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

Mr. ING (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): I wish, Sir, to join previous speakers in warmly congratulating you, on behalf of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea, on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of the Committee. Your election is a tribute to your country, Indonesia, the cradle of the 10 principles of peaceful coexistence. It is an even greater tribute to you in that it has occurred on the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and on the thirtieth anniversary of the first Afro-Asian Conference, in Bandung in 1955, six years before the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement, of which Indonesia and my country, Cambodia, were among the founder-members.

It is always a pleasure for me to recall that Kampuchea and Indonesia are two countries of South-East Asia that have long enjoyed excellent relations, including cultural relations, as evidenced by the wonderful historic monuments of Borobudur and Angkor.

My delegation is convinced, Sir, that thanks to your competence, wisdom, experience and diplomatic abilities our work will be crowned with success. I also sincerely congratulate the other officers of the Committee and assure you all of our full co-operation.
This year we are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of our world Organization with the theme "United Nations for a Better World", without losing hope, as the Charter proclaims, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

In their statements in the General Assembly or in the First Committee eminent representatives of State Members have all agreed that, although a world-wide conflagration has so far been avoided, peace, on the other hand, is not a world-wide phenomenon, since it does not obtain throughout the world and the security of many States continues to be threatened.

According to the study prepared by a group of experts on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament, more than 150 armed conflicts have broken out since the Second World War, costing the lives of more than 20 million people. These figures do not take into account the consequences of such conflicts in the economic, social, cultural and demographic spheres and in terms of infrastructure, as well as the long-term consequences for the victims of chemical war.

The group of experts has rightly observed that
"there are no signs that there will be a decrease in the incidence and severity of such engagements". (A/39/348, para. 182)

Mankind as a whole is disturbed by the idea that our world can at any moment be the scene of rivalry leading to a nuclear tragedy. Existing strategic nuclear arsenals are so powerful that they would suffice to destroy Earth several times over, thereby causing the extinction of all forms of life on land, in the atmosphere and under water. Even limited nuclear war would have immeasurable consequences for the the humans and nature, as well as the economy, ecology and infrastructure, of the victim State. It would irreversibly disrupt its cultural and social environment, not to mention the indescribable suffering caused by
radiation and its long-term harmful effects or the problems resulting from the massive flow of refugees or displaced persons and those disabled during the war of whom there would be several million.

The nuclear threat as a concept of brute force has become the subject of major concern for the peoples of the world, and the only barrier the human spirit can erect in its path is peace and world-wide understanding among the peoples.

Against this background of threats to and breaches of world peace, the community of Member nations gathered here at the United Nations has proclaimed the year 1986 the International Year of Peace. To achieve this noble goal of saving our world from inhuman suffering and guaranteeing a future of peace and prosperity for future generations, many representatives in this forum spoke out in recognition of the need to lift this screen of distrust which sustains the syndrome of nuclear rivalry and to establish a framework for trust and confidence among States.

The nuclear-arms race is a reality, and if some international machinery is not found in time to block its sinister progress the world will run the risk of death and destruction.

My country – which during its contemporary history has experienced upheavals and suffering and which at this very moment knows the tragedy of a war of aggression imposed upon it by a State Member of the United Nations in flagrant violation of the spirit of the Charter – fully subscribes to all initiatives aimed at preventing all forms of war and at restoring and maintaining peace and security throughout the world wherever there exists a focal point of tension or the risk of armed conflict.

In this context my delegation welcomes the initiative of the United States of America and the Soviet Union whereby they have agreed to enter into negotiations in a few weeks on disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destructin and on ways of resolving and ending disputes sustaining sources of tension throughout the world.
My delegation is convinced that this manifestation of a common will for peace and understanding between the two nuclear super-Powers will contribute to easing world tension and open the way to a process of true peace and security and of not having recourse to nuclear force as a means of world domination and supremacy.

While the nuclear threat is terrifying by reason of the possibility of total annihilation, there are other tragedies engendered by the proliferation and use of conventional weapons.

Modern technology and advanced research methods in ballistics and operational logistics are such that these weapons have become instruments of war that are quite as destructive and devastating as weapons of mass destruction, for while nuclear weapons characteristically have a point of impact and a well-defined effect, the area of deployment of conventional weapons is limited only by the human mind. There are no places on Earth or any region that has been spared the risk of armed conflicts with conventional weapons - in the new world, Europe, Africa or Asia. To refer but to South-East Asia, my country is under armed aggression in which sophisticated means and instruments of death are being used - armoured vehicles, long-range artillery and missiles, not to mention conventional bombs and, above all, chemical, bacteriological and biological weapons.

The threat of a conventional arms race as a substitute for strategic and nuclear weapons cannot be removed from the concept of force invoked by countries in conflict.

It is sad to note that the countries victims of conventional armed conflicts are third-world countries. That a State would allow itself to be tempted into a bellicose adventure, endangering the peace and stability of an entire region of the world, at the expense of a smaller or weaker State presupposes that there is a convergence of political and strategic interests between the aggressor State and the super-Power providing it with the means and the money, a correlation between a covert economic or territorial ambition and a world-wide and regional expansionist
aim. To give an example illustrating this kind of co-operation, Professor Paul Kelemen of the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom wrote in the March 1984 edition of *Asian Survey* that

"In order to seize Indo-China, the aggressor against Kampuchea needs the massive assistance of a super-Power, which in turn needs the territorial expansion of its protégé to spread its influence in South-East Asia."

The use of force as a means of achieving a political, ideological or territorial goal, particularly in the third world, is out of the question without assistance or massive supplies of weapons from outside. In this regard my delegation very much values the statement made by the representative of Singapore referring to the report of the Secretary-General on the arms race, in document A/38/348 of 31 August 1984, and mentioning the state of war created in Asia, Afghanistan and Kampuchea. It is only fitting to say that the danger involved in the proliferation and offensive use of conventional weapons in conflicts in the third world remains the source of explosive situations the intensity of which could lead to a general conflagration. This testifies to the magnitude of the effort needed from the international community and to the resolve that is necessary to arrive at solutions to these hotbeds of tension in the world that have the potential of degenerating into a world-wide conflagration leading to nuclear catastrophe.

My delegation has repeatedly drawn attention in the United Nations to the use of prohibited weapons by certain Member States against other Member States, notwithstanding the mounting opposition of the international community. In this respect we have provided a clinical picture of the syndromes suffered by the victims—the characteristic manifestations of the use of T2 and HT2 toxins. Although no evidence has been provided as to the continuation of the use of these products in frontier areas, except for hyperactivated tear gas during an armed
offensive during the last dry season by the enemy, my delegation considers that it is imperative to implement resolution 37/98 D with regard to its provisions for upholding the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the 1972 Convention.

The work of the Conference on Disarmament on the elaboration of a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction has not yet made tangible progress. My delegation reiterates its desire to see this convention adopted within a reasonable time, in keeping with the legitimate aspirations of all.
My delegation now wishes to state before this Committee its position on a number of other items on our agenda. In all disarmament documents, zones of peace are generally acknowledged to be one of the suitable ways of putting an end to the arms race in those zones, and of building up mutual confidence among States. In this connection, my delegation wishes again to express its firm support for the proposal of His Majesty the King of Nepal to declare Nepal a zone of peace. My delegation also agrees that concrete action to achieve the objectives of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace would help to strengthen international peace and security. And at this point my delegation would pay tribute to His Excellency Ambassador Nissanka Wijewardane, Permanent Representative of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka and Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, for the exemplary way in which he has carried out his duties.

I also wish once again to express my delegation's support for the concept of denuclearized zones in the world. It is in that spirit that we continue to welcome the adoption of the Treaty of Tlatelolco in Latin America. Similarly we warmly endorse the decision of the Association of South-East Asian Nations to establish a commission to study the proposal for a denuclearized zone in South-East Asia. But we believe that such a zone will be possible only after the problem of Kampuchea has been resolved in conformity with the relevant United Nations resolutions - in other words, after the total withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea.

This Committee has before it this year the report of the Secretary-General containing the study on the naval arms race (A/40/535). That study was conducted in accordance with resolution 38/188 G of 20 December 1983. As the Group of Experts points out,

"In essence, this report is an overview of a very wide and complex subject from which several significant conclusions of a general nature may be drawn".  
(A/40/535, para. 308)
My delegation wishes to pay a well-deserved tribute to you, Sir, as Chairman of that Group of Experts. Its important report will surely meet with a favourable response in the context of the international community's disarmament efforts.

Mr. Bierring (Denmark): First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to extend to you and to the other officers of the Committee my sincere congratulations on your election. Your professional skill, Sir, and your wide experience, not least in disarmament matters, are well known to all of us, and will certainly assist us in dealing successfully with our task.

I should like to refer to the statement made some days ago by the representative of the Netherlands speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Community, a statement which we, of course, fully endorse. During the fortieth anniversary celebration last week, Heads of State or Government reviewed the performance of this Organization over the past four decades and addressed important questions concerning its future role, one of them being how the United Nations can best support and promote our efforts to cope with the frantic arms race.

My Government believes that the United Nations can and must contribute to progress in disarmament, and that the First Committee plays a useful role as a forum for deliberations in the fields of disarmament and international security. Efforts should, however, continue to be made to improve the efficiency of this Committee's work. We understand, Mr. Chairman, that you have undertaken informal bilateral and regional contacts on this problem; we welcome your initiative and wish you luck in your endeavours.

Instead of multiplying the number of resolutions which emanate each year from this Committee, we should make a serious attempt to channel the world community's frustrations and feelings of impotence in the face of the arms spiral into our
decisions in such a way that the clearest possible signal can be sent to those who are able to do something about it. Only by concentrating on the main issues and by seriously attempting to arrive at consensus decisions can we hope that the message will be heard.

In this respect, it should be borne in mind that genuine security for all at the lowest possible level of armaments can be arrived at only if arms control and disarmament measures are balanced and are so designed that no State or group of States, at any stage of the disarmament process, obtains essential military advantages at the cost of another State or group of States. We therefore regret the trend which we have witnessed in recent years towards resolutions which violate that fundamental principle. In order to make real progress towards disarmament, we must do our utmost to secure support from all the principal parties to that process.

As we see it, we are today faced with two main problems, the first being the fact that the speed of technological development is so great that particularly energetic and timely diplomatic efforts are necessary to come to grips with the issues involved. On the other hand, technology can also be an important ally in this respect. I am thinking, of course, of the role it can play in meeting the essential need for adequate verification of arms control and disarmament measures. In this respect, I should like to stress the importance of looking into verification mechanisms from the very outset rather than regarding verification problems as a question of detail to be considered at a later stage.

The second problem with which we are confronted is that the present international climate has not for some time been very conducive to generating the mutual trust and confidence which are essential for meaningful talks on arms reductions. Such talks cannot take place in a vacuum, but must be inserted into a
framework marked by a genuine political will to overcome the mutual mistrust which has marred international relations since the founding of the United Nations. In this respect, progress towards understanding in other areas of international politics may very well turn out to be an important catalyst for progress towards disarmament. On the other hand, it goes without saying that agreement on arms control or disarmament measures will in turn promote genuine détente.
We therefore welcome the broadened dialogue on a number of bilateral issues as well as regional conflicts that has been initiated between the Soviet Union and the United States and urge them to proceed along this path notwithstanding the difficulties involved.

We therefore welcome also the decision to resume the dialogue at the highest level between these Powers, a dialogue that has been absent much too long, with a view to addressing specifically the arms control and disarmament issues relating to the strategic balance between them.

We are all aware of the far-reaching importance of the summit meeting in November. It is bound to have broad and deep repercussions. We realize full well that a dramatic breakthrough in United States/Soviet relations can hardly be expected as a result of the meeting. Nevertheless we expect that an agenda for the continuation of the dialogue can be drawn up and that impetus can be given to the continuation of the ongoing detailed negotiations with a view to working out effective balanced and verifiable agreements preventing an arms race in space and terminating the arms race on earth. The meeting must prove to be the beginning of a new and more constructive relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, the dialogue between East and West should not remain an exclusive preserve of the super-Powers.

Medium-sized and small countries also have their contribution to make to the broadening of the dialogue so that it encompasses all aspects of East-West relations. Denmark has always been a proponent of a multifaceted perception of East-West relations. As my Prime Minister put it the other day in the Assembly, peace has been preserved in the part of the world where we belong, but by means that cannot be acceptable for ever. We see no alternative to dialogue and co-operation. Only on that basis can we hope for greater confidence between East and West and the gradual irrelevance of the arms build-up.
The outcome of the Third Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which ended recently, was indeed encouraging and was proof of the fact that when the genuine political will is present it is possible to reach results. The Conference may thus serve as an example for negotiations on other issues, even if in its essence it was a holding operation that did not take us any further towards disarmament. The debate and the Final Declaration adopted by the Conference confirmed the strong commitment of the 130 States parties to the Treaty to the non-proliferation régime.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is regarded by my Government to be perhaps the single most important contribution towards safeguarding peace and security in the world. Despite many predictions to the contrary, the number of nuclear-weapon States has remained unchanged since the entry into force of the Treaty. This is a remarkable result and is one of the few bright spots in the field of arms control and disarmament in recent years.

Denmark urges States which have not yet done so to accede to the NPT.

Closely related to the NPT are the endeavours towards the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. My Government strongly supports the conclusion of such a treaty as the most practical and immediate way of preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty would constitute a major step in curbing the development of new and more sophisticated weapons.

It is to be regretted that at its session this year also the Conference on Disarmament was unable to agree on a mandate for an ad hoc group on a comprehensive test ban. Discussion in the Conference on Disarmament has thus not as yet produced any tangible results. The Danish Government fully supports the draft programme of work for an ad hoc committee on item 1 of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, entitled "Nuclear test ban", proposed by Australia and other countries members of the Conference on Disarmament. The core of the matter is, of course,
the crucial problem of verification. The test conducted by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to determine the verification capabilities of a full-scale seismological network was a step forward, and the work of the group of seismic experts must be intensified in order to provide the technical background for verification of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

We appeal to all parties involved in the negotiations, and especially to the nuclear Powers, to try to break the present unsatisfactory deadlock and work with the aim of concluding a verifiable comprehensive test ban at the earliest possible moment.

The question of nuclear-weapon-free zones is being considered by experts charged with the task of preparing a United Nations study. So far this study has not been completed, but we hope that it will be agreed upon in due course. The Danish Government supports all realistic efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in conformity with the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. As stated last year in this Committee, we are in favour of discussions with the aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Nordic area in a larger European context. Such a zone must be guaranteed by the United States and the Soviet Union. The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world could contribute to non-proliferation and to the disarmament process in general.

Throughout the years the General Assembly has adopted several resolutions calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons. As also stated last year, the Danish Government supports the idea that the nuclear-weapon States should agree to a verifiable freeze on all type of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles as a basis for negotiations on a reduction, taking into account the security interests of all States.
Another item on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament is prevention of an arms race in outer space. We note with satisfaction that this year the Conference agreed on a mandate for an Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, which began its work during the summer session. We hope that the Assembly's draft resolution on this subject this year will be passed by a consensus, as was the relevant resolution last year. The Danish Government is deeply worried about the risk of the arms race being extended to space. Denmark is opposed to the deployment of weapons in outer space as well as to research on and development of such weapons. In this regard Denmark attaches particular importance to the preservation and observance of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty as it has hitherto been interpreted by both sides.
(Mr. Bierring, Denmark)

The high-priority items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament include the question of chemical weapons. Negotiations on this item at the summer session have been slightly more constructive and businesslike than previously, although verification still remains a very difficult issue, and no major progress has been made towards solving that problem. Last year we were able to welcome the comprehensive and far-reaching draft on the prohibition of chemical weapons which was introduced by the United States of America. We also noted at that time, as a positive element, the statement by the Soviet Union that it, in principle, would be prepared to accept the presence of observers while chemical weapons were being destroyed.

Since then, unfortunately, no major step forward has been made, and we can only appeal once again to the parties involved to show the utmost good will and flexibility.

Proposals have also been made concerning a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe. We feel that work on a limited chemical ban should not take precedence over the global negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament. In our opinion, none of the problems connected with negotiating a global ban would be easier to solve in a regional framework. The urgent need for a world-wide ban on chemical weapons is also demonstrated by the continued use of such weapons, in clear violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, in areas outside Europe.

If progress in the work of the Conference on Disarmament has been only slight, it is with great regret that we must note that no progress whatever has been made by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in its deliberations this year. It is possible that a better structured agenda could ensure a better outcome. Such proposals have already been put forward and they should be carefully studied.
No recommendations were agreed upon, and the debate was mainly a repetition of statements already made in this Committee.

Turning now to another subject, it is our hope that the Stockholm Conference, which constitutes an integral part of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe process will, in view of recent developments at the Conference, be able to fulfil its mandate in the course of 1986 and agree on a set of militarily significant confidence and security-building measures covering the whole of Europe. In connection with the adoption of such concrete measures, we are prepared to reconfirm, in a form which can be agreed upon, the general validity of the principle of non-recourse to force.

The successful conclusion of the work of the Stockholm Conference could prepare the way for a decision by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe at the follow-up meeting in Vienna next autumn, to supplement the mandate of the Conference for its next stage. The Danish Government hopes that it will be possible to extend its mandate so that, immediately following the Vienna meeting, the Conference in Stockholm could proceed to issues pertaining to real disarmament in Europe.

The highest priority in international negotiations must of course be given to measures aimed at preventing nuclear war. Progress in limiting conventional weapons, however, is also a matter of concern. It is the conventional weapons that every day claim countless lives. The conventional arms race, moreover, squanders precious economic resources. In the United Nations Study on Conventional Disarmament (A/40/486), the world's armed forces are estimated to total more than 25 million men.

An even modest reduction of the global arsenal of arms and armed forces could release resources for better use. In this connection we hope that this year's
General Assembly will take a final decision on the convening of a conference on disarmament and development in 1986.

We welcome the report of the Secretary-General containing the views of 22 Member States regarding the Study on Conventional Disarmament. We think that the Study deserves more attention and believe it appropriate to suggest, in a draft resolution, that Member States which have not yet informed the Secretary-General of their views on the Study should be invited to do so before the forty-first session of the General Assembly. We will revert to this matter when the question of conventional weapons is considered in the Committee.

In concluding, I would like to refer to a recent statement made by the Secretary-General in which he says:

"Today, we should look back on the 40 years of experience the United Nations has had in seeking to deal with problems of disarmament and draw lessons from that experience. But even more so, we should look to the future. We must call for a renewed effort on the part of both the Member States and the peoples of the world to reduce the danger of nuclear war, to proceed to disarmament, and to strengthen and improve the contribution the United Nations can and must make to the establishment of lasting peace and security on our planet."

These wise words of the Secretary-General are fully shared by my Government.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): In a previous statement my delegation underlined with particular concern the danger of the nuclear and space arms race. In our view, this is the paramount danger at the present time, but unfortunately not the only one. The non-nuclear armaments race has had no less a destabilizing role in international relations, particularly in the military-strategic balance of forces.
All representatives in this Hall are well aware of the plans and actions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) aimed at the production and development of new systems of conventional arms comparable in destructiveness to weapons of mass destruction. Plans have been approved for the manufacture of highly sophisticated weapons systems of extraordinary range, high precision and mobility, which are capable of striking at targets deep in the adversary's rear. Their use would make conventional warfare extremely destructive in character, which would inevitably increase the likelihood of its escalation past the nuclear threshold.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria has repeatedly called for the adoption and implementation of specific measures to curb and halt the conventional arms race at the global level, as well as on a regional and bilateral basis. The proposals of the socialist countries in this respect are well known, and are still on the table. Our position is that we stress the need for agreement among States with the largest military arsenals on the non-increase of armed forces and conventional arms and their limitation on the basis of the principle of unimpaired security of either side.
(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

In this connection, I should like to draw attention to the new concrete proposal made by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty at their session held from 22 to 23 October 1985 in Sofia, requiring that:

"... the USSR and the United States of America assume the obligation not to develop and manufacture new types of conventional weapons comparable in destructiveness to weapons of mass destruction."

We consider that efforts should also be directed at the adoption of measures to curtail and reduce armed forces and armaments, particularly those based on foreign territories. In this respect, the participants in the Sofia session proposed, as a first step, to

"... freeze the armed forces of the USSR and the United States of America, including those outside their national territories, at the level of 1 January 1986."

The reduction of military budgets is a question that is very closely connected with the arms race. It is assuming ever greater significance in the context of the forthcoming International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development. The use of the economic resources thus released for economic and social development, particularly in developing countries, is an objective that should guide and stimulate the efforts of all States towards the attainment of concrete results. The proposal of March 1984 which the Warsaw Treaty countries made to their counterparts in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for a freeze and reduction of the military budgets of the members of the two military alliances is as well known as their other proposals on this question. At their session in Sofia the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty formulated a new proposal. They are of the opinion that:
"... a mutual freeze of the military budgets of the USSR and the United States of America, starting with the next fiscal year, would be an effective measure for limiting the arms race in all its aspects."

An important role in curbing conventional armaments is to be played by the 1981 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The People's Republic of Bulgaria has signed and ratified that Convention. We are of the opinion that the process of its ratification, particularly by the militarily significant States, should be speeded up so that the Convention may enter into force as soon as possible. It would also be necessary to take additional steps to improve further restrictions on the use of such weapons.

In order to impart fresh momentum to the Vienna talks on mutual reductions of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, the socialist countries have presented important new proposals that offer a real possibility of reaching agreement. The People's Republic of Bulgaria supports those proposals and is in favour of reaching agreement on a reduction of armed forces and armaments, beginning with a reduction of Soviet and United States forces, at the earliest possible time.

The adoption of confidence-building measures, measures for the non-use of nuclear and conventional weapons, and the non-use of force in general would contribute considerably to progress in limiting and reducing armed forces and conventional armaments. Bulgaria has been doing its best to ensure the successful conclusion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and to reach agreement on the entire range of political and military confidence-building measures.
Efforts to put an end to the nuclear and conventional arms races would to a large extent be futile if parallel measures were not taken to save mankind from other weapons of mass destruction, both existing ones as well as any that may be developed in the future.

In this respect particular attention should be paid to the work being done by the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The headway made in elaborating the first single text of the future convention, although not fully agreed upon, shows that there is a real possibility of resolving this matter in the immediate future. The positive results achieved on so-called permitted activities, the declaration of chemical weapons in separate tables and the agreed principles for their elimination, as well as on verification measures were possible thanks to the painstaking efforts of a number of countries. In this connection, I should like to express our gratitude to Ambassador Stanislav Turbansky of Poland for his able guidance of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Further progress in the elaboration of a convention has been endangered by the decision of the United States to initiate the production of binary chemical weapons. Not only has that step raised an insurmountable obstacle to the ongoing negotiations but it also threatens to block the conclusion of the convention itself. The arguments justifying that decision are most unconvincing. Furthermore, it has been taken at a time when the Conference on Disarmament has embarked upon the actual work of drafting the provisions of the future convention. The sum of $10 billion has been earmarked for the development and production of the new chemical munitions, in spite of the fact that there are already about 150,000 tons of poisonous chemicals and more than 3 million chemical weapon units in the United States arsenal capable of destroying all living things on Earth many times over.
A particularly dangerous situation has been created in Europe. In the opinion of a number of experts, at least 100 million persons would be affected if the chemical weapons stationed in Western Europe alone were to be used in hostilities. Thus, European peoples have become hostages not only to nuclear arms but to chemical weapons as well.

Nor can the possibility of the deployment of binary chemical weapons in other parts of the world be excluded. The organization of their production in other countries poses the threat of uncontrolled proliferation, as well as the danger that they might end up in the hands of régimes following aggressive policies. This serves to increase the risk of the use of chemical weapons in regional conflicts.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the manufacture of binary chemical weapons, once initiated, will unleash a new, even more dangerous round of the arms race and undermine prospects for progress in other fields of disarmament as well.

My delegation is of the view that the General Assembly cannot remain indifferent to such a dangerous turn of events and should call firmly for an end to it. The General Assembly should reaffirm the need for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons as one of the most urgent and important tasks of our time and should call upon all States to spare no effort in contributing to its solution.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to participate actively in the work of the Conference on Disarmament on this question. We also consider that the adoption of regional measures to limit chemical weapons would not only reduce the risk of their use in various regions but would also substantially facilitate the world-wide prohibition and elimination of such weapons. Guided by those considerations, the States parties of the Warsaw Treaty have proposed to the NATO countries that agreement be reached to free Europe from chemical weapons. That proposal is still valid today.
(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The Bulgarian delegation has already expressed its wholehearted support for the proposal which the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic made to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the initiation of negotiations on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Europe. Achievement of such an agreement would meet the desires of all European peoples.
We also appreciate the merits and enormous potential of the idea of non-proliferation of chemical weapons and consider that it warrants most careful consideration and support.

The important task of elaborating a convention banning radiological weapons has been for years on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. My delegation shares the conviction, referred to in the report of the Conference, that the work accomplished by the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons in 1985 made: "a further contribution to the solution of the issues entrusted to it".

(Supplement No. 27 (A/40/27), p. 123, para. 10)

It is a positive fact that concrete work has been done on the texts of a number of provisions of the future convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons. An active discussion was held on the issue of protecting nuclear facilities against attack.

The position of the socialist countries as reflected in the memorandum of 12 June 1985 (CD/514) is sufficiently flexible, and offers concrete solutions to the issues of the prohibition of radiological weapons and attacks against nuclear facilities. The work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons in 1985 has illustrated the realism of our position. We hope that the small progress accomplished in 1985 will not be wasted. Given political will, flexibility and constructiveness, the existing differences can be bridged. For this it will be necessary for some States to assume more constructive positions and for others to give up some of their more excessive claims. No agreement can be reached if States refuse to recognize that a prohibition of radiological weapons, if ever achieved, would constitute only a partial measure towards the cessation of the arms race. This, however, should not belittle its significance.
One problem which cannot be passed over, particularly in the year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations is the role and effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. The international community has come to expect from this single multilateral organ for negotiations in the field of disarmament the elaboration of specific practical measures for curbing the nuclear arms race and for disarmament. During the détente years the Conference demonstrated that it could play an important role in harmonizing positions and achieving effective international agreements in the interest of all States. Regrettably, we cannot disregard the fact that for many years the Conference has been unable to accomplish a single result of practical importance. As things stand now, it has turned from an organ for negotiations into an organ for discussions. Months of futile debate are wasted on ordinary procedural issues such as the creation of subsidiary organs. This fact has seriously undermined the authority of the Conference and has caused the justifiable concern of many Member States, including my own country. It is clear that the futility of the Conference on Disarmament is not due to any lack of ideas and proposals. The numerous realistic and practical initiatives and proposals of the socialist countries, and the concrete proposals put forward by the Group of 21 on all agenda items are well-known. The members of those two groups of countries have been making consistent and painstaking efforts to lead the Conference out of the dead-end of fruitless general discussions and guide it towards practical activities. And if those efforts have so far been unsuccessful, the reason for this is by no means to be found in those two groups. It should be sought in the policies of those countries for which the Conference is only a convenient smoke-screen for carrying out their military programmes.

My country which, like the majority of Member States of the Conference on Disarmament, is truly interested in real progress, calls for the starting of prompt
negotiations on all items of the agenda for the purpose of elaborating relevant international instruments.

As the Sofia Declaration of the Member States of the Warsaw Treaty proclaimed:

"There is no type of weapon that they are unwilling to limit, reduce or withdraw from their arsenals and destroy for good under an agreement with the other States, while abiding by the principle of equality and equal security."

Mr. IMAI (Japan): May I begin my remarks by first expressing our sincere congratulations on seeing you, Sir, the representative of an important Asian nation, in the Chair of the First Committee at this fortieth anniversary session of the United Nations, guiding the deliberations on the most vital issues of disarmament and international security. Under your capable leadership, I am convinced that we shall be able to deal effectively with the task before us and continue the unceasing joint efforts to make contributions to this common cause of ours. It is my pleasure to pledge my delegation's full co-operation and support to you in your discharge of these very important duties.

Forty years ago, the United Nations proposed to the post-war world a new order. In particular, an order structured around the maintenance of peace and security through collective efforts has been the most important of the objectives and, as such, embodying that, the United Nations has enjoyed the broad support and appreciation of the peoples throughout the world. On this occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we, as one of the now expanded family of 159, feel that this is an opportune moment to look back on the ideals of those founding days and reflect on the extent of its most effective achievements and simultaneously to consider carefully its role for our common future.

Prime Minister Nakasone of Japan attended last week's commemorative session, and delivered a speech which is the manifestation of Japan's appreciation that the fortieth anniversary is much more than just an occasion to commemorate the
number "forty", it is an opportunity of considerable importance from the perspective of international politics and economics, and especially in the area of international security. On the occasion of his speech, the Prime Minister stressed that since joining the world Organization, Japan has made the United Nations one of the central pillars of its foreign policy, seeking its own peace and prosperity within the broader context of global peace and prosperity, and further, as one very concrete measure towards this end, Japan has made every effort to further the maintenance of world peace through the advancement of disarmament, especially through the elimination of all nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.
When Japan was admitted to the United Nations as the eightieth Member State - after a considerable effort to convince the world of our determination to pursue world peace - we were fervently hopeful, and firmly resolved, that this new comprehensive world Organization should promote the construction of a peaceful international society. The realities of the world are such that, unfortunately, the sincere desire of the people alone is not sufficient to bring about real and lasting peace on Earth. At the same time, if we were to belittle this simple but sincere wish of the people as unrealistic, it would be a most conceited attitude to take and one that would be grossly in error. As all of us involved in disarmament are well aware, this simple but strong wish of the ordinary citizen is the starting point for all our work, and it is on that basis that our security policy and technical, political, economic and other measures should be built.

In the field of arms control and disarmament, we have recently seen two encouraging events. One is the resumption of the United States-Soviet dialogue, with a summit meeting scheduled in November, and with the hope that new initiatives and even a new basic agreement on disarmament may be forthcoming. The other is the successful conclusion of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in September this year.

I welcome the new bilateral arms control and disarmament negotiations begun in Geneva in March, which today are in their third round. The situation in which no major arms control and disarmament dialogue took place for a period of over a year between the two States with overwhelming military strength, to say nothing of their nuclear capability, was highly unusual and certainly not welcome. The peoples of the world have long waited for the two States to sit down together and negotiate in a sincere and constructive manner with a view to the ultimate and complete elimination of nuclear weapons.
In the course of the previous bilateral negotiations on nuclear arms, the United States made proposals for a large-scale build-down of strategic arms as well as for a reduction in, and the eventual elimination of, intermediate nuclear forces. My country regarded those proposals as constructive steps towards the realization of parity at the lowest possible level of an overall nuclear capability on a stable long-term basis, and therefore expressed its support for efforts in that direction.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has recently responded publicly with a proposal containing specific numbers as targets for reduction. My delegation welcomes this new development as an encouraging indication of a starting point for the continuing negotiations. Having said that, I wish to point out that the Soviet proposal seems to contain many points that need clarification, such as the handling of the proposed numbers, the problem of definition and measures to be taken pursuant to reduction or elimination, to cite some examples. We wish to see an early clarification of those issues, including a global solution to the problem of SS-20 missile deployment, about which we have expressed our concern on a number of occasions, so that progress may be made towards a real relaxation of tensions and the building of confidence. We believe that the Soviet Union should take steps to that end, and therefore call upon it to do so.

In the circumstances, with both the United States and the Soviet Union possessing vast nuclear stockpiles of enormous destructive power and deploy sophisticated and long-range delivery vehicles, including powerful and sometimes precision-guided missiles and rockets, as well as other more complicated platforms in outer space, the only way to avoid war, especially nuclear war, is for the two super-Powers to acknowledge their tremendous responsibilities and take the
initiative with actual deeds leading to a reduction of weapons, rather than with high-sounding but not so substantive words, and thus take courageous steps towards meaningful progress in this respect.

The Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was held in Geneva in September, with the participation of 86 States Parties. In the 15 years since the Treaty came into force the proliferation of nuclear weapons has been virtually prevented, and the ominous predictions of the 1960s about an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States have not been realized. We can claim and confirm that the Treaty has made a major contribution to the peace and stability of the world. As one who personally took part in the process of Japan's ratification of the Treaty, I know well that the national policy decision to reject the so-called nuclear armament option is never an easy step. I believe that this unique non-proliferation régime, founded on the self-restraint of many, should continue to be maintained and strengthened, and that the solemn bargain struck at the time the Treaty was drafted should be upheld both by nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States.

The Third Review Conference adopted by consensus a Final Document containing a Declaration, in which the Conference: recognized that the Treaty is essential to international peace and security; supported the three objectives of the Treaty, namely, non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; reaffirmed its firm commitment to the purposes of the Preamble and the provisions of the Treaty; and resolved to strengthen the authority of the Treaty régime in coming years. This result is of extreme importance for the maintenance and strengthening of the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime, and, indeed, for the peace and security of the world in general. It is also a significant improvement over outcome of the Second Review Conference in 1980.
In view of the limited developments in the field of disarmament during the past five years, not everyone was optimistic about the outcome of the Conference this time. Indeed, the adoption of the consensus Final Document was uncertain until the very last moment. Despite all the difficulties, however, we were eventually able to reach that consensus because, I believe, while the non-nuclear-weapon States may have felt strongly about the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament, they realized even more strongly the importance of the non-proliferation régime for the maintenance of international peace and security, and resolved to make their due contribution to combined world-wide efforts to bring about a world free of nuclear weapons. This seems to me to be an example of rational considerations of overall international peace and security prevailing over sometimes near-sighted national interests or concerns.

It goes without saying that all the international responsibilities provided for under the Non-Proliferation Treaty régime will have been assumed only when the nuclear-weapon States honour their part of the bargain and fulfil their obligations under the tenth preambular paragraph and Article VI of the Treaty. The successful result of the Third Review Conference only goes to show the strong desire of the parties not only that the spirit and fabric of the Treaty should be maintained, but that States should also maintain their sincere attitude in moving towards nuclear disarmament in general and thus continuing the process into the twenty-first century.
(Mr. Imai, Japan)

I should like next to touch briefly on some of the important items in the field of disarmament which are of particular concern to my country.

The first is a traditionally important disarmament measure which leads to a halt in the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and then to a reduction in existing nuclear stockpiles - namely, a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. My country has consistently stressed the importance of such a ban and has made active international efforts for its realization. We regret to note that recently this item has been gradually taking secondary place in the shadow of such glamorous armaments subjects as multiple and guided or manoeuvrable nuclear warheads, more accurate and far-reaching mobile missiles and arms competition in outer space, while at the same time actual and substantive progress on the test issue seems to have been slowed down because of difficulties encountered in the verification provisions.

It was because of such recognition, and because of a sense of urgency, that Foreign Minister Abe of Japan proposed at the Conference on Disarmament in June 1984 a step-by-step approach as the most feasible way to a comprehensive nuclear test ban. I have taken steps to follow up this proposal by introducing a working paper on the subject in July of the same year. Further, in August this year we set forth our thinking on concrete measures for the realization of an international seismic data exchange system in order to improve multilateral verification capabilities and make more credible the régime of a multilateral nuclear test ban. Despite these efforts of ours, accompanied by equally serious proposals by others concerning substantial issues, the Conference on Disarmament was not able to reach agreement on the mandate of an ad hoc committee on the nuclear test ban, and has thus failed to see the establishment of the ad hoc committee two years in a row. In view of the importance of the item, my country believes that adequate arrangements can be worked out to overcome differences in the wording of the mandate, establish the ad hoc committee and find a suitable
formula to allow practical work to continue and make progress step by step - on the assumption, of course, that the comprehensive test ban is a subject of serious concern for all parties.

My country has stressed on many occasions that in dealing with questions of disarmament one must not look solely at nuclear weapons. In the realm of non-nuclear disarmament, my country wishes to stress the importance of a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons as having the potential of bringing about a scale of comparable mass destruction no less than that of nuclear weapons.

We feel that substantial work was done in the active negotiations for a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons at the ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament during the course of its 1985 session and, in spite of various reservations, some of them fairly serious, I must say, we now have an outline of an agreement and its major elements expressed in treaty language. The necessary material for the drafting of a chemical weapons convention is now almost all at hand and our future task is to sort that material out into the necessary and acceptable form. My country feels that it may be advisable to expand the ground of common understanding among the parties concerning the basic modality of control over the various chemical substances concerned. This will enable us to reach an early agreement on such basic components of the convention as "definitions" and "permitted activities". Further, as regards "verification", we are confident that, with a good sense of balance and realism, efforts to develop practical measures to ensure compliance with the convention can be worked out.

I cannot conclude this statement without touching on the all-important issue of outer space, an area where much attention is rightfully focused upon today. As a country with some capabilities and considerable interests in this new frontier of technology, Japan is keenly interested in the prevention of an arms race in outer space.
The advancement of technology for the development and utilization of outer space is beyond the ordinary level of comprehension or imagination, while outer space is no longer a world alien to us but is fast becoming more of an integral part of our daily life. It is not hard to imagine that in the twenty-first century the human race will come to interact with space in a manner beyond our current understanding, but definitely including the processing of information transmitted from outer space, covering, but not limited to, weather, communications links, resource detection and so on. The elaboration of a rational order to prevent an arms race in outer space is a responsibility the present generation owes to posterity. The present level of the utilization of outer space is already extremely complicated and varied, while some of these uses are directly related to the issue of East-West strategic stability. In considering the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, we must start from the recognition of the kinds of weapons or equipment of military use that are stationed there, as well as the actual detail of the research and development activities taking place and what counter-measures or replacement can be foreseen to minimize the future arms race possibilities.

We welcome the establishment by the Conference on Disarmament at its 1985 session of an **ad hoc** Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space and the substantial work conducted therein. We hope that the Conference on Disarmament in its 1986 session will see fit to develop the discussion on the basis of the work done this year in order to identify those areas where a multilateral approach would be most appropriate.

In the 40-year history of the United Nations, efforts for disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, have been made from the very early days in New York, Geneva and other places around the world. It is possible to describe the outcome of these efforts in various ways. If it were not for the 40 years of continuous disarmament efforts, the world as we know now could have already been
destroyed and under radioactive ashes. At the same time, to realize that the 40 years of nuclear-arms-control efforts have increased the number of nuclear weapons from 3 in 1945 to some 60,000 in 1985 is an irony of the first degree.
Those of us who are involved in disarmament negotiations know that a purely philosophical or utopian approach alone cannot bring about our goals. It is also true that disarmament efforts are often taken as a testimony of faith or a barometer by which to gauge the extent to which a particular country is "peace-loving", and can thus be turned into a tool of "peace offensives". We have both a need and an obligation to remove such secondary or tertiary concerns, and to take the opportunity to reassess what should be the status of pure and unadulterated efforts.

One does not have to refer to lasers, particle beams, ocean surveillance satellites or BMD battle management radars to point out that present-day military hardware - especially when nuclear-weapons-related - their delivery vehicles, C3I, and corresponding defensive weapons have developed to the extent that it is now almost beyond the comprehension of any single individual to have a complete grasp of its software or hardware. A good deal of related software could be developed through a technology called auto-programming, without requiring the intervention of human ingenuity.

Given the continuing sophistication of nuclear weapons systems - that is, warheads, launching platforms, guidance, aiming and tracking systems, and so forth - we should try to do our best to grasp their basic substance, then see how it is possible to regain the control which mankind may be on the verge of losing over this technology. In other words, today's questions of disarmament and arms control are questions of the modern-day philosophy of science and the role of technology. We may need to seek means to restructure man's relationship with technology. Given a situation where disarmament efforts are either, on the one hand, completely abstract idealism or proclamatory declarations, or on the other, discussions of technical details among experts, we feel it necessary to re-introduce into United Nations disarmament forums the perspective of "science and man."
I should like, if I may, to look back 40 years to the Organization's beginnings. When discussions on the proposal for international management of atomic energy were undertaken in all seriousness, in the 1940s, there certainly were considerations of respective national interests as well as a lack of understanding of the full significance of the emerging nuclear age and of the questions posed by this new nuclear technology. Forty years have passed since then, and having heard the same arguments and seen the same resolutions on nuclear disarmament year in and year out, while little progress is made, one cannot hide a sense of frustration. My proposal is to return to the spirit and the hope and the conviction that people were talking about in this very United Nations only 40 years ago.

On the occasion of this fortieth anniversary I have taken the liberty of reflecting on the enthusiasm in our country in those days of our joining the United Nations and, recalling the gravity of our responsibilities, I wish to convey my Government's renewed vigour with regard to disarmament.

Mr. McDonagh (Ireland): I should like first, Sir, to extend to you our warm congratulations on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. My delegation is gratified that the Committee's activities will be guided by the valuable skills and experience which you bring to the work on which we are embarking. I should like to assure you and the other Committee officers of my delegation's full-hearted support for your efforts to achieve concrete and worthwhile results in the course of the Committee's work.

When our Committee began its last session, we had to draw conclusions about a year in which no dialogue had taken place between the Soviet Union and the United States. Our statements then reflected our common dismay. Despite the joint responsibility of the super-Powers to pursue arms control measures which would contribute to the prevention of nuclear war, the bilateral negotiations necessary
for the discharge of that responsibility had been broken off. In the meantime, the nuclear arms race had continued unabated.

Today, 12 months later, the picture is more promising. We are witness to a resumed dialogue between the two super-Powers and to a declared commitment on their part to persist in arms control negotiations.

However, the resumption of those negotiations does not in itself give grounds for complacency. The problems and developments which must be addressed have not altered. The causes of the failures of the SALT process and of the breakdown of the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks and the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces have not been set aside. It is therefore to be welcomed that the agenda established for the resumed bilateral talks addresses the issues of fundamental and immediate importance to the arms control agenda.

The coming talks will indeed be crucial. They represent the resuscitation of hopes long cherished by thinking people everywhere. They will meet the concerns of our peoples only if they open the way to a comprehensive approach to the complex problems involved.

Reviewing the developments of the past year, we find it difficult to divine any signs of movement towards the necessary preconditions for lasting peace. There is no halting or slackening of the spiral of the arms race. Of particular concern is the absence of restraint with regard to the dynamic - both technological and industrial - which fuels that race. Technology sounds its siren song and lures its listeners to seek a new competitive edge over others. It has been a commonplace to say that the peace of the world and, therefore, the survival of the planet have become hostages to the possible errors or miscalculations of human beings. Now we hear that we may have more to fear in the future from the "bug-content" of computers.
There appears to be a growing unwillingness to search for arms control and disarmament routes to halting and reversing the nuclear arms race and thereby contributing to the establishment of genuine peace and security. The current debate on meeting the weaknesses inherent in nuclear deterrence follows the route, not of dismantling through balanced reductions, but rather of challenging the potential aggressor with a new tier of weaponry which threatens to add a further dimension to the arms race. The cycle of armament and rearmament continues to be driven by traditional theories of balance and counter-balance aimed at achieving superiority rather than adequacy. Amazing as it may seem, there still appears to subsist a concept that the kind of peace which has existed for the past 40 years can be relied on to persist indefinitely in spite of an unbridled continuance of the nuclear arms race.

A prime example of the failure to look at alternatives to the nuclear-weapons race can be found in the reluctance on the part of nuclear-weapon States to negotiate on the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. With a comprehensive test-ban treaty nuclear weapons would not disappear, but their refinement would be constrained, and the option of reducing and eventually eliminating them reinforced. In the interim, a commitment by all nuclear-weapon States to halt testing at the earliest possible date, coupled with a commitment to proceed to the negotiated conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, would demonstrate their intention to follow paths other than that of nuclear weapons and to seek new directions in the pursuit of security.
(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

It was the strength of the recently concluded NPT Review Conference that, in its Final Declaration, the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty called upon the nuclear-weapon States with one voice to proceed to the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Pending the conclusion of such a treaty, we must regretfully acknowledge that the nuclear-weapon States are conserving the option of building further upon these weapons as the future mainstay of their military might.

We see, too, as we have seen for so many years, that the accumulation and modernization of weaponry is diverting attention and resources from the desperately needed effort in the field of development. Essential development goals are neglected in favour of the acquisition of the latest and most sophisticated hardware. Military needs ride roughshod over those of the poor, the suffering and the starving. And this flawed approach to mankind's problems is not confined, of course, to the underdeveloped and poorer countries alone. It also characterizes the policies of the richer and more heavily armed. In this connection we welcome the convening of a Conference in Paris in 1986 to examine more thoroughly this relationship between disarmament and development.

Disarmament has been a primary focus of the work of the United Nations since its founding. In recent years, therefore, the work of our Committee and the role of its deliberations in the pursuit of the goals set out in the Charter have been subjected to growing scrutiny. For some, the role of the General Assembly in the disarmament field is largely a hortatory one. The Assembly does not negotiate the details of multilateral measures and cannot lay down the agenda for bilateral negotiations. Nevertheless we should not underestimate the authority of this body and its role in the field of disarmament. The authority of the Assembly can be considerable, representing as it does 159 States.
Disarmament measures directly affect the security interests of States and, therefore, the acceptance or rejection of initiatives and proposals in the General Assembly will inevitably reflect national or collective security perceptions. But such perceptions should also recognize the existence of the community of nations. The nuclear-weapon States, in particular, must contribute and not erode confidence by their handling of the commitments and responsibilities that arise from their possession of the largest military potentials. It is entirely legitimate that demands should be made on them by the international community, and it is proper that the Assembly should continue to articulate these demands.

When we look at the achievements of our Committee from this perspective the picture is not entirely negative. In recent years, for example, the Committee has been able to advance the multilateral pursuit of the question of preventing an arms race in outer space some considerable distance, owing to the efforts of delegations committed to accommodating their particular interests and concerns within the framework of a single resolution. This resolution in turn has formed the basis upon which the Disarmament Commission has been able to reach agreement on a modest, but none the less substantive, mandate.

But in other areas, unfortunately, the situation is less satisfactory. For example, the singular importance attached by the international community to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty has for many years received little stimulus from the General Assembly. Perhaps we should seek to pursue in this Committee the underwriting of the goal for a comprehensive test-ban treaty with the unity of voice that was apparent at the NPT Review Conference.

We must anticipate that again this year almost two thirds of all resolutions presented to this Committee will be adopted by votes in which significant groups or important individual States choose to disassociate themselves from particular
recommendations. Because we adopt resolutions year after year that reiterate points of contention between delegations or that criticize the non-implementation of earlier contentious proposals, the authority of our Committee is certainly being eroded.

Our Committee is likely this year to adopt some 80 resolutions on disarmament matters, whereas 25 years ago some 15 resolutions sufficed. Yet this expansion in the number of resolutions has not produced anything like a proportionate increase in activity in the field of disarmament. Reference has been made in this debate to the volume of draft resolutions put before the Committee. The representative of Austria has suggested that we resist the temptation of imitating the stockpiling of weapons by stockpiling draft resolutions. My delegation agrees. Perhaps it is time for a freeze. The growing proliferation of resolutions tends to obscure, rather than clarify, the very stern reality of our concerns about disarmament problems; it is evidence of our inability to work in a constructive manner; and it arises largely out of a basic failure to recognize that any resolution that is adopted against the votes of a significant number of States is clearly incapable of eliciting the necessary political support for positive action on the subject it addresses. And then, of course, there are the obvious point-scoring resolutions which seem to serve nothing but a propaganda purpose.

Chemical weapons have been on the disarmament agenda for most of the century. At the Conference on Disarmament the international community is perhaps within reach of a negotiated convention to outlaw these weapons of mass destruction for all time. However, this optimistic prospect is challenged by two developments in particular. The first is that certain States continue to improve and enlarge their chemical weapons stocks. The second is that these weapons are now being used again in war.
(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

It is remarkable how little attention is being paid to the renewed use of chemical weapons. Chemical weapons capability is relatively easily acquired and there are signs of growing interest in acquiring this potential. Arguments that the retention of such weapons in the overall strategic deterrent of the major alliances make their use unlikely in an East-West confrontation have little application in regional situations where the threat to stability presented by the possession of such weapons is immediate and real.

We have recently heard calls for the establishment of a non-proliferation régime in chemical weapons analogous to that in the nuclear field. Let us be realistic as to what can be achieved in this regard. Ireland, in common with the other States members of the European Communities, has taken measures to control the export of chemical agents that might be used to produce chemical warfare agents. We have also supported the establishment of mechanisms whereby the Secretary-General can verify the use of such weapons. We have not intended thereby to begin a process leading to the establishment of a non-proliferation régime. Rather we have sought to respond to a specific current threat to erode the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol pending the conclusion of negotiations on a chemical-weapons ban. At a time when negotiations on a convention to outlaw chemical weapons are at an advanced stage, it is, in the view of my delegation, inappropriate to consider the question of establishing a non-proliferation régime for these weapons. Such a development would result in a loss of political commitment and of momentum in the movement towards a convention. It is with the same scepticism that we view proposals for partial measures related to the placement of chemical weapons currently in existence.

The Irish Government considers that the negotiated conclusion of a chemical weapons convention can be achieved if the parties concerned will display the
necessary political will and at the same time take a realistic approach to verification. Such an approach would recognize the value attached by parties to binding international commitments. Further, it would acknowledge that arms control will succeed only if due regard is paid to transparency and verification measures. We must face up to the reality that there is today a unique opportunity, which may not exist in three or four years' time, of concluding a convention.
Nineteen eighty five has been a year in which a number of positive developments in the arms control field can be recorded. As I have already said, the resumption of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union offers the prospect of tangible advances which will contribute to halting and reversing the arms race. The successful conclusion of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty demonstrates how much store the non-nuclear weapon States set by the negotiation now of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament, which is in progress in Stockholm, is studying in depth possibilities of reducing the risks of military confrontation in Europe. A successful outcome of the Conference would make an important contribution to peace and stability in the continent.

It is often stated that disarmament cannot proceed in a vacuum, that progress in disarmament cannot be divorced from progress towards the relaxation of international tension. Yet, disarmament becomes all the more urgent in times of international tension because the arms race itself generates and reinforces such tension. Disarmament, therefore, is an appropriate theme for all seasons and in all circumstances. Thus, although we may rethink our way of working, we should not cease to give disarmament the special and urgent attention that it so obviously requires.

Mr. AGSTNER (Austria): During the next 15 minutes - my statement will not last much longer - mankind will spend $27 million for military purposes. During the same short lapse of time, while we are comfortably seated in this conference room, 255 children under the age of five will die in developing countries for lack of nutrition and medical care. Such a state of affairs is an indictment of the priorities of the strange world we are living in. My delegation considers it an aberration, that in a world where the majority suffer from want and hunger, military expenditures have grown out of all proportion. It seems, however,
that we have not seen the worst, as the major weapons Powers are committing themselves to large increases in military spending.

Military expenditures almost doubled during the first part of our decade. Anyone who might think that this also holds true of development aid is mistaken, as the funds earmarked for development aid continue to stagnate and now constitute only around 4 per cent of total military expenditure. Unfortunately, the rise in military expenditures is not a phenomenon confined to the super-Powers and their allies, but also shared by the third world, whose share in global military expenditures has until recently been constantly rising.

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament concluded that:

"The vastly increased military budgets ... and the development, production and deployment ... of new types of weapons systems represent a huge and growing diversion of human and material resources ... Existing and planned military programmes constitute a colossal waste of precious resources which might otherwise be used to elevate living standards of all peoples; furthermore, such waste greatly compounds the problems confronting developing countries in achieving economic and social development." (A/S-12/32, para. 61)

As long ago as during the First World War - the war supposed to end all wars - President Woodrow Wilson demanded, in point 4 of his famous 14 points, that armaments should be reduced to the "lowest level consistent with domestic safety". The call for reducing military expenditure is not a new one. With the beginning of the decolonization process after the Second World War, the idea of reducing military expenditure was combined with the concept of development aid. As early as 1955, the French Prime Minister Edgar Faure proposed the establishment of an international fund for development and mutual assistance, which was conceived as part of a comprehensive and detailed agreement providing for the financial
supervision of disarmament and allocation of the funds made available to peaceful purposes.

In the following years we were to see a variety of interesting proposals by States and non-governmental organizations on the issue. It was, however, only in 1977 that the General Assembly decided that a study on disarmament and development should be initiated, a study which was ready in 1981 for the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly and came to be known as the Thorsson report. This study was the first attempt at an in-depth look into a range of relationships between disarmament and development.

Among others, the study also addressed the issue of research for military purposes, and concluded that 80 per cent of all military research and development expenditure is accounted for by the United States and the Soviet Union. The fact that 500,000 scientists and engineers are engaged in perfecting the art of destruction and are implementing in a modern way the old Latin saying that "war is the father of all things", diverts scarce expertise and intellectual effort from civilian sectors, reduces development of civilian technology and depresses economic growth rates. No wonder therefore that, in the circumstances, internationally agreed programmes, such as the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, despite as good record, face an absolute lack of funds and imminent dissolution.

Under item 10 of the provisional agenda of next year's Conference, we agreed to a "Consideration of ways and means of releasing additional resources through disarmament measures, for development purposes, in particular in favour of developing countries". (A/40/51, para. 11) In looking through the Thorsson report we find that there is by no means any dearth of constructive proposals on how this could be achieved. My delegation does not intend at this stage to go into the details of these various proposals, as it will be the task of the Preparatory Committee at its next two sessions and of the Conference itself to agree on the
most propitious action to be taken. The Austrian delegation offers its full co-operation in achieving constructive and realistic results at next year's Conference.

During the general debate in our Committee, we heard all speakers state that their countries were willing to contribute actively to the successful outcome of next year's Conference. If the Conference is really to achieve meaningful results, it will also have to tackle the question of military budgets and arms transfers. It will not only be necessary to examine, as agreed upon in item 9 of the provisional agenda, "the implications of the level and magnitude of the continuing military expenditures" (ibid.), but the size of military budgets themselves - all the more so, as contributions to the envisaged fund should be a mathematical function of these figures. My delegation cannot but wonder how this question can be discussed in a meaningful manner when data concerning the military budgets and arms transfers of countries with the greatest military expenditure and a considerable share in global arms exports are not available. Without establishing a sound basis for the calculation of contributions to the envisaged fund, we run the danger of setting up yet another fund, which operates on the basis of voluntary contributions of Member States, contributions which, as we all know, are increasingly difficult to obtain. We would not like to see annual pledging conferences convened in connection with such a voluntary fund, as this approach would certainly not generate sufficient resources for development aid.

My country has, for its part, always participated in the Secretary-General's reporting system on military budgets. In this regard, I would like to inform this Committee that the share of military expenditures in Austria's total government expenditures remained virtually unchanged over the last 15 years at approximately 3.6 per cent of the federal budget and at 1.2 per cent of the gross national product. With its $107 per capita military expenditures, Austria appears at the end of statistics on the military budgets of industrialized countries.
As my Ambassador has already stated, Austria considers the decisions of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development to convene the Conference in the summer of 1986, in Paris, to be one of the rare successes of our work this year. The fact that agreement on last year's resolution 39/160 and the report of the Preparatory Committee - which held its deliberations in a calm and constructive atmosphere - was reached by consensus must be attributed to a considerable degree to a general feeling of the urgency and justification of the matter. Austria appreciates the thorough preparation of the Conference, which will have at its disposal a variety of documents and papers which are already available or are being prepared. However, my delegation misses a highly informative publication which speaks for itself - I am referring to the wall-sheet prepared by the World Disarmament Campaign on the costs of the arms race. We would suggest that that wall-sheet be placed near the seat of every delegation taking part in the Conference in order to serve as a constant reminder that action, not rhetoric, is needed.

As the issue under consideration is a highly complex one, my delegation believes that next year's Conference will have to address not only disarmament and development in general terms but, under item 9 of the provisional agenda, also the question of arms transfers and the share of the military-industrial complex in our national economies. We should also bear in mind that 80 per cent of arms expenditure in accounted for by conventional weapons that can be produced by a steadily increasing number of States. The urgent necessity of halting the nuclear arms race has been emphasized by practically every delegation in this conference room. However, we should not overlook the simple fact that a reduction in the level of nuclear weapons is likely to be offset by an increase in conventional
weapons – weapons that are becoming increasingly sophisticated and therefore more costly. Nevertheless, it should have become clear to everyone by now that more weapons do not mean more security. In such a scenario, which seems all the more likely if the present state of relations between the two super-Powers continues, we would achieve exactly the opposite of what is required.

A sudden cut in military spending could, furthermore, have serious effects on the economies of several industrialized and newly-industrialized countries, which account for a large proportion of global arms production and weapon transfers. In a comprehensive approach, industries will have to be restructured in order to implement the age-old call to beat swords into ploughshares. In this regard, Governments will have to ensure that this conversion is not accompanied by large-scale unemployment. Such restructuring should also take into account the shift from military research to research for civilian purposes – for instance, in the fields of medicine and environmental protection.

Those were the comments that my delegation felt were necessary to avoid wrong expectations. The problems involved in reducing military budgets and reallocating – it is hoped – a significant proportion of the resources thus released to development aid should, however, in no way deter us from pursuing the goal of converting industries from military to civilian production. Such conversion has – as experience after the two world wars shows – been possible in the past, and my delegation feels it should be possible now and in the future. It would indeed be wrong to continue our present "business as usual" approach towards the military-industrial complex, as all past experience clearly shows that weapons are built not only to be sold but also to be used.

Furthermore, we should refrain from viewing the reduction of military budgets as a distant dream that runs counter to the belief that military expenditure is
bound to rise. We should not forget that, under propitious conditions, military expenditures were reduced in the past by both super-Powers. Not long ago the representative of China outlined in this conference room his Government's decision to reduce conventional forces by 1 million soldiers so as not to waste limited resources on military expenditures.

The economic state of the world is so unbalanced and precarious that it is itself a threat to peace. In past decades the developing countries made great efforts to catch up with the developed world, and it was regarded as merely a matter of time before that aim would be achieved. Now, however, it has become obvious that many among them cannot hope to reach in the medium term a standard of living comparable to that of the industrialized countries. Worse, for a number of reasons - including fast population growth and environmental degradation in which the industrialized countries have had a major share - many are even now faced with famine, crises, and unsustainable debt levels. A situation without hope in which none of the key players takes or even considers comprehensive measures to improve the situation is extremely dangerous for the democratic process that we have witnessed over the past few years. Economic injustice is a breeding-ground for aggression and extremism.

It is clear that, if the arms race were slowed down, all the funds released would not automatically go into development. In fact there might not be any funds at all, but merely a balanced budget instead of a deficit in several major countries. That in itself would be of major benefit to the world economy, and especially favourable to developing countries. At the recent joint World Bank/International Monetary Fund meetings in Seoul, it was recognized that huge national budget deficits have a destabilizing effect on the world economy as a whole and must be addressed in the search for long-term economic solutions.
Austria looks forward to the Conference on disarmament and development, which will serve as a powerful reminder to the world's conscience of the waste of funds for military purposes and, it is hoped, will find ways of contributing substantially to the reallocation of funds from destructive to constructive purposes.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.