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GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. PENAŽKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The Czechoslovak delegation wishes to devote its statement today to a problem of primary importance, namely, the growing threat of the extension of the arms race into outer space. The significance, and the genuinely urgent need to resolve this problem, is determined by the fact that if the well-known plans for the comprehensive militarization of space are carried out it is inevitable that a new unprecedented threat to universal peace will arise and there will be a sharp and possibly uncontrolled intensification of the threat of a global nuclear catastrophe. Such an assertion is not a one-sided reflection of our position on this question. It is the inevitable objective conclusion from any sober analysis of the consequences which would result from the implementation of the programmes for the deployment of offensive space arms, which today has become a reality.

The realization of such plans - which were publicized in the United States in March of 1983 - would lead to a qualitatively new military and strategic situation characterized by the emergence of unpredictable crisis situations, a critical lowering of the general level of confidence and a further destabilization of international life as a whole.

The creation of systems of offensive cosmic weapons dreamt up by the strategists at the Pentagon, in essence to ensure an unpunished first nuclear strike, would also be a powerful new impetus to accelerate the race in and further development of strategic nuclear weapons, thereby extinguishing the remaining prospects for achieving agreement on their limitation and reduction. The notorious strategic triad would thus be supplemented by one further and apparently dominant component of a decisive destructive force intended to ensure undisputed military superiority over the socialist countries. This is undoubtely the main purpose of the plans for so-called star wars, whose attainment is also illusory, as can already be determined by the instigators of the arms race, who, to the same end, have initiated the deployment of United States intermediate-range missiles on the territories of a number of Western European States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).
The reckless programmes which are being prepared for the militarization of space on the basis of the latest space technology give rise to a direct threat to the peaceful co-existence of the whole of mankind. This space project to create anti-missile and anti-satellite systems for some so-called defensive or preventive purposes, as was stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the course of the general debate:

"... has in fact shifted the question of war in outer space - in that 'sixth ocean', as it might be called today - from the realm of theory to that of practice. However, a war in outer space would not be an alternative to a war on earth, as some people foolishly believe, but rather a prelude to it."

(A/39/PV.20, p. 32)

It is not surprising that such a prospect is causing serious concern to all the peoples, who are calling for the adoption of the most resolute measures to eliminate the threat looming over mankind of a nuclear conflagration and to prohibit the emerging militarization of the earth's atmosphere.
The urgent nature of the problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is emphasized also by the economic side of the question.

The published calculations of the proposed financial means are genuinely dizzying. Already now, at the early stage of the implementation of United States programmes for space armaments, one is speaking of a sum that exceeds $1 trillion dollars. In other words, by way of comparison, a sum which exceeds by more than a factor of three the most grandiose project ever devised for developing countries by way of granting them economic assistance.

The problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space consists of a whole series of interrelated questions, including both individual aspects of putting into operation various types of systems of space weapons and their consequences for the security and development of peaceful co-operation of States, as well as questions of a broader nature. That is probably the explanation, to some extent, of the variety of approaches to the solution.

Lately, again - and from the highest quarters - we have heard the hypothesis concerning the defensive nature of large-scale deployment of space-based anti-missiles, and it was asserted that the introduction of such weapons in co-operation would be the most effective method for the achievement of agreement on nuclear disarmament.

The inconsistency of views of that kind is quite clear to anyone who is familiar with the laws governing the development of strategic confrontation in the nuclear era. It was precisely for that reason that in 1972 the well-known Soviet-United States treaty was concluded on the limitation of anti-ballistic missiles system. The realization of space armaments by the United States - and particularly the establishment of anti-ballistic systems based in space - is directly aimed at undermining that most important treaty and disrupting the interrelationship and established balance between offensive and defensive strategic means that have been outlined in the Soviet-United States agreement. The conclusion is obvious: the introduction of anti-ballistic missiles in outer space by either side is directly connected with the strengthening of its offensive nuclear potential and the substantial lowering of the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons as the first party.

Of great significance, in our opinion, is solution of the question of the prohibition of anti-satellite weapons, which was raised in the course of bilateral Soviet-United States negotiations towards the end of the 1970s until they were
broken off by the United States side, as well as in United Nations multilateral forums. Apparently, there is extensive international agreement on the fact that the deployment of anti-satellite weapons would lead to a new and further exacerbation of military and political tensions and greatly increase the threat of sudden attack and distrust among States.

The problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is intimately connected with the questions of the use of outer space for peaceful purposes and the development of comprehensive international co-operation in implementing peaceful programmes for the conquest of outer space.

The intensive development of space technology and science during the past few decades has introduced increasingly greater results, which serve the whole of mankind. The use of space technology today is already a necessary component in many fields of human activity, including the prospecting of natural resources, meteorology, medicine, communications and a whole series of other questions. The prospects for the utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes and development are truly limitless.

Czechoslovakia, which is the third country in the world to have one of its citizens visit outer space and which has taken an active part in the implementation of a number of important outer space projects under the INTERCOSMOS programme, is assigning significance of principle to the maintenance of peaceful conditions for the activities and co-operation of States in outer space.

To place science and technology at the service of the militarization of space not only would bring with it a sharp increase in the threat of war but would also be the most serious obstacle in the way to carrying out peaceful space programmes and fruitful international co-operation.

We share the view that the new space mentality that has become current must necessarily be transferred from the economic and scientific spheres into the political sphere also. This means, in the first instance, that it is necessary to erect a reliable barrier to the militarization of outer space and to ensure favourable conditions for the harmonization of the efforts of States aimed at the peaceful conquest of outer space in the name of the comprehensive progress of mankind. We support the new important idea that in the future this might lead to the establishment of a new world-wide organization on the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.
A reliable and realistic way towards the achievement of agreement on all aspects of the problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space is outlined in the series of initiatives and proposals that have been submitted for the consideration of the States Members of the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament by the Soviet Union. This includes such major initiatives as the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement in outer space of weapons of any kind, introduced in 1981; the 1983 proposal to conclude a treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from space against the earth; the one-sided moratorium on the launching into space of any types of anti-satellite weapons; the appeal of the Government of the USSR in June 1984 for an early commencement of Soviet-United States negotiations on the question of the prevention of the militarization of outer space; and, clearly, the new important initiative of the Soviet Union on the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind, which is now before the current session of the General Assembly.

Those proposals constitute a broad, comprehensive programme aimed at preventing the militarization of outer space. They include not only political and legal obligations but also far-reaching measures of a material nature. Provision is made for the prohibition of the use or threat of use of force in outer space, in the atmosphere and on earth by means of spaceships as a means of attack.
At the same time it is proposed to prohibit the use of force or threat of force with regard to spaceships themselves. The Soviet proposals include renunciation of the testing and deployment in outer space of any weapons for attacking targets on earth, in outer space and in the atmosphere. Provision is made for the prohibition of the testing and establishment of new anti-satellite systems and the elimination of existing ones. Finally, provision is made for the prohibition of the testing and use for military, and therefore anti-satellite, purposes of any manned spaceships.

The treatment of these initiatives would be an important step towards the conversion of outer space into a zone of peace and the achievement of the goals which the United Nations has set for itself, namely, the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The approach of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to a solution of the problem of the prevention of the militarization of outer space has met with a broad international response, including a response within the United Nations, and has served as an impulse for the adoption of important decisions by the General Assembly with regard to the early holding of negotiations for the purpose of concluding an agreement or agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

Against that background, serious concern is felt over the protracted stagnation on the question of the militarization of outer space at the Conference on Disarmament that negotiations have found themselves in through the fault of the Western countries. While those countries, which had voted in favour of the relevant resolution in the General Assembly and in this Committee, have subsequently been unwilling to take part in its implementation and in essence have frustrated the beginning of practical negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament, proposing that instead the Conference should deal with abstract studies on problems relating to the militarization of outer space and an analysis of corresponding international legal norms and the like. We, of course, cannot agree with such an approach and we hope that the General Assembly will at the current session adopt firm measures for the purpose of implementing already existing decisions. In this connection, we again express full support for the new proposal of the Soviet Union on the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind, contained in draft resolution
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(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

A/C.1/39/L.1. We believe that that proposal could play a prominent role in the mobilization of efforts of the States Members of the United Nations and of the international community as a whole on the comprehensive and fundamental solution of the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, in order to lessen the nuclear threat and ensure a peaceful future for the whole of mankind. The delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is ready to participate most constructively in efforts to that end.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) (interpretation from French): In extending the congratulations of my Government and my own congratulations to the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Souza e Silva, I should like to stress his long experience in the field of disarmament and the skill and perspicacity he showed when he was Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament. It is with special pleasure that I express to the representative of a friendly country my sincere wishes for the full success of his task. It will be seen that these wishes are all the more justified if I quote from his opening statement at the beginning of our work:

"If that responsibility is heeded through a commitment to constructive and rational action ... we could look forward to some possibility of progress on issues that concern all nations." (A/C.1/39/PV.3, p. 7)

May I also extend my congratulations to the two Vice-Chairmen, representatives of friendly countries, and the other officers of the Committee.

The representative of Ireland, in his capacity as acting Chairman of the 10 States of the European Community, explained succinctly on 19 October in this room the views of the Community, in the general debate on disarmament. While fully subscribing to what was declared by Ambassador Robert McDonagh, the Permanent Representative of Ireland, I should like today to present some additional views of the Greek Government on a number of points.

The international situation is such that all States are resolutely striving to achieve the hopes of peace and progress for the peoples of the world and to dispel the common fears of war and destruction. To begin with, if we wish to avoid a new war and also local conflicts we must not only contribute to the enhancement of co-operation between all the families of nations but also devise procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In addition, we must also, as members of an organization whose first mandate is the preservation of international peace and security, scrupulously respect the purposes and principles of the United Nations
Charter. Thus the Greek Government opposes any act or omission which would render
the process of disarmament more difficult, thus increasing the reasons for the use
or threat of force. Moreover, security cannot be ensured in a climate of recourse
to the use or threat of force, of military intervention, aggression, foreign
occupation, fait accompli and new crises in addition to the existing ones.
Disarmament and security are closely interlinked. Both are decisively influenced
by these two factors and it is for this reason that security cannot be safeguarded
by amassing weapons; quite the contrary. It can be guaranteed by co-operation,
increased exchanges, the elimination of economic injustice and the interdependence
of peoples, as well as mutual trust, something to which the effective process of
disarmament cannot fail to contribute.

Greece is firmly attached to all the principles and ideals of the United
Nations Charter, among which the maintenance of international peace and security
holds pride of place. This constant reminder of our Charter is addressed to all
Member States, nuclear and non-nuclear, but although the prevention of war is a
priority task for all, nuclear-weapon States bear the added responsibility of
preventing all war, both nuclear and conventional. Greece is therefore convinced
of the need to strengthen disarmament mechanisms as well as every effort of our
Organization aimed at preserving peace and removing the danger of a nuclear
escalation. Greece cannot disregard the fact that nuclear weapons have completely
changed the concepts of war and peace and that, unfortunately, nuclear weapons have
been invented and are an established fact. Thus if we want to prevent a nuclear
holocaust, human attitudes and ideas about the preservation of peace must be
modified.
(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

The use and threat of force, which our Charter condemns, obliges us not to overlook the importance of scientific developments and technological progress, which reduce the time for deliberation and decision making in times of crisis to thus far unknown minimum factors. We are also obliged to reduce the margin of errors in judgement to controllable limits in order to prevent nuclear war. In this context, we can readily understand the need to reduce the risk of war by accident or by surprise attack. The improvement of techniques for the management of crises therefore deserves growing attention and reflection by our Organization. This evolution leads us to seek out norms that may render the situation more stable and control the most destabilizing aspects of the arms race. The Hellenic Government sincerely hopes that the nuclear-arms race between East and West will as soon as possible be oriented towards the mutual and progressive reduction of such weapons through a search for balance at ever-decreasing levels following substantive negotiations.

The conclusion of balanced, equitable and verifiable agreements for the control of weapons, together with the restoration of faith in East-West relations, would minimize the risks of conflict and provide durable bases for a peaceful international order.

Negotiations that would not lead to significant and verifiable reductions, the final objective of which is arrival at a more stable and gradual balance and total elimination, would meet neither the letter nor the spirit of the Final Document adopted and reaffirmed at the two special sessions of our Assembly devoted to disarmament. Sharing the conviction that there would be no victors in a nuclear confrontation, and firmly attached to détente, Greece is ready to assist in every effort likely to contribute to a more constructive dialogue between East and West.

In this spirit, on behalf of the Greek delegation I wish to reiterate the content of the Joint Declaration of the Presidents of Argentina, India, Mexico and the United Republic of Tanzania and the Prime Ministers of Sweden and Greece of 22 May 1984, issued as a General Assembly and Security Council document (A/39/277-S/16587) on 25 May 1984, which stipulates, inter alia:

"We will do everything in our power to facilitate agreement among the nuclear weapons States. We will continue to keep in touch with one another about the best ways and means of achieving this objective. We will be
consulting with the leaders of the nuclear weapons States and with other world leaders as well as pursuing discussions through United Nations channels.

"We affirm our belief in détente and mutual understanding, with broad international co-operation and respect for the right of each state to a peaceful, secure and independent existence and the right of each people to organise its life according to its own aspirations. There can be no assurance of safety for one side only. That is why we attach such importance to a halt in the nuclear arms race that allows for renewed talks on nuclear disarmament." (A/39/277-S/16587, p. 5)

Greece, a party to the nuclear-weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty, expresses the hope that all countries that have not yet acceded thereto will do so as soon as possible. The dissemination of nuclear weapons to other non-nuclear-weapon States, known as horizontal proliferation, is a daily danger that increases with the passing of time, and perhaps the international community has not given it all the attention it deserves.

I emphasize this without wishing in any way to minimize the exclusive responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States to meet the obligations embodied in article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which deals with so-called vertical proliferation and in respect of which no progress has been made. Moreover, we respect the right of every State to share the benefits of the peaceful use of atomic energy.

In this context, we sincerely hope that next year the Third Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which will meet in Geneva, will arrive at practical and mutually advantageous solutions for all States in order to consolidate a régime which thus far has proved to be if not ideal at least realistic, without disregarding the fact that the risks of proliferation have not been eliminated.

This should not slow down all the efforts, which Greece supports, aimed at the complete cessation of all nuclear-weapons tests. That question, which is of high priority, should be the subject of intensified negotiations at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva without precluding other negotiations that could lead us to fill the present gaps in the field of nuclear tests.

The work of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, the only multilateral negotiating body, is being followed by Greece with great concern. By this I mean
that the progress achieved is far from satisfactory. We hope that the patience shown by Members of our Organization not members of that Conference will be justified by tangible results.

The danger of nuclear war is but one side of the coin. Any armed conflict can lead to nuclear escalation, but the destruction thus brought about in terms of loss of human life can also be brought about by conventional weapons given the destructive power of such weapons today. But when we assess the importance of conventional disarmament we must also bear in mind that the existing imbalance in this field is one important reason why many countries have acquired nuclear weapons either to defend themselves or to achieve supremacy.

Therefore, balance in conventional weapons could help to temper the nuclear-arms race. Thus my country subscribes to the principle that no effort should be spared to reduce the present level of conventional forces and to achieve a balance at the lowest possible level while maintaining undiminished security for all States.

Allow me to deal with another aspect of disarmament, namely regional disarmament. The latter could to a very large extent strengthen wider multilateral efforts aimed at achieving the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament. In addition, it could strengthen the political climate and confidence in a specific region, thus reducing hotbeds of tension. The security demands in the different regions are not always the same, and it follows that broad concepts cannot always be applied in a regional context to very different situations. Thus there is a great deal of room in each region for independent initiatives and practical action.

Such initiatives can only stem from the will of the States of the region concerned, bearing in mind the legitimate interest in security in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Moreover, the overall concept of a regional approach could usefully be applied at the regional level. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) has an important role to play in this connection – that is, of course, with the agreement of the States of the region and the competent regional organizations.

The Department for Disarmament Affairs also has an important role to play in stimulating the regional approach. I wish to emphasize that on behalf of my delegation.
As far as Greece is concerned and as was emphasized by our Foreign Minister, Mr. Karalambopoulos in his intervention in the general debate on 27 September 1984:

"The Greek Government ... seeks firmly and consistently to create, together with Greece's neighbouring countries, a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Balkans. In order to promote the establishment of such a zone, a first conference of experts of the Balkan countries was convened in Athens in January and February 1984. My Government attaches great significance to those efforts and intends to pursue them persistently. It is particularly pleased to see that the inter-Balkan dialogue, which aims at further developing the existing friendly and good-neighbourly relations among Balkan peoples, has been enriched with the security factor. My Government is also firmly convinced that the second meeting of experts due to be held in Bucharest will give new impetus to this worthy endeavour." (A/39/PV.9, pp. 92-95)

It therefore goes without saying that the Greek Government is firmly attached to the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament concerning the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace.

My Government is convinced that such zones can make an important contribution in an effective disarmament process and in the field of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this connection, I should like to recall that Greece has always voted in favour of every resolution aimed at the creation of such zones, in so far as all countries concerned are ready to subscribe thereto, on the basis of freely accepted agreements.

Moreover, as my Government has repeatedly stated, Greece is in favour of and firmly supports any initiative aimed at transforming the Mediterranean into a zone of peace, security and co-operation. The Greek Government has spared no effort to achieve that aim, thus eliminating areas of tension in that region.

The acceleration of the arms race and slowing down of negotiations on arms control and reduction cannot but increase fear, mistrust, prejudices and all grounds for a feeling of insecurity among the peoples of our planet as well as the uncertainty of Governments which are responsible for the security of their States. That unfortunate situation, makes it necessary in particular in Europe, to restore a climate of confidence, which is a minimum condition if new impetus is to be given to the negotiations on disarmament whether in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva or elsewhere.
In this context, Greece cannot but be pleased that despite the fact that this year began with not very encouraging prospects, the States participating in the Stockholm Conference have initiated a new series of multilateral negotiations in a first stage on confidence measures.

In keeping with the mandate of Madrid, Greece subscribes to every effort aimed at an agreement among all States participating in the Conference in Stockholm to refrain from the use of force in their mutual relations and to every rule of conduct which would reduce the risk of surprise attack or the threat of war.

Without disregarding the fact that confidence-building measures cannot be a substitute for disarmament, their value was recognized as a complement and a useful contribution to the process of disarmament. In this same context, I am duty-bound to stress the work dealing with confidence-building measures at the global and regional level which are taking place in the Committee on Disarmament and to which one of the Vice-Chairmen of our Committee, Ambassador Wegener, devoted particular effort at the last session of the Disarmament Commission. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to endorse all efforts along those lines.

May I be permitted to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the edifying manner in which the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, headed by the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Martenson, has discharged its duties concerning the World Disarmament Campaign. In our view, that campaign should be pursued with equal fervour so that all countries and regions in the world are factually informed in a balanced and objective manner about questions relating to disarmament.

It would be unpardonable on my part to disregard another factor closely connected with peace and the stability of the international order as well as with disarmament. I am referring in fact to development, on which the social, economic and scientific progress of our endangered planet depends and which cannot be achieved without it and which should particularly benefit the underprivileged countries of the third world.

It is no secret to anyone that the stockpiling of nuclear and conventional weapons threatens the efforts and resources allocated to development, hinders the establishment of a new international economic order and prevents the solution of other crucial problems of mankind.

And yet the arms race, rather than slowing down, is being intensified. The information given by international organizations on military expenditures by all
countries and more especially by the great Powers refers to staggering figures: over a million dollars for every minute of every hour of every day!

In the face of this deplorable situation, there is still another more deplorable one. Hundreds of millions of people live in conditions of such dire poverty that one cannot even speak of "living standards". There are at present 570 million persons who are undernourished, 800 million illiterates, 1,500 million who are deprived of medical services, 250 million children who do not go to school, others who die of disease or hunger.

That is why the time has come to put an end to a situation which is aggravated daily and results from the increase in military expenditures. If we want seriously to speed up development, disarmament is a must. That is to say, according to a gradual but effective process beginning with a reduction in the present level of weapons, to arrive progressively at the lowest possible level, bearing in mind the development needs. To put an end to the arms race and to achieve true general and complete disarmament are therefore two fundamental urgent tasks. All countries and peoples of the world have a political and economic interest in realizing this aim, just as they have an interest in guaranteeing for themselves effective security and a future of peace. If the arms race is not curbed, the danger that it represents for peace, the development of the underprivileged countries and the very survival of mankind will only increase.

Allow me to revert yet again to the Joint Declaration of the six political leaders (Presidents and Prime Ministers) of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania, of 22 May 1984; the conclusion of their Declaration sums up not only the motives that prompted them and the aims that they set themselves, but also the hopes which they place on our future and which should be the point on which the work of our Committee should focus:

"We have faith in the capacity of human beings to rise above the current divisions and create a world free from the shadow of nuclear war. The power and ingenuity of the human race must be used, not to perfect weapons of annihilation, but to harness the resources of the earth so that all people may enjoy a life of security and dignity in an international system free of war and based on peace and justice.

"Today, the world hangs in the balance between war and peace. We hope that our combined efforts will help to influence the outcome."

(A/39/277, p. 5)
Mr. MOLI (Uganda): Mr. Chairman, I am extremely gratified to associate my delegation with the well-deserved tribute you have received from many delegations here assembled. Your fine diplomatic qualities, skill and tact make you eminently qualified to preside over the Committee. The contribution of your country, Brazil, and you personally to the search for a durable peace and harmony on our planet is a matter of record.

May I also be permitted to congratulate the other officers of the Committee who are assisting you in the discharge of your onerous tasks. I wish to assure all of you of my delegation's full co-operation.

As we approach the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the aspirations for peace rekindled in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament have been treated to a dishonourable burial. Confrontation seems to supersede peaceful co-operation in international relations while mutual fear, distrust and despair have replaced hope. The universal yearnings for peace for all peoples at all times are not heeded. The United Nations and its relevant organs have displayed utter helplessness in the maintenance of international peace and security. Excessive rhetoric, accompanied by a proliferation of resolutions, cannot be substituted for serious negotiations aimed at achieving concrete progress towards disarmament. Member States must display the necessary political courage and moral drive that can pave the way for the realization of the lofty goals of this Organization. Peace is the most fundamental of these goals. But peace is not merely an abstraction. It must be a concrete reality.

Peace and development are inseparable. We must disarm so that our collective endeavours are entirely devoted to social development. In the absence of peace, staggering sums of money are spent on the instruments of war and destruction while millions of peoples in the world die of hunger. It does appear ridiculous to us that nations, particularly the developing countries, should be spending money on armaments while masses go hungry and suffer from disease and lack of education. Social and economic development are prerequisites not only to removing the sources of internal instability that threaten national security but also to creating the overall development process.

According to the available data, annual global military expenditure is now about $1 trillion. The developing world bears a large proportion of this financial burden. These rising military costs are not at all matched by developmental assistance, which reaches poor countries in trickles.
Africa is a living example of this human tragedy. The legacies of colonialism have conspired with the forces of nature to bring untold suffering and social deprivation to millions of peoples. A long-drawn-out drought compounded by local conflicts has imposed starvation on dozens of African countries. Added to this are problems posed by the sale and transfer of conventional weapons. Aside from the human toll and sufferings they inflict on local populations, conventional weapons inflame regional conflicts, eliminate opportunities for the peaceful resolution of social conflicts and overburden national budgets to the detriment of productive social programmes. If the billions of dollars squandered on the manufacture of military hardware were diverted to redressing human misery, the world would be a better and safer place to live in. The expansion of military production and procurement to the virtual neglect of arresting the global economic hardships reminds us of what Mr. O'Connor, a famous Irish playwright, was once bitterly moved to remark, namely, that the inhumanity of man to man makes thousands mourn. The General Assembly has a moral and political obligation to deplore the ever-increasing tendency of countries to squander resources and energies on war preparations rather than producing bread to secure the continuous survival of the human species. We call on the producers of armaments to refrain from dumping conventional arms into areas of tension.

We have noted with interest that, for the first time in a United Nations context, a study has addressed the nature, causes and effects of the arms race in conventional weapons. This study seems to have assisted in identifying the possibilities for progress in the field of disarmament relating to conventional arms as well as the problems that might arise in negotiations on conventional weapons.

Disarmament and development have drawn tremendous interest from virtually all delegations. But what remains to be done is to translate these concerns into concrete action. In this regard, while welcoming the proposals for the creation of a development fund, we concur with the conclusion of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research that the establishment of a fund for development is desirable as a means of giving tangible expression to the recognized link between disarmament and development and starting a process of transferring to development the resources that are now allocated to armaments. In other words, we view the
establishment of a development fund as a logical consequence of concrete results in disarmament. It would be totally wrong and unacceptable for such a fund to serve as a smokescreen for countries to thwart a genuine disarmament process and indulge in policies of continuous rearmament. The major Powers must make a firm commitment to limit the arms race with a view to devoting resources to development tasks which require urgent attention.

Africa is confronted with twin evils of insecurity. These are starvation and economic calamities exacerbated by current natural disasters, on the one hand, and militaristic-racist aggression perpetrated by apartheid South Africa, on the other. The policies of racism in South Africa and colonialism in Namibia have attracted universal condemnation. The apartheid régime has feverishly taken to militarization in order to insulate itself from the opponents of the system. One of the major concerns to us in this regard is the nuclear programme of the racist régime.
South Africa's plan and capability to manufacture nuclear weapons have been established. This year the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research in its report contained in document A/39/470 indicated that uranium exploitation in South Africa and Namibia has increased by about 50 per cent since the Secretary-General submitted his first report four years ago. More detailed information and data were also provided on South Africa's uranium resources, production, enrichment and nuclear policy. We wish to commend the Institute for work well done. This report again reaffirms that South Africa continues to have a technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons.

Despite this self-evident truth, the Disarmament Commission at its last two successive sessions failed to adopt concrete recommendations on the question, and, to add insult to injury, the racist régime continues to receive military and nuclear support from its close allies. We wish to reiterate that the racist régime poses a serious danger not only to regional but also to international peace and security. Those who claim to champion peace and human dignity must truly so indicate by their actions rather than words. A non-peace-loving country with the credentials of apartheid South Africa must be denied military technology. The Security Council must assume its full international responsibility and impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions on the racist régime, which continues to perpetrate heinous crimes against its people and neighbouring countries.

One of the inescapable blames this Organization has to share is its apparent inability to cater effectively for the special security needs of very small States, particularly island nations located in vast bodies of ocean waters. The history of "mini" States is replete with invasions of foreign predators and fortune-seekers. This situation remains valid today. Recent experiences in countries like the Seychelles have pinpointed the security threat, internal and external, to which these countries are exposed. Events around the world must force attention to the special security needs of small States.

Serious attention must be addressed to this problem by the United Nations. Our apprehension stems from the ominous developments in the Indian Ocean region, which continue to send wrong signals to the Pretoria régime. Similarly the existence of foreign military bases in the Indian Ocean poses a serious danger to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and national independence of the non-aligned countries in that region. It is over a decade since the non-aligned movement
called for an end to the militarization of the Indian Ocean. To date, the realization of this region as a zone of peace remains a distant dream. There is an urgent need for the convening of the Colombo Conference, the dismantling of foreign military bases in the Indian Ocean and the establishment of a zone of peace in the region characterized by peaceful navigation, trade and commercial intercourse for all nations.

This debate takes place against the background of a very bleak international climate. The negotiations on strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons, suspended over a year ago by the two super-Powers, have yet to resume. The Vienna mutual and balanced force reduction (MBFR) talks show no signs of yielding tangible results. New generations of nuclear weapons are being deployed in Europe and elsewhere. The Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament, the only United Nations multilateral negotiating forum, is stalemated owing to lack of political will and dilatory tactics on the part of some delegations at the Conference.

The existence of well over 50,000 nuclear weapons puts the survival of mankind in jeopardy. The time has come to put an end to this horrific situation. The security of countries and regions must not be placed at risk as a result of the action of a handful of nuclear-weapon States. The doctrine of deterrence is no longer tenable. Military doctrines which are based on the possession of nuclear weapons and their possible use are not only reprehensible but indefensible. We cannot accept that the prospect of the annihilation of human civilization is used by some States to promote their security.

International peace must be based on a clear commitment by all States to joint survival rather than a threat of mutual annihilation. Nuclear-weapon States must begin as a matter of urgency the process of halting and reversing the nuclear arms race. The testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons should cease. It is high time immediate multilateral negotiations in which both France and China are invited to participate were initiated in order to conclude a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapon tests. In 1972 the Secretary-General declared that all technical and scientific aspects of the problem had been so fully explored that only a political decision was necessary to achieve final agreement. The world is anxiously waiting for the sound judgement of all those concerned.

The militarization of outer space is a matter of deep concern to the entire international community. An urgent agreement must be reached to prevent an arms race in outer space, as requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/70.
Outer space is the common heritage of mankind and should be preserved exclusively for peaceful purposes. We are seriously concerned about the dangers posed by the extension of the arms race into outer space. Disturbing developments are taking place that underscore the urgency of initiating negotiations to prevent an arms race in outer space. Unless urgent steps are taken to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space it will be too late to reverse this trend. The testing and development of anti-satellite weapons have made it imperative that appropriate agreements be concluded banning the development, testing and deployment of anti-satellite weapons on earth, in the atmosphere and in outer space as well as the destruction of existing anti-satellite weapons systems.

These are a few of the preliminary remarks I have to make on some of the items before the Committee at this stage of our deliberations. But, before I conclude, I wish to underscore the importance my delegation attaches to the World Disarmament Campaign.
The United Nations must do all it can to reach all corners and peoples of the world in order to educate them about the virtues of peace and the adverse consequences of the arms race. Governments must co-operate with the United Nations and all its relevant agencies in this sphere. We note with appreciation the regional conferences organized by the Department for Disarmament Affairs in this regard in the past year and we encourage them to do more still, especially in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In so doing, we deem it appropriate for the Secretariat to consult with all interested parties.

My delegation is happy to report that this year, in my own country, a seminar whose theme was "Peace and Disarmament" was organized at Makerere University in Kampala. Scholars, government officials, non-governmental organizations and the military participated in it. The response was very encouraging indeed. It is the intention of my Government to continue with similar programmes in future and to invite the United Nations to render the requisite assistance in their organization.

Finally, I wish to record the satisfaction of my delegation for the very efficient manner in which the United Nations disarmament fellowships programme continues to run.

**Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic)** (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to express to you congratulations on your election to the high office of Chairman of this Committee, which is a recognition of your wide experience in matters of disarmament and your ability to steer the debates of this Committee. It is also a recognition of the efforts made in this field by your country, Brazil, which is linked to the Syrian Arab Republic by bonds of cordiality and friendship. On behalf of my delegation, I congratulate, the other officers of the Committee on their unanimous election.

Just a short time after the conclusion of the general debate in the General Assembly we still hear its echoes everywhere. The foreign ministers and prime ministers of the various countries have told us of the problems and preoccupations of their peoples, the foremost of which are the cases of lack of security in the world and the dangers that threaten international peace. All the speakers at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly reaffirmed that international peace and security have been jeopardized as a result of the explosive international situation arising out of the spiralling arms race and the stockpiling of arms, especially nuclear arms. They drew a dim picture of the future of humanity and the danger of nuclear confrontation looming over it. If we listened to the voice of
reason and the appeals of the masses of the world calling for an end to the arms race, there would be no need for us to come here to urge that steps be taken to halt both the conventional- and the nuclear-arms race. The entire international community, represented by the United Nations, believes that the failure in achieving any progress in this field is not due to the States themselves, the majority of which have the political will, as well as the absolute belief in the necessity of putting an end to mankind's common menace. The problem, in our view, is rooted in inadequate confidence, and even a lack of confidence in a few cases, especially among the nuclear Powers.

We do not intend here to hold one party accountable, or to single it out for blame. We firmly believe that our task at present is to focus on demonstrating the benefits of negotiations and highlighting the disadvantages of remaining away from the negotiating table. We believe there is no alternative to dialogue, which can ease tension but will not be beneficial unless it is open to all countries.

The international community needs to co-operate in order to achieve complete disarmament rather than confrontation, through which the problems of the world cannot be solved. The world today is suffering from the lack of security. Peace in the world is threatened as a result of recourse to violence and the use of force in international relations. The world today is menaced by the greed of international imperialism and its desire for domination and hegemony. It is also menaced by the re-emergence of fascist and racist régimes.

We feel that we have not progressed at all in averting the danger of annihilation facing mankind. The main objectives of the international community have remained elusive. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was adopted unanimously, is still a dead letter. The resolutions of our First Committee in this matter have also remained ineffectual. Suffice it to say that the negotiations between the super-Powers are still stalemated and the Geneva Disarmament Conference is paralysed. The international community is faced with increased production and use of chemical weapons. Furthermore, outer space has become an increasing field of armaments. This lack of progress runs the whole gamut and is proof of the failure of the organizations and of the international community in this respect.

The subsistence of nuclear-free-zones and their ability to survive are called into question. Moreover, the two racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv continue to possess nuclear weapons and they receive foreign help to this effect from States perfectly known to the international community.
The world is frustrated, as a result of this situation, the responsibility for which should rest with the loss of confidence between the nuclear super-Powers. This is one of the reasons for the deterioration of the international situation and is behind the spiralling arms race.

My country maintains that the first and foremost goal on which our efforts should be focused, in the strained international situation, is the need to reinforce the role of the United Nations as the co-ordinating organization for the positions and activities of States against the possibility of a nuclear war, as well as reducing international tension and curbing both the conventional- and the nuclear-arms race.

The non-aligned movement, through which the Syrian Arab Republic works in the field of disarmament, has given the United Nations a special and important role in this respect, especially in preventing the outbreak of a world war, through curbing the conventional- and nuclear-arms race.

We believe that it is incumbent upon the nuclear-Powers to sign an international treaty under which they would commit themselves not to use nuclear weapons and halt all nuclear tests, while engaging at the same time in serious negotiations on nuclear disarmament, in order to protect humanity from a destructive nuclear war.
We also consider that a big contribution to solving the problem of nuclear disarmament could be made by the prohibition of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the final creation of support for and development of the capacity of the racist and settlement-oriented régimes which produce them.

We eagerly look forward to the Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, scheduled for 1985, and think it necessary that the international community should confirm the importance of all countries' accession to that Treaty, as a guarantee of the limitation of the nuclear-arms race.

Chemical weapons and the danger of their production are one of the important concerns of the international community. My delegation therefore considers the complete prohibition of their production and use and ultimately their total destruction to be one of the most important issues which we should tackle seriously so as to reach agreement in this regard.

Outer space, which is today the aim of military operations, should remain a source of light and life, not one of missiles and destruction. The removal of arms from outer space and the prohibition of its use for military purposes should be accorded the highest priority among the international community's concerns. Immediate negotiations by the super-Powers on this matter and a pledge not to deploy satellites in outer space have become one of the most important requirements for consolidating international peace and security.

The establishment of nuclear-free zones is an important step towards general and complete disarmament and will contribute to promoting international peace and security. My delegation has supported the declaration of nuclear-free zones of peace in the Indian Ocean, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. As far as Africa and the Middle East are concerned, the declaration of both areas as nuclear-free zones, is a similar problem that expresses the concern of the peoples of those two areas as a result of policies of hegemony, domination and expansion. Both areas have been afflicted by two régimes which are racist and inimical to their peoples and which have been able to acquire a nuclear capability as a result of the constant support of the United States of America, in contravention of the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East has been supported by the Syrian Arab Republic and all the other Arab countries; Israel is the only country there which does not agree to this. The issue of Israeli nuclear armament has become a chronic item on the agenda here and constitutes a source of
anxiety and concern for the peoples of the area and the international community. It belies Israel's false claim that it supports the declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-free zone. Israel still refuses to accede to the international Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Also, it continues to refuse to subject its nuclear installations to the control and inspection of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Disarmament issues constitute an indivisible whole. The fact that certain aspects are not singled out by my delegation does not mean any lack of concern on our part. We are aware that some of them have been considered exhaustively; what is now lacking is the political will for implementation.

The relationship between disarmament and development is very close; that was emphasized in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The astronomical expenditures on the development of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, has obstructed the economic and social development plans of all the countries of the world. That is not limited to the advanced and nuclear Powers only but equally affects the poor countries and those with very limited revenue. Those small countries, so as to preserve their independence and wealth, allocate a very high percentage of their national revenue to armaments, whereas this was supposed to be allocated to raising their peoples' standard of living.

My country believes that the danger to international peace and security is not confined to the continuation of the arms race policy. No one can deny that the arms race, especially its nuclear aspect, constitutes a source of danger to international peace and security in the world. However, the threat to world peace and security has other sources which make the international situation tense.

We consider that international peace and security may be jeopardized because certain countries are pursuing a course of violence, force and consequently aggression to solve differences. Domination and hegemony are also sources of tension and jeopardize peace and security. Finally, there are also certain countries which follow the doctrine of expansion and annexation and do not recognize the right of neighbouring peoples to exist and to self-determination. That approach also constitutes a source of danger to international peace and security.

The conduct of certain countries in putting a strain on the international situation has become one of the phenomena that should be considered by this
Committee, which deals with matters affecting peace and security. It should be beneficial to recall this from time to time owing to the gravity of this phenomenon for world peace. The danger of such conduct is exacerbated by those countries' possession of nuclear weapons and their attempts to introduce certain racist régimes, whether in Pretoria or in occupied Palestine.

The United States of America is one of the countries which contribute to straining the international situation. Its economic, financial and military support for the Zionist entity in occupied Palestine has made that region a focus of the arms race and of international polarization. The United States of America is fully responsible for turning that area into a hotbed of tension that may affect world peace and security. The flow of sophisticated American weapons to Israel, in addition to the stockpiling of American weapons in Israel, under the strategic co-operation agreement makes one wonder about the strategic goal of the United States. By such conduct, the United States of America has pushed the area to the brink and compelled the people of the area to think of finding an alternative which would restore the strategic balance in the region after the disruption resulting from the bias of the United States of America in favour of Israel.

We in the Syrian Arab Republic long for peace. We co-operate with other peoples for a better world. We struggle with others so that peoples may not yield to despondency and passively wait for war to come. We work for the preservation of international peace and security. Like other peoples, we consider that the conduct of the United States in providing the Zionist régime in Palestine with all kinds of weapons of destruction and war jeopardizes international peace and security.

The reinforcement of peace and security in the Mediterranean has become one of the important and essential issues that affect and are affected by international peace and security. As a country overlooking the Mediterranean, the Syrian Arab Republic considers the Valetta Declaration, adopted by the meeting of the non-aligned countries of the Mediterranean, held in Malta on 10 and 11 September of this year, to be a contribution to peace and security in the Mediterranean. My delegation reserves its right to return to this subject at a later stage when the items on the enforcement of international peace and security are taken up in our First Committee.
This would open the way for a consideration of fleet movements in the area and the danger they present to the security of coastal States. It might also be necessary to refer this subject to the bodies competent in matters of disarmament, for consideration.

In conclusion, my delegation attaches importance to the Conference on Disarmament because it is a multilateral negotiating body whose debates may contribute to the formulation of the many conventions which are needed by the world in the field of disarmament. If those debates have so far not borne fruit in reaching such an agreement, that is due to the fact that the political will has so far been lacking in certain States; but we shall attach importance to the continuation of the debates.

Mr. Pawananit (Thailand): May I take this opportunity, Sir, to join previous speakers in extending on behalf of the Thai delegation and on my own behalf, sincere congratulations to Ambassador Souza e Silva on his election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. His election is clear testimony to his outstanding diplomatic skill and wide experience in the field of disarmament, as well as a tribute to his country in its assiduous contribution to the establishment of international peace and security.

Our sincere congratulations also go to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur on their election to their respective high offices. The Thai delegation wishes the Chairman and all officers of the Committee every success in their undertaking and I pledge my delegation's full support and co-operation in the performance of their duties.

The international situation and developments in the field of security and disarmament during the past year cannot be described in optimistic terms. Recurring crises, periods of exacerbated international tensions and military conflicts still characterize the international scene. Such a situation has not only produced a virtual stalemate in the process of disarmament negotiations but has also heightened a sense of insecurity and raised suspicions of hostile intentions among States. Consequently, instead of arms limitation and disarmament we have witnessed a persistent and sustained increase in the production and stockpiling of increasingly sophisticated and deadly weapons and a sharp rise in world military expenditures on nuclear and conventional weapons. These
developments are further aggravated by the fact that the arms race is moving into the new dimension of outer space. Such a trend, if not brought to a halt, could bring the world closer to the possibility of confrontation and threaten even further the very survival of mankind.

In view of the unabated acceleration and intensification of the arms race and its political and security implications for the world at large, it is becoming increasingly urgent and imperative to accelerate the movement towards sound and effective measures to halt and reverse the arms race in both its nuclear and its conventional aspects. As part of such effort, priority should be accorded to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The successful conclusion of such a treaty would be a major step towards ending the development and improvement of more sophisticated nuclear weapons and would constitute a vital element for the success of efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race.

In this connection, my delegation notes with concern that although the partial test-ban Treaty was signed and entered into force two decades ago its objective of discontinuing all test explosions has not been accomplished and nuclear tests have continued unabated. As a party to the Treaty, Thailand is in favour of the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty which, it is to be hoped, would prohibit nuclear tests for all time and in all environments. In line with this position, my delegation joined the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations in welcoming the decision of the Conference on Disarmament in 1982 to establish an Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban to discuss and define issues relating to verification and compliance with a view to making further progress towards a nuclear test ban. Although there still exists a divergence of views in the Conference on Disarmament with regard to the present mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group, my delegation hopes that the differences can be narrowed so that the Conference on Disarmament will be able to establish the framework within which it could embark on negotiations concerning the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The Thai delegation would also like to call on all nuclear weapon States to participate fully and contribute constructively to the realization of a comprehensive test-ban Treaty, for only their full participation and co-operation could ensure genuine success in the ongoing efforts to put an end to nuclear-weapon tests.
While the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests remains a vital element in efforts to halt the nuclear-arms race, the promotion of this objective could be furthered by the prevention of any further proliferation of nuclear weapons, through universal acceptance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The acceptance of that Treaty by all States would be in the interests of all, for the risk of nuclear warfare and its dangers to human survival would not be diminished if more such weapons should be acquired by additional countries. Instead, further proliferation of nuclear weapons would increase suspicion among traditional rivals, aggravate regional instabilities and hinder efforts to resolve disputes, thereby escalating the risk of war.

It was out of this belief that my delegation supported the establishment of the Preparatory Committee for the Third Review Conference in 1983 with a view to evaluating the implementation of the Treaty and to fulfilling the ways and means of improving and strengthening the non-proliferation régime towards the final aim of achieving universal accession to the Treaty. The Preparatory Committee, at its first session in April and at its second session early this month, admirably carried out the task of paving the way for the convening of the Conference. My delegation hopes that the Third Review Conference, to be convened next year will make further progress towards ensuring the validity of all the provisions by all the parties.

To advance further the cause of nuclear disarmament, measures to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race should be complemented by such regional initiatives as the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The establishment of such zones could curb the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and strengthen the non-proliferation régime, thereby contributing to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. In this connection, the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia was endorsed by the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) during the meeting of its Foreign Ministers last July.

The Thai delegation remains concerned over continuing reports regarding the alleged use of chemical and biological weapons in certain parts of the world, including South-East Asia. In view of the inhumane and indiscriminate effects of such weapons, my delegation is strongly opposed to their development, manufacture,
stockpiling and use in any circumstances. The Thai delegation believes that the efforts of the international community to verify the use of such weapons in the areas of alleged chemical weapon attacks should be supported and continued since the attention of the world community on this question could have an effect of deterring their possible use.

Recent reports of the alleged use of chemical and biological weapons must also remind us of the urgent need to control and eliminate this type of armament. While the 1925 Geneva Protocol still retains all its value, it is insufficient to eliminate the danger of the possible use of chemical and biological weapons in armed conflicts and it contains no provision for verification; therefore, only a complete ban, with adequate verification, could guarantee that a country at war or in conflict would not in an hour of desperation turn to these horrifying weapons at its disposal.

In this connection, my delegation notes with satisfaction the serious and effective nature of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for a convention on the complete prohibition and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. We welcome the progress which was made in the Conference during its 1984 session regarding the preliminary drafting of some of the provisions of the convention. However, in view of the complexity of the problems involved, my delegation urges that all efforts be made to narrow the divergence of views on the remaining problems in a spirit of compromise and that the Conference on Disarmament continue the negotiations with a view to elaborating the convention as a matter of the highest priority.
The Thai delegation continues to attach particular importance to the establishment of zones of peace in various parts of the world. Such zones could strengthen the fabric of regional peace and stability and prevent extraregional interference, thereby creating conditions conducive to regional co-operation in the fields of economic and social development. In the light of this fact, Thailand and the other members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations will make every effort to bring about the early establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia. Similarly, the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace reflects the hopes and aspirations of the countries of the region to enhance the prospects of peace, stability and security so that the peoples there can devote their energies to promoting economic well-being, thereby ensuring the progress and prosperity of their countries.

Thailand supports all constructive and meaningful efforts to bring about the early realization of the proposal. In this connection, it is regrettable to note that although the convening of the Conference within a time frame has been the subject of intensive discussion in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean for the past three years, the proposed Conference has not yet been held. Thailand, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, supports the early convening of the Conference in Colombo, Sri Lanka. My delegation urges that the Ad Hoc Committee continue to make determined efforts to overcome the remaining problems and finalize all preparations for the Conference, including the dates it will be convened, in a timely manner.

One of the consequences of the escalation and intensification of the arms race has been the diversion of material as well as technical and human resources for military purposes. If the world can be spared the immense costs of the arms race, enormous amounts of resources can be released for such constructive uses as the economic and social development of the poorer countries. My delegation shares the belief expressed by the Disarmament Commission that the world economy, and particularly the economies of the developing countries, would benefit from appropriate international action that takes into account the close relationship between disarmament and development.

Disarmament is a vast and complex task which cannot be achieved in a short span of time. However, we should not allow too much time to elapse if we do not want to be caught up in unexpected events. It should be realized that time passes
and with each passing day the risk of confrontation increases. The security of man requires that all of us redouble our efforts in the field of disarmament so that the prospect of universal peace can be within reach. In this task, my delegation pledges its full co-operation and support.

Mr. JITOKO (Fiji): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first opportunity we have had to address this Committee, let me on behalf of my delegation congratulate you and the other officers on your election to your high posts. Your years of experience and your contribution to and in the field of disarmament assure us and the Committee of the meaningful progress that we all desire and strive for. For its part, my delegation pledges its support to your efforts in the weeks ahead as the Committee embarks on its work at this critical time.

The continuation of the present trends in the escalation of the arms race underlies the very real need of this Organization to confront this problem with a determined sense of urgency. No one can deny the gravity of the problem and the magnitude of the dangers that mankind is faced with unless we collectively and individually make some commitments to arrest and control the escalation of the arms race with a view to reducing and eventually eliminating the threat of war.

The commitment of which we speak and continuously seek is a commitment from the militarily strong and the nuclear-weapon States, especially the super-Powers, to take action to decrease and remove the danger of war, especially nuclear war. It is a commitment to enter into meaningful dialogue and negotiations that will ensure progress towards the control of nuclear weapons, the achievement of world peace, general disarmament and international co-operation. It is a commitment, in the words of paragraph 18 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, to "halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation".

Nowhere is this commitment so sadly lacking as in the ongoing negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament and the stalled bilateral negotiations in both Geneva and Vienna between the two super-Powers.

In evaluating the work of the Conference on Disarmament at its 1984 session, one is struck by the fact that despite the serious efforts and determination of many of its members, representatives of the vast majority of Member States of this Organization, very little progress has been made, owing in no small part to the two
super-Powers' inability to agree over details in the negotiations. It would therefore seem to my delegation that so long as this difficulty over substance prevails and disagreement on procedural frameworks continues our goal of general and complete disarmament will remain elusive.

In his report to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session, the Secretary-General pointed out that nuclear disarmament will depend primarily on agreement being reached among the nuclear-weapon States, particularly the super-Powers. But, as the Secretary-General also pointed out, success or failure in securing reduction will affect the future of the entire international community. Therefore all States, big or small, aligned or non-aligned, have a role to play and must make their views and concern known. After all, and as much as we do not wish it to be so, we shall all share the same fate if there is a nuclear war.

In his address before the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, last year, my Foreign Minister reaffirmed what my Government believes should constitute the thrust of our disarmament efforts, especially in the area of nuclear disarmament. He said:

"...for many of us the road to a comprehensive programme of nuclear disarmament properly begins with a nuclear-weapon freeze. In our view, a freeze on nuclear arms would not only constitute an important first step in a disarmament process but would at the same time provide a favourable environment for negotiations ... to be conducted in good faith and mutual trust. The structure and scope of such a nuclear arms freeze, we believe, should embrace a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons, the complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, a ban on all further deployment of nuclear weapons, and the complete cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes." (A/38/PV.25, pp. 44-45 and 46)

This, my Government's stand, is consonant with our overall policy on a general and comprehensive programme of disarmament and in line with the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. Moreover, it at the same time closely reflects the principles enunciated by the 13 member States of the South Pacific Forum as contained in its August communiqué of this year.

Within the framework of a nuclear-weapons freeze, my Government regards the question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as the single most important
first step towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race. While in the past we have in this Committee supported resolutions on the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty because of its significance in checking the serious danger to human life from the contamination of the environment, we are at the same time fully aware of its limited value as a disarmament measure for halting and limiting the arms race, for it leaves unimpeded all underground nuclear tests.
According to the preliminary data provided by the 1984 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, nuclear tests numbered 50 in 1983 alone. It is also of particular significance that the average number of nuclear tests or explosions per year dramatically rose after the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty. My Government shares the view that all efforts should be intensified to encourage the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty which would outlaw all forms of nuclear testing by all States in all environments.

In respect of nuclear-weapons testing and especially in the face of increasing momentum and tendency towards the testing and development of new and more formidable weapons of mass destruction, my delegation once again urges Member States, especially nuclear-weapon States, to respond positively to the proposal of an all-encompassing nuclear-test-ban treaty. There can be no clearer indication, in my Government's view, of the intention of the nuclear-weapon nations, in our efforts towards disarmament, than the success or failure of the comprehensive test-ban negotiations. We wish in this regard to refer to the Programme of Action of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, under which the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing was placed first among the measures by which the goal of nuclear disarmament might be achieved.

Since then, a succession of General Assembly resolutions have reiterated the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty with the request that the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Conference on Disarmament, with appropriate mandate, examine all issues relating to it. But in spite of this desire and the support to hasten its work, the Working Group is currently being retarded from making any progress owing to disagreement over its procedural framework. It is our hope that these procedural difficulties will be resolved at the coming session of the Conference on Disarmament so that the Working Group might exercise in an efficacious manner the task assigned to it.

There is an additional aspect which underlies the fact that my Government attaches the highest priority to the comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations. Fiji is a composite of more than 300 islands spread over thousands of square kilometres of ocean space in the heart of the South Pacific. Many of these islands rely on the resources of the sea for their livelihood. My Government, cognizant of this fact, is committed to a policy that recognizes the vital importance of the
protection of its ocean space and environment. Any activity, be it by accident or
design, that has or will have the effect of degrading the quality of our
environment, we vigorously oppose. A tangible manifestation of our commitment to
the environment can be seen in the establishment in 1982 by the island Governments
of the region, of a South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, to work towards a
common approach to the protection of the environment.

For us in the South Pacific, two such activities, both nuclear, remain matters
of vital concern to our people. The first relates to the proposals by some
Pacific-rimmed countries to dispose of nuclear waste in the region. The members of
the South Pacific Forum view such proposals as intolerable and unacceptable and
will continue to make their opposition known to those countries concerned.

The second, and certainly the one of greater momentum to our region, is the
issue of nuclear testing. Perhaps there is no singular issue on which all of the
South Pacific nations are so unanimous in their disfavour, and concerning which
their opposition is so total, as the question of the continuing nuclear testing on
Mururoa and Fangataufa atolls, by the Government of France. The countries of the
region, individually and collectively through the Forum, have expressed in
unequivocal terms their very strong opposition to these tests.

The underlying reasons for our opposition to the continuation of the French
nuclear-testing programme have been articulated by my Government as well as the
countries of the region over the years. The threat it poses to our environment, to
the living resources of our ocean on which many of our islands' livelihood are
derived, to the health and well-being of our peoples and to the peace and stability
of the region as a whole are issues of very real concern to my Government. No one
can deny the sovereign right of the Government of France over its territories. But
what is of greater concern to us is the use of our peaceful surroundings as testing
grounds to perfect instruments of war. This goes against the very grain of our
belief and the region's commitment to the cause of disarmament. It is useful to
recall here the fact that while all the nuclear-weapon States conduct tests within
or close to their mainland territories, only the French tests are conducted at
sites far removed from the shores of metropolitan France.
It is my Government's resolve to continue in its efforts, here and in other forums, until nuclear tests in the region are stopped.

The South Pacific region is blessed with a history of peace and tranquillity, of peaceful coexistence between its island Governments and between its peoples. Our cordial relations with our neighbouring island nations as indeed with the bigger and more powerful Pacific-rimmed countries are deeply rooted in tolerance and mutual respect for the recognition of the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of each member nation of the region. It is a situation which Fiji earnestly desires to see endure, and we will continue together with the countries of the region to work towards ensuring that it remains an area free from any activities which are likely to endanger the maintenance of peace and security.

In furtherance of this conviction, and at the same time to lend credence to our belief that a regional approach can make a substantive contribution to the achievement of disarmament as reaffirmed in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, my Government joined the other members of the South Pacific Forum at its recent meeting, in agreeing to undertake a study leading towards the establishment of a South Pacific nuclear-free zone. Such a zone, we believe, to be established in accordance with international law and treaties, but at the same time to assert that there be no development, manufacture, use, testing or stationing of nuclear explosive devices in the South Pacific zone, would spare us and the countries of the region from the threat of nuclear attack or involvement in a nuclear war.

We attach great importance to the work currently being undertaken by the Secretary-General with the assistance of an ad hoc group of qualified government experts on a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones pursuant to General Assembly resolution 37/99 F. While we are naturally disappointed at the efforts of some members of the group to impede the progress of its work, my delegation believes that the difficulties can be overcome so as to enable the Secretary-General to complete his task.

My delegation's statement has been directed purposefully to some nuclear aspects of our disarmament efforts. While we do not belittle the importance of achieving progress in other areas as in the curbing of the manufacture of and trade in conventional weapons, the prevention of an arms race in outer space or the
complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, there cannot be any doubt that it is the threat and use of nuclear weapons and the potential horrors of a nuclear war that remain the primary concern of the world today.

In the final analysis, the question of disarmament rests on two basic premises, namely, peace and security. They are, after all, the same principles that are the pillars of the United Nations. Unfortunately, those of us who are militarily strong, who possess nuclear weapons, and especially the super-Powers with all their destructive capacities, view the question as one that entails security first and foremost. Peace, according to this view, can be achieved only if adequate security in whatever form and shape is guaranteed. Whether it be seen in the operation of the concept of "balance of power" or in the modernization of weaponry systems for the purpose of "deterrence", they both reflect and are cited as justification for this view. This, in my Government's opinion, looks at the issue from the wrong end of the telescope and constitutes the very basic flaw in the approach to our disarmament efforts. When will we ever learn that the development of nuclear weapons and their continuous refinement in the cause of so-called national security only begets a new cycle of rearmament?
When will we ever learn that there is no added security to be gained by anyone as we pursue the present arms race in quantity and quality? When will we ever learn that security, as we have now been given to understand in the name of peace, is a concept that is as illusory as it is unattainable? After all, to be secure, to feel secure, is only a state of mind. To nurture and promote it, an atmosphere of harmony and peace must first prevail. We need not look further than to the United Nations Charter for guidance. The effective application of its relevant provisions by each and every one of us, will ensure the generation of an atmosphere conducive to the propagation of peace under which the security of all nations is assured. It is within our power to create this condition without resort to arms or the threat of their use. It is certainly in the interest and within the capacity of the super-Powers, with the necessary political will, to lead the way.

Mr. MORENO-SALCEDO (Philippines): Our debate on the subject of disarmament this year brings to mind George Orwell's apocalyptic work, 1984. There is, of course, no ubiquitous Big Brother menacingly hovering over us. But Orwell's failed imagery offers us no comfort. For today, much like Orwell's world in 1984, we live in constant fear for our lives - threatened by the prospect of instant annihilation in a nuclear war, and agonized by the thought of survival in its aftermath.

Nuclear weapons, and the technology they represent, have come to dominate our lives. And like Orwell's Big Brother, they have sentenced men to live under their tyranny.

Why have we come to this state of affairs?

Looking back over the years since Alamogordo, we are hard put to find a single answer. It could be that we have failed to tame our own technology; that where technology was meant to serve man, man has submitted to be enslaved by it.

It must be that we have distorted our perception of the question of nuclear arms and their control. While we have largely viewed this question as a political and security issue, we have ignored the reality that it is, in the final analysis, a moral issue of transcendental importance which has to do with man's survival on this planet.

Or perhaps it is because we have allowed the issues of nuclear weapons and their control to pass into the hands of bureaucrats and specialists, with their impressive doctrines and concepts couched in an arcane argot.
The vital need is to halt and reverse the escalating arms race. My delegation believes that in order to achieve this objective, the first and indispensable requirement is to create a climate of confidence and trust. In our view, this could be attained by the conclusion of priority agreements designed to curb the arms race, and ultimately lead to nuclear disarmament.

My delegation believes that these agreements should encompass the following: first, the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban agreement; second, agreements to freeze the production of nuclear weapons and of fissionable materials for weapons purposes; and finally, agreements to strengthen the peaceful régime in outer space.

For the last several years, there has been a mounting demand for the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Expectations had been heightened by the entry into force in 1970 of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in which, significantly, the nuclear Powers made an explicit undertaking to begin negotiations leading to the cessation of the arms race and the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

Now, 15 years later, a comprehensive test-ban treaty is still nowhere in sight, for reasons which escape comprehension. The argument that commitments under a comprehensive test-ban treaty cannot be verified is no longer tenable. As far as the experts can see, the alleged technical obstacles to verification are not insurmountable, and therefore do not really constitute a barrier to agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has established an international safeguards system to ensure that nuclear facilities for peaceful purposes are not utilized for military purposes or for the manufacture or production of nuclear weapons. The safeguards system, which involves the physical presence of IAEA inspectors in the nuclear facilities covered by agency safeguards, is at present applied in the territories of four nuclear Powers and will soon be applied in another nuclear-weapon State.

We see no reason why the IAEA safeguards system, which is universally accepted, cannot serve as the basis or as a model for an international verification system for the purposes of a comprehensive test ban.

With respect to the second point, my delegation holds the view that an integral part of priority measures that could lead to nuclear disarmament is agreements on a freeze in the production of nuclear weapons and of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. These agreements could be satisfactorily verified
by a system similar to the IAEA safeguards system, an international mechanism which, as stated before, has been universally accepted.

Like most delegations at this meeting, the Philippine delegation is disturbed by the possibility of the use of outer space for military purposes. It violates what might well be the last sanctuary of peace in our small universe and adds new and incalculable dimensions to an arms race that today has no defined limits.

In his report on the work of the world Organization last year, Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar urged in strong terms the beginning of comprehensive negotiations on a peaceful régime for outer space. My delegation fully supports this view.

My delegation has noted with alarm the lack of progress during the recent period towards curbing and reversing the nuclear-arms race. Yet, as we look further back, we cannot but be impressed by the intensity of the political will which made possible the agreements and initiatives reflecting a shared perception by the international community of a common nuclear peril.

Thus, we can cite treaties which have gained widespread support, such as the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Outer Space Treaty, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Sea-Bed Treaty, the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques and the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.
The fact that more and more nations are acceding to these treaties, and that these agreements are being ratified, indicates the growing concern of Governments and peoples over the need to impose limits on weapons development. Consequently there is an acceptance of principles of international law which are needed to govern a crucial area which affects all mankind. Beyond the signing and ratification of treaties, however, there is the overriding need for their implementation.

While there are no effective means of totally eliminating tensions, regional groups could play an important role in diminishing them. The Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, held in Stockholm in January of this year, was one example. Considering that Europe was the site of two destructive world conflicts, this Conference served to heighten the importance of measures taken by regional groups to diminish tension. It is too early to evaluate the long-term effect of this Conference. Nevertheless, it is a laudable effort towards the goal of disarmament through regional confidence-building measures.

Confidence-building measures are taking root not only in Europe but also in other areas of the world. Significantly, Latin America was the first area to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. The Treaty of Tlatelolco is a model for similar treaties in other areas of the world. In yet another example, and in response to the conflict in Central America, the Contadora Group has devised a series of measures designed to alleviate mounting tension.

In South-East Asia, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has proposed a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. It has also undertaken to lessen tension in the South-East Asian region by calling for a peaceful political solution to the Kampuchean conflict.

Cutting across geographical boundaries, non-governmental groups have also been active in arousing the conscience of humanity towards the perils of nuclear escalation. While there has always been a universal fear of nuclear war, there has recently emerged a public outcry indicating a mass desire to be actively involved in the process of nuclear disarmament. When missiles are deployed within distance of one's community, one is justified in protesting against further deployment of weapons. When the next wind can deposit the debris of nuclear-weapons-test explosions in one's backyard, one has a right to protest against the continuation
of such a test. And when permanent damage to the whole of posterity anywhere becomes a possibility, one certainly has both the right and the duty to speak up against what appears to be a mindless process of escalation in nuclear weaponry.

Let us consider these facts, for example. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, world military expenditures in 1983 reached $US 750-800 billion at current prices. This is a staggering burden not only for the developed countries but also - and especially - for the smaller nations barely able to cope with their debt-service problems.

The Philippines as a medium-sized developing country sees a disturbing trend in resources being allocated to a futile arms race when these could have been better devoted to development. The experts' study of the relationship between disarmament and development completed in 1981 bears out the close correlation between the twin goals of disarmament and development.

It is no less true today than when the United Nations was founded that beating swords into ploughshares is the only way out of this dilemma. We submit that all countries, regardless of size or power, have a stake in this issue and that it is imperative for the United Nations once again to take the lead in acting as the principal forum for negotiations on these issues.

In his statement before the General Assembly this year, the Foreign Minister of the Philippines Mr. Arturo M. Tolentino, had this to say on the subject of nuclear weapons:

"The subject of nuclear arms and their control has for too long been cluttered with the doctrines, concepts, and esoteric jargon of the war-room strategist and nuclear-arms specialist. It is time for us to sweep all these aside and get down to the elementary facts which all of us can understand.

"First, nuclear weapons do not confer absolute security, and accumulating more and more of them diminishes security.

"Second, there can be no limited nuclear war. Once nuclear weapons are used their use will escalate into a full nuclear exchange that could spell the death of all of us. The profound global climatic changes following the onset of the nuclear night, as both Soviet and American scientists have recently described it, will not spare even those of us outside the immediate areas of nuclear blast and radiation.

"Thirdly, human civilization as we know it will be effectively exterminated." (A/39/PV.11, p. 35)
These are the facts, the reality of the peril that confronts mankind. Yet we are witnesses to an alarming lack of progress in nuclear arms control, in efforts to reduce and finally to eliminate nuclear weapons. We see instead a frenzied rush to increase and deploy nuclear arsenals. Outer space, man's common heritage, threatens to be a new arena of super-Power nuclear confrontation.

Nuclear arms control negotiations have turned into esoteric exercises among officials and specialists who often find agreement difficult, if not impossible, because it fails to satisfy their perceptions of national security. But there is irony in what we see – the ever-increasing numbers of the very peoples who are to be "protected" demanding the abolition of nuclear weapons and who, despite assurances that nuclear weapons are for their safety and protection, want no part of them because nuclear weapons provide not protection, but assured mutual destruction.

There is nothing much or good to say of a world that drives its youth to seek alternative ways of dying – including the use of cyanide poison pills – rather than face the prospect of the agonizing end that is in store for survivors of a nuclear war.

The peoples of the world have the right to demand that nuclear weapons never be used and that they be finally eliminated. For the survival of mankind cannot be the exclusive business of the nuclear-weapons States. Survival on our planet is the business of us all.

The Philippines earnestly hopes, and joins the many voices who strongly urge for this to happen, that the nuclear super-Powers will find it possible to return at an early time to the nuclear-arms-reduction talks. As the Philippine Foreign Minister, Arturo M. Tolentino, recently said before the General Assembly:

"The nuclear Powers have among them more than enough of the instruments of nuclear death to extinguish the human race. By the same token, they have in their hands the power and the means to ensure the survival of human civilization on earth." (Ibid, p. 36)

What we have failed to attain is that most essential of the ingredients for peace: a strong political will and the courage to face the unknown perils which inhere even in a state of peace. Peace may have its perils but, surely, none even remotely comparable to those which would face us with the coming of Armageddon.

I suggest that our primary responsibility is clear: all of us must ensure the survival of the human race. Nothing takes precedence over this imperative task.
The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of France, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. de La BAUME (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to make a clarification concerning the statement made this morning by the representative of the Soviet Union. In the course of his statement, he alleged that France and other States were making efforts to stall the process of ratification of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and preventing it from becoming a meaningful instrument in the area of arms limitation.

My delegation rejects these allegations as being arbitrary and unfounded. France signed the Convention on 10 April 1981. Its ratification is within the purview of the competent French authorities.

My country considers, therefore, that any interpretation of that process as indicating any reservation concerning the treaty to which it attaches considerable importance is unjustified and mistaken.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.