

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION
*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Friday, 2 November 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE
(continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria)
Mr. Nuñez Mosquera (Cuba)
Mr. Petrovsky (USSR)
Mr. Wegener (Federal Republic of Germany)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)

*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, from 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.1/39/PV.25
3 November 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 65 AND 142 (continued)

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

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): I should like at the outset to extend, on behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, our deepest sympathies and condolences to the delegation of India on the occasion of the tragic death of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The people of India has lost its great daughter, respected leader and worthy continuer of the work of the unforgettable Jawaharlal Nehru. The international community has lost a prominent advocate of peaceful coexistence among States, an untiring champion of peace, democracy and social progress and a great leader of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. The Bulgarian people will always treasure the memory of Indira Gandhi, a great friend of Bulgaria.

In this statement, my delegation would like to dwell on two particular items: curbing the naval arms race and the World Disarmament Campaign.

The interests of peace and security require that concerted efforts be made to close all channels of the arms race, which is ruinous for mankind, and to eliminate all its forms and sources. Along with the imperative goal of preventing nuclear war and achieving nuclear disarmament, we also have today the particularly urgent problem of curbing the naval-arms race.

As is well known, the role of naval forces in the overall military strategy of States has been growing steadily. Profound changes have come about in the development of the operational capability of naval forces and their strategic role has increased. The adoption of nuclear missiles as armaments has given naval forces a war potential far surpassing everything known in the recent past.

In recent years we have witnessed a new momentum in the development of United States naval armaments. The militaristic forces, which for decades have been the driving force behind each new round of the arms race, are now deploying qualitatively new systems of nuclear weapons based at sea at an accelerating rate. Owing to their accuracy, survivability and numbers, those systems are "first-strike" weapons which have destabilized the entire military-strategic situation and have increased the danger to peace and security coming from systems based at sea.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

A quite disturbing development for the vast majority of Member States is the introduction of a great number of naval fleet units designed to carry out military operations in various explosive parts of the world, which in many cases are at a considerable distance from one's own shores. Such programmes are being implemented for all main classes of naval vessels in the United States Navy. Two additional aircraft carriers of the Nimitz class are under construction, together with scores of escorting destroyers and frigates, as well as transport and amphibious vessels. Recently, there has been an increase in the number of cases involving the use of naval formations as a show of force and as a means of interfering in the internal affairs of States, particularly developing countries, and threatening their vital interests, independence and territorial integrity. Even the mere presence of such large naval forces in areas of conflict leads to a further aggravation of tensions in the region concerned. We have had many examples of this, such as in the East Mediterranean, the Red Sea and also the Caribbean.

The increased naval activities in a number of regions have an adverse effect also on the security of the busy sea lanes which traverse them. The permanent presence of entire naval fleets or other major naval formations in maritime communication areas increases the vulnerability of shipping and prevents the unimpeded use by all States of the seas and oceans for peaceful navigation and trade, for the exploration and exploitation of the wealth of the world's oceans for peaceful purposes.

A number of States are justifiably alarmed at the threat to their security directly posed by the proximity to their territory of numerous naval bases and strongholds, very often thousands of miles away from the States which use them. The growing danger of the increasing naval presence and activities is not one of the limited regional nature. It has assumed global proportions and includes all parts of the world's seas and oceans: the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian oceans, the Persian Gulf, and so on.

The attempts of the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies to upset, to their own advantage, the military balance of forces, including the strategic balance, by using for this purpose the channels of the naval arms race, naturally create a need for the threatened States to take legitimate countermeasures for their own defence. Thus a new round of the naval arms race is being opened, fueled by imperialist ambitions to obtain military superiority.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The arms race in the seas and oceans increases the military threat to all States. For this reason the struggle to demilitarize the world's seas and oceans should become an integral part of the joint efforts aimed at preventing nuclear war, curbing the arms race and building confidence in every possible way. This activity is one of the major topical aspects of disarmament.

It is vitally necessary to undertake at the international level urgent and concerted measures to curb the naval arms race and to limit and reduce naval armaments quantitatively and qualitatively while all that is still possible. Joint and bilateral steps to restore confidence in freedom of navigation and create conditions for substantially limiting naval activities must also be taken as a matter of urgency.

The countries of the socialist community have set a clear-cut goal for themselves, which is to contribute, together with other concerned States, to limiting the level of military confrontation and to curtailing the naval arms race. They have put forward a number of concrete proposals designed to achieve this goal.

The Warsaw Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty Organization, adopted on 15 May 1980, emphasized that it was necessary:

"In the interests of peace and the stabilization of the international situation, as well as in the interests of ensuring the safe and unimpeded use of major international maritime communications, to begin consideration, in such a forum as the United Nations, of the question of restricting and lowering the level of military presence and military activity in appropriate regions, whether in the Atlantic, the Indian or the Pacific Ocean, in the Mediterranean or in the Persian Gulf". (A/35/237, p. 15)

In the Prague Political Declaration of 5 January 1983, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty called for the opening of talks on the limitation of naval activities, on the limitation and reduction of naval armaments and on the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans.

At its thirty-eighth session the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted, at the initiative of several countries, including my country, resolution 38/188 F, whereby the question of curbing the naval arms race was included for the first time in the agenda of the United Nations. In this resolution, the United Nations acknowledged the necessity of opening talks on this

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

question, with the participation of the major naval Powers, and particularly the nuclear-weapon States. Moreover, the United Nations called upon these States to refrain from enlarging their naval activities in areas of conflict or tension, or far from their own shores. Taking duly into consideration the necessity of studying further the nature, scope and subject of the proposed talks, the resolution invited Member States to communicate their views and recommendations relating to this question.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, in pursuance of this resolution, circulated his report (A/39/419) containing the replies of Member States.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is pleased to note that these replies show unequivocally that Member States are sincerely interested in starting a process of reaching agreement on mutually acceptable measures on the limitation of naval armaments, on the limitation of naval activities and the building of confidence. Moreover, the replies of a number of countries, including one nuclear-weapon State and a major naval Power, namely the Soviet Union, contain many ideas and concrete proposals relating to the subject and character of the proposed talks and the measures to be adopted. My delegation is of the opinion that this report of the Secretary-General of the United States has laid a solid foundation for conducting a broader and more business-like exchange of views on the question of future joint efforts in this direction.

At this stage, of importance are the questions of the subject, the representation and the possible organizational formats of the talks.

It is obvious that in view of the nature of the talks, which would affect the security interests of all States, all countries concerned should participate in negotiations on this set of questions.

The majority of Member States which communicated their replies to the Secretary-General expressed similar views. In the reply of Bulgaria, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Petar Mladenov, welcomed the readiness of the Soviet Union to participate in such negotiations. Positive responses from the other nuclear-weapon States, expressing their readiness to facilitate this effort through constructive participation in negotiations on this question would be of considerable importance for successfully curbing the naval arms race.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

With regard to the nature and scope of measures to be considered and adopted at the proposed negotiations, interesting guidelines could be found in General Assembly resolution 38/188 F, as well as in the replies of a number of Member States. The comprehensive programme of measures contained in the reply of the Soviet Union offers promising prospects for constructively orienting the efforts of the international community towards curbing the dangerous naval arms race.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

All relevant measures should of course be elaborated and implemented in full conformity with the principle of undiminished security, taking into account all factors determining the relationship of forces at sea, as well as other ways of limiting weapons affecting naval forces in one way or another. Only thus would it be possible to reach lasting and effective agreements in such an important area affecting the security of States.

In our view, as far as concrete proposals are concerned there are three basic types of measures that are envisaged.

First, reaching agreement on the non-expansion of naval activities of States in areas of conflict or tension. Solutions should be sought that would correct the unacceptable situation in which the naval fleets of great Powers are deployed for long periods far from their home shores. Beyond any doubt, steps should be taken to bring about the withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons from certain areas of the world's oceans and to establish limits on the presence of certain types of ships in those areas, as called for by a number of States.

Secondly, measures to limit naval armaments, which should include a limitation of the number of warships of the main classes. This type of measures should also include limitations of anti-submarine warfare forces and weapons and certain measures affecting naval bases in foreign territories. The interests of mutual security require that, besides limiting armaments in the seas and oceans, consideration should be given to the balanced reduction of the number of vessels in the combatant arm of the fleets of the great Powers. This applies, in particular, to such naval vessels as aircraft carriers, which have an extremely destabilizing effect and are used in shows of force and as an instrument for pressure and, sometimes, aggression against independent States.

Thirdly, confidence-building measures would be of major significance in averting conflict situations and in strengthening the security of the busiest sea lanes.

The Bulgarian delegation shares the view expressed by a number of countries in their replies to the Secretary-General that the possibilities of not only a global, but also a regional, approach to limiting naval activities and naval armaments should be fully utilized. The success of independent efforts by countries in some regions of the world, such as, for example, the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean Sea and others, in reaching agreement among themselves on certain measures for limiting

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

various aspects of naval armaments and activities would make a valuable contribution to solving the general problem of the demilitarization of the world's seas and oceans and curbing the naval arms race.

These and other mutually acceptable measures could be discussed and agreed upon within the framework of the proposed multilateral negotiations, as well as of parallel bilateral talks between the most powerful naval Powers, which would complement and facilitate the progress of the multilateral process.

In view of the large number of States interested in solving the problem of naval disarmament, the relevant multilateral negotiations I have already mentioned must be sufficiently broad in scope and representation. In this connection, promising prospects are offered by the possibility of starting such negotiations within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Other possible forms of consultations and negotiations could also be considered, including within the framework of a specially established organ of the United Nations system.

In this connection, my delegation notes with interest the idea contained in the reply of the Government of Argentina concerning utilization of the possibilities of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. By its character and composition the Commission could become a suitable instrument for generating the necessary consent to start concrete negotiations, either within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament or in another forum specially created for this purpose.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, as one of the initiators and advocates of the active consideration of this question, is well aware of its complexity and multifaceted nature. However, as pointed out in the reply of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria to the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

"The complexity of the questions related to curbing the naval arms race cannot justify inaction. Experience has shown that by means of negotiations it is always possible to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution in the interests of peace and general security provided that all States concerned have the necessary political will and take a constructive approach."

(A/39/419, para. 24)

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

I come now to the second question.

The striving for peace and security has always been the most deeply cherished sentiment of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. This has been most eloquently demonstrated by the massive anti-war activities of the international community, which have become the hallmark of political life in our time. The growth of the anti-war movement illustrates that mankind will not accept the ruinous fate which those who are planning to prevail in a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war have in store for it. Millions of people, who until recently had remained passive in politics, now show a lively interest in the issues of peace and disarmament.

This year the anti-war movement was again involved in a large number of varied activities and actions at the national and international levels.

The fourth international congress of the world's physicians for the prevention of nuclear war, held in Helsinki, was attended by representatives from 50 countries. The National Committee of Bulgarian Physicians submitted to the Congress over 30,000 signatures of Bulgarian medics in support of the call for the prevention of nuclear war. The Vienna meeting of retired generals from the Warsaw Treaty and NATO countries discussed important matters related to the strengthening of peace and security in Europe. At the seventy-first Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, representatives from more than 100 countries were largely unanimous in their view that the world should be saved from and spared a catastrophic nuclear war and that there is no other constructive approach to solving all contentious issues than serious negotiations. The eighth world conference for the prohibition of atomic and nuclear weapons, held last August in Tokyo, reiterated that the most important and urgent task facing mankind is that of the prevention of nuclear war and the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. The thirty-fourth Pugwash Conference, held last July in Sweden, stressed the necessity of stepping up efforts to check the arms race. The participants, more than 150 prominent scientists, public figures and politicians from 41 countries, emphasized the need for the nuclear-weapon States to adopt a "code of conduct" and assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons as significant steps towards averting nuclear war.

The list of major actions taken by the international community could be continued. However, even those just mentioned give a clear picture of the broad

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

base of forces supporting peace and disarmament. Among those actions is the collection of signatures as an important means of expressing the will of the international community.

The public in my country has also been very active in its support for peace and disarmament.

Last May, the second border meeting of women from Bulgaria and Greece was held in Seres, Greece, under the motto of peace and against the nuclear threat.

The Committee of the Movement of Bulgarian Women, in co-operation with the International Federation of Democratic Women, organized School for Peace, a meeting which attracted representatives of 30 women's organizations, movements and groups from Europe, the United States and Canada, as well as from five international organizations. At that meeting a broad dialogue was held on the most topical issues of peace and war.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria hosted the international meeting-dialogue, "Peace - a vital condition for social progress of peoples". The Bulgarian People's Agrarian Union, the second largest political party in my country, organized a meeting with the participation of prominent statesmen, politicians and public figures from 74 agrarian and democratic parties and organizations from 45 countries, as well as representatives of four international organizations. The meeting expressed the general concern over the maintenance of peace and the necessity of joining efforts to achieve this goal.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria has followed closely the development of the World Disarmament Campaign under the auspices of the United Nations. We are pleased to note that the Campaign has contributed increasingly to the mobilization of world public opinion on behalf of peace and disarmament. The report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the implementation of the programme of activities within the World Disarmament Campaign presents a lucid picture of the achievements this year, as well as certain trends and forthcoming events in 1985.

We should note the detailed information contained in the report of the United Nations Secretariat in the field of dissemination of information and of the activities of the specialized agencies within the Campaign. In our view, the report should devote more space to information about the major activities and actions of the international community. As far as the information materials of the United Nations are concerned, it is our opinion that they should reflect in particular United Nations activities in the field of disarmament and special attention should be paid to the proposals of Member States and the decisions taken on them.

The commemoration of important anniversaries by undertaking appropriate action is a powerful stimulus to the mobilization of world public opinion and the efforts of Governments. The approaching year 1985 is remarkable for several anniversaries of paramount significance in mankind's history: the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the victory over fascism in the Second World War and the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations are pertinent occasions for the international community to carry out broad and meaningful activities and actions in support of measures to avert nuclear war and bring about disarmament.

In 1985, 40 years will have passed since the tragedy of Hiroshima, the first victim of the horrendously destructive might of nuclear weapons. Today, Hiroshima is both a warning of the apocalyptic consequences of a nuclear war and a symbol of the struggle of peoples to avert that danger. Hiroshima cannot and must not be forgotten. During the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan proposed that 6 August be proclaimed Disarmament Day. It is to be expected that the international community, particularly the non-governmental organizations, will carry out extensive activities and actions to commemorate that momentous occasion.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is of the opinion that joint efforts should be made for the further successful achievement of the goals and purposes of the World Disarmament Campaign and is ready to join actively in those efforts.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In his message to the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, President Fidel Castro Ruiz stated the following:

"We have received with consternation and, at the same time, with deep indignation the news of the assassination of Indira Gandhi, our dear friend and an outstanding figure in the international life of our time. In conveying to the people of India, to the Government of that country and to you personally feelings of sorrow at this great loss, I wish, on behalf of my Government and people and on my own behalf, to say to you that we consider her tragic death not only as an enormous loss to India, the country which she led with great wisdom and considerable personal effort, but also to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to which she made such valuable contributions and which she headed with her well-known sagacity as a statesman, to all the underdeveloped and developing countries and for the cause of world peace and the independence of peoples to which she devoted her life.

"It will be difficult to determine the dark forces that are behind her assassination. The peoples of the world know that her death serves only the most aggressive representatives of imperialism, against whom she struggled perseveringly. Cuba feels her death as if it were its own. I have lost a great friend with whom I had the privilege of co-operating throughout many years of mutual understanding and common effort.

"I ask the people of India and you personally to accept this expression of my personal condolences and our most sincere solidarity. I wish to express to you the sincere conviction that you will live up to your historic responsibilities and to the great energy and spirit of Nehru and Indira Gandhi."

Today the Cuban delegation will speak on those agenda items which refer to the relationship between disarmament and development and the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

The existing close relationship between disarmament, on the one hand, and the economic and social development of States, in particular the developing countries, on the other, has been recognized on more than one occasion by the United Nations General Assembly. The first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament six years ago unequivocally showed that the accumulation of nuclear and conventional weapons seriously affects all efforts aimed at the attainment of development goals, that it is a serious obstacle to the realization of a new international economic order and that it prevents the solution of other vital problems besetting mankind in our time.

In paragraph 16 of the Final Document of the 1978 special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly stated, inter alia, that:

"In a world of finite resources there is a close relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development. Military expenditures are reaching ever higher levels, the highest percentage of which can be attributed to the nuclear-weapon States and most of their allies, with prospects of further expansion and the danger of further increases in the expenditures of other countries. The hundreds of billions of dollars spent annually on the manufacture or improvement of weapons are in sombre and dramatic contrast to the want and poverty in which two thirds of the world's population live." (resolution S-10/2, para. 16)

When those facts were recognized by the General Assembly the figure of world expenditures on armaments was well below the sum of \$800 billion, which, according to what some regard as conservative estimates, is squandered each year. Similarly, the number of undernourished, diseased, illiterate and dispossessed in general was considerably lower than it is today. Thus, the picture then foreseen has become even more dramatic and sombre.

(Mr. Nuffez Mosquera, Cuba)

In his book The World Economic and Social Crisis: Its Repercussions on the Underdeveloped Countries, its Bleak Prospects and the Need to Struggle if we Wish to Survive, President Fidel Castro stated:

"The direct cost of the arms race has exceeded the fabulous figure of \$US 6 million since the Second World War. This is equivalent in practice to the gross national product of the entire world in 1975. According to information provided by the United Nations, world military expenditures in 1980 represented the equivalent of the joint gross domestic product of Africa and Latin America for that same year and 6 per cent of the global value of the production of goods and services."

However, these enormous expenditures on weapons and the spiralling arms race which mankind is forced to live with do not exist by magic. They are the direct consequence of the arms policies of successive United States Governments, imposed on allies of the United States and aimed at creating an impressive military might in order to resolve by force the problems afflicting the world today. These in turn have engendered a proportional and inevitable response from the socialist countries. Here lies the explanation of why the world makes enormous military expenditures while in the middle of one of its worst economic crises.

But in addition - and this must be said again, although some may wish to conceal the fact - the arms race we are faced with affects the developing countries not only because it leads to the squandering of enormous resources which could well be used to improve the living standards of our peoples but also because to some extent we too are involved in its financing. The enormous arms expenditures incurred by some military Powers constitute one of the main factors which account for the large budgetary deficits, induce them to maintain high rates of interest and lead to a flow of resources away from the indebted countries.

The difficulties that the militaristic and warmongering policy entails for the world economy are evident. During the Viet Nam War, the enormous expenditures incurred were borne by printing paper money which then became devalued, leading to enormous inflation. Today, the huge expenditures of the arms race are to be borne through the mechanism of rates of interest. We must face this, and we cannot speak of disarmament and development without stating the facts.

(Mr. Núñez Mosquera, Cuba)

There is another aspect of the problem which we must not lose sight of. Apart from the implications which it has for development and international peace and security, the sale of costly war materials brings enormous benefits to the manufacturers, enabling them to realize economies of scale and helping them to improve the balance of payments. That is why some Governments are engaged in exacerbating tensions and intrigues in various parts of the world. Directive No. 47 of the National Security Council, adopted in 1982, refers, for example, to the use of resources of other countries to finance the military efforts of the United States. As has been said, it would appear that the results are tangible, because the Pentagon covers 27 per cent of its budget through the export of weapons.

These are realities which we cannot disregard. It is in this context that my delegation considers the proposal on the holding of a conference on disarmament and development. That conference would be objective and would advance our interests - unless it were used to divert attention from the real problems before us - and if the subject were dealt with in all its dimensions. We must begin today to work towards that end.

It is also in this context that my delegation approaches the proposal relating to the creation of a disarmament fund for development. Our countries, which have been subjected for many years to the most pitiless exploitation of their wealth, need resources in order to face their economic and social development tasks. Those resources are necessary and must be promoted. However, for a fund to be called a disarmament fund for development it must provide resources which come from effective disarmament measures, otherwise we shall be deceiving ourselves.

I wish to conclude this part of my statement by quoting from the Final Communiqué of the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly:

"The Ministers and Heads of Delegation reiterated that peace and development were closely inter-related. They reaffirmed that stable global development and viable international order require the halting of the arms race, followed by urgent disarmament measures that will release sorely needed resources for development." (A/39/560, para. 121)

May I now refer to the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. It had been hoped that the Group of Experts set up two years ago to supplement the study on nuclear-weapon-free zones which was carried out in 1975 would this year submit the

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

results of its work. However, for the reasons explained in the note of the Chairman of that Group, attached to the report of the Secretary-General on this item, the work was not concluded in the time allotted.

My delegation hopes that in the event that the General Assembly should so decide, the Group of Experts may fulfil its task if the time given to it is extended. The completion of that study is extremely necessary. Not only are nuclear-weapon-free zones an important disarmament measure, as recognized by the General Assembly at its 1978 special session, but their creation in various regions would represent a real obstacle to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the study is called upon to establish guidelines in that regard.

The study is necessary, moreover, because with each passing day it becomes more obvious that it is difficult to implement nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In Africa and the Middle East, for instance, running counter to the desires of the countries of the region, the systematic military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régimes there continues. But even in Latin America, where thanks to the laudable efforts of the Government of Mexico and the will expressed by countries in the region those countries can live in an area which has been declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone, nevertheless denunciation of violations of the Treaty of Tlatelolco become each day more alarming.

In this connection we must point out that on 4 September 1982 the General Assembly of the Bar Association of Puerto Rico, an institution to which all Puerto Rican lawyers of all political trends belong, adopted a resolution expressing its concern at the nuclear-arms race, with its dangers for Puerto Rico. The Assembly set up a special committee to carry out a study on the subject. That study was completed in August of this year and was even submitted to the Committee of 24 last September.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

In that study, substantiated by abundant and topical documentation, the Committee arrived inter alia at the following conclusions.

First, the United States is making preparations and plans connected with the command, control and use of nuclear weapons in various parts of the globe from the Roads naval base in Ceiba, Puerto Rico. Secondly, there are in Puerto Rico many communication facilities devoted solely or primarily to the guidance or control of nuclear weapons or of vessels capable of deploying nuclear weapons. Thirdly, there are contingency plans to operate from Roosevelt Roads and anti-submarine nuclear war centre. Fourthly, the Roosevelt Roads base is capable of accommodating nuclear weapons. Fifthly, in Roosevelt Roads, in Vieques and in the maritime space and airspace of Puerto Rico the testing of nuclear-strategic military techniques and equipment is carried out. Sixthly, although it has not been possible to determine with certainty the presence or permanent installation of nuclear weapons in Puerto Rico, the official United States policy of neither confirming nor denying the existence of such installations or emplacements creates uncertainty and doubt. Seventhly, the almost constant presence in Puerto Rico of nuclear weapons on ships and in military aircraft entering the territorial waters, the territory and the airspace of the island is highly probable.

Finally, the study concludes that, despite having signed and ratified the two Additional Protocols to the Tlatelolco Treaty, the United States has neither established nor elaborated norms or guidelines regulating or limiting the introduction of nuclear weapons in Puerto Rico.

These conclusions are substantiated by documents and references which leave no room for doubt as to their validity. Suffice it to mention, for instance, the existence of a list identifying 21 members of the Personnel Reliability Program in the Roosevelt Road base. It is not idle to say that, according to a guideline from the United States Defense Department, the Personnel Reliability Program seeks to "ensure the highest possible standards of reliability among the personnel who carry out tasks connected with nuclear weapons or nuclear components". That same guideline says that the number of posts in the Personnel Reliability Program will be limited to the minimum required. In the case of Puerto Rico that minimum is 21.

All this information is highly alarming if we bear in mind that, even though the sole multilateral instrument that has declared a highly populated area to be a

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

nuclear-free zone states in its preamble that the establishment of those zones is closely connected with the maintenance of peace and security in the region, security in the Latin American area has deteriorated in past years because of the strengthening and creation of military bases, threatening military manoeuvres and intimidation of the people in the region, and the obstinacy in maintaining archaic colonial situations, as well as interference and intervention in the internal affairs of States.

Those are matters that have led to direct military aggression, the mining of ports and every kind of hostile action against States parties, signatories and non-parties to the Tlatelolco Treaty which we cannot disregard.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity in this Committee to explain our position of principle on disarmament issues. We have stressed that the main pre-occupation today is the need to eliminate the nuclear threat, the growth of which has brought the world to a point where inaction is dangerous if not criminal and where vigorous actions are needed to remove that threat.

We have submitted our practical proposals as to the direction which should in our view be followed.

Undoubtedly States, and above all nuclear-weapon States, play the major role in this area. But this matter also concerns all countries and nations. Public opinion too is to play an important role. It is incumbent upon all of us to participate in the global movement to save mankind from the nuclear threat.

The unity of action of all forces which seek reliable and lasting peace and security for all is not just a good intention but the imperative of our time. The conditions for doing that are all there. No prejudices or biases, no preconceived notions spawned by unscrupulous propaganda or distrust and suspicion fostered by this same propaganda can conceal the fact that there is something much stronger, something which brings States and peoples together and calls for their concerted action, namely, the need to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear conflagration. This danger has in effect bound mankind together by a new sense of oneness which people feel when they are in the same boat in stormy seas. They can survive together only when nobody tries to push anybody overboard and when they all stick together.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Konstantin Chernenko, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, has emphasized the following:

"The current situation in the world can be remedied by joint and concerted efforts of State authorities and citizens regardless of their political, religious or philosophical views, social status or party affiliation."

It is in this spirit of co-operation of States with public opinion in the interest of preventing nuclear war that the Soviet Union approaches the question of the World Disarmament Campaign.

We are gratified to note that at its previous session the General Assembly adopted a resolution on this subject - 38/73 F - reaffirming the usefulness of carrying out actions and activities which are an important manifestation of the will of world public opinion and which contribute effectively to the achievement of the objectives of the Campaign.

The Soviet delegation has studied carefully the current report of the Secretary-General on the World Disarmament Campaign, document A/39/492. It notes with satisfaction United Nations Secretariat activities carried out within the framework of the Campaign. We hope that the United Nations will continue to be a useful instrument in mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

Our delegation is convinced that United Nations efforts within the framework of the Campaign will be even more effective if they are aimed at developing close co-operation with the most representative mass non-governmental organizations. We also believe that it would be quite useful to give wider publicity in materials disseminated by the Secretariat among the public at large to United Nations decisions on such key questions as the prevention of the nuclear threat and disarmament.

We have repeatedly stated and wish to reaffirm our view concerning the usefulness of implementing the World Disarmament Campaign as an important measure contributing to the intensification of the efforts of all peace-loving forces on our planet, which is so crucial in the present aggravated international situation. That is why the Soviet Union not only welcomes the World Campaign but is also making an important contribution to its implementation.

For example, our initiative led to the convening in Leningrad from 11 to 16 June last of a regional United Nations Conference within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign which was attended by representatives of over 50 national non-governmental organizations of various political leanings from Europe, the United States and Canada and a number of international organizations, including the World Peace Council and the Women's International Democratic Federation, as well as research institutions dealing with the problems of peace and disarmament. At the Conference prominent politicians and public figures and scientists from the Soviet Union and foreign countries discussed urgent problems relating to the prevention of the nuclear threat and the halting of the arms race, the atmospheric and biological effects of nuclear war, disarmament and confidence-building measures in Europe and the role of the United Nations in disarmament.

The Conference proceedings, which were widely publicized and reported in the mass media, were in general constructive and motivated by a sincere desire on the part of an overwhelming majority of the non-governmental organizations to multiply their efforts in support of United Nations activities aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat and stopping the arms race.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The holding of the Leningrad Conference was, in our view, an important stage in further carrying out the World Disarmament Campaign under the auspices of the United Nations.

We believe that it is possible to continue such a practice, inter alia, by holding a similar regional conference on the territory of one of the Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union through the use of our contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign. We also believe it would be possible through the use of our contribution to carry out other activities on the territory of the Soviet Union, such as an international festival of anti-war films and an international festival of anti-war songs.

The annual holding of Disarmament Week at the initiative of the Mongolian People's Republic plays an important role in the mobilization of world public opinion on behalf of disarmament. The experience in holding Disarmament Week is vivid proof of its useful role in fostering the objectives of disarmament.

We deem it important not only to back those activities within the Campaign which have become traditional, but also to welcome new ones. Specifically, the idea of designating 6 August as Disarmament Day has been widely supported by the public. The representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Ambassador Kostov, has reminded us of that today. We wonder whether the United Nations ought not to declare Hiroshima Day, which would be all the more timely since the fortieth anniversary of the unprecedented tragedy of that city will be observed in August 1985. Such an event would undoubtedly mobilize public opinion for the struggle against the nuclear threat.

The mass anti-war movement, which is steadily gaining ground and momentum, has nowadays become a powerful factor in world politics, a kind of a new guarantee of universal security - a socio-political guarantee. The major demands of public opinion mirror the most urgent concerns of our time. They are the need to avert nuclear war, to prevent the arms race from spreading to new environments, above all to outer space, to secure the renunciation by all nuclear Powers of the first use of nuclear weapons, and subsequently to ban such weapons, to cease all tests thereof, to freeze arsenals of them and to move towards their gradual reduction

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

until they have been completely eliminated and to work consistently for compliance by all States with their international obligation to limit the arms race.

It is gratifying to note that Soviet fighters for peace have been in the forefront of the international anti-war movement. The anti-war campaign involving the Soviet public has been broad in scope. I shall furnish just a few figures concerning the major anti-war actions carried out this year by the Soviet Peace Committee and by other non-governmental organizations. Last May alone during the Month of Vigorous Actions against the Threat of Nuclear War there were 163,000 mass anti-war events in which 76 million people took part. Numerous mass marches and rallies in support of the struggle for disarmament were held on 22 June to commemorate the forty-third anniversary of the attack launched by Hitlerite Germany against the Soviet Union.

Last September we observed a Week of Action for Banning Nuclear Weapons and for Solidarity with the Victims of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki Atomic Bombings in response to the appeal of the World Peace Council. Millions of Soviet citizens participated in various actions within the framework of that Week.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

The Week of Action for Banning Nuclear Weapons and for Solidarity with the Victims of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki Atomic Bombings was marked by a series of meetings with representatives of foreign anti-war organizations. For example, a Soviet-American mass rally was held on 7 August in the city of Rostov. Taking part in that rally were 118 United States peace activists who had just completed a "Peace Cruise" along the Volga River and 4,000 city residents. A meeting attended by 168 Japanese trade union officials was held in Leningrad from 14 to 17 August in support of the struggle for peace and disarmament.

At present another Disarmament Week is being held in the Soviet Union in response to the United Nations appeal. Demonstrations, rallies and meetings involving many thousands of people are now being organized in all Soviet cities and towns in support of the struggle against the nuclear threat, for curbing the arms race and for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. All those facts, the enumeration of which could be further continued, are convincing evidence that today the involvement of Soviet nationals in the World Disarmament Campaign has assumed truly nation-wide proportions.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize once again that the World Disarmament Campaign enjoys the wide support of both the Soviet Government and the entire Soviet people. We see the further deepening and expansion of this Campaign coupled with the growing mass anti-war movement as one of the important factors at long last making the elimination of the threat of nuclear war and the limitation and cessation of the arms race a reality of international life.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Having contributed a comprehensive statement to the general debate, my delegation intends to speak on a number of specific issues during phase II of our work. In the last couple of days several key delegations have addressed the issue of chemical weapons. My delegation wishes to do likewise. Additional statements will be devoted to nuclear matters, specifically the prevention of nuclear war, and issues relating to that agenda item, as well as issues relating to the policy of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

The negotiations on a convention to ban chemical weapons in Geneva have recently made some modest progress. The drafting of parts of the future agreement in treaty language and the unanimous elaboration of a preliminary structure of the convention are certainly to be counted among the positive developments. Also, numerous important proposals were made during the 1984 session, including the Soviet proposals of 21 February 1984 on the verification of the destruction of stockpiles and the submission of a complete draft convention by United States Vice-President Bush on 18 April 1984, both events testifying to the shared determination of the two great Powers to negotiate seriously and with the full authority of their highest decision-making organs.

Those are encouraging developments, and yet there is no reason to be complacent about the present state of negotiations. My delegation is concerned that even the recent use of chemical weapons in the conflict between Iraq and Iran has not generated sufficient momentum for the negotiations to reach a decisive stage. A greater collective effort is needed. We must not allow the window of opportunity which has now opened for the negotiators to close prematurely. The unabated production of chemical weapons and chemical warfare equipment by the Soviet Union and other Eastern European States; the preoccupation as to whether Powers that have taken the welcome decision to renounce the production of chemical weapons earlier will eternally uphold their moratoria; the threatening proliferation of chemical weapons to countries of the third world; the ominous prospect of new applications of science and technology to a possible chemical warfare of the future - all those impending threats heighten our responsibility to intensify the actual negotiating process with a view to producing a final agreement in a critically brief interval.

My concern today is with the crucial subject of verification on challenge, on which the outcome of the Geneva negotiations may very well hinge.

In a statement of 25 October 1984 that was unusually aggressive, the Soviet delegation criticized the American draft convention on chemical weapons on this point, attempting to hold the American side solely responsible for the lack of progress in the Geneva negotiations.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

My delegation feels that this one-sided accusation against the United States Government is incorrect in substance and inappropriate in its form. Polemical words such as "policy of obstruction" and "absurd system of verification" are not conducive to a rational discourse on the merits of the subject.

My delegation, for its part, has grave doubts as to whether an approach which - in only a slight exaggeration - translates into the catch phrase: "If you don't accept my views, you wreck the negotiations", contributes to successful negotiations and, indeed, is compatible with the welcome profession of a more co-operative disposition and readiness to negotiate which the Soviet delegation has affirmed in recent statements.

Already from a chronological angle, the assertion that article X of the American draft blocked negotiations on a system of on-challenge verification is quite untenable. The truth is rather that no negotiations took place on that article during the 1984 session of the Conference on Disarmament, because the relevant working group concentrated its efforts during the summer session exclusively on solving the institutional and organizational aspects of on-challenge verification. The substantive discussion of the American approach to verification - and of all other proposals made in the context of on-challenge verification - is still awaiting detailed consideration. Only the result of the next round of negotiations will show which delegations will have demonstrated flexibility. The Vice-President of the United States, when he was introducing the American draft, did offer flexibility in the negotiations on behalf of his delegation. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament has been waiting in vain, so far, for a corresponding offer of flexibility on the Soviet side, in particular, as to the question of on-challenge verification.

Any future negotiations must, however, necessarily focus on all available proposals, not the American proposals alone. The Soviet proposals as submitted in working paper CD/294 will have to be exposed to the same scrupulous examination. My delegation would like to state, at this juncture, that it can hardly imagine an agreement on chemical weapons whose on-challenge verifications are based on the Soviet proposals in their present form.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

The harsh criticism voiced by Ambassador Petrovsky on 25 October vis-à-vis the United States position prompts my delegation briefly to point out to the representatives in the First Committee five grave weaknesses of the Soviet approach to on-challenge verification.

First, in its basic position paper (CD/294) the Soviet Union has elaborated a system of on-challenge controls by means of a rigorous application of the principle of voluntariness. A contracting party on whose territory an on-challenge control is scheduled to take place may thus adopt a forthcoming attitude to such a request or do the contrary. The original text in working paper CD/294 reads as follows:

"The State ... to which such a request is sent may treat the request favourably or decide otherwise." (CD/294, p. 8)

The Soviet approach to solving the problems of on-challenge verification is thus tantamount to saying: "You shall abide by the convention or else you may choose to break it."

Secondly, ironically the Soviet approach would place the party that violates the agreement in a more advantageous position as if there was no such verification clause at all. According to the procedure proposed by the Soviet Union, any violator of the agreement would even act in full accordance with the convention if he were to evade an inspection requested on its territory. The Soviet approach would virtually constitute an "open invitation" to bypass the constraints of international verification and, by implication, legitimize a breach of the convention.

Thirdly, there is a further point in the Soviet concept that deserves criticism. A compulsory bilateral procedure of conciliation would have to precede the on-challenge inspection itself. This procedure would, however, have to be exhausted before a request for an on-challenge inspection could be made. There is no time limit placed on it. This means that a contracting party under suspicion of having violated the convention could delay bilateral procedures and thus prevent timely international control by the competent organ of the convention.

Fourthly, in the Soviet view the decision to proceed to an actual on-challenge inspection would have to be taken by consensus. In practical terms, this would confer a right of veto on the very State against which the suspicion of breach is directed.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Fifthly, the principle of an entirely voluntary on-challenge inspection appears to be at variance with paragraph 31 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which requests that disarmament and arms limitation agreements should provide for adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned in order to create the necessary confidence and ensure that they are being observed by all parties. This would exclude arrangements of an entirely discretionary nature.

This brief critical analysis of the Soviet position on the on-challenge verification procedure is sufficient to illustrate that negotiations on this point are complicated and multilayered and that none of the authors of the existing proposals can easily pretend to have discovered a panacea for the solution of this difficult problem. For the Soviet Union, considering the problems created by the Soviet side itself in this context, some self-critical restraint would appear to be in order in the place of attempts to incriminate other delegations.

My delegation does not overlook the fundamental problems to be overcome before agreement on a system of on-challenge verification can be reached in the context of a convention banning chemical weapons. The Conference on Disarmament will be breaking new ground with the elaboration of an adequate system of verification on this decisive point. None of the existing instruments of arms control policy has hitherto contained a verification mechanism designed to ensure respect for a convention for the banning of a whole category of weapons. Hence, particularly business-like, serious efforts for the solution of this complex problem are necessary.

Three principal proposals for the concretization of on-challenge verifications have been on the negotiating table in Geneva, namely: first, the United States draft (CD/500), which contains a rigorous elaboration of the principle of mandatory inspection; secondly, the Soviet proposals (CD/294), which contain an equally consistent elaboration of the principle of inspections on an exclusively voluntary basis; and thirdly, the proposal made by the Brazilian chairman of the working group on "compliance", Mr. Sergio Duarte, during the 1983 session, according to which under normal circumstances a strict obligation to submit to on-challenge controls forms part of the contractual understandings, whereas in exceptional cases reasons justifying the refusal of an inspection may be accepted.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the important role Mr. Duarte has played in our joint conceptual endeavour and to similar contributions by other key negotiators from among the group of the non-aligned countries.

The negotiations of the 1985 session will take place within the framework of this triangle of diverging positions. They will require concessions by all sides on the basis of a sober collective assessment of the positions and interests of all participants.

Flexibility must be demonstrated where it is needed. No delegation should be allowed to take its readiness to compromise on certain questions of a future chemical weapons convention as an excuse to get away with rigidity on other issues. My delegation has, as mentioned above, commented positively, on several occasions, on the Soviet proposals of 21 February 1984 concerning verification of the destruction of stockpiles, although Soviet alignment with a position that had been adopted by the vast majority of the participants in the Conference was more than overdue. The Soviet action was welcomed by my delegation as a sign that the Soviet Union is by no means categorically opposed to measures of international verification, including on-site inspection on its territory, as less well disposed observers have often affirmed in too simplistic a manner. However, the concession concerning the destruction of stocks has not provided the Soviet delegation with a blank cheque permitting inflexibility in the field of on-challenge verification. By the same token it would be to mislead the representatives in the First Committee to contrast Soviet flexibility on the destruction of stockpiles with an alleged rigidity of the United States delegation on the question of on-challenge verification and thus to distract public attention from the Soviet inflexibility in this question which results from the adamant application of the principle of voluntariness.

My delegation also expects an improved Soviet concept on the verification of non-production and the destruction of production facilities to be submitted by the Soviet delegation.

The Soviet side has a particular duty to show flexibility in these matters because it has created a worrisome preponderance of its chemical weapons potential

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

vastly beyond any reasonable defensive purpose. While the United States of America has continuously been respecting the cessation of production decided upon in 1969, the Soviet Union has enlarged its chemical weapons potential during the same period and commands at present the best-equipped and best-trained chemical weapons force in the world. It has, in particular, developed the capability, unique so far, to unleash deep strikes against logistic targets, military bases and concentrations of troops. The systematic enlargement of its holdings of these particularly hideous weapons has thus imposed upon the Soviet Union a special moral obligation to promote negotiations on an agreement to ban chemical weapons.

I would like to conclude with an appeal to all participants in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament to make the necessary efforts to enable a breakthrough in the negotiations on the Convention during the 1985 session.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations it is appropriate to initiate a move for the review of the functioning of the United Nations in its primary purpose of the maintenance of international peace and security with particular reference to the security system provided for in the Charter.

To this end the implementation of Chapter VII of the Charter in its main requirements becomes a compelling necessity if the United Nations is to be a meaningful organization for world security and peace.

Turning to the present situation, the continued interruption of talks and negotiations between the two major Powers on arms control and disarmament is naturally the theme of practically all statements in this Committee, urging their speedy resumption. We whole-heartedly join our voice in this urging. We believe that close contacts between the super-Powers on disarmament and related problems signify at least a disposition towards agreements to avoid a nuclear confrontation.

Regrettably, however, we cannot overlook the fact that lengthy negotiations on disarmament for decades on end yielded no results while the arms race was escalating. It had thus become necessary to call a special session of the General Assembly on disarmament in 1978 to explore the reasons for such utter failure in negotiations and the growing threat to peace. The Final Document of the first special session on disarmament gives the reasons for the failure of the negotiations. They appear very clearly and prominently in the Final Document, which pronounces that:

"Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces ...," (resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

It is thus made obvious that negotiations for the reduction of armaments in order to be productive must proceed concurrently with measures for the aforesaid security system.

This basic requirement of the Charter, which has been expressly reaffirmed by the Final Document, continues to this day to be ignored and bypassed in the conduct of disarmament negotiations. In consequence of this default, practically all negotiations on disarmament over the years have proved wholly unproductive and an

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

exercise in futility, while the nuclear-arms race has been an escalating reality. The cause for the illogical continuance of the aforesaid major default has not so far been explained, notwithstanding its adverse effects on the disarmament process.

It should further be noted that the lack of such a security system deprives the United Nations of its essential role and effectiveness on the disarmament proceedings in disregard of the provision of the Final Document that the United Nations "has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament". (Ibid., para. 114)

These matters are of direct relevance and significance, not only to the disarmament effort, but also and more essentially in regard to the cessation of the arms race. To a considerable extent, the origin of the arms race, aside from other considerations, can be traced directly to the faulty and inadequate functioning of the United Nations from the very start, owing to the ineffectiveness of the decisions of the Security Council, devoid as it is of the means of enforcement action as required by the Charter. In consequence the system of security provided by the Charter has of necessity remained inoperative. Thus the United Nations has been rendered a "lame duck", deprived of its meaningfulness because of the aforesaid defaults of the permanent members, since the responsibility lies with the permanent members of the Security Council.

It is, however, a hopeful sign that after a number of closed meetings of the Security Council last year on the subject of the effectiveness of the Council's decisions, the President of the Council in his statement issued on 12 September 1983 recognized the need for remedying this unacceptable situation but postponed action. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary, relevant measures by the Security Council to restore to the Council its effectiveness cannot be postponed in order that the Council may have the validity required by the United Nations and the Organization become a meaningful instrument for international peace and security.

We are speaking here in the United Nations, and we have to think primarily of the United Nations if we want to have peace and security effectively maintained in the world. If we conduct discussions here as if it were a forum for discussion only, without authority to act on the matter discussed but merely a place where we can express our views and debate and agree or disagree, it is a different matter.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

But this is not the United Nations as it was intended to be, and this is a subject that on the fortieth anniversary I want to raise, namely that the United Nations is not a forum merely for discussion but an organization for taking action on what is decided here, and this will be tested now on the fortieth anniversary.

The need for the cessation of the arms race has acquired far greater dimension and significance because of nuclear weapons, which are for the first time threatening the very continuance of life on this planet if we persist in the present failure to adjust to the needs and demands of the nuclear age.

Heavy responsibility lies therefore with the nuclear Powers, and especially the two super-Powers, for averting this cataclysmic threat by bringing the nuclear-arms race to a halt without further delay.

As we all know, by reason of their radioactive effects, nuclear weapons cannot hit any part of the planet without destroying or damaging the environmental conditions in other parts of the globe. All citizens of this planet - not merely the nuclear Powers - therefore have a direct concern and responsibility to bring the nuclear-arms race to a halt in the common interest of the survival of mankind.

As we get closer to the bi-millennium and the apocalypse connected with this bi-millennium, the peoples of all nations instinctively sense the approaching apocalyptic dangers and their immensity in a world that is ruled increasingly by the computer and hardly by the human mind. It would seem as though we have reached a stage where not man, but the nuclear weapon, will be in control through the growing mechanical enslavement of a technologically overcivilized mankind. The conscience of the peoples of the world expressed through the United Nations will have to bring its influence to bear for a halt in the nuclear-arms race, in particular as we are now on the threshold of the unthinkable extension of the nuclear-arms race to outer space. Such developments cannot be tolerated by any section of humanity and have to be arrested before it is too late.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

In the present critical times how can the General Assembly effectively contribute towards the cessation of the arms race? Let us see the practical means that we can use in this Committee and the General Assembly for the cessation of the arms race. In our submission at this juncture, we have to confine our endeavours to what is urgent, imminently necessary and presently achievable. Those three requirements must be taken into account so as to arrive at some result. In our view, the relevant measures on which we should concentrate are, first, an immediate nuclear freeze; secondly, the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty; and, thirdly, the prevention of any extension of the arms race to outer space.

The peoples of the world in all nations have whole-heartedly espoused the freeze, openly or silently, depending on the degree of freedom of expression in the régimes of their respective countries. But the dedication of the peoples of the world to a freeze has been abundantly demonstrated in the whole world. A freeze would at least temporarily halt the nuclear-arms race and allow for breathing time towards a permanent halt. The freeze will have to be adopted by the major Powers, without delay and unconditionally. The United Nations should be anxiously awaiting positive responses from both sides.

Secondly, as I have said, is a comprehensive test-ban treaty. When the partial test ban was originally adopted, it was on the understanding that a comprehensive test ban would soon follow. The preamble to the Treaty incorporated an undertaking for the continuation of relevant negotiations with the aim of achieving soon "a ban on all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time". The partial test-ban Treaty was thus only a part of the contemplated whole to be completed soon after.

In 1963 the General Assembly called upon the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to prepare "as a high priority" a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The lack of results necessitated a repetition of the General Assembly call in the following and subsequent years. It is therefore timely now to proceed to the comprehensive test-ban treaty and not allow any more tests that would bring the world to its end much sooner than could have been thought.

Back in 1971 the Swedish International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) asserted that there was no longer any problem regarding verification or other

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

impediments to a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is only the political will of the major Powers that has been lacking all along. In the present critical time for mankind's survival, the comprehensive test-ban treaty must be concluded without further delay.

Thirdly, as I have said, is preventing the extension of the nuclear-arms race to outer space. The urgency of this matter is so manifest that it needs no elaboration.

In the final analysis, the whole problem of averting a nuclear cataclysm rests on the shoulders of the two major Powers. It requires a new approach on their part in a positive spirit. Such a spirit should not be lost in the negative complexities of parity in weapons or doctrines of deterrence. It can be sought only through the positiveness of common security, as expressed by various groups including in the Palme report, from which the halting of the arms race and disarmament would naturally flow.

However, a glimmer of hope in this direction may be found in statements made in this Committee by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States. Perhaps in their exchanges of accusations and counter-accusations that was difficult to find. Nevertheless, it is true that the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Petrovsky, referred to the need to show realism by directing efforts towards implementing the decisions of "such representative and authoritative forums as the United Nations". Therefore, one of the super-Powers has said that we must go to the United Nations, if we want to solve our problems. That is important; that is significant, because it is what was pronounced in the Final Document - that the central role and primary responsibility for disarmament and relevant matters rest with the United Nations.

The essence of that conclusion is that, finally, to halt the arms race and avert disaster we must rely on an effective United Nations and, consequently, on its Charter system of common security. In our view, that is an encouraging sign - one of the super-Powers showing recognition of the centrality of the role of the United Nations.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

A parallel hopeful indication of a spirit of understanding and co-operation might be gauged from the concluding paragraph of the statement by the United States representative, Mr. Adelman. He referred to the Athenian philosopher and historian, Thucydides, in his classic treatment of the Peloponnesian War. Mr. Adelman quoted from Thucydides the wise dictum that "good policy against an adversary is superior to the senseless attacks of mere force". Thucydides lamented the use of force by opposing socio-political systems in Athens and Sparta - Athens a democratic and open régime; Sparta a closed dictatorial régime - which destroyed them both.

There is a significant analogy between the opposing socio-political systems of the West and the East. Thucydides, lamenting the use of force, said it was not a good policy. We ought to take a lesson from the lesson of Thucydides brought here by the representative of the United States that the socio-political differences between the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective military alliances should not result in a nuclear clash. They should not attempt to continue the arms race, which would lead to a conflagration. If we prepare for a war in the end there will be a war. A continuation of the arms race means continuing preparations for war, a war which would destroy the whole world, as in the time of Thucydides the Peloponnesian War destroyed Greece.

Citing this example shows an appreciation of the need to act in the appropriate spirit. We therefore take the quotation of Thucydides by the United States representative as an indication of a desire for the peaceful settlement of the existing disputes with the Soviet Union instead of their mutual destruction. But, of course, I must add in all humility that words spoken by the major Powers must be followed by analogous actions, particularly in these critical times, when the fate of mankind is at stake.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.