

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.251  
20 March 1984  
ENGLISH

---

FINAL RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 20 March 1984, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. I. Datcu

(Romania)

GE.84-61042

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Ms. F.-Z. KSENTINI

Argentina: Mr. J.J. CARASALES  
Mr. R. GARCÍA MORITAN  
Mr. R. VILLAMBROSA

Australia: Mr. R. BUTLER  
Mr. R. ROWE  
Ms. J. COURTNEY

Belgium: Mr. M. DÉPASSE  
Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE

Brazil: Mr. C.A. DE SOUZA E SILVA  
Mr. S. QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria: Mr. P. POPTCHEV  
Mr. C. PRAMOV

Burma: U MAUNG MAUNG GYI  
U THAN TUN

Canada: Mr. G. SKINNER

China: Mr. QIAN JIADONG  
Ms. WANG ZHIYUN  
Mr. LIN CHENG  
Mr. ZHANG WEIDONG

Cuba: Mr. P. NUNEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. VEJVODA  
Mr. A. CIMA  
Mr. J. MATOUŠEK

Egypt: Mr. F. MONIB

Ethiopia:France:

Mr. H. RENIE  
Mr. G. MONTASSIER

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. H. ROSE  
Mr. H. THIELICKE  
Mr. F. SAYATZ  
Mr. J. DEMBSKI

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. H. WEGENER  
Mr. M. GERDTS  
Mr. W.-E. VON DEM HAGEN

Hungary:

Mr. D. MEISZTER  
Mr. F. GAJDA  
Mr. T. TOTH

India:

Mr. S. KANT SHARMA

Indonesia:

Mr. S. SUTOWARDOYO  
Mr. ANDRADJATI  
Mr. HARYOMATARAM

Islamic Republic of Iran:

Mr. N.K. KAMYAB  
Mr. F.S. SIRJANI

Italy:

Mr. M. ALESSI  
Mr. M. PAVESE  
Mr. G. ADORNI BRACCESI

Japan:

Mr. R. IMAI  
Mr. M. KONISHI  
Mr. T. ISHIGURI

Kenya:Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES  
Mr. P. MACEDO RIBA  
Ms. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG  
Mr. S.O. BOLD

Morocco: Mr. A. SKALLI  
Mr. O. HILALE

Netherlands: Mr. J. RAMAKER  
Mr. R.J. AKKERMAN

Nigeria: Mr. J.O. OBOH  
Mr. L.O. AKINDELE  
Mr. C.V. UDEDIBTA

Pakistan: Mr. K. NIAZ

Peru: Mr. C. CASTILLO RAMIREZ

Poland: Mr. S. TURBANSKI  
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ  
Mr. G. CZEMPINSKI  
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania: Mr. I. DATCU  
Mr. T. MELESCANU  
Mr. O. IONESCU  
Mr. A. POPESCU  
Mr. A. CRETU

Sri Lanka: Mr. J. DHANAPALA  
Mr. P. KARIYAWASAM

Sweden: Mr. R. EKEUS  
Mr. J. LUNDIN  
Ms. E. BONNIER  
Mr. H. BERGLUND

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV  
Mr. P.Y. SKOMOROKHIN  
Mr. S.V. KOBYSH  
Mr. G. VASHADZE  
Mr. V. USTINOV

United Kingdom:

Mr. L.J. MIDDLETON  
Mr. J.F. GORDON  
Dr. G.H. COOPER  
Mr. D.A. SLINN

United States of America:

Mr. L.G. FIELDS  
Mr. N. CARRERA  
Ms. K.C. CRITTENBERGER  
Mr. R. HORNE  
Mr. P. LEMBESIS  
Mr. J. DOESBERG  
Mr. J. PUCKETT

Venezuela:

Mr. LOPEZ OLIVER  
Mr. T. LABRADOR

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC  
Mr. D. MINIC

Zaire:

Ms. E. ESAKI KABEYA

Secretary-General of the Conference on  
Disarmament and Personal Representative  
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary-General of the  
Conference on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is called to order.

The Conference today begins the consideration of agenda item 5 entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". However, in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any matter relevant to the work of the Conference.

Distinguished representatives, you will recall that at its last plenary meeting the Conference decided to hold an informal meeting this morning to consider the organizational matters which are ripe for decision. After having heard the speakers on my list for today, I intend to suspend the plenary meeting and to convene an informal meeting to consider the requests for participation by non-member States in the work of the Conference. We shall then resume the plenary meeting to take the appropriate decisions.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Mongolia and the German Democratic Republic, and I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Mongolia, Ambassador Erdembileg.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): Comrade President, the Mongolian delegation would like to devote its statement today to agenda item 5, prevention of an arms race in outer space, a topic which the Conference on Disarmament began considering early this week.

Before doing so, I should like to extend to you, Comrade President, our sincere congratulations and wish you, the representative of fraternal socialist Romania, all success in carrying out your responsibilities as President of the Conference for this month.

The Mongolian delegation would like to express its gratitude to the Ambassador of Poland, Stanislaw Turbanski, for his great contribution to the work of the Conference at the beginning stage of its work.

The subject of the prevention of an arms race in outer space occupies a special place in the gamut of disarmament problems. It is an extremely urgent and timely matter. What is involved is primarily the prevention of a new and still more dangerous turn in the arms race and the elimination of potential opportunities for using space technology for military purposes.

It is well known that the most powerful and destructive modern weapon, the strategic nuclear missile, makes use of near space. There has been, furthermore, an increasing number of disturbing reports in the world press about other forms and means of using space technology for military purposes. In particular, such reports have referred to the development in the United States of space devices intended for carrying out military operations, including the development and testing of space components for anti-ballistic missile or anti-aircraft defence systems, orbiting attack systems and so forth. Such unprecedented plans and projects for extending the arms race to outer space and for the use of military force from space against the Earth are aimed at achieving military and strategic superiority, at obtaining a unilateral advantage and, ultimately, at gaining a first-strike potential.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

The idea of establishing an anti-ballistic system in space, put forward by the President of the United States on 23 March 1983, was aimed precisely at achieving those goals. Under the pretext of "defence" the United States is attempting to undermine the strategic balance, which is an important factor in averting the threat of nuclear war. Washington is seeking to protect its territory from the threat of a nuclear-missile response, thus maintaining for itself the freedom to use nuclear weapons in other areas. It is clear that the United States expects that no one will be able to match it in this field and that it will be able to have complete dominion in space.

The steps taken by the Pentagon to establish a unified space command covering all branches of the armed forces of the United States are aimed at this same goal. These steps are clearly aimed at gaining mastery in space for the United States. In the President's State-of-the-Union Message the establishment of a manned military space station is described literally as increasing American superiority and the building of new frontiers. United States National Security Directive No. 119, signed by the President on 6 January 1984, sets the same goals, calling for a multi-billion dollar programme of development of new space weapons and other sophisticated types of weapons.

The danger of the arms race spreading to outer space is quite obvious. The agreed completion-time targets in the Pentagon's plans relating to building up the strategic strike forces and deploying anti-ballistic defence systems on Earth and in space show that the aim is to complete the establishment of a so-called first-strike potential in the 1980s. The United States magazine "BusinessWeek" describes with extreme clarity the future plans and activities of the United States in space: whoever manages to gain control of space, the main theatre for future wars, will be able to change the balance of forces decisively and this will amount to the establishment of world dominion.

The transformation of outer space into a theatre for the arms race is a matter of great concern to the world, which firmly and decisively calls for the peaceful use of outer space for the benefit of all States and in the interests of the development of friendly relations and mutual understanding among States.

This is the main reason for the urgent need to direct the space activities of States to peaceful purposes and to conclude effective international agreements that would place reliable barriers in the way of any attempts to turn space into a theatre for the arms race. This position on the prevention of an arms race in outer space is that of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including the Mongolian People's Republic.

In his speech of 2 March 1984, K.U. Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, referred inter alia to the importance of not transferring the nuclear-arms race to new areas, including space.

In that context, we should like to dwell in greater detail on the important new proposal of the Soviet Union to conclude a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the Earth, a draft that was introduced at the previous, thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly and received broad support and high praise from many States, including those represented at the Conference on Disarmament.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As is known, the Soviet Union presented a proposal in 1981 for the conclusion of an agreement on banning the deployment of weapons of any kind in outer space. This proposal was endorsed by the General Assembly and a draft treaty on the subject was submitted later to the Committee on Disarmament. However, as is known to members of this body, it was not possible to begin negotiations aimed at preparing the appropriate treaty, owing to the negative position of some delegations, in particular the NATO countries.

It is our view that the new Soviet proposal effectively combines the political and legal obligations of States not to use force against each other in space and from space with measures of a substantive nature aimed at preventing the militarization of space. In specific terms, the Soviet Union proposes the following:

Firstly, to prohibit the use or threat of force in outer space, in the atmosphere and on Earth through the utilization, as instruments of destruction, of space objects in orbit around the Earth, on celestial bodies or stationed in space in any other manner, and to prohibit the use or threat of force against space objects in orbit around the Earth.

Secondly, to undertake not to test or deploy in space any space-based weapons for the destruction of targets on the Earth, in the atmosphere or in outer space.

Thirdly, to undertake not to test or develop new anti-satellite systems and to destroy existing anti-satellite systems.

Fourthly, not to destroy, damage or disturb the normal functioning or change the flight trajectory of space objects of other countries.

Fifthly, not to use space objects in orbit around the Earth or on celestial bodies as means to destroy any targets on the Earth, in the atmosphere or in outer space.

And finally, to prohibit the testing and use of manned spacecraft for military, including anti-satellite, purposes.

The proposal provides also for the appropriate control measures and a system of consultations and co-operation aimed at the implementation of the provisions of the future treaty.

Looking at the above-mentioned prohibitions as a whole, it is not difficult, in our view, to see that they constitute specific proposals aimed at a radical solution of a broad range of complex matters linked to the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

In addition to its new proposals the Soviet Union took an extremely important decision in committing itself not to be the first to launch anti-satellite weapons of any type into space and, in so doing, it established a unilateral moratorium on such launchings for as long as other States, including the United States, refrain from launching anti-satellite weapons of any type into space. That decision is yet another clear demonstration of the Soviet Union's determination to conduct negotiations aimed at arriving at the appropriate agreements and its willingness to take effective measures in order to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

There have been on several occasions broad exchanges of views on this subject in sessions of the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament, and it is now necessary to begin active negotiations without further delay. We feel that the time has come to establish a subsidiary working body of the Conference that would immediately begin negotiations on the conclusion of an agreement or agreements, appropriate to prevent an arms race in all its aspects in outer space, taking into account all existing proposals, including of course the Soviet proposal on a treaty on the prohibition on the use of force in outer space and from space against the Earth. This is the very task envisaged in the General Assembly's recommendation in resolution 38/70, which was adopted by 147 Member States of the United Nations.

Owing to the negative position taken by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom and some other delegations of Western States, the establishment of a subsidiary body on agenda item 5 continues, unfortunately, to be delayed, as does agreement on its mandate. Those countries bear the entire responsibility, therefore, for the fact that the Conference has up to now been unable to begin negotiations on this important and priority topic.

In this connection we simply cannot understand the position of those Governments that were in favour of the adoption by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session of the single resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space but do not, at the session of the Conference on Disarmament, seem willing to undertake negotiations aimed at the preparation of an agreement on the subject.

The negative experience of the work in this forum, when its subsidiary body was set up with a deliberately restricted and narrow mandate, must not be repeated. If some delegations of the Western countries again insist on their obstructionist position, such an approach can only be seen as a pretext to avoid a businesslike solution of the problems facing the Conference.

The Mongolian delegation, like many others, calls for the speedy establishment of an ad hoc committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space with a mandate that would include the undertaking of negotiations aimed at the conclusion of an important agreement on one of the priority items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, and not general discussions and studies.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Mongolia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the President. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Rose.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): Comrade President: At the outset of my statement I would like to congratulate you, the representative of socialist Romania, on your assumption of the Presidency for the month of March. As the first weeks have already shown, your long experience in the disarmament field is indeed of great value for the work of our Conference. We appreciate your efforts to continue our work in a dedicated manner with the aim of achieving tangible results, and it is indeed a great pleasure to see you presiding over our Conference, all the more so at a time when from your country's capital, Bucharest, a new important common initiative has been submitted by the member States of the Warsaw Treaty to the NATO countries concerning negotiations on the non-increase and the reduction of military budgets. Permit me, Comrade President to express once again our appreciation to Ambassador Turbanski for the effective manner in which he guided our Conference through the first month of this session.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

I would like to deal with agenda item 3 concerning the prevention of nuclear war. The debate in this Conference has reflected the deep concern about the aggravation of the international situation and the growing danger of nuclear war. Actually, all delegations demand that a nuclear war must be avoided. However, at the same time it has become obvious that there are different views on the concrete approach to the substantial and procedural matters involved.

Obviously, there already exist different assessments as to the danger of nuclear war. Most countries share our view that this danger has grown considerably during the past years.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the first positive results in curbing the nuclear-arms race were achieved. I would like to recall the SALT agreements and the 1973 Soviet-United States agreement on the prevention of nuclear war. These and other bilateral and multilateral steps raised hopes for further more comprehensive measures.

However, this development was brought to a standstill as a result of the course of superarmament and confrontation adopted by the United States.

As a result of this:

First, the number of nuclear weapons has further increased and the nuclear-arms race is characterized by higher efficiency of nuclear weapons; qualitative improvement has become the main trend.

Second, the so-called doctrine of nuclear deterrence and other concepts for the use of nuclear weapons to a growing extent turn out to be guidelines for the preparation of a nuclear war. To materialize them, precedence is given in military planning to the creation of a nuclear first-strike potential.

Third, the deployment areas for nuclear weapons are being expanded. More and more vessels, aircraft and military bases are being equipped with such weapons. Nuclear first-strike weapons are being moved closer to the borders of other States. The deployment of Pershing 2 and Cruise missiles in Western Europe demonstrate the extraordinarily dangerous nature of this development.

The extension of the arms race to outer space is being pressed by certain circles which are devoting enormous efforts and funds to that purpose.

This proliferation of nuclear weapons at the same time drastically increases the risk of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war.

Fourth, during the past few years important negotiations have been broken off by the United States, while the basis for other negotiations has been removed by a policy of strength. Here, at this Conference, we daily witness efforts to complicate or even block serious steps on urgent measures for preventing nuclear war.

Fifth, attempts are being made to belittle the devastating consequences of a nuclear catastrophe, in spite of the fact that scientific findings prove the contrary and give clear evidence that the destiny of mankind is at stake.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

All these facts are incontestable and lead to the cogent conclusion that the danger of nuclear war has grown considerably. These facts directly concern the sphere of competence of our Conference.

Furthermore, we have to take into consideration the growing tendency of certain forces to solve political issues by replacing the search for the accommodation of interests by the dictate of weapons.

To avert the danger of nuclear war has become a matter that deeply concerns all peoples in our times. Indeed, it is the most important international task.

With your permission, Comrade President, I would like to refer to the statement made by His Excellency Archbishop Achille Silvestrini on 15 March, who stressed that more and more numerous are our brothers and sisters who are 'haunted' by the terrible sensation of living on top of a volcano that at any moment could become active and unleash devastating forces and spread its mantle of death over our planet and put a final end to the story of our history. This is, indeed, a very unambiguous description of the reality.

Nevertheless, certain governments deny that there is a growing danger of nuclear war. They try to avoid the discussion of its consequences and seek to continue unhindered the arms race to obtain military superiority. They maintain that their own security has to be guaranteed by increasing stocks of evermore sophisticated nuclear weapons.

Obsessed by their armaments hysteria, ruling imperialist circles of NATO are blind and deaf to the threat to international security as a whole. They ignore the fact that movements for peace and disarmament and sober-minded politicians all over the world have emphatically stressed this acute threat to mankind. To recall their demands is not only fully legitimate but also serves that cause.

The different assessment of the danger of nuclear war finds its expression accordingly in a different approach to the elaboration of measures to avert that danger. This applies to both the urgency and the concrete substance.

Thus, at this Conference too the majority of States is in favour of making the solution of this problem the central task which should be tackled immediately. Others, however, try to push this question into the background.

Whereas the majority of delegations demands the elaboration of effective measures, the suggestions made by other delegations rather look like cosmetic surgery. One cannot but gain the impression that they are intended to be tactical instruments rather than considerations on how mankind's survival can be guaranteed by effective measures to prevent nuclear war. However that may be, if their authors are convinced of their proposals they should put them to the test in businesslike negotiations.

The differences in substance are necessarily reflected in the discussions on procedural matters. It is logical that those who stand for swift and effective steps against the danger of nuclear war also urge specific negotiations and the establishment of an appropriate subsidiary body. Those, however, who would like to

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

ward off anything that might impede their armaments programmes, would prefer to evade the consideration of these questions, and at most are ready to keep repeating their negative attitude in non-committal debates. This leads away from the factual consideration of the matters and delays or prevents any progress as far as their solution is concerned.

It cannot be denied that the procedural debates have their roots in the general approach to item 3 of our agenda. To offer mere methodological advice to diplomats who have long years of conference experience and who have substantially contributed to working out important international agreements cannot replace the lack of political will on the part of certain delegations.

There is hardly another subject at this Conference that would be more apt to prove the unity between words about peace and deeds to maintain it than the elaboration of practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war. As long as such deeds are missing, we shall be compelled to tell the world why the Conference fails to make any progress.

What some delegations sometimes call reality in fact turns out to be the subjective negative position of some nuclear-weapon Powers, which is in contradiction with world-wide public demands.

We, therefore, urge the States concerned to reconsider their position and help lead the activities of this Conference onto the path of businesslike and fruitful negotiations. The security interests of all States and the existence of mankind can only be guaranteed by taking swift and concrete steps. It is inadmissible for a State, no matter how powerful it may be or may feel to be, to use its own arbitrarily defined security interests as a tool to act counter to the security interests of other States.

Our delegation is ready to study all proposals very carefully, point by point. Nobody underestimates the hard work necessary to reach agreement. However, it is indispensable to begin to look for and agree upon common ground through businesslike negotiations. We are convinced that, given readiness in principle to take part in elaborating measures against nuclear war, all arguments put forward in favour of the establishment of a Committee with an appropriate working mandate will be accepted.

I have especially in mind the following:

First, the United Nations General Assembly adopted at its thirty-eighth session several resolutions reflecting the concern of the peoples about the growing danger of nuclear war and requesting this Conference to undertake as a matter of the highest priority -- I underline: highest priority -- negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on appropriate and practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war.

Second, we now have a corresponding separate item on our agenda. Those who accepted this should not refuse the consequences. We cannot agree with arguments to the effect that the establishment of a Committee would be "premature". As everyone knows, in the past working groups were set up on questions where differences of opinion existed concerning detailed issues. No one can say that the issues connected with the prevention of nuclear war are unknown. Extensive deliberations have already taken place in the United Nations and the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

Third, important as it is, the establishment of a Committee can only be one step. What is equally required is a mandate that makes it possible to negotiate and agree upon concrete measures. A mere stating of positions will not do to make headway.

Fourth, there are concrete proposals on the table constituting a good basis for negotiations. Working papers have been submitted by different sides, and during the debate valuable suggestions were made. Every delegation is requested to render its contribution to achieving further progress.

The negotiating process makes possible what is urgently required now: the careful consideration of the proposals with a view to agreeing on practical measures.

The establishment of a Committee with a negotiating mandate would put an immediate stop to the procedural debates and create the preconditions making it possible to turn to substantive issues.

My delegation reserves the right to give the details of its position on the substantive questions at a later stage of our deliberations in plenary. At this moment, I would like to reaffirm our stance in favour of such measures which would create real obstacles to the outbreak of nuclear war.

The socialist countries have undertaken many concrete initiatives in this respect. Earlier this month, Comrade Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, put forward proposals of both political and military character. They range from the ratification of the treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear-weapon tests and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes by the United States to the prohibition of propaganda for nuclear war, to the obligation to be undertaken by all nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, to a freeze of nuclear weapons and their reduction and final complete elimination through negotiations on the basis of equality and equal security. The Conference has these proposals before it in document CD/444 of 6 March 1984.

This is, in the view of the German Democratic Republic, the road that must and can be followed.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the President. The list of speakers for today is exhausted: does any other representative wish to take the floor? If not, I now intend to suspend the plenary meeting and to convene an informal meeting of the Conference, immediately after which we shall resume the plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. The plenary meeting is suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 11.35 a.m. and resumed at 11.45 a.m.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is called to order. The Conference has before it two draft decisions which have been circulated by the secretariat following the requests for participation and subsequent clarifications received from Greece and Ireland. We shall consider the draft decisions in the order in which the initial requests were received from the non-members. The first draft decision refers to the request by Greece and is contained in Working Paper No. 120. 1/ If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The second draft decision is contained in Working Paper No. 121. 2/ If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have now concluded our work for today, and if no other member wishes to take the floor at this stage I now intend to adjourn the plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 22 March, at 10.30 a.m. The meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

---

1/ "In response to the request of Greece (CD/477 and CD/478) and in accordance with rules 33 to 35 of its rules of procedure, the Conference decides for the present to invite the representative of Greece to participate during 1984 in the plenary meetings of the Conference and in the subsidiary body established under item 4 of its agenda."

2/ "In response to the request of Ireland (CD/479 and CD/480) and in accordance with rules 33 to 35 of its rules of procedure, the Conference decides for the present to invite the representative of Ireland to participate during 1984 in the plenary meetings of the Conference and in the subsidiary body established under item 4 of its agenda."