



FIRST COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
9 November 1983
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

- Mr. McIntosh (Australia)
- Mr. Bhurgari (Pakistan)
- Mr. Fischer (Austria)
- Mr. de Souza e Silva (Brazil)
- Mr. Fields (United States of America)
- Mr. Tinca (Romania)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.28
29 November 1983
ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 50, 51, 56, 59, 60, 63 and 139 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. McINTOSH (Australia): The most vital issue facing the human race today is peace. There is nothing more important than preventing the ultimate stupidity of wanton destruction of human life and property. War is the greatest of all human follies. In the past it has been justified by a belief in glory and patriotism. It has now become an activity of such indiscriminate destruction that it will undo most, if not all, of the achievements of mankind. War must be rejected and peace must be obtained. This means using all the energies and resources that are available to us to stop the arms race, to reduce tensions in international dialogue, to find the required solutions, to prevent nations and people living under the constant cloud of war. It means creating a new economic order in which war is unnecessary and where there is no place for such folly or social injustice. Often war itself and the arms expenditures which precede it are the product of economic enmities and rivalries.

How do we break down the fears and jealousies which give rise to national and economic aggression? There is no simple way, there is no inherently correct way, but there is a way. I suggest that we must create an environment of increased public awareness that will be the necessary catalyst for international understanding and by necessity peaceful coexistence.

Well-publicized statistics on arms expenditure show that the world's military will spend more than \$700,000 million this year, in other words over \$1 million per minute. The volume of resources devoted to military expenditure has increased fourfold since 1950 and is almost twenty times greater than all the economic aid programmes of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development of the past 20 years.

World military spending amounts to approximately 20 times the total amount of official development aid. Why engage in this race to nowhere? We must make people aware that a significant increase - I am talking about a really significant increase - in the flow of economic aid from developed to least developed countries is unlikely to take place unless developed countries reduce their military budgets. Disarmament is thus essential for development.

(Mr. McIntosh, Australia)

However, the super-Powers are increasing their military expenditures and at the same time less-developed countries have stepped up their arms expenditures and also arms imports. Arms often come from the super-Powers. It is interesting that the economic development aid expenditures of these Powers also often appear to be determined by political criteria rather than development needs. In other words, their aid programmes are more often than not determined by cold-war criteria. And aid is often allocated to entrench the position, to increase the power of régimes opposed to the sort of policies needed to overcome the most urgent problems - those of the rural poor. Anyone who doubts this has only to take a close look at the top recipients of bilateral aid and they will find that they are not all members of the third world and they are also the recipients of heavy military aid. In other words, resources are being channelled to military régimes whose ideologies typically make them opponents of radical structural reform.

Increased defence expenditure is occurring at the same time as universal decreases are taking place in average economic growth rates, at the same time as growing unemployment and at the same time as there is an increased scarcity in many raw materials and concern over environmental degradation.

In the less-developed countries, mounting foreign debt liabilities are straining their capacity to pay for necessary and increasingly expensive fuel, fertilizers and much-needed imports. These countries cannot and should not afford expenditures on arms.

It is relevant that, in the bottom two-fifths of the third world's population, conditions have in many cases actually worsened during the past decade: in the less-developed countries, only one person in three ever sees a doctor; among children under 15 it is estimated that 12 million deaths could be prevented by immunization; in relation to births, six times as many infants die in developing countries as in developed countries.

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) takes the view that:

"The basic consequence of the militarized world in which we live is, simply stated, a waste of the world's limited resources ...".

Today, when we talk of a militarized world or of a military budget, we are talking of a nuclear militarized world and a nuclear military budget.

(Mr. McIntosh, Australia)

If we want to create a lasting peace, it is necessary that we make people aware of the international economic crisis and its link with the nuclear arms race. This is not going to be an easy task. As the physicians with social responsibility acknowledge, the world is in a state of psychic numbing: the threat of nuclear war has been around so long, and is so horrific that we have shut off, we do not want to hear any more. I believe we are being conditioned to accept nuclear war. Consequently, too many people are no longer talking of whether a nuclear war will happen but of when it will happen. Some people even believe that the only way out of the current economic difficulties for the super-Powers is for them to have a war. We must not accept the inevitability of war. We must reject war; we must promote peace. We must insist on peace, and that peace can be maintained only through social justice.

I have attempted here to describe the linkage between disarmament and development. The problem is that militarism has intervened and become an essential part of the infrastructure of the current economic system. Development of the war machine has tended to become more important than the development of people.

Until this priority is reversed peace will be elusive and nuclear catastrophe even closer.

Mr. BHURGARI (Pakistan): The purpose of my intervention today is to introduce two draft resolutions sponsored by Pakistan. The first draft resolution relates to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East and has been distributed in document A/C.1/38/L.6. The second relates to the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and has been distributed in document A/C.1/38/L.7. Pakistan, it will be recalled, has had a long-standing interest in both these subjects. This interest flows from Pakistan's principled position on the grave threat which our world faces as a result of the existence of nuclear weapons.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament states in its paragraph 61 that the ultimate objective of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world is the achievement of a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. The immediate objective for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in a specific region would be

(Mr. Bhurgari, Pakistan)

to insulate it against the threat of nuclear attack or nuclear blackmail as well as to prevent the geographical spread of nuclear weapons and thereby contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament.

The objective of establishing nuclear-free zones was reaffirmed at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March this year, where it was stated:

"The Heads of State or Government affirmed that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constituted an important disarmament measure. The establishment of such zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons." (A/38/L32, para. 31)

Pakistan shares with other States of the South Asian region a deep commitment to the objective of keeping our area free of nuclear weapons, and this has been reflected in the unilateral declarations made, from time to time, by individual States in the region in regard to non-acquisition of nuclear weapons. Pakistan thus believes that proper conditions exist in the South Asian region to carry forward the objective of transforming it into a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world is by no means an end in itself, nor is it a substitute for a global, general and comprehensive approach to disarmament. However, nuclear-weapon-free zones do constitute an important partial measure in a step-by-step approach to general and complete disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. Additionally, they derive their relevance from being important confidence-building measures. The many complex elements that make up the nuclear-weapon-free-zone concept have been referred to by a number of delegations. These will require serious attention as the concept is refined in the light of its practical application and the actual experience of States.

It is our hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.6 will receive the full support of this Committee. The resolution follows, both in its preambular and operative paragraphs, the one adopted by the General Assembly last year. In its operative paragraphs the draft resolution reaffirms once again its endorsement, in principle, of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in

(Mr. Bhurgari, Pakistan)

South Asia and urges the States of the region, and such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as may be interested, to continue to make all possible efforts for the establishment of such a zone.

The second draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.7 falls under agenda item 53 entitled, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". For many years Pakistan has vigorously pursued the question of concluding effective international arrangements for what have come to be described as negative security assurances. In our statement in this Committee on 20 October, we referred to the existence of continually expanding nuclear arsenals, especially those of the major nuclear Powers. The existence of those weapons, we said, posed a threat to the very survival of both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States. In such circumstances, the non-nuclear-weapon States have the right to refuse to become victims of a nuclear war which they have not sought and which they want to prevent.

The most effective assurance against the nuclear threat remains the complete prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and their eventual elimination. However, interim arrangements can also play an important role in allaying the legitimate concern of the non-nuclear-weapon States as regards threats to their security. Such assurances have become all the more essential since meaningful progress on nuclear disarmament does not appear likely in the foreseeable future.

Following the first special session on disarmament, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Negative Security Assurances in the Committee on Disarmament recorded some forward movement during its 1979 and 1980 sessions. This held out the encouraging possibility that the Committee might be able to agree on the necessary elements that could be included in effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons before the second special session on disarmament.

However, the negotiations undertaken in the Ad Hoc Working Group since 1981 have not proved productive. The second special session also failed to register any progress. In fact, there was no response at all at this session to the legitimate concerns of the Group of 21 in this regard from some of the nuclear-weapon States concerned.

(Mr. Bhurgari, Pakistan)

The unilateral declarations made by some nuclear-weapon States on this subject do not adequately meet the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Those declarations reflect the security concerns of the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves. As such, they cannot constitute a meaningful response to the search of the non-nuclear-weapon States for security against the nuclear threat. My delegation continues to believe that assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, in order to be effective, must be unconditional and of a legally binding nature.

The draft resolution submitted by my delegation and contained in document A/C.1/38/L.7 has been prepared along the lines of resolution 37/81 adopted last year on the same subject. The draft resolution has been updated in its preambular paragraphs by the inclusion of a reference to the recommendations of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March of this year. In its operative paragraphs it appeals to the nuclear-weapon States to demonstrate the political will necessary to reach an agreement which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character. It is the hope of my delegation that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/38/L.7 will receive the unanimous support of this Committee.

Mr. FISCHER (Austria): Today I should like to speak on an issue to which Austria attaches particular importance. I refer to agenda item 62 (i), on measures to provide objective information on military capabilities. Our interest in this matter is based on the conviction that inadequate information on the military strength of States is a major cause of mistrust, fear and tension in today's international relations and a significant reason for the continuation of the arms buildup and the stagnation of disarmament efforts.

The measures taken by a State to ensure its security against foreign military attack and the resources devoted to this purpose depend to a large extent on the assessment of the military potential and the intentions of other States. In a climate of mistrust and in the absence of reliable information, Governments tend to overestimate the military strength of potential adversaries and to carry out arms programmes on the basis of worst-case estimates. If the same syndrome of inadequate information, insecurity and fear also determines the behaviour of the other side, a vicious circle of rising tensions and increased arms buildup is set in motion.

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

Throughout history, misconception of military intentions and capabilities has triggered competition among States in building up their respective armed strength. Today's situation is no exception. In the relationship between the two major military alliance systems, as well as in various regional contexts, armament programmes are often justified by subjective assessments of the opponent's military potential. Austria is convinced that the vast discrepancies between estimates of the military strength of States are often caused by uncertainty about the intentions and capabilities of the adversary.

It is universally acknowledged today that significant military agreements on the limitation or reduction of weapons and military forces require an understanding of the actual state of the armaments and forces concerned. But it is still a matter of dispute whether military data should be exchanged exclusively in the framework of disarmament negotiations or whether the availability of reliable information constitutes a precondition for the beginning of meaningful negotiations. Austria believes that this question must be resolved pragmatically in each particular case, according to the specific requirements of the arms limitation measures under discussion. Experience with previous arms limitation efforts, however, clearly suggests that as a general rule the lack of reliable information is a serious obstacle to disarmament. Disarmament negotiations are successful only if there exists a minimum of confidence and mutual trust. Disarmament agreements are verifiable only if mutually accepted data is available. Where these conditions do not exist, States have been reluctant to enter into disarmament talks. When they have done so nevertheless, protracted negotiations without tangible results have generally ensued.

Austria does not believe - and I should like to emphasize this because it has been misunderstood in the past - that inadequate information on security-related issues is the only or the most important factor responsible for the arms race and the stagnation of disarmament efforts, but it is a cause of insecurity and fear that contributes to the negative trends of international relations. The present situation is so serious that we cannot afford to ignore any measure or approach which holds some potential for dampening the arms race and promoting disarmament.

In the age of nuclear weapons the security of all peoples is interdependent. In recognition of this fact, the General Assembly, in paragraph 28 of the Final

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, declared that all States have the duty to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament and the right to participate in disarmament negotiations. That statement, no matter how well it responds to the universality of the nuclear threat, will remain a dead letter to the extent that the capacity of States to form their own independent judgements on disarmament matters is limited by the lack of reliable information. At present only a few military Powers possess the national means to collect basic facts for the assessment of the distribution of military strength. Especially for smaller States outside the information networks of the military alliance systems, it is difficult to follow developments in the area of military security and to take informed positions on them. If the responsibility of all States to contribute to disarmament efforts, as proclaimed in the Final Document, is to be meaningful, the need for all States to have access to more objective information has to be recognized as its necessary corollary.

The crucial role of public opinion in the promotion of disarmament is becoming increasingly apparent in recent years. In launching the World Disarmament Campaign, the General Assembly initiated concerted action to generate public understanding and support for disarmament. To inform has been rightly recognized as one of the primary purposes of the Campaign. It is only through free discussion and debate on the basis of balanced and objective information that the public can exercise a positive influence on the attainment of disarmament objectives. The success of the World Disarmament Campaign, as well as of other efforts to promote public support for disarmament, will be directly commensurate to the amount and quality of available information on security-related issues and on the various aspects of disarmament.

For all these reasons, Austria believes that efforts are needed to improve the flow of military information and to enhance the reliability thereof. It is to be hoped that growing awareness of the favourable impact the possession of objective information on security-related matters would have on the establishment of greater mutual confidence, on détente and on disarmament will motivate Governments to adopt more open and predictable policies in the military area. Measures to enhance the quantity and quality of information should be developed on the national, regional and global levels. The great potential of modern techniques for gathering, disseminating and evaluating data needs to be fully utilized. In addition to the

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

follow-up action on initiatives already existent in this area, new ideas and proposals should be encouraged, explored and - wherever possible - implemented. The United Nations should play a leading role in this regard.

Some of the most significant achievements in the area of information on military matters have been made within the wider context of confidence-building measures. Efforts to make military activities more open and predictable have been at the very heart of confidence-building, ever since the emergence of this concept in the 1950s. The United Nations Comprehensive Study on Confidence-Building Measures not only recognizes this fact but contains a list of concrete measures that could usefully be taken.

Such measures are also a major element of the regional endeavours to promote confidence-building, in particular, within the context of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Austria is convinced that the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building and Disarmament in Europe, to be convened in January 1984, will also devote attention to measures to improve information on military capabilities. Furthermore, we hope that the continued in-depth consideration of the issue of confidence-building by the United Nations Disarmament Commission will further contribute to this end.

The introduction of an international system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures constitutes another important approach to the objective of reliable information on military matters. If this system were to be further developed and more widely implemented, it could lead to a considerable increase in the data available with respect to the resources devoted by States to military purposes, and it could thereby eliminate a major source of misconception and mistrust. The ongoing work on methods to make reported data comparable will certainly enhance the effectiveness of the system. The most serious obstacle to its usefulness, however, has so far been the relatively small number of participating States. The decision of Governments from different geographic regions and representing different budgeting systems, to report annually on their military expenditure to the Secretary-General, using the reporting instrument, would require only minor expenditures but would have important beneficial consequences for confidence-building, détente and disarmament.

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

The proposal for the establishment of an international satellite-monitoring agency also has great potential as a measure to provide objective information on security-related matters. Apart from its functions in the verification of compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements, such an agency could monitor military activities of States in areas of tension and thereby contribute to the settlement of international crises. It could also be entrusted with other missions designed to build confidence through the dissemination of reliable and objective information. Austria hopes that the General Assembly will actively pursue its consideration of this proposal.

Dissemination of information to governments and to the general public has long been one of the primary functions of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. A part of this process of dissemination takes place within the framework of the studies made in the area of disarmament under the auspices of the United Nations. Such studies have proved to be a useful tool for clarifying specific aspects of the arms race and of disarmament, strengthening public support for disarmament measures and paving the way for negotiations to this end. Experience has shown that the value of studies depends greatly on the availability of relevant information and, more particularly, on the co-operation of Member States in supplying such data. Although the record has not so far been unsatisfactory, there can be no doubt that the authority of the studies, their public impact and their usefulness for disarmament negotiations could be greatly enhanced if all Governments were prepared to provide detailed information on the subjects concerned.

Apart from studies, the United Nations Secretariat implements a variety of programmes for the dissemination of information on disarmament. Much of this work - for instance, the United Nations Disarmament Year Book - focuses on the relevant activities of the Organization itself. In so far as facts and data on aspects of the arms race are presented, they usually stem from various governmental or non-governmental sources. Austria supports these activities and believes that they should be further developed and strengthened. We also feel, however, that the United Nations, as is the case in many other fields, could itself become a source of objective data on security-related issues.

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

As a focal point for the sharing and exchange of military information, the Organization could perform an invaluable service to governments, to the public and to the disarmament negotiating process. Austria therefore believes that further measures should be considered within the framework of the United Nations, to promote the systematic collection, compilation and publication of data on military matters. The desirability of such measures has already been recognized in the context of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament, issued in 1976. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research has also been involved in related work. Implementation of this proposal would require agreement on criteria for the definitions of the data to be collected, and would include the elaboration of generally acceptable procedures for collection, evaluation and dissemination.

Austria is well aware that these conditions can only be fulfilled gradually, over several years. We are also aware that the views of all Member States regarding such measures need to be taken into account. For this reason, last year's General Assembly resolution 37/99 G invited Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General their views and proposals concerning this issue. The replies received so far are contained in the report of the Secretary-General (A/38/368 and Add.1).

The great majority of them are very supportive of the objective of improving information on the military strength of States and present valuable proposals on how to achieve progress on this issue. There were also a few critical replies. In view of the complex nature of the subject matter, the sponsors of resolution 37/99 G believe that it is desirable to obtain a wider spectrum of views on this subject.

I therefore have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Measures to Provide Objective Information on Military Capabilities". The preambular part of this draft resolution sets out the motives underlying the present proposal, including a reference to the relevant provision of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Operative paragraph 1 takes note of the report of the Secretary-General. Operative paragraph 2 calls once more upon all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, to consider additional measures to facilitate objective information on, as well as objective assessments of, military

(Mr. Fischer, Austria)

capabilities. Operative paragraph 3 once again invites Member States to communicate to the Secretary-General their relevant views and proposals. Operative paragraph 4 requests the Secretary-General to ask the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies to consider the modalities of further studying the question.

As Member States are aware, the Advisory Board now also serves as the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, which has already carried out a number of studies related to the subject of the present draft resolution. We therefore believe that it is a particularly suitable organ for making suggestions on how to proceed with the further study of measures to provide objective information on military capabilities.

The last operative paragraph requests the Secretary-General to report to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the draft resolution. On behalf of the sponsors, I recommend this draft resolution to the First Committee for adoption.

Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): In my capacity as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission I should like to introduce the report of the Commission, contained in document A/38/42, on the 1983 substantive session of the deliberative body in the field of disarmament.

As delegations are aware, the 1983 session was organized following the guidelines set by the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly in resolution 37/78 H, in which the Commission was requested to direct its attention at each substantive session to specific subjects and to make concrete recommendations on such subjects to the subsequent session of the General Assembly. That request, of course, was fully in accordance with the mandate of the Disarmament Commission as set forth in paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I am much indebted to all delegations, and particularly to the members of the Bureau of the Commission and the chairmen of the various working groups, for their invaluable co-operation and assistance in fulfilling the guidelines given us by the General Assembly. Despite difficulties in securing the necessary services and facilities for the effective functioning of the Commission, the 1983 session devoted most of the time available to substantive deliberations and completed its work on schedule. The results of that work are contained in the report I am submitting today.

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

The specific recommendations made therein to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly have been adopted by consensus, as noted in paragraph 10 of the report, and are those adopted by each of the four working groups and one contact group, which took charge of the substantive items of the agenda. In accordance with the guidelines that had been set, such recommendations were drafted in as concise and action-oriented a manner as was possible under the circumstances in which the Commission operated.

The results of the 1983 session should, however, be seen in the proper perspective. The deliberative body was revived in 1978, mainly on the initiative and with the support of the non-aligned countries, as a universal forum designed to provide guidance, emanating from the whole community of nations, on the various pressing questions of disarmament confronting mankind. During the past five years the Commission has performed invaluable services, particularly on the occasions when it was called upon to formulate recommendations on specific questions. I refer specifically to the elaboration of the guidelines for the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament in 1979, to the preparation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade in 1980 and to the elaboration of guidelines for the study of all aspects of conventional weapons.

The efforts undertaken at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly to strengthen the Commission's role and to improve its capacity to deal effectively with the question within its purview must be further pursued so that the Commission may become an increasingly effective tool for the promotion of solutions to the urgent and vital issues of disarmament confronting mankind as a whole. With this concern in mind, my delegation has consulted extensively with a large number of delegations and has the honour to announce that, together with all members of the Bureau of the Disarmament Commission as co-sponsors, it has submitted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.14 dealing with the report and with the work of the Disarmament Commission. It is the hope of the sponsors that this draft resolution will be adopted by the First Committee by consensus.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): I welcome this opportunity to discuss the World Disarmament Campaign. At the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the thirty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly, my Government supported a truly universal,

(Mr. Fields, United States)

comprehensive and objective world-wide discussion of disarmament. At the Special NGO Committee meeting in Geneva last September my Government presented its views on the implementation of the Campaign. Today I should like to outline some of these thoughts to the First Committee.

In his statement before the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly this September, President Reagan recognized the vital role that can - and should be - played by individuals and groups, as well as Governments, in promoting peace in this world. Standing before the Member States of that body, President Reagan asked:

"What has happened to the dreams of the founders of the United Nations?"

"What has happened to the spirit which created the United Nations?"

And he continued:

"The answer is clear: Governments got in the way of the dreams of the people. Dreams became issues of East versus West. Hopes became political rhetoric. Progress became a search for power and domination. Somewhere the truth was lost that people do not make war, governments do." (A/38/PV.5, p. 3)

How then can we ensure that Governments remain accountable to their people in making decisions of war and peace, especially in a nuclear age?

A first and vital step in ensuring that our Governments remain, or become, accountable to their own people is to allow the people the tools to make informed decisions.

In the United States vast amounts of diverse information on the momentous issues of war and peace are freely available. One need only step out of these cloistered halls to appreciate the vitality and diversity of discussion that abounds in the open society here. Governments might not always like what we hear or see; demonstrators sometimes protest against the established authority that our Governments represent. All of us here have at one time or another portrayed our Governments as watchdogs of public morality on the momentous issues of war and peace. But who watches over us?

I submit that a well-informed public is the best guarantee we have against misuse of that authority. On 4 June 1982, at the second special session devoted to disarmament, for example, hundreds of thousands of my fellow citizens demonstrated openly and peaceably for various disarmament measures. My Government shared their concerns and their goals. As members of the Committee are aware, we did not agree

(Mr. Fields, United States)

with every means proposed to achieve the end of disarmament, but we listened. No one was harassed; no one was incarcerated. We cannot afford to do otherwise. Unless any of us, as individuals or as representatives of Governments, can honestly say he has a monopoly on the truth or on virtue, we dare not close our minds to the voices of our own people.

Unfortunately, over and over again in this century wars have been started by Governments which are opposed to the principle of free expression or which deny their people a true voice in their governance and instead propose to speak on their behalf. Free nations do not want or choose war. Free speech leads them towards justice; freedom of opportunity offers progress without recourse to violence; and political freedom ensures that Governments reflect the views and concerns of their people.

Throughout this troubled century, the United States has never been at war with another country committed to democracy and the free expansion of ideas, whatever their content. Indeed, it has supported the process of democratic change from its inception as a nation, and it champions peaceful change today. In the contemporary world, it has always been, and remains today, the least free and most repressive countries which are the main instigators of international tension and conflict. Of the one-hundred-plus wars and conflicts which have been fought since the Second World War, none have been fought between two democracies. This is an incontrovertible fact worth contemplating.

The second special session on disarmament produced a consensus document for a truly universal and effective world disarmament campaign. The language of this document is clear and unequivocal. It stipulates: that the campaign "should be carried out in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner"; that its universality should be "guaranteed by the co-operation and participation of all States and by the widest possible dissemination of information and opinions on questions of arms limitation and disarmament and the damages relating to all aspects of the arms race and war, in particular nuclear war"; and that it should provide an "opportunity for discussion and debate in all countries on all points of view relating to disarmament issues, objectives and conditions".

These are admirable goals. Now it is up to all Governments of the world to put these clear principles into practice, to realize in concrete deeds and in their day-by-day actions what all Members of the United Nations have already endorsed in words.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

In the United States and in all open, democratic societies, the workings of free, multi-sided media ensure that essential information about security and disarmament is readily available to the public. Scores of public and private institutions are working actively to propagate their views on arms control and security issues. No censors or commissars impede the flow of public information. Demonstrations are not staged, nor is participation in them restricted to those invited by the Government. Unfortunately, that is not the case everywhere. In the Soviet Union, and in other countries following similar domestic repressive politics, only that information which supports official Government positions can circulate freely and be openly and publicly discussed, even when it affects the most profound issues for mankind. Those who do demonstrate for peace and disarmament without permission run the risk of prison or internal exile.

It is particularly ironic that the Soviet Union's domestic actions contrast so sharply with its rhetorical support for peace movements in free countries. While it cynically seeks to exploit the noble aspirations of the peace movement in other States, the Soviet Union simultaneously inveighs against pacifism and arrests those who take part in unauthorized "anti-State" activities in its own country. The message is clear: for the Soviet Union, what is anti-State at home is state policy abroad.

The situation in the East, however, is quite instructive. As Nobel Peace Prize winner Andrei Sakharov has written,

"Soviet society remains as closed as ever. The most important decisions are made in antidemocratic fashion. The freedom to exchange information, the freedom of conscience, the freedom to choose one's country of residence are violated. Conditions for monitoring Soviet compliance with the international agreements to which it is a signatory are practically nonexistent. The persecution of dissidents has increased."

This forum is all too well aware of the difference between internal reality and the external rhetoric of certain States of this body. Suppression and/or intimidation of peace movements in the East bloc in direct contravention of consensus United Nations resolutions cannot - and should not - be ignored by this body. Over the past six months, for example, the following occurred.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

The Soviet and other Eastern European Governments denied independent peace campaigners from their respective countries exit visas to attend the European Nuclear Disarmament Movement's second Convention held in West Berlin from 9 to 14 May 1983.

Soviet peace activist Alexander Shatravka was gaoled for three years for collecting signatures for a statement calling on both the United States and the USSR to scrap their atomic arsenals and work towards better relations.

Twenty members of a pacifist group in the German Democratic Republic were expelled to the West for singing peace songs and wearing badges with the slogan "Swords into Ploughshares", which is taken directly from the United Nations Charter.

German Democratic Republic police seized five leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany's Green Party who crossed into East Berlin to demonstrate against nuclear weapons.

Three Hungarian members of the autonomous Hungarian peace movement, Peace Group for Dialogue, were detained by police after attempting to demonstrate in Budapest.

Czechoslovak authorities barred local peace activists and members of the unofficial peace movement in the German Democratic Republic from participating in the World Assembly for Peace and Life Against Nuclear War.

Police dispersed 300 youths demonstrating for freedom in Czechoslovakia.

Police broke up a press conference given in Prague by members of the Charter 77 human rights movement.

Rather than continue this sad litany, I shall allow one poignant contrast between open and closed societies to speak for itself: at the same time as 700,000 openly and peaceably demonstrated for peace and disarmament in the streets of New York during the second special session, seven who dared unfurl the seditious banner calling for "peace, bread and disarmament" in Red Square were summarily arrested.

It is much more difficult to generalize about the developing South than about the East, because of the diverse nature of societies in the developing world. Moreover, nations of the developing world face vexing social and economic problems which, understandably, often take precedence over questions surrounding the world

(Mr. Fields, United States)

disarmament campaign. None the less it is important that all peoples have access to a wide range of information and experience vigorous debate on all topics related to arms control.

How to ensure with certainty that the campaign will in fact have adequate access in all regions remains the central conundrum of the campaign. There are no easy answers to this problem, but the experience of the implementation of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe Final Act is instructive. While the Final Act continues to be violated, it does set standards to which countries can be called to account and the continuing Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe review process has provided a forum for that very purpose. Those who wish to see that the world disarmament campaign is faithful to its purposes, as stipulated by the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, will need to use the General Assembly as a forum for the review of the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign guidelines. While it cannot be expected that such reviews will lead to radical changes in the nature of societies, nevertheless every effort should be made to open all societies in ways which will permit the universal implementation of the campaign.

Finally, I would like to reaffirm my Government's commitment to a truly universal world disarmament campaign. We urge all Governments to respect fully the recommendations adopted at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the consensus resolutions on the World Disarmament Campaign passed at the thirty-seventh General Assembly of the United Nations. These resolutions represent important consensus documents and moral commitments by all nations to abide by generally accepted norms of behaviour. We in this body should now focus on appropriate follow-up resolutions and actions.

The important work of implementing the World Disarmament Campaign falls on the broad shoulders of the Department of Disarmament. My delegation would like to commend Under-Secretary Jan Martenson and his dedicated staff on attempting to translate the lofty goals of the Campaign into concrete deeds. We are aware that this task has not been easy. In the coming months we will be watching with special interest to see if the Campaign is indeed carried out in a balanced fashion in all regions of the world and that the public in all regions have access to disarmament discussions sponsored by the United Nations.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

Last year, 20 American leaders of the movement to freeze Soviet and American arsenals - including among them a Nobel Prize winner, the Chairman for the Council for a Livable World and one of the few American members of the Soviet Union's Academy of Sciences - sent a letter to the Soviet leadership criticizing efforts to "harass and persecute" their Soviet counterparts. A portion of that letter reads,

"The double standard by which the Soviet Government abides - applauding widespread debate in the West, while crushing the most benign form of free expression at home - only strengthens the complex of forces that impel the nuclear arms race."

The United States Government fully subscribes to that sentiment. That is why the United States supports the concept of a universal world disarmament campaign that meets the criteria established at the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament and that is why we urge all countries to lend their support to efforts to promote an unhindered flow of information to all peoples of the world and to permit the widest possible freedom of public expression and assembly on the crucial issues of world peace and disarmament.

Mr. TINCA (Romania) (interpretation from French): In our earlier statements in this Committee the Romanian delegation has stressed the urgency, in the present international situation, which has recently deteriorated, of beginning the real process of negotiation on measures to halt the arms race and bring about disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. In this statement we should like, in the institutional framework and from the point of view of negotiations on disarmament problems and the mobilization of a general effort to achieve that goal, to discuss the paramount importance of international peace and security.

The first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament defined a new single concept regarding negotiations in an organizational framework, a more democratic framework, in order to mobilize the efforts on different levels with a view to achieving the basic goal of disarmament. Romania has always wanted the basic disarmament machinery to answer the broadly-felt need to democratize international relations. Every country, no matter what its size or military potential, should have an opportunity to exercise its rights and obligations and to take an active part in the settlement of this major problem facing the world today. The existing machinery for negotiation on disarmament problems, although

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

not perfect, is an appropriate framework for effective disarmament measures: yet we must not lose sight of the fact that the concrete results achieved in those bodies are far from satisfying us.

During the five years since the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, no notable results have been recorded. The Conference of the Committee in Geneva has concluded no disarmament agreement, and debates on problems of great urgency, such as nuclear disarmament and the reduction of military budgets, have been on the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for a number of years, but debates on those subjects have been at a standstill.

There are many reasons for this, which we shall not go into here, but we should like to stress certain things which are fundamental in restoring the debating and negotiating machinery for disarmament. The efficiency of the machinery depends primarily on the political will of all States to negotiate in good faith and to try to ensure their right to security by negotiations and by concluding agreements on a real and substantial reduction of armaments, primarily nuclear armaments. It is essential that a firm, genuine political will be demonstrated by States in disarmament negotiations. That will must be based on an awareness that the balance of forces can be maintained only by reducing armaments to ever-lower levels. That goal can be attained only at the negotiating table, while taking into account the undiminished security interests of all States.

Secondly, the effectiveness of disarmament negotiations requires that there be active and responsible participation by all States and that their proposals be taken into account on the basis of the right to equal security. As we have often said, we are in favour of disarmament negotiations based on strict respect for the sovereignty of every State and on the elimination of all discriminatory practices, including those based on membership in a given bloc.

Thirdly, it is necessary that we understand and properly resolve the relationship between bilateral and multilateral negotiations. We have always recognized the importance of bilateral negotiations. We welcomed them when they began and have done whatever we could to support them and promote their success. Yet we cannot allow the difficulties or the impasse in bilateral negotiations automatically to hinder multilateral negotiations. Nor can we allow the standstill in bilateral negotiations, or their inflexibility, to have an inhibiting effect on the activities of the United Nations, which it has been generally recognized has a central role in and bears primary responsibility for disarmament.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Once again we solemnly draw attention to the need to observe the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, under which bilateral and multilateral negotiations on disarmament must be mutually supportive and be an organic part of common objectives, as set forth in the Programme of Action which was worked out and adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Fourthly, we have often expressed our position of principle that measures to resolve the major problems before mankind should be adopted on the basis of consensus. In disarmament, a consensus guarantees that agreements reached will meet the security interests of all participating States, which ensures one of the basic factors in their implementation. Yet we must express our concern over the evermore obvious tendency in multilateral debating and negotiating forums to use the consensus as a means of blocking negotiations and the decision-making process. It is regrettable that such practices have taken place precisely when the international situation has worsened and when it is more necessary than ever that States do their utmost to maintain a dialogue and mutual trust as they endeavour to settle disputes by political means through negotiations.

In our view, a consensus requires the active participation of all parties in all stages of the negotiating process; it also implies the obligation to give all proposals equal treatment and, in a flexible manner, after mutual concessions, to reach solutions that take all interests into account.

Those, we believe, are the four elements essential to any major change in the disarmament bodies. In the final analysis, however, such a major and necessary change depends on the attitudes of the Governments that we represent, on the sincerity of our statements in support of disarmament, and on how we intend to put those declarations into practice.

The present session is supposed to start the preparatory process for the third conference which will consider the implementation of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. This is a particularly important political event to which the Romanian delegation is paying special attention. Moreover, the entire international community is interested in reducing the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and it is in everybody's interest that the existing Treaty on the subject become an effective, viable and credible instrument acceptable to all States. This is the essential objective to be pursued in the preparatory work for the conference and in the negotiations that the conference will bring about.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The starting point in identifying ways and means for achieving this objective lies unquestionably in the conclusions and criticisms formulated by most States parties to the two Conferences which considered ways and means of implementing the Treaty. Both the first and second Conferences brought out very clearly the justifiably bitter criticism that nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty, in spite of their legal obligations under Article VI of the Treaty, have failed to fulfil their obligation to negotiate in good faith certain nuclear disarmament measures. The requests of non-nuclear-weapon States are equally justified. They have renounced, under the Treaty, the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons, and they wish to obtain sure guarantees from the nuclear Powers that in no circumstances will they be ever victims of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, or of the use of force in general.

In the course of the last three years since the second Conference the situation, instead of improving, has worsened. The nuclear arms race has intensified in an unprecedented manner, and that is especially true of the qualitative side of that race. The emplacement of intermediate-range rockets in certain European countries has undermined the moral authority of the Treaty and added to its original shortcomings. The contribution of the Treaty to the maintenance of international peace and security, the primary reason for its existence, has been more and more limited. The feeling of security that States parties should enjoy has, for all practical purposes, been replaced by uncertainty and concern over the danger of nuclear war. In addition, we are greatly concerned by the ever-growing number of restrictive measures and artificial barriers stemming from the monopolistic policy pursued of late in the transfer of energy and nuclear technology for peaceful purposes - at a time when the achievements of science and technology should be made available for the economic and social progress of all States, primarily the developing countries.

On the whole, we believe that the balance between the rights and obligations of parties to the Treaty has become ever more unstable because of its growing shortcomings and gaps.

Romania has always considered that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons requires genuine and sustained measures aimed at nuclear disarmament, the granting of security guarantees to non-nuclear States and uninhibited access by all countries, primarily the developing countries, to nuclear energy for peaceful

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

purposes. Strong action to meet these three goals should be at the very centre of the preparatory work and the negotiations that will take place during the conference. All nuclear and non-nuclear parties to the Treaty must make an effort to reach agreement on urgent and efficient measures to avert the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As in the past, the Romanian delegation is determined to make an all-out contribution, together with the other States parties to the Treaty, to the preparation and ultimate success of the conference.

Major peace and disarmament demonstrations have taken place in many countries, and with particular fervour, in the post-war period. They attest to the fact that popular action and world public opinion in support of disarmament and peace have become a new progressive factor of special significance, capable of halting the arms race and protecting mankind from a nuclear catastrophe.

The Romanian people, like other peoples, moved by its unshakeable desire for peace, independence and friendship, has recently committed itself to a broad movement in support of disarmament. We did so out of a desire to make our own contribution to the prevention of war and the attainment of lasting peace. Confronted with a need for resolute action to halt the escalation of the arms race and to get negotiations on disarmament moving again, the United Nations must step up its efforts to alert world public opinion and people everywhere to the dangerous course taken by the arms race.

I am referring, of course, to the World Disarmament Campaign, an initiative which Romania has supported right from the very beginning. My country contributed to the preparation and adoption by consensus of the fundamental principles of that Campaign at the second special session devoted to disarmament. Romania was also one of the first States to announce voluntary contributions to the Campaign's fund, and we wish to state our willingness to participate actively in the implementation of those measures.

We welcome this year's report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the programme of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign and share his opinion that the resources allocated thus far are inadequate for the effective implementation of the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign.

In view of the political importance of those activities and the positive influence that mobilization, objective information and world public opinion can have on efforts to halt the arms race, we believe that the relevant department of

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

the United Nations Secretariat ought to have the necessary means to intensify its efforts to achieve the objectives of the Campaign. It should make a greater contribution to an objective awakening of world public opinion to the real situation concerning arms and disarmament negotiations and stimulate public interest in disarmament problems. It should also reaffirm support for the United Nations goal of arms limitation and disarmament. It might be necessary for there to be closer co-ordination between United Nations activities in the World Disarmament Campaign and measures planned for other major political events aimed at a larger audience, such as the International Youth Year and the International Peace Year. In our opinion, non-governmental organizations, the mass media and the schools should play a greater role in mobilizing public opinion in support of disarmament and peace.

As funds allocated to the World Disarmament Campaign increase, it will be necessary to have a broader diversification of activities within its framework in order to meet the genuine interests and needs of various categories of public opinion for specific information. When the Campaign's annual programmes are prepared, greater attention should be paid to proposals put forward by States and even to suggestions from representatives of public opinion. We are particularly keen on devising practical ways and means for the public to make itself heard in the various debates and negotiations on disarmament and thus advance the cause of disarmament and international peace and security.

We should like to assure the Department for Disarmament Affairs of our co-operation and support in the full implementation of all measures called for in the 1984 programme of action.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.