

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.305  
2 April 1985  
ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 2 April 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President:

Mr. K. Vidas

(Yugoslavia)

GE.85-50933

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. B. OULD-ROUIS  
Mr. A. BELAID  
Mr. H. RABEHI

Argentina: Mr. R. GARCIA MORITAN

Australia: Mr. R. BUTLER  
Mr. R. ROUE  
Ms. J. COURTNEY  
Ms. S. FREEMAN

Belgium: Mr. M. DEPASSE

Brazil: Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA  
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria: Mr. K. TELLALOV  
Mr. V. BOJILOV  
Mr. H. HALATCHEV  
Mr. R. DEYANOV  
Mr. P. POPTCHEV  
Mr. N. MIKHAILOV

Burma: U MAUNG MAUNG GYI  
U HLA MYINT

Canada: Mr. A. BEESLEY  
Mr. R. ROCHON

China: Mr. QIAN JIADONG  
Ms. WANG ZHIYUN  
Mr. LIU ZHONGREN  
Mr. SHI JICHENG  
Mr. SHI JINKUN  
Mr. LIN CHENG  
Mr. YE RUAN  
Mr. PAN JUSHENG

Cuba: Mr. C. LECHUGA HEVIA

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

Egypt: Mr. M. BADR  
Mr. F. MONIB

Ethiopia: Mr. F. YOHANNES

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE  
Mr. H. RENIE  
Mr. GESBERT  
Mr. G. MONTASSIER

German Democratic Republic: Mr. H. ROSE  
Mr. W. KRUTZSCH  
Mr. L. MUELLER  
Mr. F. SAYATZ

Germany, Federal Republic of: Dr. HANS DIETRICH GENSCHER  
Mr. H. WEGENER  
Mr. F. RUTH  
Mr. R. ELBE  
Mr. M. GERDTS  
Mr. W.-N. GERMANN  
Mr. J. PFIRSCHKE

Hungary: Mr. D. MEISZTER  
Mr. F. GAJDA  
Mr. T. TOTI

India: Mr. H. DUBEY  
Mr. S. KANT SHARMA

Indonesia: Mr. S. SUTOWARDOYO  
Mr. HARYO MATARAM  
Mr. I. DAMANIK  
Ms. R. TANZIL

Islamic Republic of Iran: Mr. N. KAZEMI KAMYAB

Italy: Mr. M. ALESSI  
Mr. F. PIAGGESI  
Mr. M. PAVESE  
Mr. R. DI CARLO

Japan: Mr. R. IMAI  
Mr. N. KONISHI  
Mr. T. KAWAKITA  
Mr. T. ISHIGURI  
Mr. I. AKIYAMA

Kenya: Mr. P.N. MUAURA

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES  
Ms. S. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO  
Mr. P. LIACEDO RIBA

Mongolia: Mr. L. BAYART  
Mr. S-O. BOLD

Morocco: Mr. M. SBIHI  
Mr. O. HILALE

Netherlands: Mr. R.W. VAN SCHAIK  
Mr. R.J. AKKERMAN

Nigeria: Mr. B.O. TONLE  
Mr. O.O. GEORGE  
Mr. C.V. UDEDIBIA

Pakistan: Mr. M. AHMAD  
Mr. Z. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. GONZALES TERRONES

Poland: Mr. S. TURBANSKI  
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ

Romania:

Mr. I. DATCU  
Mr. T. MELESCANU  
Mr. P. BALOIU  
Mr. A. POPESCU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. J. DHANAPALA  
Mr. P. KARIYAWASAM

Sweden:

Mr. R. EKEUS  
Mr. L-E. WINGREN  
Mrs. E. BONNIER  
Mr. S. ALEMYR

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN  
Mr. A.M. SHMATOV  
Mr. G.V. ANTSIFEROV

United Kingdom:

Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE  
Mr. R.J.S. EDIS  
Mr. D.A. SLINN

United States of America:

Mr. D. LOWITZ  
Mr. T. BARTHELEMY  
Mr. H.W. DAVIDSON  
Mr. D. DORN  
Mr. R. SCOTT  
Mr. P. CORDEN  
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER  
Mr. L. BELGARD  
Mr. P. GARDNER

Venezuela:

Mr. E. TER HORST  
Mr. O. GARCIA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. K. VIDAS  
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC  
Ms. M. STEPANOVIC  
Mr. D. MINIE

Zaire:

Mr. O. MONSHEMULA

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

Mr. M. KOMATINA

Deputy Secretary-General of the  
Conference on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 305th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset, allow me to extend a very warm welcome to the Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, His Excellency Hans Dietrich Genscher, who is addressing the Conference today. The Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs is well-known to the members of the Conference, as he addressed us for the first time on 3 February 1983. The significant role that he plays in the international scene, as well as his well-known concern for questions relating to disarmament do not need any elaboration. I am sure that the Conference will listen to his statement with particular interest and I wish also to thank him for coming to address us today.

The Conference continues today its consideration of item 4 on its agenda, entitled "Chemical Weapons". In accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

Before I invite His Excellency Hans Dietrich Genscher to address the Conference, I would like, on behalf of the Conference and on my behalf, to express sincere appreciation to my predecessor, the distinguished representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Adolfo Taylhardat, for the work he carried out during the month of March. The manner in which he guided the Conference and the efforts he made to identify areas of agreement will, no doubt, facilitate my task as President of the Conference for the month of April, and I am especially grateful to him for that.

The Conference on Disarmament is now entering the third month of its 1985 session. Since the beginning of its work in 1985 the Conference, besides adopting the agenda and programme of work, has taken decisions enabling the Ad Hoc Committees on Chemical Weapons, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and Radiological Weapons to continue their work. At its previous meeting, the Conference, after more than two years of efforts, decided to establish an Ad Hoc Committee under item 5 of its agenda entitled "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space". This decision is important for the future work of the Conference because of the existing situation and the urgency of the matter. In spite of its efforts, the Conference failed to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. In this connection, as stated by my predecessor, item 1 on the agenda remains open in case there might be any new initiative concerning the item. I will be available for any consultations on this question. Furthermore, we should consider the question of the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on the so-called Negative Security Assurances. The establishment of a subsidiary body under item 3, entitled "Prevention of Nuclear War, including All Related Matters", has met with some difficulties which are not, in my opinion, insurmountable. Consultations should, therefore, continue on this question. This shows that the differences relating to some substantial issues and methods of work of the Conference have not yet been overcome.

I also wish to recall that the Conference needs to appoint the Chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committees on Radiological Weapons and Outer Space. I would invite members to intensify their consultations, so that we could start substantive work on these items as soon as possible.

(The President)

The Conference continues its work under somewhat more favourable conditions. All participants who so far took part in the general debate, have invariably underscored the importance of the beginning of bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the USSR in view of their possible contribution to arresting the arms race --- in particular the nuclear arms race and the arms race in outer space, to limiting arms and achieving disarmament. The unanimous opinion was also expressed that bilateral and multilateral negotiations should facilitate and complement each other. All this should have a positive effect on our work through the efforts of all members of the Conference, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to make full use of it as a negotiating forum.

The tasks facing the Conference are great, just as great as the responsibility of its members before the world community which has entrusted them to negotiate on its behalf arms limitation and disarmament.

The unabated arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, the research, development, testing, production and deployment of new generations of weapons of mass destruction, the constant rise in military expenditures, the use of force and recourse to interference in internal affairs, the crisis of the world economy are some of the constant sources of danger threatening if not checked to bring the world into the situation of no return. This year, which marks the anniversary of the United Nations, reminds us of the horrors of World War II and of the determination of mankind to prevent a new catastrophe which, because of the apocalyptic nature of nuclear weapons, could result in its total annihilation. It also reminds us of the wasted chances to avert such dangers and to create conditions for an unhampered economic development, of developing countries in particular. Consequently, an active role of the Conference on Disarmament has never been more imperative than today. It is essential that the spirit of confidence and mutual co-operation prevail and be further promoted, that no opportunity be missed to initiate negotiations for which conditions are ripe, and that we refrain from everything that can be detrimental to the work of the Conference. Further, it is necessary that the Conference act more efficiently, that its activities be directed at the fulfilment of its primary negotiating role, that emphasis be placed on substance rather than on procedure. Therefore, the Conference will also have to continue consideration of its improved and effective functioning, taking into account the desire of its members to get involved in the positive consideration of the substantive items on the agenda of the Conference. I also wish to remind members that according to our rules of procedure consultations should proceed with regard to expansion of the membership.

In assuming the duties of President of the Conference, I would like to express the hope that our concerted efforts will help fulfil the expectations expressed by the members of the Conference at the outset of this session. As President of the Conference I shall do my utmost to contribute to finding solutions for outstanding issues on our agenda and to overcoming the impasse. In this I count on the support and co-operation of all delegations. I shall, in co-operation with the Secretary-General of the Conference and the Secretariat, continue consultations with all delegations, and be willing to meet at any time such requests.

This concludes my opening statement.

I now give the floor to the Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, His Excellency Hans Dietrich Genscher.



Mr. GENSCHER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. President, as the first speaker under your Presidency, and you made a very good introduction, I should like to express my congratulations on your assumption of this office and wish you every success in fulfilling your important responsibilities. You are the representative of a country that has always tried through its constant policy of non-alignment to promote security and peace in the world. The work of the Conference on Disarmament also serves this purpose. For that reason you are particularly competent to guide the discussions of this Conference.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to address you once again and thereby to underline the importance that the Federal Republic of Germany attaches to the Geneva Conference on Disarmament as the only global forum of negotiation on disarmament.

My visit today comes at a time when the beginning of the negotiations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on 12 March 1985 has opened a new chapter of disarmament negotiations. An opportunity to bring about a new, second phase of détente policy has thereby been created.

The object of such efforts is to achieve deeper, more wide-ranging and durable results than those obtained during the Seventies. This is what we have in mind when we speak of a realistic policy of détente. Excessively high public hopes do not foster these efforts. What we need now is a clear view of what is possible and necessary. Among the Western public today, the prospects and limitations of understanding and co-operation between West and East are assessed more clearly and realistically as the importance of co-operation and accommodation of interests, the need to seek understanding in view of existing and increasing military capabilities but equally as the diversity of the systems, with their differing codes and values. These two poles mark the setting for the tasks of realistic détente and security policy, as embodied in the prevailing Harmel doctrine of the Western Alliance, a policy among whose integral components we include sufficient defence capacity as well as disarmament and arms control. A constructive dialogue between the super-Powers and the inclusion in negotiations of the central security issues are therefore indispensable requirements if Europe and the world are to develop and prosper. Yet for this process to bear fruit, it must not be restricted to the super-Powers nor to security matters.

All States, including the medium-sized and small ones, must without exception co-operate and contribute; dialogue and co-operation must cover all aspects of relations.

The negotiations between West and East are a decisive element of the efforts for a secure peace.

It is now crucial that constructive use be made of the bilateral, multilateral and global negotiations and political processes to make peace more secure throughout the world. This creates scope for everyone to participate where he can and calls upon all of us to be aware of our own responsibility.

The Federal Republic of Germany is conscious of its national and European responsibilities for peace.

In Europe, East and West confront each other with the highest concentration of troops and armaments. No people experiences this situation as directly as the Germans in their divided country at the heart of Europe. The joint statement made by the Federal Chancellor, Helmut Kohl, and General Secretary Erich Honecker in

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

Moscow on 12 March 1985 reaffirmed that Germans in both German States agree that war must never again emanate from German soil, and that Germany must be a source of peace. Co-operation in a spirit of mutual trust between the two German States for the benefit of people and for peace in Europe is in the interests of all of Germany's neighbours.

The community of responsibility in which both German States consider themselves to be linked is directed against no-one. It serves the cause of peace and stability in Europe. Indeed, it gains by every step achieved along the way to détente, for every bridge across the gulf dividing Europe also makes life easier for the Germans in East and West.

We have linked our future to the Community of European democracies, which shall be joined in a few months' time by Spain and Portugal. At the same time, in our political thinking and actions, we are constantly aware that Europe does not end at the River Elbe but includes all of our Eastern neighbours as well as the Soviet Union.

Our policy towards the States of the Warsaw Pact is intended to improve East-West relations in general; for this reason, we can conduct neither a policy that leaves certain European States out of account nor a policy of playing one nation off against another. At the same time we are aware of our historically conditioned relationship with the Soviet Union, which was put into a long-term perspective by the Treaty of Moscow.

All participating States of the CSCE established in the Helsinki Final Act a joint basis suitable for the construction of lasting peace in Europe.

If all co-operate in a constructive manner, there is now a chance of attaining more stable and durable East-West relations on this firm basis, relations that must entail improvements in the political, economic, cultural and humanitarian spheres. The CSCE Final Act must be resolutely implemented and applied with determination. It contains unexplored scope for mutually beneficial co-operation in areas such as those where new challenges and new sources of prosperity become apparent. It is not a manual for the export of social systems but the framework accepted by all signatory States for a dynamic process of evolutionary change and adaptation to an age of rapid and radical developments. All nations have the chance of participating in this process instead of isolating themselves.

The basis of peace -- not only in Europe -- is the renunciation of force. This means strict observance of the prohibition under international law of any threat or use of force. That applies to the use of, or the threat to use, both nuclear and conventional weapons. The renunciation of force is indivisible; it must apply world-wide and among all States.

To renounce force does not mean renouncing convictions, values and positions on controversial issues. It is concerned with the form and the means with which States go about settling their differing and often conflicting interests. Renunciation of force is embedded in the Charter of the United Nations and is binding upon all States. It must become the fundamental principle governing international peace and co-operation. It requires that relations between members of the community of nations be based on dialogue, co-operation and accommodation of interests, not on threats or domination, on claims to hegemony or security privileges. That must apply between the alliances as well as outside and within them.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

To renounce force also means banishing from people's minds the readiness to use force. Education in hatred jeopardizes peace. Polemics disputing the peaceful intentions of other nations poison the political atmosphere.

Any threat of force still being applied must be ended.

The undertaking to refrain from the threat or use of force must be reflected in world-wide policies of moderation and restraint and in universal recognition of and respect for international law. The rule of law and respect for human rights are of particular importance to peace.

In the past, the suppression of human rights and of self-determination often marked the start of a development that went on to endanger international peace and co-operation. Nobody is more acutely aware of that than we Germans. Progress on the way to a peaceful order therefore demands greater respect for the rights of every individual and greater respect for the right of national self-determination -- in Europe and throughout the world.

Everyone realizes how important security issues are in the new phase of East-West relations now beginning. However, that must not make us lose sight of political relations, economic co-operation and cultural exchanges. Progress in these spheres can create a climate that will facilitate the solution of the tough security issues. The long-term goal is to strengthen, through progress in the security dialogue, the basis of trust on which more comprehensive co-operation can be established between West and East.

Central to these security issues are the subjects under negotiation in Geneva between the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

The United States-Soviet agreement of 8 January 1985, in which it was decided to resume negotiations, is a document of outstanding political import and great moral significance. It sets forth in advance, in clear and precise language, the negotiating aims:

"The sides agree that the subject of the negotiations will be a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms both strategic and intermediate range with all the questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship.

The objective of the negotiations will be to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on Earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms and at strengthening strategic stability."

Seldom has a joint declaration by East and West met the expectations of people throughout the world to such an extent as this one. For this reason, the Joint Declaration will be the yardstick by which the progress of the negotiations will be measured.

The Federal Government unreservedly supports these negotiating aims. On 27 March 1985, it stated that it believed the purpose of the negotiations, in line with the negotiating aims formulated by the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva on 7 and 8 January, to be:

to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on Earth and to strengthen strategic stability;

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

to reduce greatly and limit strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons in line with the preamble to the ABM Treaty and Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty;

to ensure that both mutual research into new anti-missile systems and questions concerning anti-satellite systems lead to co-operative solutions;

to reaffirm the ABM Treaty as long as no other bilateral agreements have been reached.

The Federal Government is in no doubt that the research programme of the United States Government accords with the ABM Treaty and that it is also justified on the grounds of Soviet research.

The Federal Government recalls the declaration of 8 January 1985, which states that the questions under negotiation in Geneva will be considered and resolved in their interrelationship.

In these efforts, special significance will attach to the relationship between offensive and defensive weapons. Our goal remains stability with as few weapons as possible.

The desire of both the United States and Soviet Governments to strengthen stability is of particular importance, since both are thereby committing themselves not to seek superiority. To refrain from striving for superiority, to practise moderation and to respect the legitimate security interests of the other side in accordance with the United States-Soviet agreement of 1972 are and will remain vital conditions for the success of the Geneva negotiations. The network of bilateral relations in diverse fields, of co-operation and multilateral negotiations that have managed to weather the heavy storms of recent years, has finally smoothed the way for both super-Powers to resume their bilateral dialogue.

It is now time to utilize the positive impetus generated by the bilateral negotiations to bring about progress and results in the multilateral and global security policy dialogue.

Confidence-building must be a key term in the efforts to introduce a new phase of détente. Disarmament negotiations cannot flourish in an atmosphere of mistrust, slander and aloofness. There is a need for both respect for the legitimate security interests of all concerned and willingness to create confidence through increased transparency and effective verification.

Let me refer in this context to the standardized reporting system that exists in the United Nations for the military expenditure of Member States. Almost all members of the Western alliance and some non-aligned States participate regularly in this system. I repeat my appeal to the members of the Warsaw Pact to contribute to transparency by participating in this reporting system.

Effective verification, too, is indispensable to the creation of confidence. Anyone with nothing to hide can agree to specific verification measures. Anyone rejecting such measures arouses the impression that he may have something to hide.

That applies equally to the United States-Soviet negotiations, to the Stockholm CDE, to the MBFR negotiations in Vienna and to the negotiations here at the Conference on Disarmament. We want to create more confidence by means of more transparency and thus greater predictability.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

The open democratic systems of government, through the transparency of their decision-making processes and of their intentions and capabilities, which derives from their underlying philosophy, render an important contribution in terms of security and predictability. But openness and transparency must not remain a one-sided concession. They must be extended if threat perceptions are to be eliminated and if confidence is to increase. Confidence-building requires the fundamental realization that one's own security must not be assured at the cost of the security of others.

For this reason, the CDE in Stockholm is to agree on measures leading to greater openness and predictability in the military behaviour of the participating States, so that the risk of surprise attack is reduced and it becomes clear that no State has aggressive intentions and that all are observing the comprehensive ban on the threat or use of force.

The MBFR negotiations in Vienna also serve to stabilize the military situation in Europe. We are all unhappy about their slow and faltering progress. Yet the long years of intensive negotiation have not been in vain. A considerable degree of agreement has been reached between the two sides on some fundamental issues, such as on the principle of manpower parity. If more significant progress is to be made, a more receptive attitude on questions of effective verification is indispensable.

We welcome the fact that the East has tabled a new proposal at the Vienna negotiations. We shall utilize every opening for a constructive dialogue and shall examine proposals made by the other side just as constructively as we expect them to consider our proposals and concerns.

Success in the MBFR negotiations in Vienna would be an important contribution to security and confidence in Europe. But to attain real stability in the balance of conventional forces in Europe, we need specific militarily effective and binding agreements reaching beyond the narrow confines of Central Europe to cover all of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

European security means equal rights to security for all. There must not be a large measure of security for the major States and a small measure of security for smaller States. That is a key problem in the field of intermediate-range nuclear forces as well as with regard to the balance of conventional forces throughout Europe.

Among the major requirements of our age are economic development and bridging the gap between North and South, as well as guaranteeing the right to self-determination and human rights.

And foremost among these requirements, too, are negotiations on disarmament and arms control as instruments for reducing tension and the risk of conflict and for establishing the political conditions for peaceful development in our world.

Major tasks face us in this field; as all the regions of the world become increasingly interdependent, the global dimension of the security dialogue gains in importance.

It is essential that on a global scale, too, co-operative instruments for ensuring peace should be developed. The United Nations and the Geneva Conference on Disarmament must be well utilized to this end. In no period of human history has disarmament been so urgent as it is today.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

We all know that in many parts of the world the build-up of armaments must be stopped. That is the reason why we attach such great importance to the work of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. No international body is better suited to demonstrate that the preservation and securing of peace is a global responsibility. The Conference on Disarmament is the only permanent multilateral forum for security and disarmament negotiations on a world-wide scale. It is the only body in which all five nuclear-weapon States participate in the dialogue on disarmament and arms control. The group of non-aligned States from East and West has the opportunity here to participate in shaping world-wide security. Here the opportunity, and indeed the need, for substantive efforts to achieve disarmament and arms control, including efforts outside the framework of East-West relations, are made manifest.

The Conference on Disarmament has given itself a working programme that permits it to devote itself to the latest problems and developments in the field of international security. These include: the negotiations on the world-wide ban on chemical weapons; discussion of issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space; the problems pertaining to the prevention of war; and the question of a comprehensive and verifiable nuclear test ban.

The Federal Government attaches central importance to the negotiations on a world-wide agreement outlawing chemical weapons. We have long held the view that every effort must be made to attain a comprehensive, universally applicable and reliably verifiable ban on these weapons 60 years after the conclusion of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. The reports on the use of chemical weapons in the conflict between Iraq and Iran have in a horrifying manner confirmed fears regarding the proliferation of chemical weapons. Fresh dynamism and willingness to be flexible are now called for to expedite these negotiations.

Difficult questions in the fields of "on-challenge" inspections, verification of the destruction of stocks and production facilities, and verification of the non-production of chemical weapons are still to be resolved. In its active participation in the work of the Conference in these spheres, my country is the only one that can invoke practical experience of international controls in connection with its pledge not to produce chemical weapons, controls which have been carried out within the Western European Union framework.

This experience has shown that effective verification of the non-production of chemical weapons is possible and can be reasonably expected, even in cases where the country in question has such an extensive and widely diversified chemical industry as the Federal Republic of Germany.

Outer space has long been a part of the arms control process. When it comes to safeguarding peace, there must be no gaps left. It is in the interest of all of us that the use of space for peaceful purposes should not be jeopardized. It is an undeniable fact that outer space has long been used for military activities. In this context, it should be remembered that certain satellites serve to ensure strategic stability and are indispensable, particularly to the verification of arms control measures. What is crucial today is that drastic reductions in nuclear arsenals must be agreed and that an arms race in outer space must be prevented by means of foresighted arms control measures. We therefore welcome the fact that this very objective is the agreed aim of the United States-Soviet negotiations.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

The Conference on Disarmament cannot replace these extremely important bilateral negotiations, but it can usefully supplement them. What is called for is a "constructive parallel approach". We are prepared to play an active part in the discussion on space issues here in this multilateral framework.

Let me recall in this context the statements made by the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany to the General Assembly and to the Conference on Disarmament, which outlined the potential area for multilateral arms control in respect of outer space: the initial task would be to take stock of the existing arrangements and to identify issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in space. In these efforts, particular consideration should be given to the protection of satellites, which is essential if stability is to be ensured.

We therefore welcome the success achieved in agreeing on a mandate for an ad hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament. This creates the chance to pursue the constructive parallel approach to which I referred.

In the nuclear age, the prevention of every kind of war is a responsibility of global dimensions. Just as peace is indivisible, the efforts to ensure peace in all parts of the world must also be incorporated into an over-all approach. Hence, I am pleased that the Conference on Disarmament has addressed the questions of the prevention of nuclear war and the prevention of war in general.

It is not surprising that, on account of the widely diverging fundamental views, the substantive discussion of these topics has proved difficult over the last two years. It is nevertheless my impression that the discussions by the Conference on Disarmament of questions pertaining to the prevention of war have also revealed common elements that should be further developed.

In the Conference on Disarmament and in the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Federal Government has been advocating that, in dealing with the problems of preventing war, one should not focus on partial aspects, but that a comprehensive approach should be selected which aims at the prevention of each and every military conflict. Only in this way can it be made clear what is really at stake, namely, the translation into intergovernmental practice of the valid prohibition of force contained in the Charter of the United Nations.

It must be the aim of more thorough consideration of the problems associated with the prevention of war to establish joint arrangements that take account of the legitimate security interests of all States.

This requires willingness on the part of the participants to discuss all proposals in an open-minded and unprejudiced manner.

The Federal Government continues to attach great importance to a comprehensive and reliably verifiable nuclear test ban. It hopes that the Conference on Disarmament can agree on a mandate for the continuation of its work in this important field. In our view, these efforts are of considerable importance to the third Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, scheduled for September of this year. The Review Conference has an important and difficult task. We are, however, confident that it can fulfil this task in a positive and constructive spirit. During the term of the non-proliferation régime, no new nuclear-weapon State has been added to the original five. This is a success that must not be put at risk.

(Mr. Genscher, Federal Republic of Germany)

Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty commits the Parties to pursue negotiations on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament.

The negotiating aim set forth in the United States-Soviet Joint Declaration of 8 January, which I should like to quote again, is in line with this Treaty:

"... to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on Earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms and at strengthening strategic stability."

This is an encouraging statement, particularly with regard to the prospects of a successful outcome to the Review Conference. The Federal Government hopes that the Review Conference will achieve a result that strengthens the non-proliferation régime and promotes the goal of universal acceptance of the Treaty.

Mr. President, we are approaching the day on which, 40 years ago, the most dreadful of all wars ended in Europe and on which the longest period of development began. In these 40 years, we in Europe have made considerable progress; in full awareness of the lessons of history, to achieve reconciliation and to lay new foundations for international co-operation. One of these foundations is the Helsinki Final Act, whose 10 years of existence will be celebrated by the CSCE participating States on 1 August. This ought to be marked by a conference at the political level. We must utilize the fresh start made in East-West relations in 1985 to reduce distrust and tension, to extend co-operation and to strengthen stability and peace.

The States of Europe, which were so frequently engaged in bloody wars in the course of history and were the source of violence and oppression in other continents, must at last provide the world with an example of understanding and harmony and generate momentum for peace and stability in other continents. We shall achieve secure and lasting peace only if we achieve it on a world-wide scale. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament is called upon to render an important contribution to the attainment of this aim. I wish you and all of us success in this work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany for his important statement and for the kind words addressed to the President and to my country.

There is no other member inscribed to speak today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I see none, and I intend now to adjourn the plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 4 April at 10.30 a.m. The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.