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CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka): For the third year in succession, the delegations of Egypt and Sri Lanka are associated together in an initiative to submit to this Committee a draft resolution which seeks to prevent an arms race in outer space. I have the honour this year to introduce this draft resolution (A/C.1/39/L.37). The list of sponsors is not yet complete and will be announced in due course.

The statements made by many delegations in the general debate focused on the alarming danger of an arms race in outer space. Clearly, this danger is more imminent today than it ever was before. We are aware of plans to develop new, and even unverifiable, weapons systems in order that outer space should become an arena of conflict. The widespread expressions of concern are sufficient grounds for urgent action on the part of the international community, and particularly on the part of those States with a space capability.

My delegation has spoken at length on this issue and I do not propose on this occasion to repeat the arguments in favour of preventing an arms race in outer space. Suffice it to say that now, 27 years after 1957, we have reached a watershed in man's use of outer space. We are faced with a choice between co-operation and confrontation. Even as I speak, human beings are in space demonstrating the immense possibilities that lie ahead in man's use of space. These possibilities must be used for peaceful purposes exclusively.
Last year after prolonged negotiations, we were successful in adopting resolution 38/70, which represented the only resolution adopted on this subject at last year's session of the General Assembly. That in itself was a major achievement. It was consolidated by the fact that 147 Member States voted for the resolution. To our great disappointment, however, the Conference on Disarmament was unable to reach agreement on a mandate for action on this item in an ad hoc committee. At the same time, the international community has observed in 1984 that both super-Powers have publicly acknowledged their readiness to embark on bilateral negotiations. The commencement of these negotiations cannot come a day too soon. With these bilateral negotiations, it follows as a logical corollary that the Conference on Disarmament — the sole multilateral negotiating body — must also be seized of the subject within the framework of an ad hoc committee with a view to negotiating a multilateral agreement or agreements on this important matter.

International opinion has become increasingly concerned about the dangers of an arms race involving outer space. The Charter provision requesting States to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations must now be extended to the area of outer space. Existing international instruments and commitments appear to be ineffective to prevent what is being referred to as the "weaponization" of space and unless we act now we shall not be able to arrest and reverse this new and terrible phase in man's use of space. The impact of these developments is to undermine the maintenance of international peace and security and the promotion of international co-operation and understanding, to which we have all pledged ourselves in the Charter and in treaties. It seems vitally important to reaffirm today articles III and IV of the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies. There can be no room for any ambiguity regarding the use of space. Our intention is to prevent an arms race and not to legitimize in any way the placing of weapons in space.

The draft resolution I have introduced is substantially the same as resolution 38/70, with some modifications. It has become necessary, for example, to update that resolution in recognition of the agreement in principle to have bilateral negotiations, although these negotiations have yet to take place. Such negotiations should be linked to negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. We
have also had to stress the danger posed to mankind by an imminent arms race in space and the development of new weapons systems. The quest for invulnerability in space and the search for an unverifiable weapon is futile and only fuels the arms race at a cost far greater than that invested in earlier programmes. The contradiction between the insistence on a verifiable ban on space weapons and the search for unverifiable weapons is dangerously illogical.

May I take the opportunity to point out a typographical error that appears in operative paragraph 2, where the word "arena" has been mistyped as "area". I shall, therefore, re-read operative paragraph 2:

"Further reaffirms that general and complete disarmament under effective international control warrants that outer space shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it shall not become an arena for an arms race;"

Last year 147 States voted affirmatively for this resolution. My delegation is hopeful that this year all delegations will find it possible to support this resolution. We are all aware of the technical complexity of the problem, but this is no excuse for inaction on our part. There can be no limited arms race in outer space just as there can be no limited nuclear war. The urgency of preventing an arms race is of overriding importance. I trust, therefore, that this resolution will be accepted. Let us all be true to the words on a plaque left on the moon which reads: "We came in peace for all mankind."

As I stated in the general debate, my delegation hopes that there will be a single resolution on this critically important matter this year, as happened in 1983. The door for negotiation is open on the basis that we are committed to preventing an arms race in outer space.

Mr. GRUNDMANN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.15 entitled "Prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons".

As the discussion on agenda item 64 and that of the recent session of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament make clear, the prohibition of chemical weapons is given great attention. There is a growing awareness that the production of modern chemical weapons would add to the threat to international peace and security which
already emanates from the nuclear arms race and would make the possibility of the application of chemical weapons more probable. Therefore, a new round of a chemical arms race must be prevented. Based on the results reached so far in the negotiations it is imperative to intensify efforts to expedite the preparation of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. This is what draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.15 is aimed at. The draft resolution takes into consideration that the work of the Chemical Weapons Committee of the Conference on Disarmament is, in accordance with its mandate, directed at the full and complete process of negotiating, developing and preparing the convention and that in 1984 a preliminary draft of some of its provisions was prepared. But now, after the 1984 session of the Conference on Disarmament, it has become obvious in which direction the efforts should be intensified.

The draft resolution before us is based on resolution 38/187 A. The first preambular paragraph recalls paragraph 75 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which characterizes the prohibition of chemical weapons as one of the most urgent measures of disarmament. Consequently, the need for the earliest possible conclusion of a convention has again been reaffirmed in the third preambular paragraph.
In view of the growing awareness of the fact that the qualitative improvement and further development of chemical weapons will inevitably complicate current negotiations, the fifth preambular paragraph draws attention to the intended production and deployment of qualitatively new chemical weapons. The seventh preambular paragraph underlines the necessity that all States - today more than ever before - display a constructive approach to such negotiations and the political will to elaborate the convention. Taking into account that the creation of chemical-weapon-free zones would have stimulating effects on a comprehensive prohibition, the ninth preambular paragraph takes note of relevant proposals. It also takes into consideration the positive and substantive discussion of this concept.

The basic concern of this draft resolution is expressed in operative paragraph 3. The Geneva Conference on Disarmament is urged to intensify the negotiations in the relevant Ad Hoc Committee with a view to achieving accord on a chemical-weapons convention at the earliest possible date and, for this purpose, to proceed immediately to drafting such a convention for submission to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

Operative paragraph 4 calls on all States to conduct serious negotiations in good faith and to refrain from any action that could impede negotiations, especially concerning the development and production of any new types of chemical weapons, as well as the deployment of chemical weapons altogether on the territory of other States.

My delegation wishes to inform the Committee that it supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.24 and, like last year, has become a co-sponsor. We consider the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.15 as complementary to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.24.

My delegation expresses the hope that the draft resolution I have just introduced will continue to find broad support in the interest of the speedy elaboration of the chemical weapons convention.

Mr. NATORF (Poland): The discussions in our Committee this year have once again reflected the growing concern of the international community over the dangers stemming from the continuing presence of such indiscriminate weapons of
mass destruction as the chemical weapons and the still by far insufficient progress in negotiations towards their complete and effective prohibition and destruction. This concern was also the driving force behind the many voices heard here, demanding urgently increased and accelerated efforts, in particular in the Conference on Disarmament, to that end.

It is with all this in mind that I wish today to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Norway, Rwanda, Spain, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Poland draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.24 under agenda item 64, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". I wish to add here that while the names of some of the sponsors did not appear in document A/C.1/39/L.24, all of them should be regarded as original sponsors and I would like to request the Rapporteur that this fact be duly reflected in the report of the Committee on agenda item 64.

In elaborating this draft, the sponsors adhered to the pattern of earlier so-called "traditional" resolutions on this subject, and in particular General Assembly resolution 38/187 B of 20 December 1983.

In the preamble, we recall the previous resolutions of the General Assembly relating to the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and to their destruction, and reaffirm the urgent necessity of strict observance by all States of the two international instruments now in force pertaining to the prohibition of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to the elimination of the latter.

The work of the Conference on Disarmament in 1984 regarding the prohibition of chemical weapons, and in particular the progress achieved in its Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, has been duly recorded and appreciated both in the preamble and in operative paragraph 1.

Operative paragraph 3 urges the Conference to intensify, during its 1985 session, the negotiations on a convention in this regard and to reinforce further its efforts, inter alia, by increasing the time during the year that it devotes to such negotiations, with a view to the final elaboration of such a convention. This provision stems directly from the last preambular paragraph and is also in full
conformity with paragraph 12 (c) of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which is contained in paragraph 98 of the report of the Conference (A/39/27).

The mention in the same operative paragraph 3 of the re-establishment by the Conference in 1985 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons with the 1984 mandate is in accordance with paragraph 12 (d) of the Ad Hoc Committee's report that I have just mentioned. The remaining operative paragraphs are self-explanatory.

The sponsors hope that this draft resolution will enjoy the unanimous support of the First Committee and that it will be adopted by consensus. Such a consensus would in our view contribute to further progress in this important area of disarmament.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In the discussion which is coming to a close in the First Committee, the overwhelming majority of delegations have expressed profound concern at the continuing accumulation of enormous arsenals of death, including particularly the growth in nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

It is extremely important to stop and turn back the flywheel of this arms race, a race of existing weapons. But no less important is it to prevent this arms race from developing in new directions, and the decisions of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament called for this. We have in mind in particular paragraphs 39 and 77 of the Final Document of the session.
In connection with this urgent task, 25 delegations representing various regions of the planet are submitting for discussion in the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63 entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". The Byelorussian SSR has the honour to submit it on behalf of the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe, as well as itself.

In submitting this draft resolution, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR would like to stress the importance and the advisability of a preventive approach to the prohibition of new types of weapons - that is, prohibiting them prior to the time when they take their place in the arsenals of Governments and States. The effectiveness of such an approach is seen convincingly in the successful effect of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques and the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof. On the other hand, experience shows how difficult it is to liquidate such instruments once they have materialized.

In this connection, we note with satisfaction that in the present discussion a number of delegations of different political orientations have spoken in favour of a preventive approach to the prohibition of such weapons, in particular in the context of preserving outer space for exclusively peaceful use. Provisions to this effect are contained in the political documents of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. In fact, no delegation disputes the real need to prevent the appearance of new instruments and systems of weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, there are certain divergences in respect to how this goal should be most effectively reached.

In taking into account all of its previous approaches to resolving this problem, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63 was drafted. It calls for both types of approaches which have been proposed by the parties, one being the preparation of an all-encompassing agreement prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types
of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, and also the preparation of possible agreements on particular types of such weapons. This is all to be entrusted to the Conference on Disarmament. It is also important as a first step towards resolving the task of prohibiting the appearance of new instruments and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Such a step could be in the form of declarations, identical in substance, by the States permanent members of the Security Council as well as by other militarily significant States that they would refrain from developing new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. Such declarations could be approved thereafter by a decision of the Security Council. Such an appeal is contained in the draft resolution.

Finally, the draft resolution contains an appeal to all States to refrain from any action which could adversely affect existing talks, and also to undertake efforts to ensure that ultimately scientific and technological achievements may be used solely for peaceful purposes.

Preventing the appearance of new weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons will make it possible to limit the channels of the arms race and to protect the future of humanity from the dangers of such new departures and will make a substantial contribution to the struggle for the liquidation of the nuclear threat. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, on behalf of the 25 sponsors, urges other delegations to support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.63.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegations of Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and Uruguay, I have the privilege of introducing to the Committee draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.60.

The purpose of this text is expressed in the two operative paragraphs:

"The General Assembly,

..."

"Takes note of the report by the Secretary-General (A/39/488), to which is annexed the report of the Consultant Experts designated by him concerning the implementation of the provisions of resolution 37/98 D, paragraph 7, and of resolution 38/187 C;

"Notes with satisfaction that with the submission of the report of the Consultant Experts the provisions for the implementation of resolution 37/98 D are completed."
The first preambular paragraph recalls that the General Assembly, under its resolution 37/98 D, paragraph 7, had requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified consultant experts, to devise procedures for the investigation of information concerning activities that may constitute a violation of the Geneva Protocol or of the relevant rules of customary international law and to assemble and organize systematically documentation relating to the identification of signs and symptoms associated with the use of such agents—these being chemical agents—as a means of facilitating such investigations and the medical treatment that might be required.

In the report drawn up last year, contained in the annex to document A/38/435, the Consultant Experts noted that they had not been able to consider in substance certain aspects of the procedures to be established.

The Assembly, therefore, in resolution 38/187 C requested the Secretary-General to complete during 1984, with the assistance of the same Consultant Experts, the task entrusted to him under the terms of paragraph 7 of resolution 37/98 D and to report to the thirty-ninth session.

The report of the Secretary-General, dated 2 October 1984, contains in its annex the final report of the Consultant Experts. This document, which is outstanding in quality, deals principally with the investigative procedures. It sets forth a very comprehensive set of measures relating to the organization and conduct of possible investigations concerning activities which may constitute a violation of rules of international law prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. It also contains a section regarding the assembling and systematic organization of documentation.

Finally, in a further section, the Consultant Experts deal with questions pertaining to the updating of technical and administrative data contained in the report and the maintenance of adequate administrative support to enable the Secretariat to carry out the duties assigned to it. They feel in this connection that the services of a qualified consultant expert would be necessary. It appears, however, that such assistance would be required only at a particular time and for limited periods. For this reason, the present draft resolution, if adopted, will not carry any financial implications for the time being.

At this point, I should like to pay tribute to the Consultant Experts: General Ezz, who directed the work, Dr. Segarra, Dr. Ahlberg, Ambassador Flowerree,
Professor Machata, Professor Sur and his predecessor, Professor Bretton. With the introduction of their report the establishment of the provisions provided for by resolution 37/98 D has thus been completed. It seems to us useful that the General Assembly should formally take note of this. The usefulness of the interim procedure set up two years ago is no longer subject to challenge. The events of last spring and the investigation carried out by the Secretary-General confirmed this completely.
We should like to recall that that provisional procedure is in no way binding; it adds nothing to the commitments of States parties to the Protocol or to the obligations deriving from customary international law; it creates no new legal obligations. We hope that the negotiations begun at the Conference on Disarmament will in the near future lead to the conclusion of a treaty containing legally binding procedures relating to the verification of violations of the Geneva Protocol and applicable rules of customary international law.

For the present, the interim procedure established two years ago, the provisions of which have now been rounded out, expresses the vigilance of the United Nations in seeking to ensure compliance with one of the fundamental provisions of international law, namely, the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons. It tends to strengthen the authority of that provision and will, we hope, contribute to forestalling any action that might violate it.

Mr. NORDENFELT (Sweden): I am speaking to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.52 concerning the 1980 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, together with three Protocols on non-detectable fragments, on mines, booby traps and other devices and on incendiary weapons.

The adoption of that Convention on 10 December 1980 was the result of several years of preparation. The fact that it entered into force on 2 December 1983 - that is, less than three years after its adoption - is a very encouraging indication of the desire in the international community progressively to develop international humanitarian law in this field and to give it effect. The draft resolution reflects the satisfaction felt at this positive development and also notes the possibilities laid down in the Convention for reviewing the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols and for further international standard setting relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered. The Convention and the three annexed Protocols have now been acceded to by 24 States parties. The draft resolution urges States which have not yet become parties to the Convention and its annexed Protocols to exert their best endeavours to do so as early as possible so that the instruments might ultimately obtain universality of adherence.
The sponsors of the draft resolution are the delegations of Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia and my own delegation, Sweden. On behalf of those sponsors, I would like to express the hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.52 will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. BARRERA (Philippines): The Philippines is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.36 on agenda item 60 (a), which calls for the consideration of guidelines for confidence-building measures. This draft resolution is sponsored by 36 States Members of the United Nations. The draft resolution recalls General Assembly resolution 38/73 A of 15 December 1983 and the useful work accomplished during the 1983 and 1984 sessions of the Disarmament Commission.

In the view of the Philippine delegation, confidence-building measures are particularly important in the present tense international situation. The prevention of war and of nuclear war, which would spell the end of civilization, should be of primary concern to all of us.

All States should be encouraged to explore ways in which the escalating mutual distrust and suspicion which divide humanity into armed camps could gradually be reversed and replaced by an environment of peace and security, or at least of minimum confidence and mutual accommodation.

In endorsing such a draft resolution, the Philippines reaffirms the need to institute confidence-building measures in various regions of the world. As we said in our first statement in the First Committee this year, we wish to reiterate that:

"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."

(A/C.1/39/PV.14, p. 66)
Confidence-building measures by themselves do not constitute disarmament. But they are as important as - and are, indeed, part and parcel of - any disarmament negotiation, agreement or treaty. For without a minimum of mutual confidence it would be extremely difficult to achieve any effective disarmament measure.

It is for this reason that we are supporting the move expressed in this draft resolution to request the Disarmament Commission, at its 1986 session, to continue and conclude the consideration of the item "Elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level". Similarly, we would request the Disarmament Commission to submit a report containing such guidelines to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

The world today is already living under the sombre shadows of complete annihilation and total destruction. We are at the eleventh, and possibly the final, hour. We have reached the decisive crossroads of human destiny. We should, for ourselves and for future generations, take a few steps back and away from the abyss of doom before it is too late. We should seriously ponder whether it may not be better instead - and perhaps easier for all of us - together to create a climate of confidence and an era of hope.

It is in this sense and spirit that we would like to request the support of all the delegations in the First Committee for the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.36.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.29, entitled "United Nations programme of fellowships on disarmament", is based on resolution 38/73 C of 15 December 1983, which was adopted by consensus.

The present draft resolution recognizes that the fellowship programme has made considerable progress during the year and acknowledges the support which a number of member States have accorded it. It seeks to strengthen the programme and extend it in the service of disarmament. It is our sincere hope therefore that this draft resolution, like its predecessors, will command the support of the Committee and be adopted by consensus.

The Nigerian delegation is introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.66, entitled "Prohibition of use of nuclear weapons", under item 59 (f) of the agenda, fully conscious of the grave danger to human survival posed by the existence of nuclear weapons, the priority which every country represented in this hall attaches to nuclear disarmament and, not least, the various obstacles, real or imaginary, which have stood in the way of nuclear disarmament over the last few decades.

In their unanimous Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa 20 years ago, the independent States of Africa rejected nuclear weapons for their region. Since then, the United Nations General Assembly has consistently adopted resolutions supportive of the African desire and critical of the country in that region that has sought to undermine it.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco of 1970 is eloquent testimony to the resolve of States in Latin America to ban nuclear weapons from that region.

The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi in March 1983, declared that nuclear weapons were not weapons of war but weapons of mass annihilation.

The leaders of the nuclear-weapon States, including the most important among them, have recognized in various public statements - in whatever language they put it - that nuclear war cannot be won and therefore must not be fought.
The profound concern of all peoples to remove the threat of nuclear war stems not merely from the abhorrence of war, but from the awful awareness that nuclear weapons seriously endanger the human species. Respected scientists across the ideological divide have produced unassailable conclusions that nuclear weapons do not enhance national security, that qualitative and quantitative superiority by one State over another is only ephemeral and that a nuclear attack massive enough to prevent retaliation by the other side would destroy most of the world, including the attackers themselves.

It is therefore clear that in the unique case of nuclear war there will be no victor. We shall all be victims.

The Nigerian delegation's draft resolution is prompted by its awareness of these facts and the common concern of all States to remove the horrible threat to the human species. If, as delegation after delegation has said in this hall, the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare should be strengthened because it is recognized that chemical weapons constitute a serious assault on human dignity and that all decent people should abhor their indiscriminate and horrible effects and work for an agreement to prohibit their use, then nuclear weapons, which are much more destructive and which threaten the very existence of mankind, should command at least the same level of attention and approach. That is why the Nigerian delegation proposes the draft resolution on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

We realize that the nuclear disarmament process is complicated and time-consuming. But we believe that nuclear-weapon States, which, it is generally agreed, maintain an acceptable parity in conventional weapons, would at least agree to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons while negotiations continued on their reduction and subsequent elimination.

We have proposed in our draft resolution what we consider the most simple and economical way of achieving some results. The procedure we propose would require little or no extra resources. The Plenipotentiary Conference could be arranged for dates immediately before or after one of the United Nations conferences that will deal with related subjects in 1985.
(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

My delegation's draft resolution is open to ideas and suggestions; it is concerned not with form or procedure but with substance. The spectre of nuclear weapons is so ominous that we must use whatever is at our disposal to attack and eliminate it. There is no golden way. The way we now propose is a simple one and we hope it will receive the support of every delegation.

I now turn to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.65 entitled "Review of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade". That draft resolution is the outcome of the Declaration itself, as annexed to resolution 35/46 of 3 December 1980. It is an enabling resolution, meant to ensure that the objectives of the programme are not forgotten.

Section II of the Declaration itself provides for implementation, review and appraisal. Paragraph 25 states that:

"In addition, the General Assembly will undertake at its fortieth session, in 1985, a review and appraisal, through the Disarmament Commission, of progress in the implementation of the measures identified in the present Declaration." (resolution 35/46, annex, para. 25)

These requirements are the sole objective of operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution. Operative paragraph 4 requests Member States to submit to the Secretary-General their views and suggestions.

We hope that this draft resolution will enjoy the support of all Member States, in furtherance of the objectives of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade.
Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to submit to the Committee draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.48, which is sponsored by the following 34 countries: Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and Zaire.

Since the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, Belgium has developed, in the form of a memorandum, the concept of a regional approach to disarmament. This is being conceived as a factor which would reinforce and expand the efforts to promote the common objective of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. On two occasions recently the General Assembly has endorsed, in the form of resolutions adopted by consensus, the concept that the regional approach to disarmament prepares and promotes a global approach.

The regional approach to disarmament is in no way incompatible with the principle of universality of the United Nations. It is in a certain sense an expression of the fact that disarmament is of interest to all countries and particularly those which have only rather small military forces. These, considering the objective conditions of their regions, are thus disposed to undertake certain specific disarmament measures. These initiatives should be encouraged by the United Nations. Regional organizations and non-governmental organizations would also find a role to play here.

Apart from the deliberations in the General Assembly and the resolutions which they engendered, efforts for the achievement of the objectives which they defined have been undertaken through diplomacy, particularly in Europe, but also in other regions. As far as Europe is concerned, mention could be made of the convening in January 1984 of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament, as part of the process initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Vienna Conference on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Central Europe. However, in other regions of the world the merits of the regional approach are apparent and have inspired very significant initiatives, which are set forth in the interesting and substantial report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations (A/39/485). They are also
reflected in various statements, documents and draft resolutions submitted to our Committee. In this connection I should like to mention the Lomé Peace Message, dated 9 August 1984, which is reproduced in document A/39/529. All this activity has provided motivation for a large number of sponsors from all regions of the world and the major ideological groups of States in the United Nations.

Belgium is very happy to have been at the conceptual origin of this new approach to disarmament. It does not seem to need any new abstract momentum provided by the General Assembly but rather should take tangible form on the spot. That is why, instead of the usual ritual adoption of a new resolution on this subject at each session of the General Assembly, Belgium has preferred to propose that the regional approach be the object of further discussion at our forty-second session, in three years.

At the present moment we can take note of the abundant harvest which will undoubtedly be gathered, and we shall see the lines along which this initiative should be pursued, which should, as the Prime Minister of Belgium stated in June 1983 in the Committee on Disarmament, create a system which would make it possible to compare experiences in regional disarmament, with total respect for the freedom of States and other regions themselves.

Let me express the hope that the First Committee will adopt draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.48 by consensus.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In the first place I should like to mention a slight amendment to operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.67, so that it would read as follows:

"Calls on the Security Council, as the only organ of the United Nations whose decisions have the element of enforceability, to hold a special session at a high level to give consideration to the escalating arms race with a view to bringing it to a halt".

As I said the other day, I wish to explain this draft resolution more clearly. As we all know, we are at the most critical time since the Second World War, with the very survival of mankind now at stake, because of nuclear weapons. The United Nations can and must be of significant use, in accordance with the Charter, to prevent these unprecedented dangers, as we are faced with the continuing and highly aggravated nuclear-arms race.
The matter of the proper functioning of the United Nations inevitably arises. Therefore it should be a question for the appropriate body whose decisions have the element of enforceability, and that is the Security Council. The only United Nations instrument that has the possibility of effecting some change in the Security Council, but it is hardly ever used on questions of disarmament. The Security Council ought to have a say on the question of disarmament and a particularly important say, because this emerges clearly from Article 24 of the Charter, which refers to the Security Council. It states: "to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations".

So far we have done very little towards achieving progress on disarmament - in fact two special sessions of the General Assembly on disarmament were held without achieving any actual results - but we have never tried to use the Security Council as the Charter provides for the Security Council to be used, to take effective action on disarmament. Therefore my suggestion is that we must proceed through the Security Council. Let us try that organ of the United Nations, which is so important for the problem of disarmament.

The Members of the United Nations have agreed to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the Charter. Article 26 of the Charter spells out:

"In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating ... plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments."

According to the Charter, the Security Council is responsible for formulating plans to be submitted to the Members for the regulation of armaments. This source of disarmament has never been tapped. Never before has the Security Council been used for improving the methods for disarmament. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, in my humble submission, the Security Council ought to be tapped as a means of bringing about disarmament.
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The question of the continuation of the present imminently dangerous acceleration of the arms race has to be discussed fully in the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter. It is, of course, discussed in the Conference on Disarmament, but I need not at this juncture enter into all the disadvantages that arise in the Conference on Disarmament, a body which does not fall within the provisions of the Charter.

The General Assembly, on the other hand, by its very nature and function, is hardly an appropriate body for undertaking negotiations and thereby reaching agreements; that is obvious. The Security Council, therefore, is the only proper forum for effective discussions towards reaching a solution. In the General Assembly thoughts can be expressed which can contribute to a discussion with a view to the solution of the problem, but they are merely thoughts, for the Assembly is not a forum for negotiations. The Security Council is the proper forum for meaningful and effective discussion, which can and must continue until a solution is found regarding the means for halting the arms race. It must be taken as an axiom that the Security Council must meet at a high level, and continue meeting - because it can continue meeting for any length of time - until it opens a way towards the cessation of the arms race.

The dangers are so great for all the world that the Security Council must be used. If it has not been used before, this is because it was not felt that there was so great a danger as there is today.

Thus, it is my suggestion that the views of the two super-Powers - on which the question of halting the arms race rests - can be discussed effectively in the Security Council. They are both there; it is a small forum; it is a responsible forum. This would open the way to finding a solution to the problem of the arms race, a solution which has to be found not merely because this is the fortieth anniversary of the Organization, but because of the great dangers involved.

The Security Council is so organized as to be able to function continuously, without interruption; therefore it can go on until it finds a solution.

No other body has these advantages; hence my draft resolution, which, since it is so short, I shall read out in full, as orally amended above:

"The General Assembly,

"Gravely concerned over the sharp deterioration in world affairs and the escalation of the arms race, particularly in new and more destructive nuclear
weapons, to a point where, every day, the two super-Powers produce at least four new nuclear weapons, adding to their quantity and quality.

"Concerned also over the vast expenditure, amounting to many billions of dollars, in preparation for a mutually and universally destructive confrontation, while millions are dying from famine this year,

"Considering that in these circumstances, coinciding as they are with the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the international community must cross the threshold and take a historical decision to bring the arms race to a halt before it is too late,

"Calls on the Security Council, as the only organ of the United Nations whose decisions have the element of enforceability, to hold a special session, at a high level, to give consideration to the escalating arms race with a view to bringing it to a halt,

"Requests the Secretary-General to report thereon to the General Assembly at its fortieth session". (A/C.1/39/L.67)

Mr. ADJOVI (Togo)(interpretation from French): In connection with our consideration of agenda item 60 (d), I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.59.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Angola, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Senegal, Singapore, Thailand, Uganda, and my own country, Togo. It is intended to be a simple procedural draft resolution within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign.

The purpose of the draft resolution is to contribute to promoting research and information on peace and development in the world, and it is in keeping with the active commitment of the majority of the third world countries to furthering policies of world peace, security and development. We believe that peace and security are essential for progress to better the lives of our long-suffering peoples. We consider the global arms race to be the major obstacle in the way of peace, security and development.

In its first five preambular paragraphs, the draft resolution before the Committee rightly recalls the need to inform public opinion on the dangers of the present situation with regard to the arms race, on the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign and on the arrangements required to achieve those objectives.
In recalling these matters the sponsors wish to lend full support to the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign, especially those directed at informing, educating and creating public understanding and support for the aims of the United Nations with respect to arms limitation and disarmament in all regions of the world. The sponsors wish to underscore that at this time of impasse and inaction in all disarmament negotiations, perhaps our only chance of safety lies in the pressure of collective public opinion in each country and throughout the world.

We believe that the World Campaign can be of use not only in educating and informing people, but that it is equally important to inform their political leaders and Governments, thereby helping to stimulate and create political pressure in favour of peace and disarmament. Consequently, if it is to be truly effective, the Campaign must be active and visible everywhere, and above all it must be continuous.

In this respect, the sponsors believe that it is necessary to provide regional arrangements. Hence, we have the sixth, seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, particularly the sixth preambular paragraph, which gives the reasons for the establishment of regional offices to conduct the activities of the World Disarmament Campaign.

The impact of a regional seminar on disarmament organized by the Secretariat once every two years, or even once a year, in the best of circumstances, will probably be shortlived and limited, unless we have a constant, vigorous programme of activity to inform and above all, to educate the peoples of each of the regions concerned about the problems in question. This is especially true of the developing countries, such as ours, where programmes of information, research, education and training with regard to arms limitation are generally insufficient and need to be better developed and encouraged. Developing and fostering these programmes everywhere, and especially in the developing countries, where they have so far been ill-adapted, is vital for the realization of the principle of the universality of the World Disarmament Campaign, and we believe, as is pointed out in the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/39/492, dealing with the World Disarmament Campaign, that the offices in the field are in close contact with their local constituencies and, therefore, are best able to decide on the measures to be adopted. These local offices would also be best suited to make the documents and activities of the World Disarmament Campaign correspond with the local needs, in order to ensure maximum effectiveness and impact without changing
the content or in any way modifying the objectivity of these documents and activities.

It is against this background that the draft resolution we are now introducing takes note in the ninth preambular paragraph of the Lomé Peace Message adopted by the National Seminar for Peace and Disarmament held at Lomé from 6 to 9 August, with the assistance of the United Nations and underscores in the tenth preambular paragraph the fact that the General Assembly is convinced that the implementation of the recommendation contained in the Lomé Message would contribute significantly to the effective promotion of the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign.

The eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth preambular paragraphs relate to financial and practical considerations, constituting a further reason which prompted the sponsors to support the idea of the establishment of regional offices for World Disarmament Campaign activities in connection with the cost-effectiveness of the operation. Given the financial difficulties which the Member States and the United Nations must increasingly face, we believe that the United Nations programme of activities should be implemented in such a way as to ensure maximum effectiveness at minimum cost. With respect to the programme of the World Disarmament Campaign, we believe that, generally speaking, it would be more efficient and economical to implement the programme through the local offices created for this purpose together with the Headquarters of the Secretariat, which would provide a general framework for the co-ordination of activities world-wide. This approach would ensure savings resulting, for example, from the reduction of the number of Secretariat members who would have to travel around the world to organize and participate in various activities in order to ensure the universality of the Campaign and would similarly reduce the frequency of such travel. The savings thus effected could be used, for instance, to develop and carry out more activities aimed at reaching a growing number of people in the Member States, especially in the developing countries. Generally speaking, the dollar continues to buy more services in the developing countries than in Geneva or New York. Consequently, dollar for dollar, it would be more economical to print and distribute documents at the local level and to organize national, regional or subregional seminars also at the local level.

Decentralization has a further economic advantage if one bears in mind the fact that the programme of the World Disarmament Campaign is intended to be financed from the budgetary resources of the United Nations, voluntary contributions of the Member States and private sources.
A growing number of Member States, particularly developing countries such as ours, desire to make voluntary contributions in order to finance the World Disarmament Campaign. But their critical economic difficulties drastically limit their ability to find such funds, especially in convertible currencies. However, we can provide other kinds of material support, such as funds in non-convertible local currencies, office space for local offices, transport, and so forth. For local activities in our respective regions, under the auspices of the Campaign programme, the existence of local or regional machinery to accomplish the aims of the Campaign would facilitate the activities. Private local sources, including non-governmental organizations, might also be more inclined to support activities which are administered at the local level.

Our proposal does not provide for the establishment of new structures, as that would require a large quantity of additional resources from the already tight United Nations budget; rather, it is aimed at strengthening opportunities for voluntary contributions to an important United Nations programme.

The proposal aims essentially at redeployment of existing resources in the Secretariat, in order to establish regional offices for the purposes of the World Disarmament Campaign, upon the request of countries in the regions concerned. This is clearly set forth in operative paragraph 1 of our draft resolution.

Disarmament is first and foremost a political problem linked to the vital security interests of all States. Accordingly, the World Disarmament Campaign should be seen not only as an information exercise, but also as a political programme demanding active participation by the Member States.

Given the complexity of the present international situation, progress in disarmament and in the related security issues, should first take into consideration the specific situations and conditions prevailing in particular countries and regions. The process of developing global consensus in favour of general and complete disarmament will probably emerge gradually at the national and regional levels rather than through a completely centralized approach.

As was spelled out in an exhaustive report of the Secretary-General on regional disarmament:
(Mr. Adjoji, Togo)

"To set in motion processes in each region to meet the above aims and in order to give to regional disarmament efforts the necessary thrust and continuity, there may be a need for strengthening or creating mechanisms, institutions or arrangements at the regional level which would allow initiatives to develop concepts and approaches to be discussed and concrete steps to be negotiated. Experience shows that the existence of institutional frameworks has sometimes promoted initiatives and helped to sustain efforts, even when difficulties were encountered." (A/35/416, para. 247)

These are the outlines of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.59, which embodies the will of the sponsors to contribute to the implementation of a World Disarmament Campaign that will prove effective in reaching its objectives.

The sponsors of the draft resolution hope that it can be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Cyprus, Ambassador Rossides, has asked to be able to supplement the introduction of his draft resolution by a few sentences. I gladly call on the representative of Cyprus, Mr. Rossides, for that purpose.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I have only a slight correction: namely, in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.67, where reference is made to the "two super-Powers", the text should read the "two major Powers".

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.