviet Union, taking into account ideas from other groups of States, has now suggested that work should start first on a treaty for the protection of satellites and the prohibition of anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons. That, we believe, is a practicable way, one that would certainly not exclude discussion on other matters such as the banning of offensive "space-to-earth" and "space-to-space" weapons.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

The negotiations on a treaty prohibiting anti-satellite weapons and protecting satellites could start by identifying the principal elements. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic made some suggestions to this effect at the Conference on Disarmament.

Taking into consideration previous discussions at the Ad Hoc Committee, a further treaty would contain in our view the following principal elements: first, outer space should be free of any weapon intended for use against space objects; secondly, any weapons system on Earth intended to be used against space objects must be prohibited; thirdly, a prohibition on the use of space objects as means to destroy, damage and disturb the normal functioning or change the flight trajectory of space objects of other States; fourthly, a prohibition of the threat or use of force against space objects; fifthly, any harmful effects on outer space should be prevented in order to preserve its attributes for further exploration and peaceful utilization; sixthly, unintentional interference with the functioning of space objects should be minimized; and, seventhly, the free access of any State to outer space in accordance with the principles of international law should be guaranteed.

We want to see a strong commitment by the General Assembly to the demands and principles of preventing an arms race in outer space. The General Assembly should make clear that this aim could be achieved mainly by the prohibition of space-strike weapons of all kinds and by the strictest adherence to the existing legal restrictions and limitations on space weapons.

The Conference on Disarmament should be requested to begin without further delay negotiations on practical measures, including a ban on anti-satellite weapons, and on guaranteeing the immunity of satellites.



Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): The considerations put forward by my delegation in its earlier statement were devoted to the need for urgent action by all States to determine a new course in international relations to promote disarmament and peace.

Such action is necessitated by the gravity and complexity of the international situation and is of particular moment in light of the recent meeting of the Soviet and United States leaders held in the capital of Iceland. The fact that that meeting concluded without any concrete results having been achieved only strengthens the feeling that what is needed at present on the international scene is urgent action to intensify efforts to achieve appropriate disarmament agreements to halt dangerous new trends and to adopt new and bolder policies to achieve détente, co-operation and peace.

The present state of disarmament negotiations calls for a new approach that should be based, first, on specific action by States to break out of the vicious circle that now exists. That need has given rise to repeated appeals by Romania and its President to other States and their leaders to initiate steps, including unilateral steps, to increase confidence and create the conditions necessary for the resumption of negotiations or to overcome existing problems within the context of those negotiations.

It was that need that inspired the appeal recently addressed by Romania to other European States, the United States of America and Canada to move respectively towards a unilateral reduction of their weapons, troop strength and military expenditures even prior to reaching appropriate agreement on those questions. To give concrete meaning to its appeal and demonstrate its own desire to embody its words in actions, Romania also announced its intention to reduce unilaterally its arms, troops and military expenditures by 5 per cent and to submit that measure to its people for approval in a national referendum.

(Mr. Marjescu, Romania)

Today, it gives me great pleasure to announce to the Committee that on 23 October the Grand National Assembly, Romania's parliament, unanimously adopted a measure putting into effect that 5 per cent reduction of its weapons, troops and military expenditure this year and stipulating that the people would be consulted on such reduction through a referendum. That same measure also specified that the referendum would be held on 21 November 1986.

At the same time, the Grand National Assembly adopted a bill modifying certain provisions of the country's Constitution designed to enact into law the people's consultation, by referendum, with regard to matters of special importance to the country's supreme interest and also laying down the manner in which such referendums should be organized and carried out.

That measure was based on the proposal of President Nicolae Ceausescu and adopted at the third Romanian Worker's Congress, whose appeal for nuclear and comprehensive disarmament and peace will be issued as an official document at the present session of the General Assembly together with a letter from the Romanian Foreign Minister addressed to the Secretary-General informing him of the decisions taken by Romania's constitutional bodies.

As the President of Romania stated in the Grand National Assembly, this unilateral reduction, as well as the appeal to European States, the United States and Canada, attests to the Romanian people's desire to act boldly in order to develop programmes to reduce all weapons, to their unswerving policy of peace and to the desire of Romania to move from words to real disarmament deeds.

It is no accident that the appeal and the unilateral reduction are aimed principally at the European countries and at the status of negotiations on disarmament and security on that continent. In view of the present distribution of forces in the world, we believe that priority should be given to solving disarmament problems in Europe, the fate of which directly affects the interests of

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

all mankind. Europe has the largest accumulation of weapons, including nuclear weapons, the largest troop concentrations are on its soil and its arms expenditures are the highest. The two military blocs confront each other on the European continent, and it is there that the outbreak of an armed conflict would, under existing circumstances, lead to nuclear catastrophe.

Still in connection with Europe, we have recently noted a certain emerging consensus with regard to disarmament and confidence-building problems. We refer particularly to the successful culmination of the Stockholm meeting, which demonstrated that agreement is possible when we proceed with patience and perseverance, and to the statements made by the Soviet and American leaders indicating that at Reykjavik there had been a greater convergence of views on certain issues, particularly with regard to medium-range missiles.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

It is precisely on the basis of this growing common ground that, as the President of Romania said in a recent statement,

"We consider it necessary that negotiations be pursued so that as soon as possible an agreement can be reached on the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe by both the United States and the Soviet Union and so that, at the same time, negotiations can be continued on an agreement on the elimination of all nuclear weapons from the European continent."

Since this concerns the European countries, it is necessary that the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries participate directly in those negotiations.

Similarly we must emphasize the political import of those agreements on improving the situation on the continent and on the way in which they could increase confidence and reduce the danger of war. We must emphasize also the heightened prospects they would offer for the settlement of other problems relating to disarmament and peace, along the lines discussed by the Soviet and American leaders in Reykjavik.

In the same statement my President went on to say,

"We consider it necessary that negotiations be continued to lead to an agreement on an initial 50 per cent reduction of strategic weapons. It is important that everything be done to achieve agreement on the total cessation of nuclear tests."

While strongly favouring the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, Romania considers that at the same time there should be a radical reduction of conventional weapons.

The comprehensive disarmament programme advocated by Romania, the main outline of which was given in a previous statement by my delegation, embodies, in addition to nuclear disarmament measures, which are its main purpose, measures envisaging

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

the reduction by 25 per cent of conventional weapons, troops and military expenditure, initially up to 1990, and a subsequent 50 per cent reduction up to the year 2000. The European dimension of that programme is reflected in the programme appeal adopted at the last meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which requests the NATO countries to initiate negotiations for the 25 per cent reduction up to 1990 of their troops and conventional weapons, which would be followed by a proportional reduction in the military expenditures of States.

The scope of that programme appeal was reiterated quite recently in the communiqué of the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of States Parties to the Treaty, held in Bucharest on 14 and 15 October of this year, as was their willingness constructively to consider any other measures that might be put forward by members of NATO, the neutral and non-aligned countries and other European States.

The reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe is of particular importance since the initiation of specific negotiations to achieve that end would be conducive to overcoming the reluctance still entertained by certain Western European countries about giving up nuclear weapons without at the same time proceeding to reduce conventional weapons.

To realize that objective, it is important that all European States undertake practical steps to demonstrate their unfeigned desire to make a concrete contribution to the creation of favourable conditions for the initiation of the negotiating process. It can be stated that every European country, and particularly those belonging to military blocs, has every opportunity to work along those lines.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

That is the real justification for the step taken by my country's parliament regarding a unilateral 5 per cent reduction of armaments, troops and military expenditures, and its appeal to other European countries, the United States and Canada to carry out similar unilateral reductions.

Obviously the political impact of such unilateral reductions can only be enhanced if they are emulated by similar steps based on mutual example. The confidence that must be strengthened among the European countries, as among all the countries of the world, presupposes a process of interaction in which all parties must make a constructive contribution.

In this context may we express the hope that my country's appeal to the other European countries, the United States and Canada will be seriously considered in the light of the political objectives that justify and explain them. We should like to be correctly understood. It is far from our intention to appeal for unilateral disarmament and thereby to create situations of imbalance that jeopardize the security interests of any party. We have always maintained and continue to maintain that genuine measures to halt the arms race and to reduce and eliminate armaments should be the subject of negotiated agreements that are subject to international control and rigorously respected.

In advocating unilateral reductions of a certain percentage of armaments, troops and military expenditures we are also thinking of the positive contributions such measures would have as regards confidence, since, given the present level of armaments, this would by no means jeopardize the defence capacity of States or endanger the safety of any State or group of States. Rather, the adoption of such measures would prove that declarations in favour of disarmament and peace and of determination to reach agreements at negotiations are authentic and that there is a

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

political willingness to proceed to reduce and then eliminate nuclear weapons and substantially reduce conventional weapons, which is in fact the soundest possible way of strengthening the security of each State and international security as a whole.

In this connection it should also be emphasized that there would be many positive economic and financial consequences of the reduction of armaments, troops and military expenditure, which would also contribute to the implementation of the economic and social development programmes of each country, which undoubtedly represents a fundamental requirement for State security. Increased opportunities would thus be created for providing the developing countries with assistance in their efforts to overcome the economic and financial difficulties they now face.

One of the conclusions that has emerged from the Reykjavik meeting is that the problems of the world and problems of peace and international security cannot be settled by the two great Powers alone. As the President of my country has stated, we welcome the fact that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States have stated that the agreements and common ground noted in Iceland should in no way be wasted but that, on the contrary, negotiations should be continued on the basis of the common ground that has already been won. We very much appreciate the proposals of great importance that were put forward by the Soviet Union, which provide prospects for efforts to bring about disarmament and peace. But that also means that all States, and primarily the United States of America, should take a new approach, bearing in mind that nuclear war cannot be won, that it spells the destruction of mankind and that everything should be done completely and permanently to eliminate nuclear weapons from our planet.

Similarly my country is in favour of pursuing the dialogue and of fresh Soviet-American meetings, including at the highest level. There is no way other

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

than dialogue, negotiations and agreements if we are to eliminate nuclear weapons and to reduce conventional weapons.

Nevertheless the resolution of complex issues relating to peace and disarmament both nuclear and conventional necessarily presupposes the active participation of all States and peoples, whatever their size, their military potential or social system. In this context Romania believes that a growing role is incumbent upon the European countries in the light of recent developments in international life. It can be stated, and the President of my country has done so, that there is no other force in the world that can contribute more than Europe to the resolution of complex international issues and the achievement of appropriate agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States in respect of nuclear weapons, conventional disarmament and the resolution of other complex international problems.



(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In our opinion, the countries participating in the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armaments in Central Europe should intensify their negotiations with a view to concluding an agreement that would reduce military manpower by 5,000 to 10,000. It is up to all European States at this stage to make sure that the forthcoming Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which is also to be held in the capital of Austria, achieves the best possible results by making decisive progress towards disarmament and broadening co-operation in the economic, technical, scientific, cultural and humanitarian fields.

The European States can also make a decisive contribution by stimulating and intensifying negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, as well as the activities of multilateral bodies - including those of the United Nations - which consider problems of disarmament.

Generally speaking, we believe that Europe can have a more positive influence on the efforts being made internationally to bring about the exclusively peaceful settlement of conflicts in various parts of the world, to eliminate the threat or use of force, to start up real negotiations on the serious economic and financial problems of the world, to eliminate the phenomenon of underdevelopment, and to bring about broader international co-operation in all areas in order to ensure the free and independent development of all peoples.

As others have stated, any journey, however long, starts with a first step. But this step has to be taken, and it is very urgent that it should be taken because, as I said at the beginning of this statement of the very serious and complex nature of the international situation. We believe that this step can and should be taken in Europe, where the knot of contradictions is tightest and where its unravelling might have a positive and decisive impact on the entire international situation and might, indeed, mark the beginning of a genuine process of arms reduction and disarmament, and, above all, of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The unilateral 5 per cent reduction of armaments, troops and military expenditures effected by my country, as well as the appeal addressed to the other European countries, the United States and Canada that they should take similar steps demonstrates in a tangible manner that the Romanian people are resolved to embark on the path of disarmament and peace in Europe and throughout the world and to concentrate their efforts and their resources on their free and independent development.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to thank the Chairman for calling upon me this morning; I hope that other representatives will forgive me if perhaps I have thereby upset their plans to a certain extent. I am very pleased and gratified to speak today, perhaps even at this particular time, because on this very day, 20 years ago Mongolia was admitted as a Member of the United Nations.

The effort to ensure peace in outer space today is one of the most important trends in the general efforts to achieve international peace and security. Maintaining peace and security in outer space is of tremendous significance for the preservation of stability and peace on Earth. The task of prohibiting an arms race in outer space is, therefore, one of the priority or key issues that face mankind.

Thanks to the efforts of the international community over the past quarter of a century, a number of important international legal instruments and agreements have been concluded to limit the use made of outer space for military purposes. They are in force today and help to maintain peace in space, which is free of weapons.

One of these agreements that is of particular importance is the 1972 Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of ABM systems. It completely prohibits the manufacture, testing and deployment of ABM systems or

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

components - sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based - and has thus barred one of the most important channels of the arms race.

This Treaty is the very cornerstone of strategic stability and international security and is therefore in line with the interests not only of the Soviet and American peoples but indeed of all peoples.

All these treaties constitute a valuable capital asset which must be protected in every possible way and built upon. In this connection it should be emphasized that General Assembly resolution 40/87, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was the first to call upon all States, especially those with major space capabilities, to refrain, in their activities relating to outer space, from actions contrary to the observance of the relevant existing treaties or to the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space.

In the opinion of Mongolia, the Soviet Union's proposal that States should voluntarily waive their right to withdraw from arms limitation agreements is extremely timely and is directly relevant to agreements concerning space law, and particularly the need for strict compliance with the ABM Treaty.

The unwillingness of the leaders of the United States to give up their Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) made it impossible in Reykjavik to resolve the most important problems relating to the reduction and rapid elimination of nuclear weapons and to the strengthening of the ABM Treaty.

The meeting in Reykjavik revealed that SDI is the main obstacle to the prevention of an arms race in outer space and its cessation on Earth.

The highly-publicized arguments and various attempts to represent SDI - or rather, the star wars programme - as a sort of panacea for the nuclear threat and as a protective shield cannot mislead anyone. They have long outgrown their usefulness. It is quite clear that what we are talking about here is the development by

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

United States of space-strike weapons which are intended to neutralize the nuclear potential of the Soviet Union as a restraining factor.

Weapons which are designed to destroy retaliatory missiles on launch could strike any target on Earth and for that reason cannot be regarded as defensive.

Even if we admit that, when first developed and deployed, the sole purpose of space-strike weapons would be to destroy ballistic missiles and warheads, subsequently, however, as they are improved and made more sophisticated, they would undoubtedly acquire the ability to strike other targets. Thus, space weapons would not only increase the strategic offensive potential but would also become its most important component. We regard this possibility as fraught with extremely dangerous and unforeseeable consequences, since it implies the transfer of the arms race to outer space.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

It has been stated that SDI makes nuclear weapons obsolete and unnecessary. However, the meeting at Reykjavik indicated that we can quite easily do without this miracle and that, given goodwill and a mutual desire to do so, the elimination of nuclear weapons can be achieved by political means and negotiation.

May I say parenthetically that, judging by the inherent logic of things, those who really place emphasis on defence and self-protection should corroborate their statements by concrete action, undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and to provide States which do not possess nuclear weapons with guarantees that nuclear weapons will never be used against them. As the Committee knows, such undertakings have been provided by only two of the nuclear-weapon Powers - the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

The task of keeping space peaceful and free from weapons is a key element in the Soviet programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world by the year 2000. It clearly indicates that the reduction of nuclear weapons is possible only if the USSR and the United States both agree to refrain from the development, testing and deployment of space-strike weapons. We believe that present circumstances are favourable to the task of preventing the appearance of such weapons in outer space as they have not yet been included in the arsenals of States. A most realistic approach to the solution of this problem has been adopted in the proposal made by the Soviet Union in that the first step would be to prohibit the development, testing and deployment of anti-satellite systems, to eliminate such systems already in existence, to elaborate an agreement providing for the immunity of space objects and to begin consideration of the question of prohibiting offensive weapons of the space-earth and space-space type.

We believe that if the United States were to subscribe to the moratorium which was introduced in 1983 by the Soviet Union on the launching of anti-satellite

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

weapons in outer space, this would to a considerable extent facilitate the speedy initiation of talks on these matters. Mongolia also supports the phased programme proposed by the Soviet Union in June of this year for the peaceful exploitation of outer space. In our view, the crux of this programme is the creation within the next few years of a world space organization whose main function would be the peaceful investigation and exploitation of outer space through joint efforts and for the benefit of all States, and the monitoring of compliance with agreements designed to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space as and when these agreements are concluded.

In our nuclear space age it is of particular importance that States should comply with the obligations they have assumed and with the agreements they have signed and, even more important, that they should take practical measures to implement them. It is inadmissible that they should remain dead letters. What we have in mind here is the joint Soviet-United States statement of 23 November 1985 to the effect that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that there can be no victors, that everything should be done to avert war between the Soviet Union and the United States, whether it be nuclear or conventional, and that the parties will not strive to achieve military supremacy. We are convinced that strict compliance with and the practical implementation of these fundamentally important agreements is one of the main ways of improving the international climate and solving the problems which could not be resolved in Reykjavik.

A specific measure which is in accordance with the spirit and letter of these agreements was the unilateral Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions. The entire world is waiting for similar action, the necessary reciprocal step, by the United States. It is high time to recognize the fact that continuation of nuclear tests can lead only to a heightening of international tension. The facts indicate

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

that the development of more and more new weapons and the improvement, by means of nuclear tests, of those already stockpiled has not produced any change in the balance of the nuclear potential of the opposing parties, and it is clear, particularly now, that this cannot be done. Therefore, if nuclear-weapon tests are ever to be brought to an end, it is obvious that this should be done now for the opportunity to do so has arisen.

We are convinced that there are absolutely no objective reasons why the United States should not subscribe to the Soviet Union's moratorium, and return to the negotiating table in order to prohibit nuclear explosions. All we have to do is to overcome the inertia created by past thinking on this important issue. In Geneva, the United States and the Soviet Union reaffirmed their commitment under the Non-Proliferation Treaty to conduct negotiations in a spirit of goodwill on questions of nuclear arms limitation and disarmament in accordance with article VI of the Treaty. They also reaffirmed their desire to strengthen the non-proliferation régime and further to enhance the effectiveness of the Treaty by bringing about an increase in the number of parties to it.

In this connection, one wonders what more effective and practical step could be taken to strengthen the Treaty than to put an end to nuclear tests. It is after all no secret, and indeed we have heard this very day that some States which are not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty make their accession to it, depend on a solution being found to the problem of prohibiting nuclear tests. Furthermore, the Israeli aggressors and the racists in southern Africa are desperately anxious to obtain nuclear weapons. All this makes it even more urgent to put an end to nuclear-weapon tests and to effect a radical reduction in nuclear arms, and eventually to eliminate them completely. At the present session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union proposed that all the nuclear Powers should immediately

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

embark upon an exchange of views on these matters, in parallel with the Soviet-United States talks on nuclear and space weapons. Those who really desire to maintain and strengthen international peace and security, to limit armaments and to bring about disarmament cannot but react positively to this constructive initiative.

In the present difficult situation, as never before, it is becoming increasingly important that purposeful and joint action should be taken by States, because tomorrow it may be too late.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.