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GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. SUCRE FIGARELLA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): I congratulate you most warmly, Sir, on behalf of the Venezuelan delegation on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We are convinced that you will ensure that meaningful deliberations on disarmament take place, because you certainly have the capacity and the diplomatic skills to do so.

We also express our appreciation to Mr. Souza e Silva for the magnificent work that he accomplished at last year's session.

We all know what it is that constitutes the threat underlying our deliberations and makes them so difficult, if not ineffective; it is that the logic of force has reached the height of absurdity while the logic of negotiations daily weakens. Hence we find ourselves in the most dangerous of dilemmas. It is within the realm of possibility for civilizations to destroy themselves by using the military tools that human technology has developed and that are monopolized almost exclusively by the two big super-Powers. Nevertheless, nothing has been done to avert this, even though we are here to undertake precisely that task.
Once we become aware of that reality, we can understand easily how little can be done by the countries that do not have such might. How is it possible to compel the more powerful to a course of action? How is it possible to reach agreement in the absence of common interests? How is it possible to control what we want to avoid - the arms race - without the means of exerting pressure or any kind of coercion? It is true that all the members of the Committee are united by a sense of morality and of sincere responsibility; unfortunately, however, it is not on these factors that the logic of military power is based.

That is why the debates in the Committee have become a ritual of mere gestures and verbal intentions where the appeals made here barely touch the inured sensitivities of the powerful, which are intent on testing and increasing the deadly wizardry of their weapons.

The subject of disarmament is thus expressed in the most tragic of scenarios. The future of mankind, which by its very essence and purpose is of interest to all, depends on the decisions of a few. There can be no doubt that every year, among the representatives participating in this type of debate, the only concern in their minds and hearts is to make peace. As diplomats, we are called upon to make peace, but the dynamics of military power transcend the arts of negotiation and persuasion. Politics as an expression of the human possibilities for survival has become far removed from politics as a source of power.

It is a secret to no one that the great challenge of our century, the basic goal of the highest international Organization to which we belong - and whose fortieth anniversary we are celebrating this very year - is to give rationality to the logic of excessive military power, so that it may be possible to find a means of coexistence, and not a means of destruction.

Can we achieve this in the agenda we have before us and in the resolutions we adopt each year? It must be noted that we are far from achieving effective
solutions. Disarmament is one of those global concepts that defy all compromise precisely because it involves the most decisive problems of politics as an expression of power, of action and reaction, involving the strategic considerations of the big Powers. Hence, achieving satisfactory results is not easy; it is an objective that involves the most fundamental factors of power.

We can go on repeating ad nauseam the arguments in favour of disarmament. In fact, no other Committee has taken up more time expressing its good intentions to define the formula that may completely meet the lofty aspirations of mankind. None the less, time goes by and the arms race becomes increasingly complex and irreversible. As a drafter of treaties once said on this issue:

"It would be an instructive exercise for historians to compare whether there is any case in the history of a problem universally defined as serious and dangerous where so little serious efforts have been made to find a solution to it or to reduce its gravity."

We find ourselves involved in a complex of technological factors, ambitions, fears and arrogance that immeasurably complicate the nature of decisions, even though what is needed is clear and obvious.

When we consider a question as complex as that of disarmament, there is a twofold aspect that must always be borne in mind as a pre-condition. First, we have the doctrinaire-juridical approach, a technical analysis of the various factors involved that would make disarmament a cause in itself. Some have come to believe that it is enough to reach certain agreements to bring an end to the danger of the serious tensions that have built up as a result of the arms race. With good studies, with good analyses, with imaginative projects and thought, it might be possible to find the way to salvation.

It would be pointless to deny that this is the viewpoint that has prevailed in many of the deliberations that have taken place throughout the years in this
Committee. Lacking real political power, we have situated the problem in the field of mere theoretical speculation, in the hope that this might bring about the miracle of general and complete disarmament.

None the less, reality itself has shown that even the most compelling arguments and the most satisfactory analyses are not enough to reach the desired results, because the arms race is not a cause but rather a consequence of a series of factors that are related to the most blatant and powerful political strategy. In accordance with Hans Morgenthau's classical formulation:

"Nations do not fight among themselves because they have weapons. Nations possess weapons because they consider the struggle necessary."

This statement points to the political relevance of the problem of the arms race. It might be said, in a play on words, that as long as there is no real political disarmament - in other words, as long as the major Powers have not reached a certain level of understanding on the questions that divide them - disarmament will be impossible.

Clearly, it is impossible for us to decide in favour of one position over the other. Perhaps in the past the trend to see the arms race as an effect rather than a cause was correct. When, prior to the Second World War, Hitler began his bellicose policy, he clearly had in mind geopolitical expansionism and revanchism to redress earlier defeats. Had the League of Nations taken appropriate measures after the first violations of Treaties by the Nazi dictator, war would certainly have been less likely. The arms race was a decision clearly related to political problems, where cause and effect were completely united. One more task was merely an added tangible asset to the grand expansionist design.

But, in our day, the arms race is a problem in itself, in spite of its clear political implications, as in the past. Only this time the development of military technology has changed qualitatively, as the Committee knows, since the first
atomic bomb was dropped, with subsequent technological development. The nature of
the nuclear conflict forces us to consider it as sufficiently threatening to have
to control it, even though global political agreements may not exist in all areas
where they are needed. That is why measures to create security, to limit the
effects of nuclear war, and any other initiatives that may be taken in this
respect, should be considered as specific issues. We must be clear, on this
point. However threatening conventional war may be, the use of nuclear weapons
constitutes a greater danger quantitatively and qualitatively, and it must be
treated as an evil in itself, something which can be limited through agreements
however partial they may be.

The fact that the Agreement prohibiting nuclear explosions in the atmosphere
was signed in 1963 did not mean that the nuclear threat would disappear, just as
the signing later of the ABM Treaty did not mean that either. These were just
steps in the right direction, demonstrating an awareness of the danger that existed
and of the possibility for more substantive understandings given greater political
will.
While all due credit should be given to those initiatives, we believe that it is illusory, as others have said, to regard the control of conventional or nuclear weapons as being an independent and separate instrument for reducing international tension. There is still the dilemma that weapons are a consequence of a state of political upheaval that requires a defensive and offensive system to preserve the security of States and that, until that upheaval subsides the danger of a more sophisticated world war will always exist.

When one analyses this conclusion in relation to the role that the United Nations itself can play through its various disarmament agencies and the legal instruments that have been signed, we must bear in mind that the decisive question of peace or war depends largely on the great Powers' acquiring a practical sense of coexistence. Hence we are faced with the great absurdity of our time: while the United Nations has the overriding mission of leading nations, large and small, towards universal peace, the rivalries among the great Powers constitute and uncontrollable factor, and therefore that mission is unattainable. We are here to make peace and to avoid war. However, above and beyond the host of formal regulations and well-intentioned and technically justified debates, there is another crueler reality which escapes the best of rules because it obeys its own laws and motivations. It is a dilemma which causes scepticism and even cynicism to grow. We are living in a world characterized by the most outright arbitrariness which vitiates the intentions of international morality.

Of all the United Nations organs, the ones that have the most unreal tasks are those that deal with the various aspects of disarmament. We must discuss something real, the possibility of another war, and therefore avoid the means that make it possible; but, at the same time, we are working within an unreal situation, because we lack the necessary strength to carry out such a formidable task, one that is perhaps unique in history, because the alternative to peace is a war that would not
have the same characteristics as past wars. We wish to survive but we are incapable of creating the conditions that would permit it.

In his famous book on Clausewitz, Raymond Aron said that the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars had served as an introduction to the two wars of our century. Unfortunately, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we cannot say the same about future global war and its relationship to preceding wars. The concepts are different, and so are the strategies, the historical situations and the objectives. Previously one could speak about wars among States, but now we shall have to speak about war against civilization as a whole. The same author, in his posthumously published book, a continuation of his memoirs, in referring to the "last years of this century", concluded his diagnosis by comparing what he had said in 1947 about the international situation, that peace would be impossible but that war would be unlikely, with the possibilities for the last years of the century, which might bring real peace or real war. His vision of the world did not allow him to take a clear stand in favour of either possibility. His historical manicheism caused him to remain uncertain. There is no absolute answer to the question, he felt. From an intellectual point of view, such uncertainty may be justifiable, but we who belong to the United Nations system, whose task, it is unnecessary to reiterate, is to find peace by every possible means, cannot adopt such an attitude.

The truth is that deep in our consciences we know that none of us, even those who have the most direct responsibility for the conduct of political matters, could be completely certain. The most we can do is press forward with our task, ask ourselves some questions and prepare some solutions; but, above and beyond such activities, we must also make an impact so as to bring about political will that could really disarm the tragic spiral of the arms race.
What can we do in this dramatic situation? The documents, reports and resolutions that we have before us represent perhaps a simple irony of fate. So far, as we all know, agreements have proved impossible or ineffective, with certain exceptions, and the result has been the maintenance of a difficult, if not precarious, peace and the alternative of a threatening war. Such statements, however, are not enough to allay our consciences. On the contrary, all this should be an encouragement for us to continue our work.

In this year's debate in the First Committee, the delegation of Venezuela wishes to express its views on a series of issues related to this alternative of peace or war that is so decisive for the future of mankind.

In his annual report to the United Nations General Assembly at the fortieth session, the Secretary-General has referred to a factor of great importance for understanding the absence of an international order guaranteeing security among nations. It is clear that we are living in a world characterized by rivalries and that, in spite of all the efforts to create a supranational organization, which could serve as a factor for balance and understanding, we are far from having achieved it. A book has just been published the title of which is rather revealing: Nations against Nations. Throughout history, the cause of war has been rivalry resulting from a lack of international security. In our present-day world the situation is further complicated because, in addition to the known factors of rivalry, there is confrontation deriving from different ideologies. It is not merely a question of territorial claims or economic conquest but also the imposition of systems with different concepts of life and moral values. Lenin, who read Clausewitz, gave Clausewitz's theory of war its real political significance. Above and beyond the interests of States, there was the international class struggle in opposition to the capitalist system.
The theory of inevitable war has yielded to the idea of coexistence among States and political systems. The nuclear threat made it clear that another war would have neither victors nor vanquished but merely total destruction. In Kissinger's words, what is the point of speaking about superiority in a nuclear war?

For the first time in history we have a paradox fraught with grave consequences. Increased aggressiveness and an uncontrolled arms race - a factor which disrupts any possibility of creating an international order based on collective security guaranteeing peace - have led to a conviction that only political decisions at the highest level can overcome the great threat over us all. As the great French poet, Paul Valery, said a long time ago, after the First World War, "we now see that the abyss of history is large enough to swallow the whole world".

Nevertheless, we recognize - still following the thoughts of the French poet - that the modern world, with all its potential, with its technical abilities, has still been unable to arrive at a policy, a morality, an ideal or civil and criminal laws that are in keeping with the living standards it has created. This lack of balance we see clearly with regard to the problem of disarmament. The human intelligence has placed us on a course towards disaster or salvation. The choice is easy, but, as always, the interplay of interests distorts the decision-making process. One of the tasks of this Committee is to make a careful analysis, to have good practical sense and not to fall into exaggerated positions.

What formulas may be found to translate into practical terms a constructive spirit for achieving the goals of the United Nations?
There has been a great deal of discussion on this within our Organization. Paradoxically, it is deterrence that has so far averted an incalculable evil, but this is a passive, uncertain and immoral means and nothing lasting can be expected of it. It is, as has been stated, the balance of terror, the balance of fear. The fact that it has worked thus far does not mean that in a time of crisis it will be useful and, furthermore, it perpetuates the division of power between the two big Powers.

An extreme attitude may be insincere or naive. General and complete disarmament is undoubtedly an idea on which we all agree, but we know that in practice it is not attainable because it ignores the other factors involved in the problem. It means asking for everything when we have not yet attained the progressive conditions that can create a climate of general trust.

Years of international experience show that unfortunately progress can be achieved only through a steady policy of partial agreements in the framework of a general determination to improve international relations. In this respect Latin America is one of the regions that has recorded the most complete successes, thanks to its own initiative. Here I refer to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which created the first regional nuclear-weapon-free zone. On a number of occasions our delegation has had the opportunity to express its views on the implementation of this Treaty and the serious concern we feel at certain actions that might contribute to violation of it. We do not wish to repeat here our views on this issue, but we want to make it clear that measures such as those contemplated in that Treaty are considerable factors in reducing tension.

At the present time Latin America, through the Contadora Group, is involved also in an attempt to create confidence-building measures to eliminate regional conflicts and arrive at the verification of military control and political understanding, which are also part of this global effort which can step by step lead us to world peace.
This analysis indicates that we must place problems in their correct context: the nuclear arms race of the big Powers, regional conflicts, measures to create trust and to resolve disputes peacefully, the conventional arms race, the practical application of the norms contained in the Charter to create a system of collective security.

It is pointless to dwell on each and every one of these points because they are well known to all representatives here, but there is one thing of which I am certain: our discussions would be much more effective and the United Nations would be better able to devise a real disarmament strategy if we could avoid a repetition of issues and contribute to focusing on the main issues. This would make United Nations organs much more effective. Discussions on disarmament must be orderly and not get lost in statements of intent. Peace will not come from the mere adoption of resolutions.

In the light of most recent events, the Venezuelan delegation believes that we are coming to a decisive stage in the process of disarmament negotiations. All mankind has become aware of their significance. In the present session of the General Assembly the disarmament issue has occupied an important place in most of the statements made and we hope that this will be true also of statements yet to be made. It is a general outcry. Unquestionably, the United Nations must play an increasingly important role and, at the same time, the big Powers must introduce more flexibility into their own positions so that we can break the present deadlock.

Our delegation believes that the present Geneva talks between the United States and the USSR and the talks that will take place in that city between the two Heads of State may prove a major step forward in improving the climate of disarmament.

However, our delegation would like to reaffirm that those talks do not in any way diminish the role that the United Nations must play in order to fulfil its specific functions so that disarmament talks may have more momentum and relevance.
(Mr. Sucre-Figarella, Venezuela)

Clearly, if there were an improvement, conditions for the proposed meeting of the disarmament world conference - a proposal which Venezuela supports - would also be affected. Many doubts would be dispelled and the results of the deliberations could be really effective.

The destiny of mankind depends on the destiny of disarmament. It is not just the possible disaster of a new war that is involved; there is another equally dramatic and irrational aspect: the enormous sums spent daily on the arms race while millions of human beings are suffering the most scandalous poverty. This is not a matter of mere rhetoric. No one with any degree of sensibility and understanding of human problems can remain indifferent to one of the most reprehensible practices of present-day political life. It is not only that we may be doomed to disappear because of the use of weapons, but also that the expenditure on weapons increases the poverty of the poorest societies. If military expenditures were to be eliminated or limited, a new prospect would open up of meeting one of the most formidable challenges of our day: to enable millions of human beings to enjoying life's most fundamental rights.

The significance of the relationship between disarmament and development is historically unique. It could lead to the most ambitious programme ever designed in the interest of social solidarity. Hence our delegation fully supports the convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. In this respect we read with utmost attention the report of the Preparatory Committee for that Conference, which will take up this issue when it meets in June-July 1986. That Conference expresses the highest hopes of mankind. If its goals are attained, there will be a renaissance, a new morality, for our Organization.

We are aware that this is not an easy task, because its effectiveness depends on giving a practical impetus to political coexistence. It would be regrettable if
This became a new opportunity for rhetoric, for red tape, but lacking concrete results.

The subject of disarmament is full of technical complexities and strategic considerations. None the less, it is the issue most vital for the future of mankind. We have become "witnesses to the great moment of history", to use the words of a great artist. It concentrates the most decisive elements of our dialectic. H. G. Wells spoke of the First World War as "the war that will end all war". We now know how mistaken his tragic optimism was.

Freeman Dyson, the notable English scientist and expert on nuclear matters, in his book New Weapons and Hopes, spoke of the need to find new ways to deal with this inescapable alternative of peace or war.

As I said at the outset, most countries can do little, apart from fulfilling their own responsibility, to limit local arms races. The most important decision is in the hands of those that have political power.

An absurdity of politics, a tragedy of history - however we describe it this is a situation that compels all of us to unite our efforts to exert the greatest possible moral and political pressure. Great movements based on morality can have a persuasive effect on the play of interests and ambitions. Professor Dyson, in the book I have already mentioned, quoted paragraphs from Metternich's Memoirs which refer to his famous talk with Napoleon in Dresden after the unsuccessful Russian campaign and shortly before the final defeat of the Emperor. The Austrian diplomat relates that at the beginning of the talk he was fearful before the figure of the great man, afraid of what initiatives he might take in the future, but that little by little he became convinced that his defeat was inevitable.
We speak of arms and empires in this debate, of advanced technology for military domination. All this is fearful; all this is terrifying. But our hope resides in the idea that the policy of a new humanism may provide sufficient moral resources to give strength to institutions of collective security that depend on the United Nations, so that it may be possible for it to count the overthrow of militarist ambition among its fundamental achievements.

Mr. STEPHANOU (Greece) (interpretation from French): In addressing to you, Mr. Chairman, the congratulations of my Government and myself, I should like particularly to underline your lengthy experience in the field of disarmament of which your substantial introductory statement at the inception of our work gave ample evidence. It is therefore with particular pleasure that I express my best wishes that your efforts will be crowned with success.

My congratulations go equally to the two Vice-Chairmen, the Rapporteur, who has long been a very valuable colleague, and the members of the Secretariat.

I should like to take this opportunity to recall the masterly way in which your predecessor, Ambassador Souza e Silva, directed our work last year, as well as the personal contribution he made to improving the performance of this Committee.

The Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations, Ambassador van der Stoel, speaking on behalf of the 10 members of the European Community, Portugal and Spain in very succinct and concise terms on 17 October 1985, set forth the Community's views in the general debate on disarmament. While fully subscribing to what Ambassador van der Stoel said, I should like to set forth certain additional views of the Greek Government on some points.
(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

The fortieth anniversary of our Organization which we shall commemorate next week, unfortunately coincides with the 40 years that have elapsed since a nuclear bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki - an event which has so affected humanity and effectively transformed the course of its history and the future of this planet.

All the efforts made since then to create a harmonious world order based on the United Nations and its Charter have from the very inception of this Organization encountered difficulties stemming from traditional jealousies, continuing mistrust and rooted prejudices, which the permanent conflict of ideologies has not been able to remove, thus giving rise to a vicious circle of insecurity that has led to the present state of over-armament which we must face. Nevertheless, the fact that we are confronting a situation of over-armament and increased international tension should not bind us to any fatalistic attitude the consequences of which I need hardly elucidate. All the representatives of States in this forum are fully aware of that danger, and I am convinced that none of them would like this Committee to fail in its efforts particularly since they all represent peoples in the world who are anxious to live in peace safe from the scourge of war. All Governments, particularly the super-Powers, should grasp the full import of this message.

Greece, a country traditionally and firmly attached to peace and to the peaceful settlement of disputes, cannot but support any effort, any initiative, the taking of any step and the conclusion of any agreement which will help to expedite the process of disarmament. On the other hand, it opposes all acts of commission or omission that would make the disarmament process more difficult and thus increase the possibility of there being the threat or use of force.
(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

The present destructive capacity of world nuclear arsenals is such that the Greek Government and its Prime Minister, Mr. Andreas Papandreou, are and will always be in the forefront of any initiative intended to speed up negotiations to halt the arms race and pave the way for agreements between nuclear States so that adequate steps can be taken. As was stated in the Delhi Declaration of the six Presidents and Heads of State or Government of 28 January 1985, those statesmen will do everything in their power to co-operate with the Governments of nuclear-weapon States to serve the cause of the common security of mankind and peace. To this end, it might not be out of place to quote the following extract from the Pugwash Declaration of February 1985 on the occasion of the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons:

(spoke in English)

"It is becoming more and more evident that the possession of nuclear weapons is no guarantee of greater security. Even the two super-Powers, despite their huge nuclear arsenals, feel less secure and are intensifying their armaments drive even further."

(continued in French)

Thus, Greece cannot but welcome the resumption of United States-Soviet negotiations on space and nuclear weapons in Geneva next month. The growing responsibility of nuclear-weapon States, particularly of the two super-Powers, to avert any war strengthens our hope that those negotiations will lead to a reversal of the present situation. It is our earnest hope that they will prove to be the precursor of co-operation and a contribution to an effective disarmament process, as well as contribute to the elimination of economic inequalities among peoples and cases of social injustice which the present arms race can only aggravate.
May I once again stress that Greece is a staunch proponent of the thesis that disarmament and international security are closely interrelated. No strengthening of international security can be accomplished while arms continue to increase. On the other hand, security cannot be safeguarded in an atmosphere where there are constant instances of resort to force, military intervention, occupation of territories by foreign armies and faits accomplis. Only by the creation of an atmosphere of trust in inter-State relations that we can draw closer to solving the problems of international security. To this end, the strengthening of disarmament machinery, bilaterally or multilaterally, and any effort made by our Organization, whose purpose is after all to safeguard peace and remove the danger of escalation and consequently the risk of a nuclear holocaust, are an imperative need.

Thus, Greece will subscribe to any initiative aimed at the mutual and gradual reduction of nuclear weapons in both the East and the West to the lowest possible levels and will also support any effort likely to help in finding effective verification machinery.
Greece also regrets the fact that serious differences of view continue to prevail on the question of verification. These concern specific issues, difficult ones, perhaps, but which have to be overcome if tangible results are to be achieved in the course of the various negotiations being conducted in the disarmament field. For its part, Greece considers that adequate means of verification are an essential element of any arms control or disarmament agreement. A climate of confidence among the parties to facilitate the conclusion of such agreements implies that verification is essential for the effective implementation of the agreements and, moreover, time plays a paramount role in the creation of an atmosphere of confidence and trust.

Greece is opposed to any proliferation of nuclear weapons, either horizontal or vertical. Furthermore, their deployment in outer space could create new tensions with consequences of unforeseeable magnitude for the survival of mankind. This is why we warmly support the idea that space should be used for the benefit of mankind.

Furthermore, Greece is delighted that, albeit in a limited way, a greater sense of responsibility on the part of States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty during the third conference held to consider that Treaty, led this year to agreement on a substantive document by consensus. This document, although not ideal, is at least realistic and will help to consolidate a régime which up till now has proved its efficiency and refuted the pessimistic prophecies of the 1960s. At the same time, it recognizes that the risk of proliferation has not been eliminated and that constant vigilance to ensure compliance with the Treaty is essential. Thus, as a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Greece expresses the hope that all countries which so far have failed to accede to the Treaty will do so as soon as possible. Furthermore, I should not like in any way to minimize the
(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

responsibility which is incumbent upon the nuclear-weapon Powers to fulfil the obligations contained in article 6 of the Treaty. My country will therefore support any initiative designed to facilitate an agreement on the complete cessation of nuclear tests. Such an initiative could be the subject of the bilateral negotiations at present underway between the Soviet Union and the United States in which any practical and substantial measure to halt and to reverse the present arms spiral should be accorded extremely high priority.

Disarmament is a multidimensional process and the danger of nuclear war is but one side of the coin. Any armed conflict could lead to a nuclear escalation. But even if we avoid the use of nuclear weapons in a conflict, the loss of human life which that conflict might entail could also be caused by conventional weapons, particularly in view of the destructive capacity these weapons have now achieved, and not forgetting those who fell on the field of battle during the First and Second World Wars. And here I would refer to something that was said this morning by the representative of China, namely, that a total of 20 million persons had died in conventional wars since the Second World War.

The disequilibrium which exists in the field of conventional weapons is one of the important reasons why a number of Powers have acquired nuclear weapons, either in self-defence or in order to achieve supremacy. Efforts to achieve equilibrium in conventional weapons would therefore help to mitigate the effect of the nuclear-arms race.

Greece is firmly committed to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations to refrain from the threat or use of force and, therefore, subscribes to the principle that no effort should be spared to reduce the current level of conventional forces and to reach an equilibrium at the lowest possible level, while at the same time preserving the undiminished security of all States. The present
concentration of these arms, which still entails an increased risk of armed conflict, continues to consume enormous human and material resources and is a factor which exacerbates considerably the present economic crisis of which all the peoples of the earth are victim.

While welcoming the fact that the close link between disarmament and the development of the least developed countries is no longer something which passes unnoticed and unheeded, and that next year a Conference on Disarmament and Development will be held in Paris, Greece will not fail, within the limits of its possibilities, to contribute to any effort to maintain peace in the spirit of collective responsibility.

The initiative of the six Presidents and Prime Ministers of the Governments of Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, Greece, India and Sweden, which they solemnly reaffirmed in New Delhi on 30 January 1985, is aimed at freezing nuclear tests and the manufacture and development of nuclear weapons, as well as the adoption of corresponding measures in the field of space weapons.

My country is also concerned by the use of chemical weapons in violation of the obligations assumed under the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the relevant principles of international law. The dissemination and use of these weapons can only serve to increase the feeling of insecurity which prevails at present. The prohibition of their manufacture and use as well as their total destruction is one of the most important aspects of disarmament.

The work this year of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva - this unique multilateral negotiating organ - in the field of chemical weapons, was followed very closely by Greece, but with a certain degree of concern, tinged nevertheless with hope in view of the patience, perspicacity and spirit of continuity manifested by those negotiating on behalf of the States participating in the Conference.
(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

Permit me to refer to another aspect of disarmament, namely, regional disarmament, which can, to a large extent help to reinforce broader multilateral efforts to achieve the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. It can, furthermore, help to improve the political climate and increase confidence in specific regions, thereby reducing hotbeds of tension. The security requirements of various regions are not always similar, and therefore it is not always possible in a regional context to apply sweeping concepts to very diverse situations. Thus, there is a great deal of room in each region for practical action and independent initiatives. While these initiatives can in no way be regarded as a substitute for general and complete disarmament, the regional approach can nevertheless be effective in supplementing global measures and may prove to be an important factor in the progressive approach to global disarmament.

The Greek government, in keeping with its policy of promoting peace and détente, wholeheartedly supports the procedure initiated by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, as a means of preserving the East-West dialogue. We would like in this connection to reiterate our hope that all outstanding differences will be overcome and that the Stockholm Conference will successfully achieve the goals it set itself.
In the context of regional disarmament, the Greek Government is a staunch supporter of the provisions contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament with respect to the creation of nuclear-free-zones and zones of peace. Greece has therefore always voted in favour of any resolution aimed at the creation of such zones, provided that all the States concerned were prepared to subscribe to such an approach on the basis of agreements freely entered into.

The Greek Government, which shares the conviction that such zones can make an appreciable contribution to the effective disarmament process and to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and which promotes bilateral relations with neighbouring countries, is particularly concerned by the situation in the Balkans. Accordingly, the Greek Government has been making every effort to promote the proposal that the Balkans should be declared a nuclear-free-zone.

Similarly, Greece is closely following the development of the situation in the Mediterranean, not only because it borders on southern Europe, but also because of its tricontinental nature. The Mediterranean is therefore directly subject to repercussions from any source of tensions, such as those which adjacent regions continue to experience. For that reason, the Greek Government firmly supports any effort and initiative designed to strengthen peace, expand co-operation and promote unimpeded development for all the peoples of the Mediterranean, so that one day that sea can become a zone of peace, thus eliminating sources of tension in that area.

Greece has been a consistent supporter of the World Disarmament Campaign and subscribes to any effort designed to ensure that it is pursued with unflagging zeal. Greece is therefore pleased that we have with us in the Committee the
(Mr. Stephanou, Greece)

Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Jan Martenson. Here I should like to express the satisfaction of my Government as well as my own personal satisfaction that, quite apart from his duties which he performs with exemplary competence, his personal devotion to the World Disarmament Campaign gives us every reason to be optimistic.

I should also like, in this connection, to recall that Greece has already contributed, to the best of its ability, to the World Campaign, as well as to confirm that we intend to make a further contribution this year, as a token of our gratitude for what has already been done to alert mankind to the cause of disarmament and peace and to redouble its vigilance.

Efforts to bring about disarmament confer upon us immense duties and responsibilities. Therefore, with reference to the Chairman's introductory statement, I should like to express the hope that in this task we shall proceed without neglecting the opportunities which arise, and that the vision of an oasis which offers a promise of water and shade in the desert, instead of receding will gradually materialize, thanks to our concerted efforts.

Mr. AFANDÉ (Kenya): I am aware, Sir, of your wish that we abide by rule 110 of the rules of procedure, but as this is the first time that my delegation is speaking in the Committee, I should like, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the First Committee and to extend similar felicitations to the other members of the Bureau. My delegation notes with great satisfaction and confidence that a distinguished representative of Indonesia, a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement, has been elected to direct the work of this very important Committee. Indeed, Indonesia plays a constructive role in the disarmament efforts of this Committee as well as in the Conference on Disarmament, of which Kenya is a member. I wish to assure you of my delegation's wholehearted co-operation in the deliberations of this Committee.
Similarly, I should like to pay a special tribute to Ambassador Celso de Sousa e Silva for the skilful way that he guided the work of this Committee last year and for the exemplary diplomatic acumen and wisdom he displayed.

Since the world entered the nuclear era 40 years ago, the spectre of self-destruction and the final annihilation of mankind has remained ever present. The nuclear age has taken on the countenance of nuclear terror. The most destructive weapons have been developed in the search for credible defence. Others far more destructive are in the making in the name of deterrence.

Under the pretext of self-defence, several billions of dollars are being wasted in the building of armament stockpiles, while every day millions of people are wasting away as a result of poverty, malnutrition and disease. This is all the more so because the vast concentration of nuclear-weapon power rests in the hands of a few States. Such a situation constitutes a constant threat to international peace and security.

The evolving scenario increasingly causes us to worry about what the future holds for mankind. The present world political scene continues to be polarized. There is a deterioration in relations between the two major Powers and a gradual return to policies of confrontation, the use of force and the emergence of the cold war syndrome. This gloomy international situation is pushing us towards the threshold of a possible nuclear catastrophe. Hypotheses about the possibility of partial or limited nuclear wars are being contemplated. Despite world-wide reaffirmation of the conviction that the greatest peril facing the world is the threat of self-destruction by nuclear war and that consequently the removal of that threat is the most acute and urgent task of today, efforts to reach a consensus approach to the question of the prevention of nuclear war and all other related wars have remained fruitless.
My delegation welcomes the current resumed Soviet-United States arms control talks and the forthcoming summit meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva as a gesture which underscores the acceptance in principle of the grave consequences that could result from their continued escalation of the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race on earth and in outer space. In the view of my delegation, efforts to prevent nuclear war should be guided by a strong political will by all nuclear-weapon States to negotiate openly, faithfully and constructively on reliable and verifiable arrangements for compliance with all agreements and measures in order to make a successful start towards eliminating the danger of a nuclear war. We share the belief that there is no substitute for bilateral and multilateral negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament. We therefore call upon all States, particularly those with larger nuclear arsenals, to intensify effective negotiations on specific agreements for arms control and the reduction of both nuclear and conventional weapons.
Kenya is also cognizant of the political and socio-economic problems facing our African continent. As a first step to overcome this crisis we need a conducive climate of "peace", but genuine peace is impossible without restraints on arms acquisition and disarmament initiatives. Any such disarmament programme would lead to a stable future where international co-operation can prevail. However, the quest for peace in our continent encompasses, among other things, an end to apartheid, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, and respect for the territorial integrity of all countries. It was in line with this position that the summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) convened in Cairo in July 1964 adopted a "Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", that is, categorical renunciation in principle of the right to acquire or manufacture nuclear arms. Thus, the continent was unilaterally declared a nuclear-free zone. Recently it has become apparent that South Africa has developed nuclear-weapon capability through assistance from certain countries. We view this collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field as seriously undermining the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The gravity of the implications of South Africa's nuclear capability cannot be over-emphasized. Not only does it frustrate the Declaration of the Organization of African Unity but, more important, it poses a direct threat to regional and international security and especially to the security and independence of African States opposed to the apartheid régime and its odious racial policies. It is regrettable that, despite several appeals by the international community and by the General Assembly, they have been handicapped in taking enforcement action against South Africa. To our dismay, certain countries have continued to collaborate with South Africa in the development of technology, facilities and other related equipment. This contributes to the enhancement and fortification of apartheid policies.
(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

My delegation requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue to render all necessary assistance which the Organization of African Unity may seek to ensure the implementation of the denuclearization of Africa, and also to follow closely South Africa's evolution in the nuclear field and to report thereon to the General Assembly.

It is a matter of record that Kenya has always upheld the view that one of the practical approaches that could be taken to strengthen international peace and security is the establishment of zones of peace in various regions of the world. This year we have witnessed the endorsement of the draft treaty on the South Pacific nuclear-free zone by countries of that region. Kenya endorses this move and considers it as a positive development.

In the interests of the promotion of peace, stability and co-operation in the Indian Ocean region, Kenya fully shares the view that the first step towards the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region is the convening of the long-awaited international conference. That conference would harmonize the interests and viewpoints of the littoral and hinterland States of the region, the major Powers and maritime users. The success of the conference would largely depend on a firm and resolute commitment by the countries of the region, the major Powers and maritime users of the Ocean to the principles of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

While recognizing that real and potential difficulties stand in the way of the conclusion of acceptable treaties to reduce the danger of vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, I wish to reaffirm my country's strong belief that a verifiable agreement limiting nuclear tests would be a logical step in that direction. It is the view of my delegation that one of the greatest obstacles facing world security is the continuous qualitative technological modernization of nuclear arsenals. It is thus imperative that the issue of a ban on nuclear tests
be fully addressed. Since the partial test ban Treaty came into force some 20 years ago no real steps have been taken towards reaching agreement on a comprehensive test ban which would be an effective barrier against the development of a new generation of nuclear systems, and thereby strengthen efforts to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. We share the view that verification arrangements can be adequately negotiated and accommodated in the final treaty. Recent breakthroughs in seismological science and other inspection methods of verification of nuclear tests provide an adequate and feasible basis in this regard. However, all nuclear-weapon Powers have a special responsibility to initiate this line of action that would lead to a comprehensive test ban and strengthen the non-proliferation régime. A comprehensive test-ban treaty, together with the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the wide-ranging safeguards administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), promise a guarantee of peaceful intent in nuclear activities which is essential to the establishment of a climate of confidence.

Kenya is particularly gratified by the successful conclusion of the recent work of the Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The nuclear non-proliferation régime constitutes one of the key points of international stability and security. We are convinced of the need to strengthen it and make it universal. The fact that the Conference was able to reach a consensus on its final document is an indication of the wish to work together to halt and reverse both horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons.

My delegation strongly believes that nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons is the most rational and effective guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Regrettably, however, no significant genuine political will has been shown by the nuclear-weapon States to guarantee in clear and categorical terms that non-nuclear-weapon States will never be subjected
to attacks with nuclear weapons. We endorse the belief that, until nuclear disarmament is achieved on a universal basis, it is imperative for the international community to develop effective measures to assure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons from any quarter. This can be achieved by negotiating a common approach acceptable to all which could be translated into an international instrument of a legally binding character. It should also be recalled that there will be no prospects of achieving such a treaty until the nuclear-weapon States are ready to change their position and exhibit a genuine political will on the issue.

In the area of chemical weapons, we are encouraged by the considerable progress being made by the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We look forward to an early conclusion of a comprehensive and internationally respected convention which would outlaw the development, production, stockpiling, storage and use of chemical weapons, and provide for the destruction of existing stocks. In this context we believe that, with the present preliminary structure of the chemical weapons convention that the Conference on Disarmament agreed upon in 1983, and with more intensified negotiations on the verification issues, accompanied by a strong political will and trust between the major chemical-weapons States, a treaty could be completed.
My delegation has always expressed its views on the issue of prevention of an arms race in, and extending the arms race into, outer space. Today, it has become obvious that there is an overriding urgency and necessity to prevent the process of militarization of outer space from assuming irreversible proportions. It is true that some significant measures towards curbing the risks for an arms race in outer space have been taken. However, the existing treaties in this field contain too many loop-holes and cannot effectively prevent militarization of outer space. Recently, we have learned about tests and developments of anti-satellite weapons, thus confirming the need for additional measures to be taken.

We welcome the decision taken by the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which has examined in detail issues and initiatives on the matter. It is the view of my delegation that, although the major space Powers bear a special responsibility with regard to demilitarization of outer space, the subject remains a collective and multilateral responsibility which States must share in taking appropriate measures. The early conclusion of an international treaty banning all space weapons, including weapons directed against targets in space, would be a welcome development in this regard.

The socio-economic problems currently afflicting the world today cannot be viewed in isolation from the escalating military build-up supported by the largest ever recorded military budget allocations. No one can point out the logic behind the expenditures of almost a trillion dollars annually on the acquisition and manufacture of armaments. It is also a sad paradox to note that even the third-world countries, buffeted by maladies of all sorts and characterized by stagnating economies, are diverting substantial resources of their declining gross national products to the acquisition of armaments at the expense of their
developmental activities. This trend must be arrested in order for meaningful disarmament to take place simultaneously with the promotion of social economic activities, thus benefiting the lot of the vast majority of the human community currently living in poverty, disease and famine.

In this connection Kenya warmly welcomes and strongly supports the initiative which led to the decision by this Committee to convene an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. As a country which holds the view that any meaningful development cannot be realized without an atmosphere of peace and stability, Kenya attaches great importance to the Conference and is happy to be a member of the Preparatory Committee charged with the responsibility of ensuring success for that important Conference, to be convened in Paris next year.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity to mention very briefly the issue of the continent of Antarctica, which, it is estimated, represents one-tenth of Earth's surface. Because of its unique and harsh climatic condition, it has attracted limited human habitation. However, in spite of Antarctica's unique ecosystems, it bears a direct and far-reaching influence on the rest of the world. In recognition of the importance of Antarctica to the whole international community, I reiterate the statement made by Kenya's Minister for Foreign Affairs in plenary meeting last Friday:

"... it is imperative that activities in [Antarctica] be conducted by and for the benefit of the international community as a whole. In this context, the initiative and the call by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for a declaration that any and all resources in Antarctica are vested in the international community as a whole as the common heritage of mankind needs to be understood and underscored. Thus all States, regardless of their size,
socio-economic system or stage of development, have a legitimate interest in Antarctica and ought to have a say in the development and management of its affairs." (A/40/PV.33, p. 70)

Thus, while a number of positive aspects of the Antarctica Treaty régime can be identified, its shortcomings must not be minimized. Chief among these is the conceptual approach to the Antarctica problems which seems to favour the possession of technological expertise and ability to exploit the resources in the territory as a pre-condition for active membership of the Antarctica Treaty. The interests of the overwhelming majority of other States non-parties to the Treaty ought to be given due weight and consideration, and necessary steps should be taken to safeguard them in a more broad-based arrangement than the present régime.

**Mr. Dhanapala** (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, your country and mine, which in times past were linked by legend and myth, have in times present been bound together in a common commitment to the Non-Aligned Movement, which has provided such a powerful impetus for general and complete disarmament. Our countries were among the five Colombo Powers which chartered the irreversible course of non-alignment at the Bandung Conference. In this thirtieth anniversary year of that Conference, my delegation is gratified to see such a distinguished representative of Indonesia occupying the chair of this important Committee, and we offer you, and the other officers of the Committee, our sincere congratulations and good wishes. Your unique traditions of decision-making through consensus, reflected in the concepts of Mushawara and Musafat, augur well for our work. We would also like to compliment Under-Secretary-General Martenson, who continues to lead his important Department with wisdom and diligence.

It is relevant to recall that in 1955 the Final Communiqué of the Bandung Conference, addressing itself to the question of disarmament, stated:
(Mr. Dhanapala, Sri Lanka)

"The problem of peace is correlative with the problem of international security. In this connection all States should co-operate, especially through the United Nations, in bringing about the reduction of armaments and the elimination of nuclear weapons under effective international control."

That affirmation of the central role of the United Nations and the importance of multilateralism in the achievement of disarmament remains a cardinal principle of the Non-Aligned Movement. It was reiterated most recently at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Luanda in September this year, the Final Declaration of which stated:

"The Ministers underlined the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. They underlined that all the people of the world have a vital interest in disarmament negotiations, the right to participate on an equal footing in disarmament negotiations affecting their national security and an inherent right to contribute to their success. Bilateral and multilateral negotiations on disarmament should facilitate and complement, rather than hinder or preclude, each other. Therefore, the Conference on Disarmament should be kept appropriately informed of all steps in bilateral negotiations and enabled to fulfil its mandate as the sole multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament and to adopt concrete measures of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament."
This session of the General Assembly marks the fortieth anniversary of the birth of the United Nations with the signing of its Charter, enshrining a humanist and challenging vision of multilateral co-operation for peace and development. It is sombre to reflect on the fact that this year is also the fortieth anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which cast their shadows on the past four decades of human history. A new type of weapon was added to the arsenals of nations, the explosion of one of which weapons today can release more energy in one microsecond than that from all conventional weapons used in all wars in history. That destructive capacity to annihilate the world we have inherited in trust is stored in more than 50,000 nuclear warheads with an explosive power roughly equivalent to one million Hiroshima bombs. The twin anniversaries coming together are symbolic of an awesome choice facing mankind which the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament identified in the following words:

"Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation" (resolution S-10/2, para. 18).

The response of some nations to that choice remains ambivalent and ambiguous as they engage in an arms race that threatens to extend to all frontiers, including space. There is but one place where humankind can demonstrate that its choice for disarmament and peace is unambiguous and unequivocal. That place is within the forums of the United Nations machinery created for the deliberation and negotiation of disarmament issues by all nations on an equal basis. In the First Committee we are part of this machinery, and we must use this forum wisely. To do so we must first share certain basic premises. The annual report of the Secretary-General to the Assembly at this session expressed it in these words:

"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, pages 7 and 8)

If we genuinely subscribed to those premises, the record of the United Nations in the field of disarmament would have been less dismal than it is today, 40 years after the founding Members committed themselves — in Article 26 of the Charter — "to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources". We have in the United Nations institutions for disarmament which we must strengthen and use. A public-opinion poll conducted in five industrialized countries this year has revealed that at the grass roots there is greater faith and optimism about the United Nations than is reflected in the way nations conduct themselves. That hiatus between the felt needs of the people and the actions of Governments is no more blatant than in the field of disarmament, where popular support for general and complete disarmament seems to grow in inverse proportion to Government willingness to engage in productive negotiations in good faith for the cessation of the arms race.

We meet this year in a more propitious climate for our deliberations. The announcement on 8 January of this year of an agreement by the United States and the USSR, which possess 95 per cent of the world's total nuclear arsenals, to engage in bilateral negotiations has created a better atmosphere which might yet save the 1980s from being consigned to history as the "lost decade of disarmament" for its singular absence of any disarmament agreements so far. After two rounds of unproductive debate, new proposals have been submitted at the third round now in progress in Geneva, renewing our hope of seeing the realization of the immediate
objective of the negotiations, to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on Earth and limiting and reducing nuclear arms and at strengthening strategic stability, and the ultimate goal of the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere. The forthcoming summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva enhances our hope that a process of fruitful negotiations has finally been launched. We note the decision of the USSR unilaterally to stop nuclear explosions from the anniversary of the Hiroshima holocaust on 6 August until 1 January 1986, with the possibility of extending the moratorium beyond that date if the United States joins the moratorium on nuclear testing. The reports of significant proposals of arms reductions are also encouraging, and the negotiating table is no longer bare. In this context, we support the proposal made here that an appeal should be addressed to the super-Powers to reach firm agreements in their talks in the interest of global peace and security.

While we welcome these moves in the bilateral sphere, our optimism must necessarily be guarded, for we are aware that bilateral negotiations do not always produce agreements, let alone agreements in the global interest. We have therefore stressed repeatedly the essential complementarity and mutually reinforcing linkage between bilateral and multilateral negotiations. We must persist in our multilateral efforts towards disarmament, especially in the Conference on Disarmament. In the multilateral sphere too, we have cause for some satisfaction in the fortieth anniversary year. Following resolution 39/160, a successful meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development took place this year, and its report is before us at this session. We endorse the proposal for the agenda of the Conference and consider it fitting that, in recognition of the initiative taken by the President of France, the Conference should take place in Paris next year. We
are confident that, in examining the impact of military expenditure, especially of the militarily powerful States, on the global economy and its consequent reinforcing of unequal exchange, ways and means can be devised for releasing additional resources through disarmament measures for development purposes, especially in developing countries. The 1986 Conference takes place at an opportune moment both in the context of the acceleration of arms expenditure and the deterioration of world economic conditions. Military-industrial complexes have grown global in their reach, and interlocking vested interests in the arms race - both nuclear and conventional - will be slow to yield to the pressure for their transition to peaceful development purposes.

Another successful multilateral endeavour in the field of disarmament was the third Review Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Final Declaration of that Conference, adopted by consensus, mirrors the honest and comprehensive appraisal of the Treaty and its functioning which took place in a spirit of constructive debate and an overriding desire to strengthen the Treaty in all its aspects. The Declaration expresses the conviction that any proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously increase the danger of nuclear war. It declares that the commitment to non-proliferation by all parties and the acceptance of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all peaceful nuclear activities in non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty represent a major contribution to regional and international security. At the time of the Review Conference, four of the five nuclear-weapon States had voluntarily concluded safeguards agreements with IAEA covering all or part of their peaceful nuclear activities, and since the conclusion of the Conference we are gratified to learn of China's decision to conclude a safeguards agreement with IAEA.
The part of the Declaration of particular relevance to the work of this Committee relates to the review of article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which enjoins all parties to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament. The Final Declaration notes that the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapon States parties were undergoing continuing development and qualitative refinement; that nuclear-weapon systems had been developed and deployed, and that there was a potential danger of space being drawn into the arms race. The assessment contained in the Declaration that the last five years had yielded no results on effective measures to halt the arms race and achieve nuclear disarmament leads to the conclusion that article VI has still to be implemented, especially by the nuclear-weapon States. The vital importance of a treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests as a fulfilment of the non-proliferation objective was accepted at the Review Conference and the failure to conclude such a treaty so far was deeply regretted. The call on the nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty to resume trilateral negotiations in 1985 and to "all the nuclear-weapon States to participate in the urgent negotiation and conclusion" of a comprehensive multilateral nuclear-test-ban treaty is of crucial significance. We hope that the United States of America and the USSR will place this urgent item on their agenda, both at the ongoing bilateral negotiations and at the Geneva summit.

The success of the Review Conference gives no cause for complacency. It was the result of negotiations based on mutual trust that the undertakings arrived at would be honoured in the five years to come, thus reinforcing the internationally accepted moral norm that nuclear proliferation, whether horizontal or vertical, is a threat to international peace and security. We expect a speedy implementation of...
these undertakings, especially at the 1986 session of the Conference on Disarmament, where work on a nuclear test ban remains at a standstill despite the indisputable advances in the field of seismology in ensuring adequate verification of a comprehensive test ban. The next 10 years in the life of the Non-Proliferation Treaty are crucial and unless the blend of duties and obligations is honoured we shall all have a heavy price to pay.

Another heartening feature we would like to refer to is the decision of the Nobel Committee to award the prestigious Nobel Peace Prize to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. It is an encouragement to other non-governmental peace organizations striving with dedication and independent expertise to achieve a safer world, and a recognition of the important role they play. We also welcome the South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty, which declares the South Pacific an area free of nuclear explosive devices, and call on all States to respect the provisions of the Treaty. The progressive extension of nuclear-free zones must result in a converse shrinking of nuclear zones where nuclear devices are developed or deployed, and even modest steps such as the declaration of nuclear-free cities in some countries must be welcomed.

The agenda before us this year contains a host of important issues vitally linked to the overall objective of disarmament and security. The Sri Lanka delegation, with the support of the Egyptian delegation, has in the past taken significant initiatives concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Our painstaking endeavour at the thirty-ninth session resulted in resolution 39/59. The unique significance of that single resolution adopted on this subject at the last session was not only that 159 Member States voted for it, but also that no State opposed the resolution. The wide international consensus on the resolution is illustrative of the great significance and urgency ascribed to this
subject and a common commitment to the basic principle of the use of space for peaceful purposes and the application of the Charter principle renouncing the threat or use of force in international relations in the arena of space. Resolution 39/59 acknowledged the primary role of the Conference on Disarmament in negotiating multilaterally on the subject, as a matter of urgent priority. We are glad that following the adoption of resolution 39/59 the Conference on Disarmament established for the first time an ad hoc committee with an agreed mandate, thus achieving some substantial work in the examination of the issues involved. The importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space requires that the Conference on Disarmament begin negotiations on an effective ban while it is still in a position to do so. We welcome the commencement of bilateral talks, which include the objective of preventing an arms race in space, and look forward to complementary negotiations in the multilateral negotiating forum. We have a grave responsibility to save succeeding generations from the scourge of the extension of the arms race to outer space with the introduction of weapons with a strike capability. A stable and peaceful space régime ensuring peaceful co-operation in outer space must be preceded by an effective ban on weapon systems in outer space, whether for defensive or offensive purposes. We earnestly hope that at this session a consensus resolution will be adopted that will make possible the speedy conclusion of that ban.

On another Sri Lanka initiative, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, in 1971, as a means of ensuring disarmament and security in our region. The Indian Ocean States evolved in 1979 the Principles of Agreement for the implementation of that Declaration and have worked steadily in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean for the convening of a conference in Colombo. We continue to hope that this important conference will be held next year
after all the preparatory work is completed. The participation of the major maritime users, the regional States and the five permanent members of the Security Council is essential for its success. Further details relating to this initiative will be indicated by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean when he presents its report to the Committee later this session.

Without in any way diminishing our conviction that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind, we would like to recall that the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament identified the subject of conventional armaments and the balanced reduction of armed forces as one of the priorities in disarmament negotiations. The report on the study on conventional disarmament presented at the last session contained alarming findings, which compel us to act on this subject. The disarmament process is an integrated one and it was envisaged at the first special session on disarmament that States would not be prevented from conducting negotiations on all priority items concurrently. Security concepts which are dangerously invalid in the nuclear field do not become less so for the militarily powerful in the field of conventional arms and should not be used to justify arms capabilities and military budgets well beyond the legitimate needs of self-defence. Our concern over the unbridled trafficking in conventional arms is greatly enhanced by the readiness with which the diverse forces of supply meet the demands of the thriving conventional arms bazaar irrespective of their purposes and motives. Thus the links between terrorist and anarchist groups and the burgeoning conventional arms trade proliferate, with dangerous implications for international peace and stability.

We are glad to see the comprehensive study on concepts of security before us, which will undoubtedly assist in a better perception of the common security of all
nations in its all-inclusive sense and help our efforts towards international co-operation for peace and security. It is well to remind ourselves of the words of the Palme Commission that States can no longer seek security at each other's expense; it can be obtained only through co-operative undertakings.
As an island nation, we are particularly interested in the study on the naval arms race by the group over which you preside, Mr. Chairman, and the importance of the marine environment for international security in the light of the fact that some 71 per cent of the earth's surface is sea. The study reveals that a significant proportion of the world's strategic nuclear capability is sea-borne, largely on board United States and Soviet vessels. The proliferation of nuclear weapons at sea is particularly alarming and this, together with other findings in the study, seems to us added reason to implement urgently the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, among the other courses of action that will be discussed.

Another important study on the prevention of nuclear war records that there is an international consensus that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. The logical corollary of agreed international action to prevent such a war, however, remains to be addressed urgently.

In the fortieth anniversary year of the United Nations we support the call for convening of a third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament at an agreed and early date as a focal point for renewed commitment to the goals of disarmament and specific strategies to achieve them urgently in this century. We take this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General on his own courageous role in the quest for disarmament and on the continuing programme of activities under the World Disarmament Campaign, to which Sri Lanka has made a contribution.

In the weeks ahead we shall debate and vote on draft resolutions, as we have done before. Perhaps we can take this opportunity of the fortieth anniversary to stand back and ponder whether competition in resolution adoption or acquiring bigger and better voting majorities are more important than using this forum as a
step towards harmonizing our diverse views into a consensus on agreed action leading to general and complete disarmament. This anniversary year has not lacked proposals on how the United Nations can be improved and made more effective. Among them is the proposal contained in the summer issue of the newsletter Disarmament for a moratorium on contentious disarmament resolutions which record disagreement rather than promote progress on the basis of agreements.

Sri Lanka will observe the thirtieth anniversary of its membership of this Organization in December of this year. Our pride and faith in the United Nations remain strong and unyielding. Our participation as a Member State equal to all other 158 Member States in the quest to achieve the aims and objectives of the United Nations Charter remains active. A world without the United Nations is inconceivable. A better world in disarmament and security can be achieved through the United Nations by making more effective use of existing institutions before we think of creating new ones. We can make a start at this session in this Committee.

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): Please allow me, Sir, to felicitate you most warmly on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We are happy to see you presiding over this important Committee, not only because you are a talented diplomat of outstanding ability and wide-ranging experience but also because you represent a country with which we have a close historical association and deep cultural links. Your unanimous election to the high office that you occupy is fitting recognition of your long and distinguished association with multilateral diplomacy. I take this opportunity to pledge to you the unqualified co-operation of my delegation in all your endeavours towards the fulfilment of your onerous responsibilities.
(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

I should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their well-merited election.

Your stewardship of the First Committee comes at a most important time. The current year marks the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and is also the year in which we are required to review the implementation of the Second Disarmament Decade at its mid-point.

There are several spheres in which the United Nations can be seen as having failed to live up to the high expectations on which it was founded — perhaps none more conspicuous than the sphere of disarmament. While multilateral disarmament efforts have become less and less productive with the passage of time, the arms race in all its aspects has continued to gather momentum. As a result, the world is being pushed inexorably towards the apocalypse which human civilization as we know it will not survive. My delegation therefore fervently hopes that our present stocktaking will strengthen our resolve to break out of the present situation of inertia and stalemate, which would spell disaster for humankind if allowed to continue much longer.

It is worth recalling that the General Assembly, when unanimously adopting resolution 35/46, declaring the 1980s the Second Disarmament Decade, attached the highest priority to the conclusion of agreements on a comprehensive test ban, a convention banning chemical weapons, a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons, and effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The declaration in fact called for agreed texts on those subjects by the year 1982. The task of negotiating those agreements, as also some other disarmament measures, was assigned to the Committee on Disarmament — now called the Conference on Disarmament. Unfortunately, the
efforts of the neutral and non-aligned nations to start serious negotiations on such vitally important subjects as a nuclear test ban, cessation of the nuclear arms race, and nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war have been frustrated on various technical and procedural prettexts.

My delegation has stated unreservedly on various occasions that the conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear tests occupies a central position in our approach towards disarmament. It bears repetition that a comprehensive test-ban treaty would play a most significant role in curtailing the nuclear arms race, in gradually rendering the existing nuclear arsenals undependable, and in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to States that do not already possess them.

It was in 1972, when the issue of a nuclear test ban had already been under discussion for more than 15 years, that the then Secretary-General of the United Nations declared that, all its technical and scientific aspects having been fully explored, only a political decision was needed to achieve final agreement. When the trilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty began, the world hoped that, since the issues pertinent to a test ban had been so thoroughly discussed, an agreement would be forthcoming without much further delay. However, since 1980, when the trilateral negotiations were broken off, we have strayed further and further away from our goal. Despite the tremendous progress that continues to be made in seismic detection technology, we are told that a test ban cannot be adequately verified. It is also claimed that a ban on nuclear explosions would not lead to reductions in nuclear arsenals. For at least one nuclear-weapon State the test ban has become a long-term goal.
My delegation continues to believe that a comprehensive test-ban treaty, besides being a vital first step towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, is also a measure which is most easily achievable. The question of verification, like any other issue, is capable of being resolved in the process of negotiation. Its prior resolution cannot, on grounds of reason or logic, be made a pre-condition for starting negotiations. To the argument that a test ban would not lead to reductions in nuclear armaments, my delegation would point out that reductions, even deep reductions, in nuclear armaments, as a first step, would not stop the unending qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. We therefore welcome the decision of the Soviet Union to impose a unilateral moratorium on its nuclear testing and we appeal to the other nuclear-weapon States to join in this moratorium as a first move towards the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, and prevention of nuclear war, are two other items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament on which it has, unfortunately, not been possible even to initiate meaningful structured discussions. At the heart of this failure lie the strategic doctrines of the super-Powers. But those who possess nuclear weapons and agree that "a nuclear war cannot be won and hence must never be fought", continue to enhance their ability to wage the nuclear war which they admit cannot be fought. For us the proposition that when nuclear weapons exist the possibility of a nuclear conflagration breaking out also exists, is self-evident.

There is no denying the fact that the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament rests with the two super-Powers, who between them control 95 per cent of the world's nuclear weapons. As a consequence, they hold the entire world hostage to their mutual mistrust and their global rivalries. It is only logical that these two should agree to impose a qualitative and quantitative freeze on their nuclear arsenals and, after this freeze, reduce their weapons. This process should be joined in by the other nuclear-weapon States.
(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Despite its reservations about the asymmetry in the rights and obligations of the nuclear-weapon and the non-nuclear-weapon States inherent in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Pakistan has remained committed to the objective of nuclear non-proliferation. Though my country has not acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, it has observed the Treaty's central obligation through which the non-nuclear-weapon States have undertaken not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons. My Government's commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has been amply demonstrated through its initiatives in this regard at the global, regional and bilateral levels.

At the global level Pakistan has been in the forefront of those demanding that effective and credible assurances be extended to the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. In order to be credible these assurances have to be unconditional in nature and legally binding in character. My delegation holds that any State which foregoes the nuclear option has the right to receive security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States. These assurances, besides building confidence in the non-nuclear-weapon States, would also serve the non-proliferation objective by acting as a disincentive against the acquisition of nuclear weapons. My delegation, which has submitted a draft resolution on this subject every year, intends to submit one this year also. We hope that our draft resolution will receive unanimous support in this Committee.

Eleven years ago at the regional level Pakistan took the initiative in the General Assembly for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation is heartened to note that an overwhelming number of States consider the creation of such a zone as a significant contribution to nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation régime.

While I am on the subject of nuclear-weapon-free zones, may I place on record my delegation's appreciation of the agreement reached among nations in the South Pacific to declare their region a nuclear-weapon-free zone. This development, we
hope, will encourage efforts to establish similar zones in other regions. My delegation, however, regrets that, because of disagreement among its members, the group of experts commissioned to update the 1975 United Nations study on nuclear-weapon-free zones, failed to complete its task even after an extension in the allotted time. We regard this as a setback to global disarmament efforts.

At our current session the Pakistan delegation will again submit a draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, along the lines of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at the last session. We hope that the draft resolution will once again receive widespread support in its call to the regional States to enter into negotiations for the establishment of such a zone. We are also hopeful that the adoption of the resolution, along with the recent positive development in the South Pacific, will encourage the regional States to enter into mutual consultations for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

In the bilateral context Pakistan has made a number of proposals to India. An agreement on any one of them would considerably strengthen the non-proliferation régime. The proposals include simultaneous accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, reciprocal inspection of each other's facilities, and placing nuclear facilities in the two countries under similar International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. Pakistan has also proposed a declaration by all the countries of South Asia renouncing the manufacture or acquisition of nuclear weapons.

On the multilateral disarmament agenda, the banning of chemical weapons offers promise. Negotiations for the conclusion of a convention banning the development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical weapons have been under way in the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament for five years now. The Conference continues to devote, by far, the greatest amount of its time to this subject. It is a pity, however, that the outcome each year has not measured up to
the amount of labour that has gone into it. Although work in the chemical weapons Ad Hoc Committee is moving forward, the pace remains glacial. The malaise that afflicts the process is familiar and easily identifiable. The super-Powers mistrust each other. There is also the desire on the part of some to get the benefits of a convention without making the sacrifices needed for it.

While underlining the relative ease with which chemical weapons can be produced, and the danger of their proliferation, the developed nations continue to raise the greatest number of hurdles in the way of progress towards a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. It would indeed be tragic if the negotiations to ban this foul weapon were to lose momentum. The Pakistan delegation has been participating constructively in the work of the chemical weapons Ad Hoc Committee in the Conference on Disarmament and has supported all useful proposals. We continue to hold the view that a chemical weapons convention must effectively and comprehensively ban this weapon and provide for an international mechanism to ensure compliance with the convention in letter and in spirit. In order to achieve this urgent objective, nations would have to give up considerations of narrow self-interest for the larger good.

Despite the efforts of Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico the pace of progress in drafting a comprehensive programme of disarmament is far from satisfactory. We doubt whether the Conference on Disarmament will be able to finalize the draft programme in time for its submission to the General Assembly at its forty-first session, as it is required to do. In our view, the comprehensive programme of disarmament can serve a useful purpose only if it represents a step forward from the Final Document adopted at the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Pakistan delegation will spare no effort to achieve that objective.
Disarmament and international security are closely interlinked. The two are mutually reinforcing. It is not possible to think of progress in one without a corresponding movement in the other. Thus, a reduction in international tension is necessary for making any headway in the field of disarmament. The converse is equally valid. In a world characterized by super-Power mistrust and competition, military intervention in third States in pursuit of national ambitions can only serve to exacerbate tensions. Such interventions violate recognized norms of inter-State behaviour as well as the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. They are also a rude reminder to the small and medium sized States that militarily predominant nations continue to harbour primordial tendencies towards predatory behaviour.

In view of the presently obtaining global security situation, the United Nations study on concepts of security could not have come at a more opportune time. My delegation would like to commend the experts participating in the study for the thorough work they have done. While we have not yet completed a full examination of the study, it is clear that it contains useful ideas and propositions. The observations in the study pertaining to the security problems faced by the small States are particularly pertinent. Preoccupied with the security concerns of the nuclear-weapon States and the two military alliances, the world has tended to ignore the fact that the small and medium-sized States, which represent 90 per cent of the membership of this world body, and many of which are non-aligned, also require to safeguard their security. My delegation, therefore, supports the proposal for a separate United Nations study devoted only to the security problems of small States. We would also endorse the call made in the study for the adoption of a convention banning the recruitment, training and financing of mercenaries, together with a prohibition on the use of the territory of one State to destabilize another.
Despite the bleak background against which we are meeting here, we have no alternative to drawing hope from the continuation of multilateral disarmament efforts in various United Nations forums, the regional disarmament endeavours, and the resumed United States and Soviet Union arms control negotiations. My Government welcomed the resumption earlier this year of the United States and Soviet Union bilateral talks. We realize the highly intricate nature of arms control and the very difficult task that negotiations face. We do not expect any quick results. We, believe, however, that international confidence in the genuineness and worth of those efforts would be greatly enhanced if, by the end of the current round, at least the rough parameters of an agreement could be outlined.

World attention, not surprisingly, is riveted on the forthcoming meeting in Geneva between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. A positive outcome is essential to halt and reverse the seemingly unstoppable slide towards global disaster. We hope that this summit meeting will lead the world into a new and vigorous phase in disarmament efforts. We hope that, acting in conformity with the highest traditions of statesmanship, the two leaders will be able to lay aside their mutual distrust and take the right decisions in the interest of a more secure future for our world.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, I should like, on behalf of the Mongolian delegation, to congratulate you warmly on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. We are very pleased to see you occupying the Chair as the representative of Indonesia, an Asian State, with which my country maintains links of friendship and co-operation. We should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election. We are convinced that you will bend every effort to ensure that our Committee will successfully carry out the important duties which have been allocated to it.
At its last session, the General Assembly adopted several resolutions on disarmament, half of which were on nuclear disarmament. By an overwhelming majority, the General Assembly condemned nuclear war, and supported a freeze on all nuclear arsenals and the prevention of the militarization of outer space. That indicates the profound concern of the international community at the growing nuclear threat. The current international situation demands that all States do everything possible to remove the threat of nuclear war and to achieve a decisive breakthrough leading to an improvement in international relations and a return to the path of normal peaceful development.

It should be emphasized that the lessons of the Second World War and 40 years of activity on the part of the United Nations mean that Member States are called on to act together to that end, united and with determination as nations that are truly united.

As aptly pointed out in the statements of many delegations, the cause of the continuing tension in the world is the attempts of militaristic circles in the West to achieve military superiority at all costs by stockpiling and further refining virtually all types of armaments. That is a policy which accelerates the already head-long arms race, and which will lead to a growing danger of its vertical and horizontal extension into new areas and a sharp increase in the threat of war. The authors and protagonists of the policy of military superiority have deliberately sabotaged efforts to achieve disarmament and arms limitation. In this connection we need only refer to the fact that in the first half of the 1980s, which, as members know, has been declared as the Second Disarmament Decade, not a single agreement on disarmament or arms limitation has been achieved. It has not even been possible to initiate multilateral talks on such important issues as the prevention of nuclear war, the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, the prevention of the arms race in outer space, and so forth. The high point in this attitude was first the announcement by Washington of its intention to
been possible to initiate multilateral talks on such important issues as the prevention of nuclear war, the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, the prevention of the arms race in outer space, and so forth. The high point in this attitude was first the announcement by Washington of its intention to begin a large scale anti-missile programme, aptly named the star wars programme, and then the extensive publicity given to that project. That programme does not pave the way to the cessation of the arms race as we are supposed to believe, but rather blocks any progress in that direction.

As aptly pointed out by the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Troyanovsky, in his statement on 14 October in this Committee, that programme is aimed at making the weapons of only one side unnecessary and obsolete, and that is the defence potential possessed by the Soviet Union. If that programme were to be realized, it would cancel out everything that has been achieved so far in the field of disarmament and would usher in a qualitatively new stage in the arms race, with uncontrollable and possibly irreversible consequences.
Thus, the extension of the arms race to outer space and the creation of offensive space systems would mean greatly increasing by many factors the danger of a nuclear catastrophe which would not even spare those who rely so heavily on nuclear arms. Like the vast majority, we hold the view that it is essential, before it is too late, to erect a durable barrier against the possibility of the arms race spilling out into an area where as yet it does not exist, namely, outer space. The first effective and eminently feasible step in that direction would be, as we see it, for other States to follow in the wake of the unilateral moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on placing anti-satellite weapons in outer space, to remain in effect until other countries act in the same way. In this instance, the moratorium would then turn into a genuine standard for the conduct of States and would considerably facilitate the achievement of an agreement on the prohibition of anti-satellite systems.

Our delegation regards the recent United States test of an anti-satellite system (ASAT) against an actual object in outer space used as a target, as a dangerous step which will trigger off the development of a new type of expensive space weapon to carry out its strategic defence initiative. Thus it strikes a blow at all international efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space.

The further elaboration and development of anti-satellite weapons would lead to a sharp destabilization of the situation and would undermine the efforts being made to achieve trust between nuclear States. For that reason, anti-satellite weapons should be prohibited. International efforts to prevent the militarization of outer space need to be firmly supported.

As you know, in recent years the Soviet Union has in this connection put forward a number of constructive initiatives. The most recent of these was the concept of "star peace" which was embodied in the proposals made by the Soviet Union on the basic tenets and principles of international co-operation in the
peaceful exploration of outer space, provided that it remain unmilitarized, proposals which were put forward for consideration at the present session of the General Assembly. The substance of those proposals is that all States should concert their efforts in the peaceful exploration of outer space to further scientific and technological progress in that area for constructive, rather than destructive, purposes. Naturally, such co-operation can only be properly guaranteed provided that outer space is excluded from the arms race and that this become a mandatory norm of States' policies and a generally acknowledged international obligation.

The militarization of, and peaceful co-operation in, outer space are irreconcilable and mutually exclusive. The adoption of steps effectively to block all possible channels for the militarization of outer space and progress towards the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons would serve as the starting point for solving the task of preventing nuclear war.

In this connection, an important contribution could be made by the Soviet-United States talks on nuclear and space weapons, the third round of which recently started in Geneva.

The proposal of the Soviet Union that there be a 50 per cent reduction in those nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States which are capable of reaching each other's territories would, we feel, give a new impetus to those talks.

The world is awaiting with great hope that the forthcoming Soviet-American meeting in November will reach a concrete and tangible result by reducing the threat of nuclear war and improving the international atmosphere. We should like one of the results of that meeting to be the confirmation and consolidation of the provision which is contained in the Soviet-American communiqué adopted as the
outcome of the previous high-level meeting six years ago in Vienna, that the very idea of achieving military superiority be given up.

In this connection, we should like to point out that the success of negotiations on urgent matters relating to the arms race and arms limitation and disarmament directly hinges on the desire of States to take into account each other's interests and their readiness to adopt an honest and flexible approach, and with good will in seeking for meaningful agreements. We must base our actions on the principle of equality and equal security and not desire to protect our own security at the expense of the interests of the other side.

These days particular importance attaches to the resolve and the force of example of States, particularly those States which possess nuclear weapons, in order to promote the cause of peace and disarmament.

Hence, we fully commend the decision of the Soviet Union to introduce a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Provided a similar step was taken by the United States of America, this would open the way to the possibility of finally extricating the problem of the prohibition of nuclear tests from a state of deadlock and would enable the two States to get down to practical talks in order to draw up a treaty containing the full and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests which, during the last three decades, has been the anxious desire of the entire international community.

The problem of the prohibition of nuclear tests received priority attention at the recently-held Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. An important result of the Conference was the urgent appeal made to the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom to renew this year their trilateral talks on the full and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, and also the appeal made to other States, all those possessing nuclear
weapons, to participate in the talks on this problem at the Conference on
Disarmament as a matter of extremely high priority. The Conference unanimously
recognized the need to ensure the universality of the Treaty and, on Mongolia's
initiative, in its Final Declaration appealed to all countries, particularly the
nuclear ones and the so-called para-nuclear countries, which have not yet done so
to accede to the Treaty as soon as possible.

One of the important steps which would help to reduce the threat of nuclear
warfare and would help to strengthen the non-proliferation régime would be the
creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. Apart from the
conclusion of the Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America, that is, the
Treaty of Tlatelolco, recently a treaty was approved on the creation of a
nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific. We considerably appreciate
its importance in the light of the situation prevailing in the Pacific area, where
in fact nuclear weapons are now being deployed. The initiatives of various
countries to create nuclear-free zones in many parts of the world, and particularly
in the Balkans, the Near East, northern Europe and Africa, should also be acted
upon.

An important specific step both in order to prevent nuclear war and to halt
the nuclear arms race and eliminate nuclear weapons could, in the light of the
current military and strategic parity between East and West, be an agreement to
impose a freeze on all nuclear arsenals, first those of the United States and the
Soviet Union. This is a matter which brooks no delay.

Now it is important that the General Assembly confirm its previous decisions
regarding a complete freeze on nuclear weapons on a global basis, starting by a
specific date.
As before, so today we continue to believe that if States are genuinely desirous of not allowing war and wish to reduce the threat of such an outbreak, then they should take concrete steps which in fact corroborate this desire of theirs. This is precisely how we view the prospect of the remaining three nuclear States undertaking the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, following the example of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Here, I should like to point out that the undertaking which was given by the two nuclear Powers situated on the Asian continent, together with the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, is of particular significance for the Asian and Pacific area, for it is precisely in that part of the world that people were first killed by the American atomic explosion 40 years ago.

The socialist countries consider the full prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of stocks of such weapons as one of the most important tasks in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, and are making every effort to bring about a solution of this urgent problem.

Further evidence of the profound concern of the socialist countries in speeding up the task of prohibiting chemical weapons was the idea put forward by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev, that an international agreement be drawn up on the non-proliferation of chemical weapons, and also the proposals made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, that a zone free of chemical weapons be created in Central Europe. These initiatives were extremely timely ones. After all there is a genuine threat of the possible geographical spread of chemical weapons, particularly in its latest varieties namely, binary munitions which paralyze the nervous system. Like many others, we are convinced that the further accumulation of chemical weapons and the manufacture of binary
weapons run the risk of blocking the talks which are going on at the Conference on Disarmament aimed at drawing up an international convention which would completely prohibit chemical weapons.

It should be borne in mind that these talks are now at a rather advanced stage and there are glimmers of hope that the long-awaited goal will be achieved, that is, a second genuine disarmament step being taken. Therefore, we believe it is essential for the General Assembly to call upon States to focus all their efforts on speeding up the work on the draft convention and to avoid any acts which might impede that process.

A few months ago marked the sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the 1925 Geneva Protocol which prohibited the use in warfare of asphyxiating, poisonous and other such gases and bacteriological weapons. This document laid the foundation for the prohibition of chemical weapons, and despite numerous attempts, for various contrived pretexts, to denigrate it, it remains unshakeable and continues to serve its purpose. Mongolia, as before, favours the further strengthening of the Protocol in its present form, and in this connection considers that the General Assembly could make an appeal to all States which would have not yet done so to accede to the Geneva Protocol on the occasion of its sixtieth anniversary.

The strengthening of international peace and security, and disarmament, are being damaged not only by the nuclear-arms race, the designing and the manufacture of other forms of weapons of mass destruction, but also the stockpiling of conventional weapons of tremendous destructive force. With the exception of the Convention which was concluded on the prohibition and limitation of the use of specific forms of conventional weapons, or which could be regarded as causing excessive injury or which had an indiscriminate effect, international efforts in this area have as yet not been crowned with success.
Mongolia was one of the first to sign and to ratify that Convention and the additional protocols to it. We believe that the Convention should become an effective instrument in arms limitation and should help to promote the continuation of talks in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 81 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, on further steps to limit or to prohibit other forms of conventional weapons.

We would like to emphasize that efforts to limit and to prohibit nuclear and other forms of weapons of mass destruction should go hand in hand with similar efforts on conventional weapons as well. We should endeavour to ensure that the process of disarmament is continuous, step by step, in favour of this noble goal namely, general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

These were some general comments on what we regard as being the most important problems in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, which we wished to make at this stage. We hope that we will be allowed to revert to these problems later and to expound our position on them in more detail.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.