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

Mr. BENNOUNA (Morocco) (interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation, and on my own behalf, I sincerely congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. Your competence and your in-depth knowledge of the matters on the Committee's agenda, as well as your amiability and your special openness are the best guarantee of the success of our work. We are especially pleased, because you represent a country with which we have enjoyed fraternal relations for centuries, relations imbued with a spirit of constant dialogue, mutual understanding and fruitful co-operation to foster the common ideals of the promotion of peace and the liberation of peoples.

Our congratulations also go to the other officers of the Committee and to Ambassador Souza e Silva, of Brazil, who led our work during the thirty-ninth session in an outstanding manner.

Many Heads of State and Government solemnly expressed during the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of our Organization their great concern over the urgent need to reconcile the legitimate aspiration for national security and the maintenance of world peace and security, which is vital.
Faced with hotbeds of conflict and open local wars, each one for his part stated his own policy of security, but all reaffirmed their dedication to the objective of collective security, as contained in the Charter, and requested the strengthening of the effectiveness of our Organization, so that it can function adequately. In his report on concepts of security of 26 August 1985 the Secretary-General drew attention to this dual aspect of national policy, as follows:

"All nations have the right to defend their own security. There is, however, a responsibility borne by all to ensure that national policies do not jeopardize global security." (A/40/553, para. 4)

To be sure, the use of force for purposes other than legitimate self-defence cannot be considered a legitimate instrument of national policy. To be sure, institutions can help to prevent conflicts and the peaceful settlement of disputes, as well as to orchestrate all kinds of pressure against possible aggressors. But the fact remains that a climate of confidence and good-neighbourly relations based on an intertwining of interests and on mutually advantageous exchanges is the best guarantee for regional peace and security.

Those are the basic premises behind the security policy of my country, be it with our neighbours of the Maghreb or with other coastal States of the Mediterranean. We have worked, and we shall continue to do so without fail, for the development of relations of co-operation, based on respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs. In this way, common cultural, economic and trade plans can be the best guarantor for regional peace and stability, and thereby for international security.

Nevertheless, when there are constant risks of an escalation and a worsening of tension, and when the imminence of conflicts becomes obvious, it is up to the
Secretary-General to assume his preventive role and provide all the parties concerned the adequate framework and institutional ways and means to bring them closer together, without any pre-condition, and thereby begin a dynamics for peaceful settlement within the framework of international law. In his annual report the Secretary-General has quite rightly recalled:

"that it would be in the interests of the Organization as a whole if the Secretary-General's capacity to serve as an objective third party were to be further developed." (A/40/1, p. 12)

Of course, it is up to the major deliberative bodies, be it the General Assembly or the Security Council, to heed the appeals of the Secretary-General and to entrust him with precise, appropriate instructions.

Humankind has become keenly aware of the threat to its very survival because of the build-up of an arsenal of increasingly sophisticated weapons. Since the adoption in 1961 of the first General Assembly resolution on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, some progress has been achieved, especially through the adoption of major international conventions, in particular that of 1963 banning nuclear testing in the atmosphere and under water, that of 1968 on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and that of 1971 banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, as well as in the subsoil thereof.

The Kingdom of Morocco which is Party to all of those legal instruments has also placed great hope in the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament in 1978, which proclaimed as a final objective the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and set up the Geneva Conference on Disarmament as a negotiation forum. The Conference to date has served as a structure for dialogue, but we must acknowledge that it has not been able to achieve significant results,
since it has become bogged down in procedural debates or in sterile polemics. One hopes that the willingness shown recently by the two great Powers to contemplate positive initiatives for reducing nuclear weapons and the forthcoming meeting of the Soviet and American leaders in Geneva will renew the negotiating work of the Conference and allow for the adoption of concrete measures.

As a member of the Geneva Conference, the Kingdom of Morocco has spared no effort within the Group of 21 in supporting possible proposals likely to bring the parties together and foster the cause of disarmament. We also took part in the third Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, held in Geneva from 27 August to 20 September 1985. We noted with satisfaction the favourable atmosphere for dialogue which allowed for the the unanimous adoption by the Conference of a final declaration. But the most serious concerns still remain as to the future of that Treaty, when we note that vertical proliferation by signatory nuclear Powers has not slowed down and that the risks of horizontal proliferation by non-parties are increasingly real. This is the case especially as regards South Africa and Israel, which have strengthened their nuclear capability, thereby weakening the credibility and stability of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and representing, respectively, a grave danger to the security of the African continent and to the Middle East. It has become imperative to stop all co-operation with those two countries in the nuclear sphere and to ensure a genuine denuclearization of the African continent.
If there is an area where co-operation can have constructive and positive aspects for prosperity and development it is certainly that of research on the production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, without discrimination, as called for by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The Kingdom of Morocco will continue to support the strengthening of the measure of assistance and control available to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), with which we have already concluded safeguards agreements.

It is now unanimously acknowledged and recognized that a nuclear war cannot be won, and it is the duty of the nuclear Powers to make a firm commitment not to resort to such weapons, especially against States which take no part in that suicidal arms race and have repeatedly proposed the adoption of negative security agreements. By the same token the international community must intensify its campaign to heighten the awareness of the world public of the nuclear threat. This is all the more urgent and necessary because there is now the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in outer space. That would involve considerable expenditure and this could have harmful consequences for the world economy and, in particular, the economies of the poorest countries.

Resolution 35/46, of 3 December 1980, declaring the 1980s the Second Disarmament Decade, reaffirmed the basic objective of the 1970s: the release of resources, by means of disarmament measures, for the promotion of economic development and the establishment of a new world economic order. Despite this, we are faced with the unacceptable paradox of the striking contrast between the level of expenditure on armaments - nearly $1 trillion - and the meagre financing available for the economic development needs of poor countries.

In this connection, the Kingdom of Morocco welcomed the promising initiative taken by France at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, which led to the adoption of resolution 39/160 of 17 December 1984. By that resolution the
General Assembly decided to hold an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The procedural aspects of the forthcoming Conference, to be held in Paris, have already been sketched out by a Preparatory Committee which must now, while remaining open to all interested countries, undertake an in-depth study of substantive issues. We have the greatest hopes for the success of that Conference, which should adopt the first steps in a process - for a process it is - for the gradual transfer to development projects of funds released by the reduction of military budgets.

We must not lose sight of the fact that disarmament should be the subject of a comprehensive approach, including of necessity the conventional arms race, which affects nearly all the countries of the third world. Those countries are involved in a competition which is imposed upon them from outside by those that produce and have available advanced technology in the field. The prevention of tension, the development of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the improvement of the machinery of regional co-operation remain the most appropriate ways of ending the conventional arms race, whose main victims are the countries of the third world.

On the occasion of the commemoration of its fortieth anniversary, much criticism has been levelled at our Organization in connection with its role in the maintenance of international peace and security, the limitation of the arms race and the promotion of economic development. It is undoubtedly necessary to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations by better co-ordination of the activities of its bodies and by focusing them on more practical action. But this world Organization remains an indispensable forum for the creation of a climate of confidence and ongoing dialogue, so that all interested parties may participate in the search for suitable solutions.
(Mr. Bennouna, Morocco)

In the final analysis, the United Nations is but a reflection of its component parts and of their contradictions; it is a continuing creative effort, expressing the diversity and wealth of all peoples and the genius of their civilizations.

On the eve of the International Year of Peace, we express the wish that that diversity and that wealth may be channelled towards the preservation of great spiritual values, for no nation and group of human beings can build its own freedom on the oppression of others.
Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Committee, I am pleased to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. We are confident that your ability and skill will guide our deliberations to the desired results. May I, through you, also congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, and we are all called upon to pause and reflect on and take stock of our work, our achievements and our failures, in particular with regard to disarmament and arms control.

After 40 years of consideration of this matter, and in spite of the adoption of thousands of resolutions and reports and after much research, the situation over the years has moved from bad to worse. While it is true that the United Nations has thus far succeeded in preventing the outbreak of a third world war, and thereby the use of nuclear weapons, it is also true that this success, unfortunately, has not been extended to the arms race and limited the development and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. That, in our view, is the crux of the matter.

Therefore, the United Nations has not been able to defuse the constant threat of the outbreak of war, a war whose results cannot be predicted and whose ramifications are unthinkable.

The international situation has become so sensitive that any miscalculation might bring the world to a catastrophic end. Matters have reached this point, owing to the lack of confidence in international relations and of understanding between States, in particular the major Powers, as well as reliance by some States on the concept of power as an instrument for the implementation of their foreign policies.
In such an atmosphere replete with tensions and increased possibilities of danger it is the smaller States that are most vulnerable.

We note with grave concern that research and technology in the arms industry are advancing at a much faster pace than the progress in negotiations on disarmament and the limitation of strategic weapons. All this is occurring in spite of the increasing concern of all mankind over the arms race and weapons development. Every year we are presented with a new weapon and a new field for the arms race. There is "star wars" casting its bleak shadow over us and dashing whatever hopes left in the possibility of agreeing on certain limits in this field. It also leaves the door wide open to danger coming from space.

We had hoped that space discoveries would provide a new field for mankind to obtain more resources and make use of their potential for the development and progress of all. Hence we continue to share the opinion that outer space is the common heritage of mankind and that it should be used solely for peaceful purposes.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones would greatly contribute to reducing the great danger inherent in the proliferation of such weapons. It would play a positive and effective role in the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons. Therefore, my country has always supported the establishment of such zones in the Middle East, Africa, Latin America and South-East Asia. My country also attaches special importance to the question of guarantees to be provided to the non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

My delegation also believes that there is a close relationship between disarmament and development. Military expenditures, including those on the arms race, constitute a major obstacle to the full exploitation of the potential of human society in raising standards of living and achieving socio-economic progress in developing countries. We look forward to the convening of the International
Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1986, because this Conference will provide the appropriate framework to consider the matter, assess the adverse effects of military expenditures and seek ways to channel resources for the benefit of development.

Armaments and the acquisition of ever more sophisticated weapons has become the malaise of our time which is afflicting all societies. While some States have the material and economic potential to acquire weapons, the States of the third world are jeopardizing their social and economic fabric in diverting a large part of their national income to weaponry, despite the dire need to devote these expenditures to their socio-economic development. International rivalry, with its regional dimensions and extensions, has made it imperative for these States to devote a large part of their national income to armaments so as to preserve their independence and prevent interference in their internal affairs by some major Powers. There is a very close link between the economic recovery of the countries that manufacture and export weapons and the misery in some parts of the third world where regional armed conflicts are assuming such proportions that they consume most of the resources and potential of these States.

The manufacture of and trade in weapons have become the most profitable enterprise in the world. Hence the economic welfare of the States that manufacture and export weapons is achieved at the expense of the States that import and use these weapons. It is also achieved at the expense of the poor who kill each other for the benefit of the rich.

For some States to base their economies on the manufacture and export of weapons represents a grave danger, for that necessarily entails the creation by these States of markets for their products by fanning the flames of regional conflicts and creating hotbeds of tension in third-world countries, later coming to
their rescue by exporting weapons to them. In turn, that increases tension, thus making it imperative upon those States to mortgage their independence, sovereignty and the dignity of their people to acquire more weapons.

The fact that third-world States have been compelled to enter the arms race adds a new dangerous element to the economic and social dilemma of those States. The international community is therefore called upon seriously to consider this question; and certain States, in particular the major Powers, are called upon to cease interfering in the internal affairs of other States.

Israel has so far refused to place its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. We had not expected otherwise. Israel's acceptance of such inspection would have been diametrically opposed to its well-known attitude in refusing to comply with the international community. It would have also unveiled the truth of its aggressive intentions against other States in the region.

All reports and evidence point to the fact that Israel has acquired nuclear weapons. It is the only State that has acquired such weapons in our region. This poses a threat to peace and security not only in the Middle East but also in the whole world.

Israel has not accepted and will not accept IAEA safeguards. It is incumbent upon the international community, and in particular those States providing Israel with the material and technology to assist it in the production of nuclear weapons to shoulder their responsibilities and cease providing such assistance to Israel in this field, thereby moving the region further away from the dangers of nuclear war.
(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab Emirates)

My country, which is a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and a coastal State of that Ocean, still feels grave concern at the obstacle to the convening of the International Conference on the Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace caused by the lack of a consensus, which in turn is due to the absence of the necessary seriousness and the creation of what in our opinion are unacceptable pretexts. At the same time, the military presence in the Indian Ocean is being escalated in a way that does not serve the purposes of that Declaration.

In conclusion, the world looks with hope to the summit meeting to be held in Geneva next month between the leaders of the two super-Powers. The world hopes that that summit will lead to a relaxation of tension in the international situation and create a new atmosphere of mutual trust. It also hopes that at that summit meeting mutual understanding will be reached on the revitalization of negotiations on curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and on disarmament. We all hope that the two States will reach a common understanding that will have a positive effect on international relations.

Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland): The delegation of Poland has already had the privilege of conveying to you, Sir, its congratulations on your election to the prestigious office of Chairman of the First Committee, and of congratulating also the other officers of the Committee, in its statement of 17 October in support of the important initiative of the USSR concerning the critically important issue of preventing the militarization of outer space and reserving it for exclusively peaceful pursuits. May I add that at the fortieth anniversary session of the General Assembly the prestige of your office is rivalled only by its demands and responsibilities. I assure you that in fulfilling your tasks you will have my delegation's full co-operation and goodwill.
Today it is my intention to speak on the broader aspects of the disarmament agenda before us, as well as on those covered in the report of the Conference on Disarmament for 1985. At the same time, I should like to reserve my delegation's right to comment at an appropriate later date on one or two specific questions, especially the question of chemical weapons.

The debate at the current commemorative session of the General Assembly, both in plenary meetings and in this Committee, leaves no doubt as to the direction of the mainstream of concern of the international community at a time when the United Nations enters its mature middle age. Indeed, the overwhelming sense of the debate is dismay that the original promise of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" is being increasingly threatened by the dark clouds of the nuclear age.

That sombre but sober assessment of the international environment today has been foreshadowed by the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in his annual report on the work of the Organization, where he observes that:

"Without collective determination and the acknowledgement of a minimum common interest in survival, there can be no meaningful progress in disarmament. International insecurity and the arms race, with the fear of its possible extension to new areas, create a relentless vicious spiral. Where the arms race is concerned, it cannot be sufficiently emphasized that the quest for advantage is illusory. In the nuclear era it also places all people at risk and puts in doubt the lives of future generations." (A/40/1, pp. 7 and 8)
Very much the same view of the state of international relations motivated the Chairman of the Polish delegation, Prime Minister General Wojciech Jaruzelski, when in his statement to the General Assembly on 28 September he asked the following anguished question:

"Are we going to be the last generation that ensures the continuity of life on Earth? That is not a rhetorical question. Forty years ago mankind entered the nuclear era. Today, it is confronted with the threat of the transfer of the arms race race into outer space. Where this path will end is something that no one is in a position to know." (A/40/PV.12, p. 28)

The important statements in the commemorative meetings have eloquently demonstrated that indeed none of the leaders of States or Head of Government converging on the East River for the United Nations anniversary celebrations are either ignorant of or indifferent to the fateful nuclear collision course which the world seems to be approaching. It would definitely embark upon that course should the nuclear arms race take another twist by invading outer space.

The blame for that state of international affairs has also been unmistakably and squarely placed on the Western proponents of a confrontation-prone and destabilizing policy of arms build-up. Motivated as it is by a search for illusory military advantage, for total invulnerability equal to total threat to the perceived adversary, that policy is clearly the root cause of the dangers and tensions that we are all witnessing.

This becomes even more obvious when the strategic defence initiative, the alleged cure-all remedy to do away with or render obsolete all nuclear weapons, is in fact presented as part and parcel of the Pentagon's unprecedented nuclear arms programme.
Mr. Turbanski, Poland

Poland and other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have all along consistently believed that in no way can the nuclear threat be reduced, much less eliminated totally, as a result of a qualitative and quantitative upgrading of nuclear or conventional armouries.

In the view of the socialist States - and they have supported it over recent years and months with specific initiatives and proposals - the only viable and credible approach to restraining the genie of the arms race is by way of positive endeavours to reach equitable accords, arrived at with due regard for the principles of the equality and equal security of all States. Accordingly, the Government of the USSR has submitted concrete, imaginative and bold proposals. They ought to be taken up in an honest, give-and-take negotiating process and pursued constructively and in good faith. Indeed, by renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons and introducing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union has gone on record as being fully prepared and willing to practise what it preaches.
The proposals of the USSR, including those put forward by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, during his recent visit in Paris, won unanimous and resounding endorsement last week at the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty which met in the Bulgarian capital.

In a declaration of 23 October, the leaders of seven socialist countries assembled in Sofia incorporated a disarmament policy programme designed to remove the nuclear threat once and for all, as well as consolidate peace and international security in Europe and throughout the world. The document emphatically reaffirms that while the socialist States have never sought to gain military superiority, by the same token they will never reconcile themselves to a status of inferiority. What they aspire to is military balance at the lowest possible level of force.

The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have come forward with resolute support for the constructive Soviet proposals aimed at practical measures with a view to pre-empting an arms race in outer space and curbing it on Earth. To this end they have declared their strong backing of the offer to work for a Soviet-United States agreement to ban space-strike weapons completely and to effect a truly radical, 50 per cent reduction of their arsenals of nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

At the same time, declaring their determination to see Europe completely free of nuclear weapons, the socialist States have offered to reach a separate accord on an early mutual reduction of medium-range nuclear systems in Europe, without a direct link either to space or strategic arms.

In addition to, and apart from, the new proposals, the leaders of the socialist States have again reiterated their earlier suggestions made to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance. Still valid, in particular, stand the proposals for a contractual agreement on the mutual non-use of military force
and peaceful relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty members for a freeze and reduction of military expenditures and for freeing Europe of chemical weapons. The States participating in the Sofia meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty have furthermore appealed to the two big Powers for a mutual commitment to refrain from the development and production of highly sophisticated conventional weapons whose destructive power is close to that of nuclear arms.

It goes without saying that the proposals outlined, or restated, in the Sofia declaration are not addressed to the two major Powers, to the nuclear Powers or even to the members of the respective political-military groupings alone. They do recognize and provide for a crucial role for all Members of the United Nations as well as for the world Organization itself.

As will be readily appreciated, in the language of the document adopted at Sofia the United Nations does represent an indispensable framework within which to sustain and co-ordinate efforts aimed, first of all, at averting a nuclear holocaust. Precisely for this reason, on the fortieth anniversary of the world Organization and on the eve of the International Year of Peace, the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty have appropriately enough rededicated themselves to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, believing, as they do, that strict adherence to the ideals of the Charter constitutes an indispensable premise for world peace.

Public opinion in Poland, as probably the world over, expects that new positive prospects in that respect will result from the forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States.

In the view of my delegation, the importance of that meeting must be regarded as particularly critical given the lack of visible progress so far in the Soviet-United States bilateral negotiations on nuclear and space weapons, on the one
hand, and the potentially positive influence of the success of the meeting on the whole spectrum of disarmament discussions, on the other.

Against the generally grim picture of the disarmament scene over recent months and years, one welcomes with a sense of satisfaction the outcome and constructive work of another Geneva forum, the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Our satisfaction derives, first and foremost, from the fact that Poland and other European States, in particular those in Central Europe, identify their adherence to and unreserved support for the Treaty with the best interests of their national security. The adoption by consensus of the Conference's Final Declaration, as well as the positive assessment contained therein of the efficacy of the Treaty's non-proliferation and co-operation provisions, cannot but strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty, so far the most widely adhered to multilateral instrument in the area of arms limitation and disarmament.

Although threatened by the continuing nuclear-arms race and the further degradation of international security, a fact duly noted in the Final Declaration of the Review Conference, the Treaty stood the test of time well, bearing out its usefulness to the parties and to all countries not only in terms of their security preoccupations, but also in terms of profitable and far-ranging international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Major credit for this is due, of course, to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its administration of the IAEA safeguards system. We also cannot but underline in this Committee the Declaration's part on disarmament, its well-founded criticism and concern over the continuing nuclear-arms race, the implications of outer space being drawn into that race and its stress on the need for meaningful negotiations to halt and reverse this trend, with particular emphasis on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. The Polish delegation full shares and supports this appeal in the Final Declaration and hopes it will have a positive impact on the results of our deliberations here.
(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

For one who has been actively involved in the work of the Conference on Disarmament at its last session, I turn to the Conference's report before us with rather mixed feelings. The year 1985 has certainly been among the busiest sessions the Conference has held in recent years, at least in terms of the amount of time consumed, documents produced and words put on record. Unfortunately, tangible results - as can be seen from the report - are much less striking.

Allow me to comment briefly on some key problem areas.

There is hardly any need to recall here that the Conference being - to quote from paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - "a single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum", has a very special place in the system of disarmament negotiations.

Yet there was not enough real negotiation in the Conference. The main feature of its 1985 session was a lack of progress on the major nuclear items, such as the nuclear-test ban, cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, and prevention of nuclear war, issues to which the General Assembly has repeatedly assigned the highest priority. Hiding behind fancy rhetoric their unwillingness to allow the Conference to proceed to serious and practical negotiations on those questions, a few members of the Conference on Disarmament have once again abused the principle of consensus by blocking the establishment of appropriate subsidiary bodies. The notorious overstate on verification has been frequently used, in particular with regard to the nuclear-test ban which has been presented as being allegedly unverifiable. Yet we submit that it is not verification that is the real obstacle to a nuclear-test ban.
Another disquieting facet of this negative attitude is the dangerous tendency to belittle the potential consequences of nuclear war. We are dead set against any kind of war. But one fact is obvious: having survived hundreds of dreadful conventional conflicts, mankind would most probably not survive a single nuclear conflict. This simple qualitative difference calls for doing away with the threat of nuclear war first and foremost. The prevention of nuclear war requires immediate concerted action on the part of all States, without awaiting the advent of an ideal world without any wars.

Hence the picture is truly bleak, although not entirely black. The Conference on Disarmament has managed to set up the Ad Hoc Committee on agenda item 5, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space" - albeit with only a very narrow mandate. We are deeply convinced that, given the highest priority warranted by the question, this subsidiary body should be re-established in 1986 with a broader negotiating mandate.

Some modest progress has also been made in the elaboration of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, and we are indeed grateful to Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico for his untiring efforts and immense patience.

We have also noted that the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons made a further contributin to the solution of the issues entrusted to it.

Further progress was equally made in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Since my delegation intends to address this issue in a separate intervention at a later date, I shall refrain from dwelling on this today.

To sum up, it is our view that the 1985 session of the Conference on Disarmament has been slightly more fruitful than the 1984 session, but it has still largely failed to fulfil its overall mandate and to meet the legitimate expectations of world opinion. This most regrettable situation is certainly incompatible with the urgency of the key issues on the agenda of the Conference.
Similarly, the inability to make more tangible progress seriously undermines the credibility of the Conference on Disarmament as - to repeat once again - the single multilateral negotiating body for disarmament.

Let us hope that at its 1986 session the Conference on Disarmament will finally be able to make substantial headway in its endeavours to contribute in a concrete manner to the achievement of the most important goal of the human race: "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

Mr. GURINOVIČ (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to renew my congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

My statement deals with the item on "International co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization".

From the very beginning of the conquest of space, which was marked by the sending into orbit of a Soviet satellite - a model of which can be found at United Nations Headquarters - on the initiative of the Soviet Union efforts have been made in the Organization to establish conditions for the exploration and exploitation of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

A great deal has been achieved. Through international agreements and conventions, we have banned the testing of nuclear weapons in space and prohibited the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the use of outer space for military or any other purposes that might have a harmful effect on the environment. Such issues as rescuing cosmonauts, returning cosmonauts and satellites to Earth, responsibility for any damage caused by objects in outer space, the use of outer space for naval communications by satellite and the registration of satellites have been settled. There is also a significant
number of United Nations decisions on banning the militarization of outer space, and we have draft texts of international agreements for the final achievement of this goal.

The Conference on Disarmament has established a Special Committee to consider such items. That the task of banning nuclear weapons in outer space is of capital importance has now become generally acknowledged. But there remains a significant exception to that view: the United States of America, a Power with enormous military and space potential, has declined to heed the warnings of all other States Members of the United Nations, which at the previous session of the General Assembly voted in favour of a resolution banning an arms race in outer space. This is precisely why there has not been at this stage any further agreement in this area.

We should like to point out that the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR does not wish to engage in polemics. For us the major concern is, through joint action, to prevent the militarization of outer space and see to it that we secure the prohibition of outer space becoming a military threat to nations on Earth. However, the comparison and analysis of well-known facts compel us to take a closer look and to assert the following.

We must note that the United States has begun a historically unprecedented planned preparation for a new qualitative breakthrough in the arms race in outer space as well as for other types of weapons. By comparison and analysis, such activity is unprecedented. The military breakthrough is something totally new for mankind and the distances involved are unprecedented in their parameters and strategic significance. This is something designed to make outer space a new source of mortal danger for mankind and to turn the Earth into a bull's-eye of
discord for "star wars" and the target of an arsenal of sophisticated means of mass destruction. It will undermine all the painstakingly prepared international legal limits to the arms race.

Why is this being done, and what is the ultimate goal? The answer is quite simple: aspirations to social revanchism, unlimited domination over the world, usurpation of the right of States to decide on their own futures and interference in internal affairs to hold sway and, naturally, to serve the selfish interests of imperialism.
More specifically, it is an idea that dates back more than a decade. Attempts to achieve it by attacks on socialism, economic pressure and nuclear blackmail have failed, however, there is now dependence on a military breakthrough in space. It is being attempted on the appropriate scale. The sums allocated to finance the arms race in space, according to authoritative estimates, are expressed in figures so far used only in the works of astronomers and in calculating the internal indebtedness of the current United States Administration. The political support of some allies is being bought by promises of a share in the military benefits. In addition, ultimatums are used and sometimes arms are twisted.

In order to sell the idea of extending the arms race to outer space to its own public and the rest of the world, the Administration has created and spread a number of myths. Let us dwell on a few. First, the outer space weapons programme is supposedly for defensive purposes, but is that really so? If the goal of the United States is only to ensure its defences, why is it refusing to assume the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as the Soviet Union has done? Why does it continue to improve nuclear and other types of weapons and step up the arms race? Why is it seeking new pretexts for side-stepping existing Soviet-American negotiations and the purpose of the negotiations in Geneva - the prohibition of the militarization of outer space and the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons on Earth? Finally, why is it, on various pretexts, finding fault with the Soviet Union's proposed 50 per cent reduction of the nuclear potential of both countries?

Let us look at some of the real facts. The so-called anti-missile, space-based installations can be used to destroy satellites of all types and have a nuclear first-strike capability. Can there be any doubt that the space-strike weapons might also be used against targets on Earth and in the atmosphere?
High-energy laser beams, particle beam weapons, electromagnetic artillery and anti-satellite weapons can all be used against not only military targets but various types of industrial facilities, population centres and agricultural harvests covering enormous areas.

Therefore, what we are talking about is the establishment of a new, extremely dangerous type of weaponry. The possibilities of its use depend entirely on the schemes of those who have it available to them, and those schemes cannot be described as intended only to ensure defence, as is asserted to the public; they also reflect aspirations to military superiority and the vain hope of a nuclear first strike without retaliation.

On an NBC television programme on 27 March this year none other than the United States Secretary for Defense said outright that the United States Administration's only stimulus was "fear of the threat of a retaliatory strike". His assistant, Fred Ikle, was even more candid, saying

"The use of anti-satellite systems as an essential element of a first strike for the destruction of all or many of the opponent's key satellites will make it extremely difficult to carry out a retaliatory strike."

A Deputy-Secretary, Edward Aldridge, was very candid when he said

"One does not have to look very far to see that a country that can control outer space can control the whole world."

Let us now look at what some competent people who are not members of the current United States Administration have said. Senator Gary Hart said in Geneva on 21 January this year,

"The existence of space weaponry does not establish the shield that some are dreaming about. Rather, it creates a new arena for nuclear war and new opportunities and ways to begin such a war."
The former United States Secretary for Defense, Robert McNamara, said at a press conference in Washington on 31 July this year that the strategic defence initiative programme "is clearly designed to ensure invincibility for the United States after it has made a first nuclear strike".

From all that I have just said it is clear that "star wars" is not defensive; it is a programme for catastrophe, and a more accurate description would be "strategic offence initiative", not "strategic defence initiative". The current hypocritical titles follow the logic by which the death-dealing MX nuclear missile, with 10 nuclear warheads, each with a capability 30 times greater than that of the bomb that fell on Hiroshima, has been dubbed "the peace-keeper".

There is feverish activity to ensure a breakthrough in space, in flagrant contravention of many decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly, including the Declaration adopted in resolution 3384 (XXX) on the proposal of a number of countries of which the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was one - on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interests of Peace and for the Benefit of Mankind. That Declaration solemnly proclaims that all States shall refrain from any acts involving the use of scientific and technological achievements for the purposes of violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other States, interfering in their internal affairs, waging aggressive wars, suppressing national liberation movements or pursuing a policy of racial discrimination.

Let us take another well-known myth. The establishment of an anti-satellite defence would supposedly make possible the elimination of all nuclear weapons. Is that really what the United States is struggling to achieve? If so, if it is in favour of renouncing nuclear weapons, why does it oppose the attainment of positive results at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons? Why is it preventing the
beginning of talks on nuclear disarmament at the Conference on Disarmament? In fact, the truth is quite different. At special hearings of the Senate Armed Forces Committee in February this year, Fred Ikle said "The Star Wars programme opens the door to a long-term nuclear strategy." That is where we find the basis of the truth. Over the past few years the United States has decided to improve and to put in place all the elements of a nuclear triad - the production and deployment of intercontinental ballistic land-based MX missiles, the development of a mobile missile, the so-called Midgetman, and the production of strategic B-1 bombers, using Stealth technology, and the Trident nuclear submarine, equipped with long-range missiles.
They go even further. The American press has reported the existence of a secret Pentagon programme for creating missiles with a changing trajectory and with a capability of destroying the opponent's anti-missile capability. In addition to all of this, in Western Europe there continues to be deployment of first-strike American nuclear missiles.

This is thus a plan to establish a system of a gradual anti-satellite defence in conjunction with unprecedented build-up of strategic nuclear potentials for a first strike. In this context it would be appropriate to recall a statement made by President Reagan on 23 March 1983 in which, among other things he stated that the plan for the emplacement of ABM's in space:

"If we compare it with the offensive systems, we might regard it as a factor promoting an aggressive policy."

In fact this is how the overwhelming majority of States regard the current efforts of the United States. This is borne out by a discussion in plenary meetings of the General Assembly and in the First Committee as well.

At one time, at the dawn of a nuclear epic, for a propagandist justification of massive emplacement of nuclear weaponry in the United States, the thesis was put forward to the effect that supposedly nuclear weaponry would lead to the disappearance of conventional types of weaponry, because they would become outmoded or unnecessary. Now, a few decades later, we all see the cost of such methods. Nevertheless, once again unabashedly those methods are being used and the old fairy tales are being repeated.

Edward Teller, a man of sad renown, an American physicist, who is a high-level consultant on star wars with the Washington Administration, recently publicly stated the following in Paris:

"The fairy tale to the effect that strategic defensive initiative is being used to eliminate nuclear weaponry on earth was dreamed up for internal
consumption in the United States in order to deal a blow to the anti-war
movement."

I believe, with this statement the dots have been placed on the i's and the t's
have been crossed, as they say.

The next myth is that the United States supposedly does not have and there
does not exist an anti-satellite weapon, and that the only concern is not to allow
the Soviet Union to win the race in this unknown sphere. The facts, however,
clearly show that those statements are false. The United States began development
of an anti-satellite weapons system in the 1950s, and it was the first country in
1959 to test such weaponry. In the beginning of the 1960s, the United States
established two land-based anti-satellite complexes in the Kwajalein and Johnston
islands in the Pacific Ocean. Furthermore, in accordance with reports in the
American press last year it became known that the United States virtually had set
up an anti-satellite system used to destroy Soviet satellites, as far back as the
Eisenhower Administration.

Herbert York has stated that at the time when he was director of the research
installations under President Eisenhower, an undisclosed number of American
anti-satellite systems had been put into orbit. So it is that the air-based
missile complex ASAT has been established, thereby creating an anti-satellite
system not of the first generation. And the myth of a so-called lagging behind the
USSR is merely a propaganda cover-up of irresponsible activities in conditions
whereby for the third year there has been a unilateral moratorium by the USSR for
anti-satellite testing in space.

We must note that United States ASAT testing has become one of the major
salvos of star wars, a salvo with a purpose of whipping up tensions and
complicating the atmosphere at negotiations under way.
(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The most bandied about myth proffred by the Administration recently is the assertion that work on the strategic defense initiative (SDI) programme is only of innocent research nature. However, in fact, the SDI research programme is nothing other than the establishment of a new armaments system for star wars.

Today it would be appropriate to recall that the American programme to create the atom bomb, well known under the nickname of "Manhattan Project" was used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki also at the research stage. In fact, there is a desire to spend four times as much on SDI in the years to come as was spent for the Manhattan Project. This is a fantastic sum for pure research - and this has been pointed out by American scientists.

Why are so many tens of billions of dollars being spent? Only to solve abstract theoretical questions? Why then are ASAT tests being held in outer space? We can find the answer to this through the head of the American Administration. At a press conference held in the White House in February of this year, he said the following:

"I have stated repeatedly that if as a result of our research it turns out that there is the possibility to create such weaponry, in that case I would be prepared to discuss the development and the use of such weaponry."

In this quotation we should like to highlight the words "and the use of such weaponry". Hence, what is involved is not simple research, and not the fact that American scientists are casting covetous glances at outer space and are platonically wondering how they can use outer space for such purposes.

Let us recall that the current head of the American delegation at the United States-USSR negotiations in Geneva, on 22 January of this year wrote in The New York Times Magazine that the United States is already capable of establishing and emplacing a two-tier anti-satellite defensive system. One might wonder from
what they intend to set this up. From scientific articles, from architect's
drawings, from the drawing boards? The answer is quite different.

As the United States Secretary of Defense stated on 12 September 1984:
"The United States on a small scale has already tested and demonstrated the
possibility for the establishment of a system."
On the basis of the myth of the so-called scientific research nature of the United States strategic defence initiative, another, very pragmatic, myth has been devised: since this is supposedly pure research, a ban on the work cannot be monitored and, therefore, it cannot be prohibited. True, as long as scientists think and ponder and put their ideas down on paper, one could discuss whether or not it can be monitored. But we are not talking about basic, abstract scientific research work; we are talking about research work to create satellite weaponry capable of striking. Even in its early stages, such work could inevitably be monitored by national technical institutions, because models are prepared and demonstration experiments and testing are conducted. This means that if agreements were violated, it would inevitably be revealed long before the weapons in question were manufactured. The strategic defence initiative programme is no needle in a haystack, difficult to find: it is an enormous complex of tasks connected with the development of many components of satellite weapons, including laser, anti-satellite weapons and radar systems. Moreover, it involves bodies to manage the whole system. In the view of authoritative specialists, any research on such weapon components would be accompanied by signals that the other side would inevitably be able to detect.

Another myth that is being enthusiastically cultivated is that carrying out the strategic defence initiative programme does not contravene the indefinite 1972 Treaty limiting anti-ballistic missile systems. In this connection it is the fashion to interpret that Treaty in many different ways. It can be interpreted either as limiting or as expanding; it can be interpreted more or less strictly. It all depends on who is speaking to whom. Some formulations calm world public opinion and allies; others frighten the opponents of "star wars". Assertions that research to create satellite and outer space weapons is not in fact in violation of the Treaty are groundless. The Treaty bans the development, testing and deployment
of space-based components and anti-ballistic missile systems, and all diversions and attempts to find loopholes are nothing more than a violation of the Treaty.

We must note that the strategic defence initiative programme is in contravention not only of the indefinite 1972 anti-ballistic missile Treaty, but also of the entire extant international system pertaining to outer space: the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water; the 1967 Treaty on the exploration and peaceful use of outer space; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; the first and second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties. The well-known United States astronomer Carl Sagan has emphasized, in an article in *Discovery* magazine that "the 'star wars' programme, in any event, violates each of these agreements".

In an attempt to make "star wars" more attractive, another myth has been propagated. It is said that the achievements - or rather the byproducts - of the United States strategic defence initiative programme will supposedly have benefits for peaceful scientific and technological progress. But the whole notion of the strategic defence initiative leading to some kind of imagined progress is in utter contradiction of scientific and technological research and actually makes a mockery of it. We must consider this: what is the normal application for modern society of burning metals 3,000 kilometres from Earth? Who needs to develop the technology to freeze computers to absolute zero and hurl them out at enormous speed, as is in fact what is being done? Those are the kinds of things that are being worked on in the strategic defence initiative programme.

A recent report of the American Council on Economic Priorities put forward the view that the Pentagon's technical programme for the production of outer space weapons cannot be adapted to the civilian economy without essential long-term adaptation processes.
There is another significant side to the impact of military outer space research on developments in science, technology and the economy. I am speaking of a major diversion of the efforts of highly qualified specialists — first and foremost scientists and engineers — who should be solving essential social and economic problems to the development of outer space weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

The "star wars" programme is not a catalyst for scientific, technological and economic progress, but rather a brake on it. Another legitimate question arises, in terms of principle: Why, in order to solve problems of the genuine progress and development of human society, must we use the byproducts of military strategic programmes? Why should we not use our resources directly for scientific and technological developments for economic and social progress, including in the developing countries?

When that celebrated American astronomer Carl Sagan was asked what could be done to foster the peaceful conquest of outer space with the $3 trillion that has supposedly been proposed for the implementation of the strategic defence initiative, he replied that, with existing technology, that sum could send a manned expedition to Mars; it could create a permanent manned base on the moon; it could send an unmanned spacecraft to engage in solar research; it could actually pay for an Earth-orbiting space laboratory. Moreover, billions of dollars would remain for use in social programmes. This means that we should concentrate the international community's major efforts on "star peace" and on research into the peaceful exploitation of outer space.

That, in fact, is what is called for by the new Soviet proposal on international co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization. That proposal was put forward at the current session of the General Assembly and has been explained in detail in statements made
by the delegation of the USSR. As stated in the declaration issued on 23 October
by the States members of the Warsaw Treaty,

"The implementation of this major initiative would provide reliable protection
to mankind against the lethal effects of the arms race in outer space and,
what is more, would make it possible to make, through concerted efforts, a
decisive leap towards new peaks in the development of science and technology
for the benefit of all nations."

Viewed objectively, all the conditions exist for the successful implementation
of the Soviet proposal.
If nuclear energy at the outset was used for military and then for peaceful purposes, the conquest of space, which began in 1957 with the orbiting of the Soviet Sputnik within the framework of the International Geophysical Year, was from the very beginning peaceful in nature and involved peaceful co-operation. This is how it should be in the future.

Significant experience has already been accumulated in the use of outer space for purposes which are in keeping with the interests of the economy and development of society. What we have in mind, for example, is the study of the broadest use of the natural resources of the earth, a campaign against natural disasters; ensuring that there are sufficient foodstuffs; improving transport and communications; and creating new materials and technologies. All of these areas can be organized by international co-operation, which would serve as an effective way of solving global tasks, including problems of economic development.

There is significant experience in such international co-operation: the programme of co-operation of socialist States in Intercosmos; the joint efforts of various countries for Halley's Comet, the International STARSAT system, which has saved the lives of dozens of people; and the joint Soviet-American Soyuz-Apollo flight. That is an incomplete list of successful examples of such co-operation.

There is a well-known international legal basis which determines the peaceful régime for outer space, as has already been mentioned. However, currently existing international co-operation and peaceful research in the use of outer space, we could say, figuratively speaking, is on the threshold of its potential possibilities. It is not comprehensive in nature and is being carried out on a relatively narrow bilateral or regional basis, and its forms are really elementary. The implementation of what is being proposed by the Soviet Union would be qualitatively a new stage in international co-operation, naturally without doing any harm to its current forms.
What is the USSR proposing specifically? Joining the efforts and resources of States in a complex organizational framework, which would provide for the use, for the benefit of all States, of the peaceful results of outer space research, including comprehensive assistance for developing countries.

Global peaceful co-operation in outer space research would establish, or improve upon, the ways for the organic development of existing forms; scientific and technological exchange of information, in the most simple forms of co-operation, and for the objective possibilities of States in solving major existing problems in space research. We have in mind that such a long-term purpose would be served through the industrialization of the atmosphere, as a result of the joining of scientific and technological laboratories in space, with the earth-based economies of States, use of orbiting industrial facilities, for production of new materials in conditions of near total vacuum and weightlessness. As a result we would be able to use directly, for people, the resources of outer space, of space bodies and of solar energy.

The directions for future co-operation, on the basis of the Soviet proposal, are in fact inexhaustible. Any State, in accordance with its scientific and technological priorities, could in fact take part in the overall process. Co-operation in fundamental scientific outer space research, and for interplanetary spaceship travel, would be reality for any interested State.

An overall achievement would be the results of outer space research, experiments, and outer space technology, in areas such as biology, medicine, meteorology, climate studies and environmental studies, global satellite communication systems, remote sensing of the earth's atmosphere in order to receive data for geology, agriculture and marine studies.

In order to carry this out, there could be the appropriate space technology used, including major international orbiting stations, as well as manned spacecraft.
The Soviet Union, in spite of the groundless assertions of some Western critics, does not have in mind to put off its co-operation indefinitely. On the contrary, it wishes to begin effective measures immediately to prevent an arms race from breaking out in outer space and to undertake immediately the organization of such co-operation. Careful study of document A/C.1/40/4, submitted by the USSR, and its draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.1, in fact demonstrate this. Just read it through.

The immediate establishment of co-operation in outer space in fact is the object of the proposal for the earliest possible holding, no later than 1987, of the appropriate international conference. A world space organization in international co-operation and peaceful research in the use of outer space would provide the needed organizational framework for such co-operation. It would function in conditions of mutual advantage and on a non-discriminatory basis. It is difficult to regard as serious the assertions to the effect that such a world organization would not have fewer resources necessary than existing bilateral or regional forms of co-operation.

Furthermore, if in the existing forms of co-operation participation of developing States is quite limited, a world organization would ensure access for them without exclusion and without any discrimination as to the results of the peaceful conquest of space. This is in fact something which can be seen in the documents submitted by the USSR.

Quite naturally, such co-operation is possible only in conditions whereby the legal regulation of space would be carried out in great detail and where there would be a complete elimination of any possibility of the militarization of outer space. These are not pre-conditions or artificial linking, as some have tried to say. This is an honest objective conclusion made on the basis of an inevitable reality.
If outer space is to become an arena which would be extremely dangerous as a result of the arms race, then peaceful co-operation in this sphere would simply die of its own accord. Those who are trying to assert the opposite are closing their eyes and wish to mislead others. To say that the Soviet proposal is an obstacle to peaceful co-operation in outer space is simply, unabashedly, distorting the facts. The danger of the arms race in outer space and the emplacement there of strike weapons – that is the real obstacle to such co-operation.

The Soviet Union, an initiator of a campaign against this ominous threat, is one of the most active proponents of effective actions to ensure its elimination. Its proposal to establish favourable conditions for peaceful co-operation in outer space of course is not a diversion from this campaign, but, on the contrary, is an attempt to give it a new impulse and to give it a further dimension.
The peoples of the world are hoping that the threat of "star wars" will in fact go into the pages of history textbooks and that its elimination will be an example of the responsible approach taken by mankind in dealing with its fate. It is necessary unconditionally to ban the arms race in outer space, any testing of arms in outer space or from outer space to Earth. And to talk, as some delegations have done, about developing some kind of code for the arms race in outer space is consciously to endanger the fate of human civilization.

Speaking about the prevention of the militarization of space, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, has said the following:

"This problem requires a courageous approach. We can hardly view as acceptable the measures used in the recent past, or talk about unilateral advantages and superiority. Now, as never before, we need a far-sighted policy based on the understanding of realities and all the dangers which inevitably would arise tomorrow if today those who can and must take decisions in fact shirk their responsibilities."

Blocking the source of a new deadly danger - this is the decision we must take. It would open up in history a new era of peace that would help to eliminate the barriers to disarmament, solve economic and social tasks and open up the way to a more secure world.

Mr. JEAN-POIX (Haiti): (interpretation from French): Permit me, on the occasion of your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee, to convey to you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation, our warmest congratulations. Your high diplomatic qualities and professionalism certainly guarantee the success of our work.
I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee who will certainly assist you unconditionally by placing their well-known competence and sense of responsibility at your disposal.

Just as the Second World War was ending, some 40 years ago, our Organization came into being as a symbol of the fervent wish of peoples to eliminate war forever from their lives and those of future generations. Since then, although we have been spared the horrors of a third world war, we must remember the wars in Korea, the Middle East, Indo-China and Viet Nam which have left millions of victims and the consequences of which are still being felt. Lacking means of action, the United Nations was not able to prevent those wars. It can be effective only to the extent that its Member States permit. It does have persuasive force and constitutes a forum where nations come to express their concerns, leaving interested Governments free to act, and brings awareness to world public opinion about the needed quest for peace.

Man has not learnt the lessons of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He continues to create a situation which haunts us ever more. Wishing quickly to bring about the radical elimination of his opponent, he has developed the nuclear weapon.

In the name of that achievement, the big Powers with apparently unlimited resources have opened up an era of ruthless competition, leading to crisis situations which should command the attention of the international community.

Thus, mankind lives under the constant threat of nuclear conflict, wondering what will become of it tomorrow. Nuclear confrontation becomes increasingly possible between the big Powers unless they make use of their political will and prevent the ensuing holocaust. That frenzied arms race has led to a disquieting reality. The world witnesses the improvement and proliferation of conventional and
nuclear weapons. None of the regions of the globe is protected from this, despite
the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Since 1979 the North Atlantic Treaty
Organization (NATO) allies decided to emplace intermediate-range nuclear weapons
for the purpose of matching the deployment of SS-20 rockets by the Warsaw
Treaty countries. Neither side wishes to risk destabilization.

The intended denuclearization of Africa agreed to in July 1964 in Cairo
whereby the African continent would become a nuclear-weapon-free zone seems to have
been jeopardized. Bent on intimidating neighbouring States opposed to its odious
apartheid régime, South Africa has developed its own nuclear arsenal.

Nuclear testing is taking place under ground, under water and in space.
Despite the General Assembly resolution on prevention of the arms race in space and
the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space
(UNISPACE) which was held three years ago in Vienna, the militarization of outer
space continues unabated. Nuclear weapons are stored there, in violation of the
1967 Treaty which prohibits the placing in orbit of any object which carries
weapons of mass destruction as well as the installation of those weapons on
celestial bodies and in outer space.

The normal consequence of this situation of anarchy is that we are helplessly
witnessing the wanton increase of military expenditures. One hears talk of
trillions of dollars that would become the annual military budget.

We must recognize that the situation thus described, resulting from the
nuclear and conventional arms races is far from being complete. It seems as if man
has lost his instinct for survival. Only recognition of peaceful coexistence by
all, only the adoption of effective disarmament provisions can guarantee mankind its
fundamental right to development, existence and peace can stem the dangerous course
of events. The only response to nuclear war is to try to prevent it.
My delegation firmly believes that we must act methodically in the choice and follow up of a programme to eliminate all threats of nuclear war. With the aid of effective verification measures available to the major nuclear Powers, it is possible to agree on a freeze on production, as a first stage, which must be followed by the ultimate elimination of these weapons after a stage of balanced reduction. Those three stages, if followed in good faith, will necessarily lead to stopping the arms race, halting nuclear tests, prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, and the suppression of nuclear missiles.

Along those same lines and with a view to promoting peace, my delegation has always supported draft resolutions creating zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones, as well as zones free of nuclear testing. It has done so since it is convinced that guarantees must be given to States which renounce the nuclear option.
We have taken note with interest of the 15-year-old moratorium unilaterally declared by the United States on the manufacture and production of chemical weapons. Haiti, which has always supported all efforts aimed at prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of such weapons, sees in this example the resolve of all those who think along these lines.

Nuclear weapons anywhere are harmful and contrary to the interests of all. They must be destroyed. Defence shields require the development and testing of new offensive weapons capable of piercing them. It is obvious that this is prejudicial to the implementation of any plan aimed at improving economic and social well-being. That is why we urge the great Powers to pool their efforts, regardless of differences in their social systems or political, philosophical or religious views, before it is too late so as to prevent any confrontation of force in international relations. That will enable mankind to develop freely and make use of the achievements of science and technology for essentially peaceful ends. That will also permit the solution of many urgent problems and the improvement of living conditions which have been so seriously eroded by a world that is struggling, a world where the talents of scientists are exploited and the results of their work used to push their fellow men towards destruction and destabilization. So long as that situation, full of torment and insecurity, persists, no economic and social development of peoples is possible and the exercise of the fundamental rights of man will continue to be illusory. The human personality, its thirst for greater things and for achievement, can flourish only in a world without war.

The delegation of Haiti is following with particular interest the resumption of negotiations in Geneva between the United States and the USSR on questions relating to nuclear and space weapons, and welcomes the forthcoming meeting between President Ronald Reagan and the Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. It
expresses the hope that those negotiations and meetings will be successful, for they would be pointless if they failed to meet the expectations of the peoples who call for tangible agreements to put an end to the arms race and the militarization of outer space.

Mr. OMER (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish to convey to you, Sir, my congratulations on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. I would also congratulate the officers on the confidence placed in them by the members of the Committee. We have great faith in your wisdom and wide experience, and look forward with hope to balanced and serious deliberations that will give fresh impetus to the course of the debate and subsequent multilateral negotiations on all aspects of disarmament.

This year members of the international community, including many Presidents and political leaders, came together in a unique gathering that is probably the largest of its kind to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the international Organization. Although the commemoration did not resolve any urgent issues, such as disarmament and the threat of an outbreak of nuclear war, it served to renew the world's confidence in this Organization and constituted an admission on the part of the international community of its inability so far to find a viable alternative in dealing with the important issues that the international community cannot afford to disregard or ignore.

The signing of the United Nations Charter was one of the most momentous events of this era. In our view it represents the most important milestone in the history of mankind, which put an end to its divisions and destructive military and racial ambitions and adopted a more positive approach in the form of collective international action to promote peace and the welfare and well-being of man after the agonizing experience of the Second World War. Man learned a lesson at that
time, but the price he paid was exorbitant. The principles of collective
security, as set out in the Charter of the Organization, relating to the
preservation of international peace and security, should encourage us to renew our
commitment to this Organization and make it more effective in coping with its vital
responsibilities, especially when the world cannot in any way afford to become
embroiled in a new war.

But what we witnessed today in the way of efforts aimed at aborting not only
the role of the United Nations but also the multilateral negotiations in all fields
of disarmament, removing them from the umbrella of the international Organization
and confining them to a group of more militarily significant nuclear-weapon Powers,
could lead us to the firm conviction that the world's peace and security are no
longer the collective responsibility of mankind as a whole.

Some have arrogated this right to themselves. It may be high time to set the
record straight and heed those which have a genuine stake in the promotion of
international peace and security as well as in the continued survival and
prosperity of the human race.

The non-nuclear-weapon Powers, of which Sudan is one, should firmly reject the
strategic trend aimed at increasing nuclear armaments to preserve the balance of
deterrence and consequently to prevent an outbreak of war. In our view, this trend
means swimming against the current, which will exhaust its proponents and
eventually bring about their total collapse. Those who are stockpiling nuclear
weapons today are imposing a sham peace based on fear and mutual suspicion, as well
as a complete lack of confidence. We may well wonder what nuclear activity or
action can be carried out at the present time without having far-reaching
implications for man and his environment.
It is no longer possible to talk of limited nuclear military activity, and the prevention of a nuclear strike is still in the realm of theory, lacking any scientific foundation.

Competition in the military nuclear field has proved to be pointless and has even had the effect of creating real fear from which man will not be free except through the destruction of nuclear weapons. This competition also has the effect of depriving the world as a whole of enormous amounts of capital that could be spent more effectively on industrial and technological progress as well as on freeing many peoples from destitution, disease and hunger.

The world should welcome the long-awaited meeting between the United States and Soviet leaders with great satisfaction. We hope that this meeting will play an effective role in giving momentum to the existing negotiations between the super-Powers aimed at reaching agreement on a drastic and speedy reduction of their nuclear weapons and on their final destruction.
To hope otherwise would be impossible, since we are convinced that depending on a policy of self-restraint and on modern technology to avert the outbreak of war cannot provide a viable and durable alternative in all aspects. We seek the elimination of this unlimited nuclear risk. On the other hand, this is feasible, given good will by the two parties and their finding an agreed method enabling them to start the process of qualitative and quantitative reduction. This can come about only through strict observance of existing conventions on the cessation of the vertical arms race and through explicit commitment to the non-militarization of outer space and respect for the will of the international community reflected in the Final Document adopted by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in the New Delhi Declaration of the Seventh Summit and in the Declaration of the six Heads of State issued on 22 May 1984.

This leads us to examine the reasons and motivation that led some influential States to the third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), held recently to Geneva, to procrastinate with regard to continuing their commitments concerning ongoing negotiations on effective measures linked to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race at an early date and achieving a treaty on complete and general disarmament under effective international control, despite the fact that everyone is convinced of the role played by the Treaty as the corner-stone for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, at least horizontally.

The picture becomes all the more bleak if we turn to the activities of the Conference on Disarmament which have not so far culminated with even a single agreement in the field of disarmament or in paving the way for launching substantive multilateral negotiations on many of the burning issues within this framework.
We witness today that the major nuclear Powers are not in practice observing the spirit of the NPT; rather they are stepping up the feverish pace of nuclear weapons in all environments. The possibility of an increase in the number of nuclear States is becoming greater day by day, in the absence of effective international measures for the non-proliferation of all kinds of nuclear weapons binding on all States. This is taking place in the absence of an international convention on the comprehensive banning of all nuclear tests on land, underground and in space equally and of a comprehensive convention aimed at banning the production and use of chemical weapons and at their final destruction and finding preventive measures to avoid this lethal weapon.

Against this bleak backdrop we can still voice some satisfaction at the existing Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Antarctic Treaty and, recently, the Treaty of the South Pacific. All aim at the creation of nuclear-free zones in the world. We also hope that similar conventions will be arrived at with regard to the Middle East and Africa, as well as turning the Indian Ocean and its natural extensions into a zone of peace.

However, the two racist régimes of South Africa and Israel, owing to their increasing nuclear capability and their territorial and racist ambitions, are jeopardizing peace and security in their areas and, consequently, the entire world. Collaboration by Israel and South Africa in the nuclear field, as well as the support they receive from certain nuclear Powers - technologically and also by hoodwinking the world about their nuclear activities - have led these two régimes to flout all international norms and to brandish their nuclear capability in order to demoralize the militant peoples of South Africa and Namibia and undermine security and stability and seize Arab lands in the Middle East.

We have heard certain voices casting aspersions on the nuclear capability of Israel and South Africa. Suffice it in this respect to refer to reports of the
Secretary-General and to the conclusions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. The two racist régimes have not given any evidence capable of proving the opposite. They have refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and, with their customary intransigence, have also rejected any co-operation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in many of the crucial aspects linked to their nuclear activities. Some are well aware of the extent of the nuclear capability of these two régimes but keep silent in order to preserve their economic and strategic interests. On the other hand the States of the two regions of the Middle East and Africa do not have the technical means necessary to expose such a capability.

However, that should not be taken as a negation of what we wish to prove and should not be taken also as a reason for not calling on those who co-operate with these two régimes to stop this grave co-operation totally, especially in the nuclear field in all its aspects.

The peoples of Africa have confirmed, through their 1964 Declaration, their resolve to keep Africa denuclearized; the General Assembly has on several occasions reaffirmed its respect of this wish, while the same holds true with regard to the Middle East.

That should be viewed within the security guarantees that should be provided to the non-nuclear States. In our view, this supports the continuous call for the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and for bringing about nuclear disarmament and concluding a treaty on complete and general disarmament under strict and effective international control.

The world today suffers not only from the increasing danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons; we are witnessing today hotbeds of tension and the outbreak of regional and local conflicts, and this cannot in any way contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.
The development and production of conventional weapons is not merely a matter of commercial profit and benefiting the industrial machine in this or that country. It also means ordeals and devastation for many peoples, with their subjugation and humiliation. It means depriving people of secure living conditions and of the ability to concentrate on their economic and human development in all its aspects. The competition to sell or give weapons to small countries, as we see today, means the exacerbation of international tension and, in our view, victory for certain political ideologies or ideas, and thus a departure from the notion that those peoples have a right to set suitable limits to their defensive capabilities.

Thus, day after day we are moving away from the aim of reducing national military budgets and creating a suitable climate for increasing confidence among States, and we are contributing to the sabotage of attempts at disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security. It is now high time to find the international machinery to stop the production of these vast quantities of advanced conventional weapons, which are directly responsible for mass slaughter and are damaging to the economic and cultural progress of many small countries.

The organic link between disarmament and development and the welfare of all countries has led us to give constant support to the French proposal to hold a conference on the matter. Consequently Sudan participated in the meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, meetings held here in New York in August. We support the Committee's recommendations and look forward to the convening of that long awaited conference next year.

Here it may be relevant to refer briefly to the Ministerial Regional Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa, held in Lomé from 13 to 16 August this year. The Lomé Declaration and Programme of Action confirmed
between the aims of security, disarmament and development not only in Africa but at the world level. It also included an affirmation of the African conviction that dealing with this relationship within a comprehensive international framework was a necessary and serious contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security and development throughout the world.

The Declaration reaffirmed that the African countries observed the principles and purposes of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, especially with respect to settling conflicts in peaceful ways and renouncing the use of force in international relations. The Programme of Action for Peace, Security and Co-operation in Africa, provides a model to be studied in other parts of the world, since we all live in one world and have one aim, which is to provide security and welfare for man everywhere.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.