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GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. Tornudd (Finland): Several items or sub-items on the agenda of the General Assembly this year are related to disarmament studies, and I should like to make some general remarks on that subject.

Disarmament in the widest sense of the word is a very broad area, and there are obviously many problems within it which can usefully be analysed in detailed studies. The General Assembly has initiated a sizeable number of United Nations disarmament studies during the past years. Their purpose, as stated in the recent United Nations Disarmament Yearbook, is to provide information which may facilitate better understanding of the problems of the arms race and disarmament and to assist the negotiating process through the analysis of specific matters related to negotiations in progress. At the same time, much academic and semi-academic research is going on in the field of disarmament. Nobody can claim that there is a lack of material on the subject for the interested student.

There seem to be rather few general guidelines regarding the procedures to be followed in the preparation of United Nations disarmament studies. It might be useful if the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies could look further into this matter and, if possible, establish some rules and principles on the basis of practice and accumulated experience.

Until now most of the actual work has been done in the framework of study groups, appointed to assist the Secretary-General, who carries the final responsibility for presenting the completed studies to the General Assembly. The members of the study groups are normally called governmental experts, who do not necessarily work under continuous instructions or supervision by their Governments,
but who are expected to reflect in a general way the views of their Governments without formally committing them to the outcome of the studies. Above all, the study groups work under the principle of decision-making by consensus.

There has been a great variation in the size of the study groups. Experience has shown that a large group needs more time than a smaller one, and this should be taken into account from the outset in planning the work. Probably there are in most cases good reasons to be cautious in establishing large groups with more than, say, about a dozen members.

Another thing to consider at an early stage of the work is the preparation of material to be used as a basis for discussion in the study groups. If the subject matter is not very new or is controversial, a good solution in many cases could be to have preliminary studies prepared by consultants, by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research or by other institutes, available already at the beginning of the work in the study groups, to be then refined and developed by the experts.

The need for such preliminary work also depends to some extent on the composition of the respective study groups. Their composition is of course mostly determined by the Governments concerned, but on the whole it would probably be desirable to secure both competent diplomats and competent non-diplomats as members. At the very least, the methods and practices of diplomatic work should not be allowed to dominate the work of the study groups. For example, in strictly political negotiations problems can sometimes be solved by bargaining, by making reciprocally balancing concessions in different parts of documents under preparation. The United Nations disarmament studies, on the other hand, are supposed to make comprehensive analyses without ignoring important aspects for the sake of political balancing.
The United Nations disarmament studies have at least one principal advantage over the products of academic research on disarmament matters. They carry the authority of the United Nations and implicitly of the Member Governments whose views have been reflected in their contents. There is therefore a temptation to regard them, and to elaborate them, as diplomatic documents, negotiated between appointed government representatives. This temptation should, however, be resisted. In particular, the fact that some Governments may not have taken specific stands on certain matters should not prevent their discussion in the studies concerned. On the other hand, it is hardly necessary to burden the texts with summaries of all the specific views of all the Governments which have designated experts for the study groups.

It is an understatement to say that the rule of consensus is not always easy to apply successfully in practice. This year we have had evidence of the difficulties in two documents before the First Committee: the reports of the Secretary-General on the studies dealing with nuclear-weapon-free zones, and military use of research and development. Slow progress under the consensus rule has also in the past delayed the adoption of other disarmament studies.

The study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects was undertaken on the initiative of Finland. Our comments, illustrating the general problems of United Nations disarmament studies, are to some extent based on the experiences of this study. At the same time they are directed to the report of the Secretary-General in document A/40/379.
In principle, the consensus method is extremely flexible. It makes it possible, if necessary, to adopt not only statements and evaluations on which there is full agreement in the group concerned but also passages reflecting different points of view. This practice was often followed in the Study Group on nuclear-weapon-free zones. Nevertheless, the Study Group was unable, even with the extended time granted to it in a General Assembly resolution last year, to agree on a number of paragraphs in its draft study. It is striking to note that the largest numbers of outstanding difficulties pertained to the historical part of the study - in other words, to the supposedly factual description of events intended to illustrate the experiences of proposed and existing zones. Even the presentation of historical facts becomes controversial if some members feel that the selection of facts and the manner in which they are introduced is one-sided or otherwise objectionable, leading either to demands for deletion or to a need to introduce additional viewpoints. Greater flexibility and a stronger spirit of accommodation would have been needed in order to make the rule of consensus work productively in these cases.

The whole draft study on nuclear-weapon-free zones, as it stood when the Study Group ended its session in February 1985, contains 262 paragraphs, of which 29 were still under discussion, in some cases together with proposed alternatives or proposals for additions. In other words, close to 90 per cent of the study was adopted by consensus, including the important chapters on the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones and on the responsibilities of zonal States, as well as - with the exception of about four lines of text - on the responsibilities of nuclear-weapon States and other extra-zonal States.

In the opinion of my delegation, a fair and reasonable final text could be easily worked out on the basis of existing material, involving the deletion of
some proposed paragraphs and the redrafting of some of the others. The remaining work could, in our view, be done by a single person in one day, by a small group of persons in perhaps a few days. The Study Group, with its 21 members and much more time at its disposal, was not able to cope with the difficulties. Naturally, we in Finland have given much thought to the question of what should have been done and what should be done now. A simple way to follow up the work would be to propose a resolution authorizing the Secretary-General to appoint either a single consultant or a small group of experts to complete the study at a minimum of extra cost. We have found that there is wide support for this idea. Others, however, have indicated that they regard such a procedure as unsuitable for a number of reasons having to do both with the procedure as a matter of principle and with the status of the text that thus would be produced.

Another possibility we considered was to extract a part of the draft study adopted by consensus in the Study Group and insert it as an annex to a resolution in the General Assembly. In particular, the 16 sub-paragraphs containing basic principles for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones could have been presented in this manner for endorsement by the General Assembly. However, it has been pointed out that there are serious objections to this procedure as well, in particular because some members of the Study Group have considered that their adherence to a consensus on certain portions of the text is no longer valid, in view of the lack of consensus on the study as a whole.

To sum up, there have been objections to several different ideas which my delegation has discussed informally this year with interested countries in our efforts to salvage at least some of the results undeniably reached in the work of the Study Group. We regret very much that no immediate progress seems possible on this matter. The concern shown in some quarters over the fate of this study seems
to be somewhat out of proportion to its significance. Its purpose was to analyse
the problem, to present different views and thus promote a more informed and
intelligent discussion of the subject. It did not purport to advocate any
particular view concerning the desirability or possibility of establishing
nuclear-weapon-free zones in any particular parts of the world. It would not have
compromised the position of any Government on any of the issues examined.

The unfinished draft study is now in the hands of the Secretary-General. The
members of the Study Group have it as well, and interested Governments can surely
have access to it through the Secretariat. My delegation believes that this
material is of value and that the whole subject matter of nuclear-weapon-free zones
needs to be taken up again for close examination in the United Nations framework.
The comprehensive study made in 1975 is, of course, still available and pertinent,
but every year brings new evidence of developments and interest shown in the
concept of a zonal approach to nuclear disengagement. The setback all of us have
suffered in regard to the preparation of an updated study will not prevent Finland
from reverting to this matter at a later stage.

Mr. KEBEDE (Ethiopia): Sir, permit me at the outset to express to you
the warm congratulations of the Ethiopian delegation on your election to the
chairmanship of this important Committee. We are delighted to see you and the
other officers of the Committee guiding our work with such commendable diplomatic
skill and efficiency, and I should like to assure you of our full co-operation in
carrying out the tasks entrusted to you.
If there is any single issue that continues to command the undivided attention of the international community, it is the pressing problem of the arms race. Indeed, this question has been uppermost in the mind of every responsible man and woman ever since Hiroshima and Nagasaki had the misfortune of being the first victims of the deadly and devastating weapon known as the atomic bomb. It is no wonder, therefore, that the United Nations has been preoccupied with the maintenance of international peace and security and its most important corollary, the quest for general and complete disarmament.

The painstaking efforts of the United Nations in this field notwithstanding, an end to the suicidal march towards mass annihilation does not seem to be in sight. Instead the threat of nuclear confrontation and global war seems to have assumed an ominous dimension. The increasing utilization of the benefits of modern technology for the further militarization of outer space and the advent of self-serving and irresponsible military doctrines designed to enhance the nuclear posture of some nuclear-weapon States seem to have added yet another dimension to this threat.

We cannot but express our grave concern over the unabated spiral in the arms race, most particularly over the dangerous course that the so-called strategic defence initiative (SDI) is likely to set in motion. Contrary to the arguments advanced by its initiators, SDI is a resources-consuming project likely to bolster the false notion entertained by those who are bent on acquiring a first-strike nuclear capability. If implemented this programme is certainly bound to get us ever closer to the brink of a global nuclear war. Ethiopia therefore considers SDI and its fundamental premise to be unjustified. We do not believe that its realization would augur well for the security of its promoters, much less for the maintenance of international peace and security.
However, much as we are haunted by such fears and concerns, we are encouraged by the recent change in the international political climate which seems to have prompted the two major nuclear-Powers to pursue the path of negotiation in the solution of global problems, in particular those pertaining to space and nuclear arms. We are gratified to note that the Geneva arms talks between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have been resumed. We are equally heartened by the prospects for progress to be made in this field as a result of the forthcoming summit between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan scheduled to take place in Geneva early next month.

In the same vein we welcome the unilateral decision of the USSR to stop nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985 to 1 January 1986 with a provision extending the cut-off date provided that the United States joins the moratorium on such tests. My Government firmly believes that such unilateral initiatives would go a long way in creating the necessary climate for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. We also welcome the signing of the Treaty establishing a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. It is our ardent hope that the nuclear-weapon States will respect the provisions of the Treaty and allow the States in the region to determine their future in an atmosphere of peace and stability.

One important development worth mentioning during the current year has been the successful convening of the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Final Declaration of the Conference has not only underlined the conviction of the parties concerned that the Treaty was essential to the maintenance of international security and their support for the objectives of the Treaty but also emphasized that

"the nuclear-weapon States should make greater efforts to ensure effective measures for the cessation of the nuclear-arms race at an early date, for
nuclear disarmament and for a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control".

The Conference's affirmation of the determination of the signatory States to strengthen further the barriers against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, coming as it does at a moment when the temptation to acquire nuclear capability seems to be ever present, is indeed reassuring.

My Government is steadfast in its conviction that the highest priority should be accorded to the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. Although the relentless efforts by some quarters to play down and erode the priority accorded this issue continues to be an impediment in multilateral endeavours aimed at banning nuclear testing in its entirety, the urgent need for starting negotiations in this sphere has never been as acute as it is today. In this respect we note with regret the failure of the Conference on Disarmament to yield any concrete results aimed at negotiating a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. We urge the nuclear-weapon States to refrain from injecting peripheral issues likely to cripple the only multilateral forum and to start negotiating in good faith and demonstrate the political will necessary for the institutionalization of a workable method of dialogue. The stakes involved are too high to be subordinated to the exigencies of basic negotiating tactics. Any progress in this field requires an acute awareness of the consequences arising from delays in this important field of international endeavour.

With respect to the only substantive negotiation that is being conducted at the Conference on Disarmament, namely, the negotiation to elaborate a draft convention on a chemical-weapons ban, we are concerned over the slow progress registered thus far. Although admittedly highly complex issues are involved in the negotiations, we cannot but express the widely held view that failure to conclude
the drafting of a convention within a reasonable time frame can only further complicate an already intricate state of affairs. Our suspicion has been strengthened by recent attempts aimed at introducing new chemical weapons. This trend cannot be allowed to continue. Additional efforts are therefore urgently needed - above all, a genuine willingness and readiness by the parties to negotiate within a realistic framework of international and national verification systems.

We subscribe to the view that the quest for peace and disarmament must be based on genuine concern for the ultimate fate of the only world we collectively inhabit. A co-operative spirit must replace policies based on hostility and confrontation.

The most important preoccupation of the community of nations and the most pressing issue of our time is perhaps the prevention of nuclear war. In a world saturated with sophisticated nuclear weapons, the special responsibilities to be assumed by the nuclear-weapon States cannot be understated. Regrettable though it may be, the fact remains that mankind has become a hostage and that the continuity and ultimate existence of our civilization seem to depend on the capability of these States to prevent nuclear war. We believe that effective measures must be negotiated to prevent nuclear war and we continue to hold the view that such a task can best be undertaken at the Conference on Disarmament.
(Mr. Kebede, Ethiopia)

With the Committee's indulgence, I should now like to refer to an issue which is very close to the heart of my Government and, indeed, all Governments in my geographical region. On many occasions Africa has voiced its strong opposition to and condemnation of the arms race and its fundamental precepts. African States have repeatedly expressed their collective desire to keep Africa away from nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons out of Africa. This long-standing yearning for the attainment of peace throughout the continent notwithstanding, and in spite of the declaration of Africa as a nuclear-free zone, the racist régime in Pretoria and its Western collaborators are making frantic efforts with a view to enhancing the nuclear capability of the apartheid régime. This ominous development not only threatens the security of the front-line States, which continue to be subjected to South Africa's aggression and schemes of destabilization, but also poses a threat to the peaceful progress and survival of the entire continent.

Aware of the gravity of the problem, the Regional Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa, which was held in Lomé from 13 to 15 August 1985, called upon

"... all States, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and other agencies and institutions in all States to terminate any form of collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa in the nuclear field until that régime opens up all its nuclear facilities to IAEA safeguards and inspection and abandons its policies of aggression, internal oppression and apartheid."

It is our ardent hope that this modest appeal will be heeded by the nuclear-weapon States, most particularly by those which have long condoned the illegal and bellicose policy pursued by the terrorist régime in Pretoria.
Another issue inextricably linked to the security of my geographical region is the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean. Much as we welcome and support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones all over the world, we attach particular importance to the attainment of the noble goal of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. Desirous of preserving their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, the littoral and hinterland States have endeavoured, within the framework of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, to convene an international conference on the Indian Ocean as a prelude to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. That the Conference has been postponed year after year, in spite of General Assembly resolutions calling for its convening, is a matter of regret to my country and all other States in the region. It is our conviction that the full and active participation in the Conference of the permanent members of the Security Council is an essential prerequisite for the success of the Conference, and we hope that those States will assume their special responsibilities and enable the littoral and hinterland States to attain the lofty ideals enunciated in the Declaration.

Finally, I should like to underscore the need to perceive the devastating effects of nuclear armaments in their global context. No nuclear-weapon State is likely to float alive amidst the quagmire of a nuclear catastrophe. As is often said, we shall either float together or sink together. I hope we shall, through our actions, choose the first and only sound alternative.

Mr. SHELDÖV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic): I congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to your responsible post and I also extend congratulations to the other officers of the Committee. Let me also wish you success in the performance of your important duties at this commemorative session of the General Assembly.
The practice of the First Committee convincingly demonstrates the particular importance and value of the general debate - a debate which makes it possible in very direct contact to collate the positions and viewpoints of virtually all the States of the world on a very broad range of disarmament problems. It provides a simultaneous cross-section of all segments of world political opinion on these issues of such vital concern. It also elucidates points of convergence, and thus opens the way to seeking the most effective ways of achieving results.

My delegation has been carefully following the course of the debate, and now we should like to set forth a number of considerations on matters of principle, and to comment on several problems referred to during the debate, in particular problems pertaining to the prevention of nuclear war and to nuclear disarmament.

For a number of sessions now the General Assembly has witnessed with alarm the mounting international tension. Unfortunately, this session also is taking place when there is a difficult and dangerous situation in the world - a situation due to the actions of the aggressive forces of imperialism. The level of the nuclear threat continues to mount dangerously, and this is accompanied by a number of aggravating circumstances. The instigators of the arms race are by no means content with the nuclear "megadeath" potential of thousands of warheads. They are increasing their arsenals on Earth and are now invading space by concocting their "star wars" programme. By creating space strike weapons they are preparing a potential for a first nuclear strike which can be carried out with impunity. Our delegation intends to dwell further on this problem at a later stage of the debate.

As well as the nuclear space danger - which is without any doubt a crucial component of the military threat to mankind - the continuation of the arms race in other areas cannot be considered as an acceptable or inevitable phenomenon. We
associate ourselves with all previous expressions of concern at such developments voiced by the representatives of the German Democratic Republic, Mexico, Czechoslovakia, Sweden and most other delegations.

The improvement of chemical weapons, programmes for the production of binary generations of such weapons, and plans to deploy this extremely dangerous type of weapons in other countries must all be brought to an end.
A régime should be established for the non-deployment, and in due course the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. That is an important task of our age. Radiological weapons must also be banned. The prevention of the establishment and the banning of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction continue to be an important objective of the international community and its current relevance is becoming even greater as a result of the increased militarization of scientific and technological progress.

Current upgradings of so-called conventional types of weapons are now narrowing the distance between them and weapons of mass destruction, thus making the need to reduce them even more pressingly urgent and necessary.

The mounting militarization of the marine environment gives rise to the demand to limit and reduce naval armaments and activities.

Briefly summing up we can say that the elimination of the means of mass destruction is the main task of mankind.

We must beat our swords into plowshares - that is mankind's ideal. It is precisely this which the States of the socialist community have been unswervingly emphasizing and this is the approach shared by the majority of countries. We cannot in any circumstances agree with those who affirm that a positive solution of problems of security should be sought by the upgrading of military technology. There is something basically flawed in such a point of view which leads to the instigation of the arms race and the undermining of international security.

The processes occurring in international life compel us repeatedly to look for the reasons for these dangerous developments. To try to avoid that issue, as some are trying to do, means to be content with an unreliable analysis, and, of course, an unreliable analysis, as is well known, can lead only to incorrect conclusions. But we must seek correct conclusions, because they are necessary in seeking a
solution to the situation. Some are trying to distort the true reasons for the negative phenomena in the security sphere deliberately to confuse others as to their selfish purposes, which is still worse.

The space and nuclear age, in our firm opinion, demands a new approach and a basic restructuring of our thinking. Stable security can only be security for all. The time is now receding forever - in fact, it has already passed - when the model of security could be built on the denial of security to others. The continuation of such narrow selfish concepts in the military strategic sphere at the present time is not only short-sighted but exceedingly dangerous.

Fifteen thousand megatons of nuclear explosives have now been stockpiled in the world. That is 1 million of the bombs which incinerated Hiroshima 40 years ago. That is 6,000 Second World Wars, in terms of the quantity of munitions exploded.

According to calculations of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, an organization which was recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, if a nuclear war breaks out more than 2 billion people would become its victims.

The direct damage factors of nuclear explosions would be accompanied by other consequences, including what has come to be known as "nuclear winter", the effects of which would be felt for a very long time. The majority of the survivors, wounded and burnt, and those suffering from nuclear radiation, without the benefit of medical aid or even uncontaminated water and food, would be doomed to a slow and agonizing death, and there may be other consequences which are quite unpredictable. But there is one thing which is absolutely clear, nuclear war is a threat to all to an equal extent.

The logical conclusion from this situation is simple. It is essential, through the joint efforts of all States without exception, to strengthen our common
security. Unfortunately, not everyone shares this conviction. The history of the post-war decades makes it possible to express the quintessence of the two different approaches to the problem of security as follows: the initiatives for the creation and inclusion in the arsenal of new types of weapons belongs to the United States and its closest allies. On the other hand, initiatives in the sphere of the cessation of the arms race and the implementation of unilateral measures to that end belong to the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community.

In these circumstances, the argument which one still hears about the equal responsibility of the super-Powers, not only fails to reflect the facts but is also dangerous because it places in an unreliable perspective the point of departure for the preparation of measures to find a way out of the damaging spiral of the arms race.

The United States and its allies have been building up this arms race, cranking it up one notch after another. Ever new systems of increasing destruction are being brought into play and the question rightly arises, has the security of the United States gained at all from this process? Is the United States any more secure now, for example, than in 1946 when the Soviet Union proposed a ban on nuclear weapons? Is the United States any more secure now than in 1972 when the Soviet Union proposed a perpetual ban on the use of nuclear weapons? Has peace of mind been achieved by the population of those Western European countries whose leaders have taken upon themselves a grievous responsibility by agreeing to deploy American nuclear missiles?

The replies to these questions are all similar. They are negative.

The escalation of the arms race, being based on a radically flawed idea of the attainment of military supremacy cannot in the real military strategic situation at the present time, lead to true security. The new programme of measures proposed by
the Soviet Union to curb the nuclear arms race, on the other hand, is based precisely on the need to make due allowance for mutual security interests, the complete ban on space strike weapons, and the reduction by 50 per cent of nuclear armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States capable of reaching the other's territory. These proposals of the Soviet Union will make space secure for mankind and will radically defuse nuclear tension on Earth and - we should not forget this - will create a sound basis for further steps in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and also in other areas aimed at the reversal of the arms race.
The realization of the Soviet proposal would become an extremely substantial and materially palpable measure of real nuclear disarmament and it is precisely such steps that the peoples of the world expect.

The new proposals of the Soviet Union are capable also of untying the dangerous knot of nuclear confrontation on the European continent. That was the aim of the willingness of the Soviet Union to resolve the problem of medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe separately, and not directly connected to the problem of space and strategic armaments, with the participation of the appropriate nuclear States. As an expression of the sincere desire to achieve a positive result in the current and possible future negotiations, the Soviet Union has unilaterally taken an important step half-way, not awaiting the cessation of the deployment of United States nuclear medium-range missiles in Western Europe, and has reduced the number of its medium-range missiles stationed in the European zone to 243 units, a figure which corresponds to the level of June 1984. As is well known, a few months earlier the Soviet Union halted the implementation of its response measures in Europe. In combination with other unilateral steps taken by the Soviet Union, all those measures have led to a situation in which the number of Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe has now become significantly lower than it was 10 to 15 years ago.

One cannot deny that the country that takes such actions is a truly bold and peace-loving country. In this way, the Soviet side has taken resolute steps which have the character of a true initiative in order to improve the international atmosphere and relations between East and West, inter alia, in the European sphere. The new far-reaching proposals of the Soviet Union and the unilateral measures undertaken by it, as has already been emphasized by many delegations during this session, have opened up broad prospects for a constructive political
dialogue, and nothing should stand in the way of the possibility of arriving at the reduction and even the elimination of the nuclear confrontation in Europe. The Soviet Union has gone its part of the road in order to meet the West half-way and we now feel entitled to expect similar steps from the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

From 1982 onwards, a unilateral commitment by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has been in force. That commitment has unambiguous practical consequences for the level of military activity of the Soviet Union with respect to the composition of its armed forces, the training of headquarters personnel and troops, tactics and strategy. The renunciation by all the nuclear Powers, following the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, of the first use of nuclear weapons, which could be done either in the form of unilateral statements or through an international legal instrument, would have the most beneficial effect both on international security and on the atmosphere of trust among States. The resolutions of the General Assembly also call for precisely such a step.

A logical extension of the policy of the Soviet Union for the prevention of nuclear war was the moratorium on all nuclear tests introduced by the Soviet Union on 6 August this year - the fortieth anniversary of the nuclear bombing of Hiroshima. That unilateral step by the Soviet Union is intended as a contribution of fundamental importance to the achievement of that goal. It is also perceived as a real factor capable of promoting the successful outcome of the Soviet Union–United States negotiations on space and nuclear armaments in Geneva. By introducing a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union has taken an important practical step, and it was the first to do so. If the United
States now does likewise, a bilateral moratorium would be established which could serve as a convincing example for the other nuclear Powers.

Unfortunately, however, instead of doing that, the United States has recently been carrying out further nuclear-weapon tests.

The complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, subject to strict controls, continues to be the most effective means of putting an end to the qualitative arms race. In actual fact, without tests, the nuclear-arms race would eventually become impossible, and therein lies the whole thrust of the policy of the Soviet Union designed to secure the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

As far back as 1955 - exactly 30 years ago - the Soviet Union proposed that all States possessing nuclear and thermonuclear weapons should assume an obligation to put an end to the testing of those weapons. Unfortunately, because of the negative position of the Western Powers, that proposal was not implemented.

Subsequent efforts by the Soviet Union in the same direction played a decisive role in the conclusion of the 1963 Treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. It should be emphasized that the Soviet Union at that time also advocated the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests, including underground tests, but the other nuclear Powers were not prepared to agree to that proposal. However, if at that time, at the beginning of the 1960s, it had been possible to achieve a complete and general nuclear-weapon test-ban, then today peace and stability would not be threatened by ever new and more destructive nuclear warheads, by neutron weapons and there would not be the threat of the use of such weapons in space and the use of nuclear-powered laser weapons in and from space. The hydra-headed monster of the nuclear-arms race would have been choked at birth. The cessation of testing is precisely the path to the elimination of the nuclear arsenals which have already been accumulated.
If there were no tests and consequently no modernization of the existing nuclear arsenal, it would gradually lose its effectiveness and eventually simply fade away, and that would be one of the reliable guarantees of the prevention of nuclear war. And all of this could have been achieved, had the western Powers only agreed at that time to the proposals of the Soviet Union. The West invokes difficulties of verification as the reason for its refusal to agree to a ban on nuclear weapon tests, and the statements of those countries in the present discussion are no exception to that approach, but those difficulties are contrived and specially thought up, and not real difficulties at all. The feasibility of exercising effective control over the cessation of nuclear tests, using national scientific and technological means, has been confirmed by authoritative witnesses, such as the prominent Soviet scientist, Director of the Earth Physics Institute, Academician Sadovsky, who has emphasized:

"Our national seismic system, which is installed only on the territory of the Soviet Union, and is the only one to be oriented towards the American continent, is therefore in a less favourable position to monitor nuclear explosions by the United States. At the same time, we consider that our national means are adequate to monitor the cessation of underground nuclear-weapon tests so that the solution of the problem of a complete nuclear-weapon test ban does not depend on control."

To use the words of such a well-informed individual as the former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), William Colby, compliance with a moratorium on nuclear explosions:

"... can without any doubt be assured with the assistance of existing national technical means of control."
The Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Palme, declared in Geneva in June of this year:

"The work done by the experts of my country in this sphere convinced me long ago that scientific and technological knowledge and experience which has been accumulated so far offers the possibility of guaranteeing the necessary verification of compliance with a treaty prohibiting any nuclear-weapon tests."

The successful solution of the control problem is therefore perfectly feasible, and the possibility of reaching this solution is further strengthened by the Soviet Union's willingness to agree to additional agreed verification measures. In this way, the appeal which has been heard repeatedly in this discussion, an appeal addressed to the Western nuclear-weapon Powers, to demonstrate political will and to stop impeding progress towards the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests, is most topical.

In its approach to this problem, the Byelorussian SSR shares the opinion of the Secretary-General of the United Nations which he expressed in his report on the question of the prevention of nuclear warfare. He said:

"The cessation of nuclear-weapon testing by all States would make a significant contribution to ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, the development of new types of such weapons and of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons." (A/40/498, para. 82)

As in the past, we intend to support draft resolutions aimed at providing an effective solution to the problem of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

Another matter which has not lost its topical nature is the task of freezing nuclear arsenals. The intensified pace of nuclear programmes in the United States, and the disturbing plans of its allies threaten to increase the nuclear danger even
further. From our point of view, the freezing of nuclear arsenals is a realistic measure because, as it does not require complex and prolonged negotiations, it can fix the existing nuclear equilibrium at present levels, on the one hand, promoting military and strategic stability in the world and, on the other hand, promoting the successful outcome of negotiations for the reduction of nuclear armaments. An example could be set by the Soviet Union and the United States in that regard for the other nuclear-weapon Powers. We share the point of view of those delegations which, in their statements, have referred to the desirability of urgent measures to that end.

The desirability of such a step was emphasized in the statement by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden, a statement which has become known as the Declaration of the four continents. The leaders of those countries in their joint statement further emphasized that it was vitally important to prevent an arms race in space and draw attention to the urgent need for a complete and general nuclear-weapon test ban.

The Byelorussian SSR has been closely following developments at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. It is a source of great concern that this year once again the position of the member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) rendered it impossible for practical work to be done with a view to achieving agreement on concrete measures to prevent nuclear war, developing a phased programme for nuclear disarmament and solving the problem of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests. Because of the negative position of that same group of countries, we also note with regret the stagnation which has occurred on the question of the strengthening of security guarantees to non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. That sort of policy runs directly counter to a number of resolutions adopted by the overwhelming
majority at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly; this is a matter to which we cannot fail to direct the most serious attention.

Another source of concern is the continuing attempt by certain delegations, notwithstanding last year's failure, to supplant the elaboration of concrete and truly effective measures for the prevention of nuclear war by a collection of general sentences and, moreover, a desire to push through the United Nations and other organs where problems of disarmament are being considered, a dangerous NATO doctrine, whereby the participants or the members of that bloc reserve the right to make first use of nuclear weapons against any other State.
The disappointment which has been voiced in the debate from time to time over the lack of significant progress towards the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament, should not be allowed to turn into a passive approach. The only thing that can protect the world from the slide into the dangerous disastrous abyss of nuclear catastrophe is the active indefatigable efforts of all States, large and small, with or without significant military potential.

It is now high time that attention were concentrated, not on differences, however significant they might seem, but on that which unites and should unite us. That was emphasized recently by Mr. Gorbachev, the Secretary General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, when he said:

"What we want to do is to identify areas of agreement and converging interests and to affirm the logic of mutual understanding in opposition to the anti-logic of confrontation."

The task, which is of great urgency for all, of eliminating the threat of the extinction of human civilization, requires that an end should be put to the race for the pipe-dream of military supremacy. It is important that the veil of political prejudice should be lifted and that narrow selfish approaches should be done away with. Only then will it be possible to make a radical change to protect world peace for all without detriment to anyone's security.

This is what the General Assembly, at this session, is called upon to do. This is an Assembly where we hear, affirmed with renewed force, the determination of the peoples to spare future generations from the scourge of war, particularly nuclear war.

The Byelorussian delegation, as an advocate and staunch champion of peace and international security, will as in the past, continue to do its utmost towards achievement of these noble aims.
Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The general debate on questions of disarmament, that has been taking place in the Committee in the past few weeks, is coming to its end. The Committee is going to enter upon the extraordinarily responsible phase of considering draft resolutions and jointly formulating solutions to all items on the agenda, which will undoubtedly influence the general direction, as well as the outcome, of the deliberations of the Conference on Disarmament and the work of other organs within the United Nations system dealing with questions of disarmament. In this connection, we would like to express some further views concerning the activation of the efforts of the United Nations relating to various disarmament issues and the work of the United Nations on disarmament in general.

First of all, we wish to note that the general debate has, beyond doubt, constituted new convincing confirmation of the exceedingly topical importance of the disarmament problems and broad concerns over the continued arms race and the present state of affairs in international relations in general. As you, Mr. Chairman, rightly emphasized at the very beginning of our work, the cause of disarmament may now be at a crossroads of fateful importance. In this context, we consider it a particularly significant feature in the current debate that the discussion has contributed to a broader and deeper understanding of the pre-eminent importance and interrelation of the questions of elimination of the nuclear threat, nuclear disarmament and the non-militarization of outer space. Our delegation has already had an opportunity to elaborate in greater detail on these key issues.

In doing so, we have already stressed our appreciation of and support for the comprehensive proposals of the Soviet Union and the significant political initiatives of the non-aligned and other peace-loving States following that direction, particularly the appeal contained in the New Delhi Declaration of six States of 28 January of this year. It is our opinion that the First Committee has
produced fairly extensive material for a comprehensive, serious and constructive consideration of the nuclear and space aspects of the arms race and for the adoption of appropriate resolutions.

New decisive actions should also be taken with a view to blocking off other channels for the building up of weapons of mass destruction, particularly in respect of the prohibition of chemical weapons. In the recent past, the urgency of this issue has greatly increased as there has appeared a danger that Europe, and particularly central Europe, might be flooded with binary means of warfare. Being deeply concerned about this issue, we wish to elaborate on it at greater length in a separate statement. Nevertheless, we would like to emphasize today our conviction that the achievement of a comprehensive solution to the question of prohibiting and eliminating chemical weapons would be greatly facilitated and accelerated by the urgent adoption of regional parallel measures. The joint proposals of the Governments of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the establishment of a chemical-weapon-free zone in Europe offer a real possibility both for immediately reducing the dangerous level of military confrontation and, in a broader perspective, for achieving a general prohibition and the destruction of those weapons worldwide. We continue to hope that the opportunity emerging in this direction will not be wasted and that the respective negotiations will be started as soon as possible.
We share the opinion that an inseparable component of the overall task of ridding mankind of weapons of mass destruction is the renunciation of the creation of new types of such weapons and their timely prohibition. Essentially, what is needed is the prevention of a particularly destabilizing qualitative arms race and the safeguarding of the latest scientific and technological achievements for ultimate use exclusively for peaceful purposes. We fully support the new proposals put forward by the delegation of the Soviet Union at the Conference on Disarmament that envisage a sufficiently flexible and at the same time reliable approach to the solution of that problem. We consider that the adoption of an obligation to start negotiations on the prohibition of one or another type of weapon of mass destruction, as soon as identified, should not create any great difficulties for those States that have so far referred to the impracticality of a more radical solution to that problem. We agree to the establishment within the framework of the Conference of a special group of experts to submit, where necessary, recommendations on conducting the respective negotiations.

As a State with a relatively high concentration of peaceful nuclear power stations, we naturally attach great importance to questions relating to the prohibition of radiological weapons and of attacks against peaceful nuclear facilities. Striving to expedite the relevant negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament and proceeding with the greatest possible flexibility, we have declared, together with other socialist countries, our readiness to resolve those issues either by concluding separate agreements or jointly.

The issue of limiting and reducing conventional forces and armaments is becoming increasingly urgent at the present time. Of particular concern are factors such as the accelerating technological sophistication of conventional weapons and the growth of the related expenditures, which, according to certain data, amount to four fifths of all military appropriations.
As for the qualitative aspect, it is well known that certain new kinds of the most sophisticated conventional weapons are not inferior to tactical nuclear weapons in their destructive capability. For example, the "smart" weapons capable of automatically selecting their own specific targets are a case in point, as are also new generations of beam and electrical weapons designed to paralyse and blind enemy forces from a long distance and many other systems of a similar nature. In confirmation of the axiom that quality is carried by quantity, the staffs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have approved plans for truly dramatic increases in conventional armaments, including, for example, a 70 per cent growth in the current tank force by the end of this decade. If we take into account the fact that many of the latest systems of conventional weapons are designed to be used in combination with nuclear weapons, it is easy to conclude that the conventional arms race of itself already constitutes a particularly destabilizing factor in terms of strategic parity. Moreover, the question of non-proliferation of the most destructive systems of conventional weapons is becoming ever more pressing. For all these reasons, we pledge our support to the appeal that urgent action be taken, particularly by the nuclear-weapon States, to stop the further building up and qualitative refinement of conventional armaments, that is, in effect, to introduce both a quantitative and a qualitative freeze of conventional weapons as an important step towards subsequent reductions of such weapons and armed forces.

The elaboration of a concrete programme of such measures would be much easier if parallel progress were achieved at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The socialist countries have put forward at those talks more than 20 constructive proposals, taking into account in many respects the positions of the Western participants. A number of significant prerequisites for progress have been created, and understanding has been reached on
a number of issues, including the final objective of the talks in terms of equal collective levels of armed forces on both sides. We consider that the established platform should be used for finalizing the respective agreements and that it should not be allowed to become obsolete.

We also advocate starting substantive negotiations on curbing the naval arms race, limiting and reducing naval armaments and extending confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans, as proposed by the delegations of the socialist countries in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The need to solve that pressing and important issue has been highlighted in resolutions adopted at the last two sessions of the General Assembly. In the nuclear age a naval arms build-up is certainly having an adverse effect on the security of all countries of the world. It is our view that the relevant negotiations could be conducted within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament or in any other international forum that may be agreed upon, with the participation of all major naval Powers and other interested parties. It is our hope that this significant issue will not become one of those which, in the opinion of certain delegations, have "not yet matured" for negotiations.

Evidence of the timeliness of the task of reducing the military threat from the sea is provided also by the fact that the question of confidence-building measures in this field has come within the scope of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe. As far as that Conference is concerned in general, we wish to voice our conviction that it will produce practical results on the basis of gradually developed understanding, based on the binding recognition of the principle of non-use of military force in relations among States, combined with the implementation of genuine confidence-building measures in the military sphere. It is our general opinion
that confidence-building measures should always be considered, in the United Nations too, with regard to the needs of any given situation and in relation to material and legal measures designed to reduce military confrontation.

It is in the same spirit that we approach verification issues. We consider that the guiding principle in this respect should be the commensurateness of control and verification to the character and scope of the respective agreements on specific disarmament measures.
We are convinced that one of the necessary prerequisites for progress in talks on a number of issues lies precisely in overcoming tendencies to replace practical measures with talk of verification, transparency and similar issues while forgetting about disarmament itself.

The task of limiting and halting the arms race encompasses also the very significant question of reducing the arms expenditures of States. The socialistic countries, including Czechoslovakia, have constantly been advocating a freeze and reduction of military expenditures. To that end they have put forward certain well-known initiatives envisaging, among other things, the use of the resources that would thus be released for the economic and social development of States, including the developing countries.

We consider that it would be a particularly important step if the States members of the Warsaw Treaty and of NATO could conclude an agreement on the freezing and reduction of military expenditures. Last year in March we proposed to the NATO countries that negotiations on that issue should begin.

This year, striving to break the impasse over finding a general solution to the question of military expenditures, the socialist countries introduced, in the Disarmament Commission, a new and significant element, namely, the "principle of certainty" concerning compliance with the respective agreements by all participating countries. We hope that such an approach will lead in the future to the establishment of a platform of mutual confidence conducive to the formulation and implementation of practical agreements on the freezing and reduction of military expenditures.

We attach particular importance to the forthcoming Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which is to be convened in Paris next year, and we intend to take an active and constructive part in it.
For our part we consider that the Conference should focus on drawing up a specific programme of disarmament measures and on the most effective ways and means of rechannelling the resources thus released for development purposes. In other words, we advocate the adoption by the Conference of significant political solutions that would give a practical response to the acute alarm of nations over the arms race and the critical situation in world economic, monetary and financial relations, in particular the grave situation of the developing countries, and that would reflect the broad conviction that solving these complex and interrelated problems in conjunction is necessary, and holds out more promise of success.

In efforts to formulate realistic joint approaches to disarmament problems, the drafting of a comprehensive programme of disarmament takes an important place. In our view, this programme should set up a broad, practical framework for constructive negotiations on the whole complex of pressing disarmament issues, primarily on halting the nuclear-arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament. Adoption of such a programme would undoubtedly provide a more practical perspective for the final goal, which is to achieve general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. We therefore consider that the First Committee should take further steps to ensure a speedy adoption of such a programme.

In this context we also consider that the convening of a world disarmament conference is still vitally necessary. We hope that the General Assembly will determine in the near future how to proceed more effectively to the implementation of the ideas underlying this proposal, especially in relation to the need for binding solutions to the whole spectrum of disarmament problems with the participation of all the States of the world.

Czechoslovakia, together with many other States, has consistently advocated a genuine strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament
and the most effective use of all international machinery established by the United Nations, and has supported the need to move on from the examination of problems to taking practical action. We are firmly convinced that the basic task of the United Nations consists not in increasing the number of various research studies, which are sometimes out of touch with reality, but in unifying, in a concrete and consistent form, all constructive efforts by States designed to solve problems in their essence, in conjunction with the mobilization of world public opinion behind the attainment of these objectives. In short, the task is to ensure unity of action.

Our starting point is that in this struggle, as in all aspects of political life, there must not be any vacuums. Where there is no resistance to negative and destructive influences, they will inevitably fill the resulting void. Providing an effective opposition to all such influences, by the elimination of negativism and scepticism, is another sphere where the United Nations should play its part.

The World Disarmament Campaign conducted under the auspices of the United Nations is of great importance in this connection. The broad international public is certainly the most objective judge of the policies of Governments and of the extent to which words and declarations conform to practical deeds. We advocate strengthening those aspects of the Campaign that aim at mobilizing the public of all States for the further intensification of efforts to solve disarmament problems, particularly in relation to nuclear disarmament. We do not agree with those who would like to restrict the Campaign to the rigid framework of abstract education and dissemination of information on plans to continue the arms race or even to steer developments in the direction of interference in the internal affairs of States and incitement of mistrust among nations. We consider that our position is in harmony with the conclusions of the World Assembly for Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War, held in Prague two years ago - an assembly that was the
broader and most representative forum of the international public that has ever come together. That Assembly declared unambiguously that:

"a mass movement for peace is a powerful force, a determining factor in the international situation, capable of influencing the practical policies of Governments in the direction of peace"

and that

"nothing must divide us in the face of our common purpose - to save peace and life, to prevent nuclear war". 
Considering the importance that a real strengthening of the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in the field of disarmament would have, the socialist States have taken a favourable position on the initiative of some non-aligned countries for reviewing the role of the United Nations in this sphere. In this connection, we support the comprehensive programme of work elaborated by the Disarmament Commission, particularly the inclusion of the item relating to the role of the specialized agencies and organs of the United Nations system. We are convinced that the result of this examination should contribute to a broader utilization of the possibilities of the General Assembly and its organs, including the First Committee, and to encouraging the activities of the delegations of all countries, large and small, in their work so that potential may be created for new constructive ideas and approaches, and so that all United Nations activities will consistently follow the course of the practical solution of disarmament problems. If that path is followed, the fulfilment of the disarmament objectives, proclaimed particularly in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, will become more realistic and the hopes which mankind has placed in the activities of the United Nations will be fulfilled.

Czechoslovakia, consistently advocating the development of constructive international co-operation for disarmament and being the initiator of the well-known General Assembly Declaration on that question, is committed to pursuing those goals.

Mr. AL-MOHAMED (Oman) (interpretation from Arabic): Since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken in this Committee, I shall avail myself of the opportunity to convey to you, Sir, my delegation's warm congratulations on your election as Chairman of this Committee during this important session. We are confident that your experience and knowledge, especially in the field of disarmament, will contribute to crowning this Committee's work with success.
I take this opportunity also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

We are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the establishment of which almost coincided with man's success in splitting the atom and using the tremendous energy of fission, for the first time, to kill his fellow man. That introduced the concept now known as "nuclear terror", one that has become a nightmare which threatens the very survival of mankind. That was highlighted in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as follows:

"Removing the threat of a world war - a nuclear war - is the most acute and urgent task of the present day. Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation."

(General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 18)

Six years have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted the Final Document from which that quotation was taken. What we witness and notice every day gives the impression to one who follows developments that nothing has been done in this respect: the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, continues unabated especially between some countries but specifically between the two super-Powers, which exploit their technological and scientific know-how to develop and produce weapons of mass destruction, in spite of their having concluded, along with certain other nuclear Powers, agreements on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of strategic weapons prohibiting the deployment of nuclear weapons in certain areas, limiting missile defences and restricting the testing of certain nuclear weapons in some environments.

Furthermore, the record of armed conflicts between countries does not inspire optimism. Many countries continue to resort to force to resolve their disputes,
with absolutely no regard for the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on principles of friendly relations among States.

Finally, the multilateral forum - the Conference on Disarmament - in spite of serious efforts, is still far from satisfying the hopes pinned on it.

Those sombre circumstances on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations should give us added impetus to strive to realize mankind's aspiration towards consolidating the role of the United Nations and thus enabling it to take the necessary measures to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race as a first, indispensable step towards the formulation of a comprehensive disarmament programme embodying the yearning of peoples to live in peace, security and prosperity.

For any serious disarmament measure to be truly comprehensive, it must take into account the reduction of conventional arms, especially as pointed out by the Secretary-General in his report entitled "Study on concepts of security" (A/40/553), in which we read that, since 1945, the world has witnessed approximately 150 armed conflicts fought with conventional weapons which have taken a toll of approximately 16 million to 25 million lives. In addition, expenditure on conventional arms accounts for four-fifths of global military spending, some 70 per cent attributable to the two super-Powers.

We believe it is possible to reduce expenditure on conventional weapons if we take into account the security interests of all countries, regardless of their size or socio-political systems. All countries could then live in an atmosphere of confidence and mutual respect, free from any intervention or external threat; and all countries, especially developing countries, would not feel obliged to spend an ever-increasing proportion of their resources on defence instead of for the more pressing needs of socio-economic development.
Furthermore, the resources for such military expenditures in developed countries should be devoted to reducing the difficulties caused by the ever-widening gap between the developed and developing countries.

On this occasion we cannot but welcome the proposal of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development to convene the Conference next year, in Paris. We are hopeful that the decisions taken at that meeting will achieve the desired goal.
My country, by virtue of the fact that it borders on the Indian Ocean, has always sought equilibrium, especially in this region. With this as our premise, we spare no effort to implement the General Assembly's Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We hope that the Colombo Conference on the implementation of this Declaration will be convened as scheduled. My delegation believes that this Conference should achieve success, and in order to be successful all the principal maritime users, the countries of the region and the permanent members of the Security Council must participate. Nuclear-weapon-free zones represent an important contribution to confidence-building, to regional security and to international peace and security, and constitute a step on the road towards the total and complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

With this in mind, my delegation has lent its support to all initiatives in this field, especially that related to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. General Assembly resolution 39/54, adopted last year on this item, among other things calls upon the nuclear-weapon States and all other States to refrain from any action that runs counter to both the letter and spirit of the resolution. Experience has shown, however, that this and similar appeals have been totally ignored by Israel. This is borne out by the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/40/520. So I do not need to dwell at length on this. Suffice it to say that Israel continues to refuse to place its nuclear installations under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

As we commend the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament, we welcome the relative progress which it made in certain fields, particularly in preventing the arms race spreading to outer space, as reflected by the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee for this purpose. My delegation urges the two super-Powers to refrain from deploying new space-weapon systems and to take measures to prevent the arms
race spreading to outer space, with a view to consolidating international peace and security and preserving outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes as the common heritage of mankind.

It is satisfying to note the success of the Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This indicates a unanimous desire to exert joint efforts to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both horizontal and vertical.

There is no doubt that the agreement recently reached on a treaty for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific will certainly give new momentum to the wheels of disarmament.

To conclude, we wish to express our satisfaction at the resumption of negotiations between the two super-Powers in Geneva. We are hopeful that these negotiations will limit lethal arms. The summit meeting of the two leaders of the super-Powers is imminent, and we hope that it will usher in a new period of confidence and produce decisions which will make our world more peaceful, more stable and more secure.

Mr. HORN (Hungary): Allow me, first of all, to express my great pleasure at seeing you in the Chair, since you are an outstanding representative of a friendly country whose President has just paid a visit to Hungary, a visit highly appreciated by the Hungarian Government.

During the first three weeks of the general debate in plenary, the overwhelming majority of speakers dwelt on questions of war and peace, the arms build-up and disarmament - topics addressed by the First Committee. So there can be no doubt that these issues are a source of deep concern for world public opinion. Nor can there be any doubt that no single country of the world can remain indifferent to the work of the First Committee. This statement is as valid today
as it was in any of the past 10 to 15 years, but it is of particular relevance this year in view of the fact that the current deliberations of the First Committee take place at an historic moment, at a time when mankind is commemorating the fortieth anniversary of several events of really historical significance, including the establishment of the United Nations 40 years ago tomorrow. Anniversaries of such momentous events always offer a good opportunity for sober reflection, stock-taking, and drawing appropriate conclusions.

For us, the main conclusion to be drawn is simple: we should never allow history to repeat itself, we must make every effort to eliminate the possibility of a new world war, of a global conflagration. I hasten to admit that it is much easier to draw this conclusion than to say what should be done to avoid such a situation. But if we take a look at the course of events that preceded the outbreak of the Second World War, if we analyse what made its outbreak possible, then the answer may be easier to find. In addition to the fact that a few relatively powerful States wanted to turn their Fascist ideology into world domination, the responsibility for the outbreak and protraction of the war also rests with certain Governments which for a long time were stubbornly blind to the possibilities for, and the unavoidable necessity of, coexistence and co-operation between different social systems. So the second main conclusion to be drawn could be that such blindness must not occur again.

This year, however, we are deliberating at a moment that is not only historical, but also crucial. Mankind is at the crossroads. Ahead of us is a path which, though thorny and demanding, leads to disarmament, and another which leads to a new round of the arms race of enormous dimensions and to incalculable perils; we must choose, and we must choose now. We are aware that the behaviour of the two major military Powers and the relationship between them are of paramount significance to the world's choice of which path to tread.
Therefore we welcomed the announcement of the scheduled summit meeting between the leaders of the two great Powers. But the period since that announcement has seen both alarming and encouraging developments. Without trying to be too specific, I would only mention that the negative signs range from attempts to reinterpret vital arms control treaties to the testing of arms destined for deployment in outer space.
On the other hand, among the positive signals we have noted with relief that the two major Powers have resumed their dialogue and that one of them has put forward concrete proposals for radical cuts in nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories and for the establishment of a solid organization for the peaceful exploitation of outer space. Therefore, it is no wonder that we are looking forward to the Geneva summit with cautious hope and expectations. Fully aware of the complexity of the problems involved, we expect the parties to lay a sound foundation for working out effective and radical agreements to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space and to halt it on Earth. We hope that the negotiations, which are to start in less than a month, will finally pave the way for a substantial reduction of nuclear arms and ultimately lead to their complete elimination everywhere.

The proximity of the summit meeting does not mean in any way that the First Committee should be looking on with folded arms. The crucial character of the moment imposes an obligation on us, too, at least in three aspects, namely, the obligation not to sit passively, idly commenting on the dangers which the world is facing; the obligation to make practical recommittments to the principles agreed upon 40 years ago; and the obligation to exert a stimulating influence on all forums concerned with disarmament.

The Hungarian Government is guided by these considerations in dealing with the agenda items of the First Committee, establishing the order of priorities and adopting the approaches it deems appropriate.

The foreign policy of the Hungarian Government on disarmament accords top priority to measures capable of contributing to the prevention of nuclear war and creating the necessary political, social and legal environment to that effect.
Recent years have witnessed a very dangerous turn in the field of nuclear armaments. My Government's views on the reasons behind this negative trend are well known.

The latest events, such as the continuing development of nuclear delivery systems coupled with the so-called strategic defense initiative (SDI), a programme which, after a thorough examination, can be regarded as anything but defensive, give valid cause for the growing concern and anxiety of all mankind. Those steps are bound to increase the nuclear arms race and the danger of a nuclear catastrophe.

Therefore, my delegation considers, in common with many others, that the elimination of the danger of nuclear war and the prevention of a nuclear holocaust is the most urgent task of our days. All disputes - political, economic, ideological or religious - that we are concerned with today are insignificant compared to the hazards of nuclear war.

We cannot but express our great disappointment that the Conference on Disarmament has not been able - due to well known reasons - to undertake negotiations to this effect. It is our desire that the General Assembly give appropriate impetus for the next year's session of the Conference on Disarmament. The report of the Secretary-General on the prevention of nuclear war introducing a number of elements, suggestions and proposals, may enhance that work.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, the Hungarian delegation attaches the utmost importance to the question of a general and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests, which it considers to be an extremely urgent task to accomplish. My delegation firmly rejects the idea that this cannot be but a long-term goal. The same applies to the argument about the unverifiability of an eventual treaty.
It is the considered view of our delegation that the complete ban on all nuclear-weapon tests must remain a top priority item on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament and that an ad hoc committee with an appropriate mandate should be set up at that forum to this end. Until this is achieved, we feel that a useful purpose would be served by any step which, though producing partial results, is likely to take us closer to the final goal. It was in this spirit that we welcomed the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions declared by the Soviet Union and in force since 6 August 1985. A decision by the other nuclear Powers to follow this example would be an important practical step forward on the road to a treaty and would by all means contribute to a significant improvement in the international atmosphere.

We deem it particularly important for every nuclear Power that has not yet done so to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. An example has been set by the People's Republic of China and by the Soviet Union. We are firmly convinced that such a set of obligations, especially if embodied in an international contractual arrangement, would offer a realistic possibility for halting and reversing the nuclear arms race.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world is still considered an important means of increasing the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and strengthening the non-proliferation régime. We are, of course, fully aware that the final solution can only be of a global character. But this does not diminish the importance of practical regional solutions, especially if their multiplication brings the global solution closer. Consequently, the Hungarian delegation supports any proposal to this effect, provided that it is based on the common will of all States of the given region. In this context, we welcome the establishment of the third nuclear-weapon-free zone,
that of the South Pacific. Hungary, as a European State, endorses the idea of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in northern Europe, in the Balkans, in the Mediterranean and especially along the geographically adjacent areas of the two military alliances.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has provided the basis for the establishment of the international régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which has fulfilled its main function with success. No new nuclear-weapon State has appeared since the conclusion of that Treaty. Hungary was among the first countries to ratify the Treaty and, meeting its obligations under the Treaty, it has done and will continue to do its utmost to comply with its provisions. It is only natural to express our satisfaction with the successful outcome of the Third Review Conference of the NPT. The Final Document of the Conference, though duly reflecting some inefficiencies of implementation, is a clear endorsement of the régime set up by the Treaty. Wider acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty would be in the best interest of all nations and could contribute positively to defusing regional tensions and improving the overall atmosphere.

The halting of the nuclear arms race and the prevention of nuclear war constitute such an enormous and multi-dimensional task that its solution requires the mobilization of all forces - governmental or non-governmental - that are willing to act in pursuit of this goal. In this respect, we are very pleased that this year the Nobel Peace Prize has been awarded to the organization "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War". My country had the privilege of hosting the fifth Congress of that organization in Budapest last summer. The basic theme and motto of the Congress, which was attended by delegates from nearly all parts of the world, was "co-operation, not confrontation", an imperative of the
nuclear age. We fully agree with the appeal of the organization addressed to the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, which emphasizes, inter alia, "indeed, there is now a new international consensus that the only rational response to the threat of nuclear war is to work for its prevention".
The question of preserving outer space for peaceful activities, which we will discuss at greater length at a later date, is inseparable from the question of preventing nuclear war. This time I confine myself to a brief exposition of our position. We are extremely concerned at the idea of placing weapons in outer space or developing weapon systems capable of space warfare. Leaving aside the foreseeable but incalculable material burdens involved, the realization of such ideas would increase the danger of making a nuclear war much more likely. This seems to be supported by the fact that efforts to develop systems of offensive nuclear weapons are continuing at the same time as research and experiments conducted or to be conducted within the framework of the strategic defence initiative. The attempts to prove the defensive nature of that programme and at a unilateral reinterpretation of bilateral treaties in force do not allay our apprehension and raise justifiable doubts as to whether the country devising that programme is really willing to come to an agreement or to reach a compromise.

The Hungarian Government is firmly convinced of the need to prevent the proliferation of armaments and weapon systems in space and to do so while space is free from any kind of weapon. Accordingly, at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, Hungary, together with 15 other States, sponsored the resolution entitled "Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space". It is only logical that we welcome and support the highly important proposal submitted by the Soviet Union to the General Assembly at its present session concerning the development of broad international co-operation in preventing the militarization of outer space and promoting its peaceful, non-military uses.
We attach great significance to the question of prohibiting and eliminating chemical weapons. Without going into detail — my delegation will come back to this subject in a separate statement — I wish to set out our general evaluation and position of principle. This year 1985 was the sixth consecutive one of multilateral negotiations concerning a total ban on chemical weapons. As a result of those six years, with the contribution of some positive elements produced by this year's work in the Conference on Disarmament, the framework and the basic provisions of a chemical weapons convention have gradually taken shape. The results achieved may serve as a basis for speeding up the negotiations with the aim of reaching an early agreement, provided that the necessary political will exists. Unfortunately this is not the case; at least, not all the key protagonists have displayed such a will during the 1985 exercise. The picture is further dimmed by a recent resolution of the United States Congress concerning binary weapons. A reappraisal of positions is needed in order that the disarmament community may proceed with the negotiation of the treaty. Meanwhile we are convinced that regional agreements on the establishment of chemical-weapon-free zones could make a useful contribution to an eventual global solution.

Last year, during the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, a round-table discussion was organized here by the Department for Disarmament Affairs and chaired by United Nations Under-Secretary-General Jan Martenson with the title: "Disarmament: Utopia or Possibility?" At that time, because of a complete lack of contact between the two major Powers, a generally gloomy political atmosphere and an almost total stalemate in all disarmament forums, the title of the discussion was more than justified. A year has passed since then. As I have already stated, during this time we have witnessed both alarming and encouraging signs in international politics. Alas, the encouraging signs were not of a magnitude to render unnecessary the question mark in that title.
I shall not attempt now to answer that question. I only wish to emphasize that the answer must not be a speculative one. The answer depends entirely on the political will of the States of the international community. If all the major military powers of the world, the medium-sized and small countries, are ready to manifest the necessary political will, an understanding of their partners' vital interests and at least a disposition to compromise, then the answer will be positive; disarmament could become not only a possibility but a reality. In the attainment of this noble goal the United Nations and its First Committee has its very well-defined - even if modest - role to play. My delegation will do its utmost to help it in this endeavour.

Mr. SYED ARIFF (Malaysia): Mr. Chairman, the Malaysian delegation is extremely happy to see that a fellow member of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) is presiding over the deliberations of the First Committee. Your ability, knowledge and skill are well-known. We are confident that under your guidance the First Committee will be able to make constructive contributions to the cause of world peace and stability. We also wish to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their appointments.

We all face a common challenge, and we also share a common interest in the survival of the human race. Perhaps as a result of our experiences during the first and second world wars, we can at least learn from our mistakes. Both world wars resulted at least in part from the failure of the great powers to limit and reduce their national armaments. Devastating as nuclear weapons were in 1945, the current generation of armaments - created by man allegedly to guarantee peace - threatens increasingly to annihilate our globe. It is therefore timely that on the fortieth anniversary of the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we should address an urgent plea to the nuclear Powers that they undertake positive efforts towards scaling down and eventually totally eliminating nuclear weapons.
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We recognize, of course, that no progress towards nuclear disarmament can be made unless proposals originate from the major nuclear Powers themselves. But first there must be a genuine desire on the part of the super-Powers for real and qualitative improvements in their relations. It is here that we must earnestly pray that the forthcoming meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev will usher in a spirit of long-term co-operation, which will finally make it possible to open the road to real and verifiable nuclear disarmament. Anything less than substantive collaborative undertakings can only foreshadow the obliteration of our planet. Rapid strides in nuclear research and technology already foretell awesome generations of nuclear weapons - including space-based - thus opening a new and probably uncontrollable dimension to the nuclear-arms race.
It is not my delegation's intention to dwell at great length on the frightening facts related to nuclear weapons. It is sufficient to mention that the super-Powers today have in their possession approximately 50,000 nuclear warheads with an explosive capacity of up to 20 megatons, which is more than sufficient to destroy our planet several times over. Indeed, the use of only a fraction of those weapons would be enough to create the nuclear winter that would ultimately destroy all living organisms on earth. Efforts to develop new types and systems of nuclear weapons continue unabated. The arms race in all its manifestations hampers the achievement of effective international security and constitutes the principal danger to peace and international détente. Before peace can become a reality and before comprehensive disarmament can be achieved, it is imperative that the arms race be progressively halted if we are to avoid widespread devastation. Humanity has never been confronted with such a ghastly threat of extinction as it is in today's nuclear age. The need to address ourselves to this problem has therefore never been more urgent and desirable, unless we are prepared to witness the extinction of the human species.

The threats to the world stem not only from nuclear annihilation but, more immediately, from limited local wars and conflicts involving mainly the use of conventional weapons. Sadly, there are too many examples of this - the situations in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, the Persian Gulf area and Central America, to name but a few. Global military expenditure for 1984 was estimated at between $800 billion and $820 billion, with non-nuclear spending accounting for over 80 per cent of that total. The expenditures of third-world countries represent a large part of that global tab as they have acquired impressive non-nuclear arsenals to fight their
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regional and local wars. Let us not forget that since 1945 more than 140 regional
wars involving the appalling loss of millions of lives and the destruction of
property have been fought with conventional weapons. Most of these conflicts
involve members of the third world. The amount of money spent on the manufacture
and procurement of arms is obscene. It does not say much for the human race that
so much money, talent and resources is diverted to such catastrophic investment
when half of the world's population is on the verge of starvation. Indeed, the
tragedy experienced by millions in Africa, recent victims of drought and famine,
would never have occurred had the world disbursed the amount of its military budget
for one day to help overcome this tragedy which has afflicted our African brothers
for countless years.

Four years ago the General Assembly adopted a resolution on the subject of the
prevention of an arms race in outer space. At the initiative of the socialist
countries the General Assembly requested that the Committee on Disarmament start
negotiations on the text of a treaty to prevent the extension of the arms race into
outer space. That same year the Western group urged the Committee on Disarmament
to consider the question of negotiating effective and verifiable agreements aimed
at preventing an arms race in outer space and to give priority to the negotiation
of an effective and verifiable agreement prohibiting anti-satellite systems.
Despite the broad understanding by the two groups there has not been much progress
on the issue. Malaysia would like to join its voice to those voices calling for
urgent and drastic measures to prohibit the use of force in outer space. Outer
space should, on the contrary, be heralded as part of the common heritage of
mankind, and all endeavours related to it must be based on the principle of its
peaceful use for the betterment of mankind.
Malaysia attaches particular importance to making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace and has consistently maintained that the successful implementation of United Nations General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) will greatly enhance the interests of peace and security in the region. In this context we have participated actively in the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and fully support the convening of an international conference in Colombo.

The Malaysian delegation believes that the establishment of zones of peace in various parts of the globe will strengthen the fabric of regional co-operation, eradicate feelings of mistrust and suspicion and eliminate the rivalry of big Powers vying for spheres of influence. Although there is still a divergence of views on the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, we believe that divergence can be narrowed down by a spirit of compromise. While we are striving to achieve this objective, the littoral and hinterland States themselves must exercise the necessary restraint and responsibility and not act in a manner inconsistent with the spirit of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Consistent with that belief and commitment, Malaysia and its partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) will strive for the early attainment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia.

This year the United Nations is celebrating its fortieth anniversary. No one can deny that the world today is a better place than it was in 1945, and much of that is due to the United Nations. However, the present state of deteriorating international relations has again placed certain responsibilities on the United Nations. In this regard Malaysia has consistently supported the strengthening of United Nations machinery and assistance to the Secretary-General in his efforts aimed at limiting the arms race and increasing peace-keeping throughout the world.
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We are meeting at a crucial juncture in the history of mankind. Our very survival is at stake. It is therefore our common responsibility to take appropriate measures to ensure that the world will be a safer, more peaceful and happier one tomorrow. We owe this to ourselves and to our future generations. Let us therefore display wisdom and vision and utilize the vast powers at our disposal for the enrichment of mankind and not for its annihilation.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.