



General Assembly

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.75
14 May 1984

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 9 May 1984 at 10 a.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. GBEHO	(Ghana)
<u>later:</u>	Mr. STEPHANOU (Vice-Chairman)	(Greece)

- Election of officers (continued)
- General statements and exchange of views (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-0750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: As members will recall, at our 73rd plenary meeting, held on Monday, 7 May, we settled most of the organizational matters for the session except the completion of the Bureau and the appointment of a Chairman for Working Group IV, dealing with agenda item 8, "Consideration of proposals concerning the relationship between disarmament and development". I am now happy to report that as a result of consultations the Asian Group has nominated the representatives of Nepal and Pakistan as candidates for vice-chairmanship of our Commission. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Commission wishes to elect the representatives of those countries Vice-Chairmen by acclamation.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Furthermore, I am informed that the Asian Group has agreed that the representative of Nepal, who has just been elected a Vice-Chairman, should chair Working Group IV, dealing with the relationship between disarmament and development, which was established at our previous meeting. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Disarmament Commission agrees to appoint the representative of Nepal Chairman of Working Group IV, dealing with agenda item 8, "Consideration of proposals concerning the relationship between disarmament and development".

It was so decided.

GENERAL STATEMENTS AND EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. SHELDON (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to greet you and to congratulate you and the other members of the Bureau on your election to your responsible posts and to wish you success in carrying out the important tasks entrusted to you.

The exchange of views of a general nature at the first plenary meetings of this session of the Disarmament Commission, which precedes the discussion of individual specific questions in the working bodies of the Commission, in our view provides an opportunity to assess the international situation in general, to single out the major factors determining its development and consequently to highlight the objectives whose achievement is of crucial significance.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

Such an assessment in turn creates a basis on which to put into proper perspective the tasks to be undertaken at the next stage of the Commission's work so that sight is not lost of the general context in which specific agenda items must be considered. This is particularly important given the present international situation, which since the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission has unfortunately not developed positively. On the contrary, the situation has deteriorated sharply and tension is now rising to a dangerous level. An extremely negative role in all of this has been played by the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

As a result of the existing escalation of the nuclear arms race, which the States of the socialist community have consistently opposed, there has been a significant growth in the threat of nuclear war with all its catastrophic consequences for mankind and for life on earth in general. International security is being severely damaged and confidence in relations between States has been undermined. Why has this occurred? What are the roots of this course of events? Let us take a realistic look at the facts.

What is the source of these concepts permeated with aggression which preach the admissibility of nuclear war in one form or another, be it a general, a protracted war or a limited war? Where, in what capital, not only is there open talk of the need to act from a position of strength and to have the military superiority to do so but are efforts being made to achieve that end? That location is well known. Almost daily the United States Administration puts forward and Congress approves requests for ever newer programmes of arms build-up, nuclear and conventional, of all forms and types - programmes now aimed even at opening up outer space for war preparations. At the same time everything possible is being done not to allow real progress towards limiting and halting the arms race.

Since accurate scientific data regarding the danger of the use of nuclear weapons is available, we cannot in our time base policies on narrow, egoistic interests and the right of the strong to impose their interests on others by fire and sword. Today the security of States can be achieved only by ensuring global security. It would be absurd to consider that, on the threshold of the third millennium, mankind, with the wisdom of experience, having suffered many tragedies, could not find an honourable way out of the acute international problems that have arisen and could not settle them in a civilized manner by peaceful means.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

The countries of the socialist community, in their policies, reject as alien a philosophy that inexorably dooms mankind to war. They also reject the policy of a so-called balance of fear and the building up of tensions.

At the moment the most important factor is the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, the search for practical means to put an end to the arms race and the beginning of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament. Those are the questions to which first place must be given in today's political dialogue. We must throw overboard reliance on military superiority by any Power. It is necessary to reject all doctrines of nuclear war and policies of preparation for war - which are now being carried out by the United States Administration - and replace them by a policy of peace.

Since they do not consider the present course of events irreversible, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community have put forward a broad range of initiatives aimed at correcting the existing situation. These proposals are of a real and constructive nature; many of them could be implemented immediately and would bring realistic, tangible results in lessening tensions and strengthening confidence among States and, most important, would avert the threat of war, first and foremost nuclear war.

In the light of your appeal, Mr. Chairman, there is not time in the present statement to touch on all those initiatives. Let me merely refer to the proposal regarding the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of military force and on the maintenance of relations of peace between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the proposal recently set forth in the statement of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade Konstantin Chernenko, for joint recognition by the nuclear Powers of certain norms of relations in pursuing the objective of peace. The implementation of those proposals would for all practical purposes exclude the possibility of the use of nuclear or any other type of weapons, make the task of preventing nuclear war the cornerstone of the foreign policy of all nuclear States and radically change the international climate.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

At the April meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty there was a reaffirmation of the readiness of these countries to co-operate in elaborating far-ranging measures in all areas for curbing and halting the arms race and moving towards disarmament, which would create a firm basis for the real security of States.

As recently as the day before yesterday, 7 May, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty took a new and important step by proposing to the members of NATO that they embark on direct and concrete multilateral consultations with the aim of intensifying dialogue on the proposal to conclude a treaty on the non-use of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace.

Questions on the agenda of the present session of the Disarmament Commission give an opportunity to States participating in its work to make an important contribution to the creation of conditions for further fruitful progress in halting and limiting the arms race in appropriate areas. First and foremost, this affects problems of the genuine elimination of the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the beginning of nuclear disarmament. We believe that these are key issues in the present international situation.

/// In conditions of growing international tension it is particularly important that measures be adopted to ensure that military expenditures are not increased but reduced. Steps in that area would effectively promote the cessation and reversal of the arms race. Moreover, the means released as a result of that process could be used for the social and economic development, inter alia, of the developing countries. That is also the aim of a new major initiative of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty put forward in March of this year. //

We need to step up efforts aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the planet and in this context to counter the nuclear ambitions of the racist régime of South Africa.

It is necessary to continue efforts to increase mutual understanding of the concrete tasks of working out confidence-building and security-building measures which respond to the most crucial and urgent needs of the peoples and aim at reducing the danger of war and decreasing military confrontation. Along those lines also the States of the socialist community have proposed large-scale significant measures.

(Mr. Sheldov, Byelorussian SSR)

It is important that consideration of all the questions be based on the urgent need to work out concrete, realistic measures which are in keeping with the major tasks of the present day. This is the approach that will guide the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR in its work at this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We should like to stress this today, 9 May, the thirty-ninth anniversary of the victory over the forces of fascism and nazism in the Second World War.

The international situation demands the abandonment of attempts to divert attention from the essence of the problems, attempts to surround technical questions with fruitless rhetoric, efforts to substitute for the working out of tangible measures to halt and limit the arms race discussion of machinery of all kinds, in isolation from the actual process of disarmament. Only in that way, in our view, can the Disarmament Commission carry out its important tasks in a worth-while manner.

Mr. RACZ (Hungary): At the very outset, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and to wish you every success in fulfilling your responsible and difficult tasks. My congratulations and best wishes go also to the other officers of the Commission.

The present session of the Disarmament Commission takes place in an international situation which is becoming more acute as a consequence of the increasing activity of aggressive forces. The arms race has entered a qualitatively new, much more dangerous stage, involving all kinds of weapons. The escalating American arms build-up, especially in the area of nuclear weapons, which is coupled with dangerous strategic concepts and doctrines, represents a serious threat to world peace and security.

The already tense situation has become even more acute owing to the deployment now started of American medium-range nuclear missiles in some countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This has launched another particularly dangerous phase of the nuclear arms race on the European continent and has compelled the Warsaw Treaty Organization to adopt a number of responsive measures and the Soviet Union to terminate talks on nuclear armaments in Europe.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

As a result of the ongoing escalation of the nuclear-weapon race - which is consistently opposed by the socialist and other peace-loving countries - the threat of nuclear war, with its catastrophic consequences for humankind and indeed to life on earth, has sharply increased. My delegation therefore holds the view that questions related to eliminating the threat of nuclear war and the quest for practical ways of putting an end to the arms race and moving towards disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, should occupy the most important place in present-day political dialogue.

The Hungarian People's Republic, together with the other socialist countries, is making consistent efforts to curb the arms race, promote the cause of disarmament, reduce tension and strengthen international peace and security. This fact is demonstrated by a series of constructive proposals put forward by the Warsaw Treaty member States. In April of this year my country had the privilege of hosting the meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty. The communiqué on that meeting expressed the firm conviction of the participants that there are no issues that cannot be resolved through talks, if they are conducted on the basis of a constructive approach and the political will to attain positive results, with due regard for the vital interests of the peoples and of international peace and security.

It also confirms their readiness to conduct such talks on all issues of ensuring peace - talks which should aim at reaching agreements based on the principle of equality and equal security. I should like to draw the attention of Commission members to the fact that the communiqué, which contains a series of concrete and far-reaching proposals, has been circulated as an official United Nations document under the symbol A/39/209.

During the 1983 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, my delegation had occasion to set forth its detailed views on the questions of the reduction of military budgets and South Africa's military capability. Those views remain valid and, guided by the wish to save the precious time of the Commission, I shall refrain from repeating them and turn to another important topic on our agenda: the question of confidence-building measures.

My country is a strong supporter of measures that would promote the strengthening of confidence among States, complies strictly with the confidence-building measures adopted in Helsinki and is an active participant in

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

the Stockholm Conference. We hold the view that confidence-building measures do not mean, and cannot replace, disarmament; they can, however, make a substantial contribution to curbing the arms race, promoting negotiations on genuine disarmament, and diminishing mistrust, thereby strengthening mutual confidence among States. We deem it fundamentally important that those measures should be substantial and effective and at a later stage lead to reaching arms limitation and disarmament measures. Together with other socialist countries and a number of other States, my country holds the view that attention should be concentrated on measures that would strengthen confidence between the East and the West. In this connection I should like to mention in the first place the necessity of renouncing the use or threat of armed force.

It is in that spirit that the day before yesterday - 7 May 1984 - in Budapest an appeal by the Warsaw Treaty member States was handed over to the ambassadors of the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on the conclusion of a treaty on mutual renunciation of the use of armed force and on the maintenance of peaceful relations. The core of that proposal - which first appeared in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member States made in Prague on 5 January 1983 - is well known. Those States proposed to the NATO member States a mutual commitment, in the form of a treaty, not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against the other and, therefore, not to be the first to use any military force at all against the other. Such a commitment would apply to the territory of all the States parties to the treaty and also to their military and civilian personnel, as well as sea-going vessels, aircraft, spacecraft and installations belonging to them, wherever they may be located.

It would seem possible to provide in the treaty for a similar commitment on the non-use of force by the member States of both alliances against third countries, whether the latter have bilateral relations of alliance with them or are non-aligned or neutral countries.

Another important aspect of the treaty could be a commitment by the States parties not to jeopardize the safety of international sea, air and space communications passing through areas outside any national jurisdiction.

The treaty could also provide for a commitment by the States parties to strive for ending the arms race, limiting and reducing armaments and promoting disarmament,

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

such a commitment to apply to both nuclear and conventional weapons. Similarly, it could include a commitment jointly to examine practical measures to avert the danger of a surprise attack. It would be useful for the treaty to express the parties' readiness to co-operate in enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations on the basis of its Charter.

A treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of armed force and on the maintenance of peaceful relations would not, of course, limit the inalienable rights of the States parties, in so far as individual and collective self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter is concerned.

The treaty would from the outset be open to any other State wishing to accede to it.

The consultations held between members of the Warsaw Treaty, several NATO States and some other countries of late have made it clear that there are different views and ideas on the said proposal as a whole and on some of its aspects which deserve serious study. All this is indicative of the need to deepen the dialogue on the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of armed force and on the maintenance of peaceful relations. The member States of the Warsaw Treaty are ready to do so.

Those States call for a new step in the consideration of this proposal for such a treaty, namely, the starting of multilateral consultations. They are convinced that it is precisely a multilateral forum that is best capable of undertaking a thorough analysis and a joint consideration of the positions of all participants and their ideas and approaches regarding the treaty as a whole and its various aspects, as has been borne out by the experience of several multilateral forums that have discussed, or are discussing, the complex issues of European security.

The participants in such consultations could include the States members of the Warsaw Treaty and of NATO, as well as all other interested European States. The consultations could take up the idea of the proposed treaty and its main aspects.

Among other things, the consultations could take up the substance and scope of possible treaty obligations, their relationship to commitments arising out of the Charter of the United Nations, the Helsinki Final Act and other bilateral and multilateral treaties and agreements, and co-operation in ensuring compliance with the obligations undertaken under the treaty.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

Concerning the character of multilateral consultations, the Warsaw Treaty member States are of the view that future parties to the treaty could immediately set about considering substantive issues or, should the NATO member States prefer gradual progress, clarifying the scope and manner of discussing such issues at a later stage.

The Warsaw Treaty member States are naturally prepared to conduct exchanges of views on their proposals with any interested State at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament or on a bilateral basis. We expect that the appeal will be given the constructive and serious attention it deserves and we hope that the Governments addressed will respond positively to it.

The relationship between disarmament and development is a new item on the agenda of this Commission, therefore, I should like to deal with this question too in a more detailed manner.

My Government shares the view held by the overwhelming majority of countries that the arms race now absorbs immense resources, surpassing the \$700 billion mark, and increasingly prevents the solution of global problems facing mankind. We note with concern that arms expenditures continue to increase rapidly although, quite obviously, the arms build-up diverts financial, material and intellectual resources from other areas, commits productive capacities to senseless purposes and thereby makes economic growth difficult and sometimes even impossible.

The gravity of the situation is illustrated by the fact that the arms build-up and existing armed conflicts claim some 10 per cent of the world's total production and services, which is equal to the gross volume of products manufactured by half of the globe's population.

In the face of the arms build-up undertaken by some aggressive, expansionist and racist régimes, supported by the imperialist countries, the nations of the developing world often react, rightfully and naturally, by adopting defence measures, at the expense of their social welfare and development programmes. Aside from everything else, the burdens of the arms race weigh more heavily on the developing countries, whose involvement in the arms drive is therefore inconsistent with their efforts to implement the economic and development programmes urgently needed for their progress and to do away with the hardships they suffer.

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

Defence measures naturally impose a burden on the economies of socialist countries as well. For this reason we deem it important that the arms race be halted and international conditions be created that will permit us to guarantee our national security at a lower level of armaments.

The arms race has a clearly negative effect also on the peoples of the advanced capitalist countries. As against the arguments often voiced by those in the circles interested in the arms build-up, if it is a proven fact that the military industry diverts resources from peaceful programmes in those countries too. Moreover, it is one of the basic causes of the high rates of unemployment, as it creates fewer job opportunities than would result from civil production generated by similar volumes of investment.

The arms race and the rising military expenditures aggravate the world economic crisis and waste human, material, scientific, technical and financial resources. In this context too I wish to emphasize that the allocation of more material and intellectual resources for development is inseparable from the consolidation of international peace and security. Certain capitalist countries even make use of the tension that they themselves have created to subordinate their external economic policies and international economic relations to their military and political goals, thereby attempting to create additional difficulties for the socialist and other progressive countries in the implementation of their economic development plans. Another characteristic feature of their efforts lies in their increasingly protectionist economic policies which seek to pass on the burdens of the arms build-up and the economic crisis to the weaker countries, particularly the developing ones faced with numerous problems.

My Government is convinced that the most effective step towards creating the necessary material resources and intellectual capability for the solution of mankind's global problems could be made through negotiated agreements on the reduction of nuclear and other weapons.

Reductions in military budgets would make possible the development of new and more successful forms of East-West economic and technical co-operation. This would be of advantage to the peoples of capitalist, socialist and developing countries alike, would open up favourable possibilities for the provision of more economic and technical assistance to developing countries, would promote economic

(Mr. Racz, Hungary)

co-operation among the developing countries themselves and would in all ways create more propitious conditions for the establishment of a new, just and democratic economic order.

My Government is not opposed to the search for and study of organizational forms likely to be instrumental in allocating the resources released by disarmament measures for the acceleration of economic and social progress in the developing countries. It declares its continuing readiness to provide economic assistance to developing countries, thereby making a contribution commensurate with its means to the consolidation of their economic independence, the elimination of the vestiges of the colonial system and the reduction of differences in their levels of economic development.

It is a task for mankind as a whole to make rational use of the enormous resources that are today wasted on the arms build-up. Hungary lends support, even by its foreign policy actions, to the just aspirations of the peoples of the world to the curbing of the arms race.

I should like to conclude my statement by assuring members that my delegation will participate in the present session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in a constructive spirit and is willing to support every effort aimed at promoting the achievement of aforementioned objectives.

Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset, Sir, I should like through you to congratulate the new Chairman of the Commission. We are certain that under the chairmanship of this African brother, with his expertise and wisdom, well known to all of us, the work of this session will be crowned with success.

I also take this opportunity to express to Ambassador Celso Antonio Souza e Silva, the representative of Brazil, who presided over the Commission's work last year, our gratitude for and appreciation of, his efforts during a difficult time, when he gave evidence of his wisdom, energy, awareness and efficiency.

Almost six years after the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament we observe with deep regret that not one effective disarmament agreement has been concluded. We meet today in extremely complicated international circumstances, in which all the principles and rules of

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

international relations are being severely tested. The world has recently witnessed flagrant violations of the principles that we have sought to uphold in the United Nations. This is because of the resort to violent means instead of to the rule of international law and the collective security system embodied in the United Nations Charter .

My delegation believes that the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, convened in 1978, provided an essential platform for the achievement of general and complete disarmament. In its Final Document that session established the basis on which our goal can be achieved. Paragraph 118 of the Final Document defines the Disarmament Commission's role as being that of a multilateral deliberative body to make recommendations on a comprehensive programme for disarmament to the General Assembly and, through the General Assembly, to the Geneva negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, now called the Conference on Disarmament. We regret that there was not a more positive outcome of the Commission's and the Committee's work last year, but this should not be allowed to impede our progress.

As a non-aligned State, Egypt believes in the principles of non-alignment. It also believes that general and complete disarmament under effective international control is a goal that we should all work towards, to halt the drift to catastrophe. We call for real disarmament within the framework of a collective security system guaranteeing the security of all, in accordance with the principles of the Charter, the most important of which are those concerning the non-use of force in international relations, the right to self-determination, the peaceful solution of international problems and respect for the right of peoples to live in peace.

We do not dispute the importance of the fourth item on our agenda, relating to nuclear and conventional disarmament, as a framework for the other items. My delegation believes that the Commission must make a clear, firm recommendation on this item. We had hoped that multilateral negotiations on this item would have been begun, in accordance with the consensus in the 1978 Final Document.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

As bilateral negotiations between the super-Powers have stopped, as a natural outcome of the mistrust prevailing in international relations in general, we now have a choice between falling into the bottomless pit of a violent arms race that could not be stopped in the near future and accepting and living with the reality, while aiming at the renunciation of the policy of the arms race and of the production of more destructive, more lethal weapons, thus guaranteeing the equality and security of all.

We hope that through its work and its recommendations the Commission will contribute constructively to the multilateral efforts in the Conference on Disarmament, as the Commission reflects the points of view of large numbers of the other States of the world. Our effort should not be impeded by the stalling of the negotiations on nuclear disarmament between the super-Powers. We must redouble our efforts and rekindle the hope of reaching our desired disarmament goal.

The final documents of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi, gave this issue a prominent place, expressing the view that comprehensive disarmament has its impact on the question of man's survival or annihilation. The Political Declaration states:

"Disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, is no longer a moral issue; it is an issue of human survival. ... The Heads of State or Government ... find it unacceptable that the security of all States and the very survival of mankind should be held hostage to the security interests of a handful of nuclear-weapon States." (A/38/132 and Corr.1 and 2, p. 14, para. 28)

We must reject these concepts, basing ourselves on the theory of collective security. We affirm that security and armament are incompatible. I suggest that the Commission make a clear recommendation to this effect, stating the need to halt the qualitative and quantitative race in the production of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction as a first step and proposing concrete measures for the mutual gradual reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction within a specific time frame, to be adhered to by all parties. This process must be under effective international control.

Although that is our proposal, we do not believe that it is possible to achieve it in the near future. The important thing is to start working within the

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

framework of a comprehensive programme and to follow up what has already been achieved at the end of each phase, so that trust replaces mistrust and the political will that would enable us to achieve this goal within a reasonable period is established. Paragraph 30 of the New Delhi Declaration sets out the principles that could be the basis of more concrete proposals to be put forward in the General Assembly at its forthcoming session. I do not need to list those well-known principles.

There is a consensus that the fourth item on our agenda, concerning the arms race, is the principal item and provides the framework for dealing with the other items. Among the related issues are the cessation of the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and the banning of all nuclear-weapon tests, thus completing the partial test-ban Treaty, concluded on 5 August 1963, which banned tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.

Nuclear-weapon States made a commitment under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was signed on 1 July 1968, and specifically under its article VI, to pursue negotiations in good faith on the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date, on nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. That commitment by the nuclear-weapon States could be among the most important means of convincing some of the non-nuclear-weapon States which have not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty to do so.

The minimum we can expect of the two super-Powers is that they should quickly put into effect the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests, of 3 July 1974, and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, of 28 May 1976. That, however, would not absolve them from the responsibility of making greater efforts in the field of nuclear disarmament.

I should like to address briefly other items on our agenda. With reference to item 5, on reduction of military budgets, the reduction of military budgets is bound up with many other interrelated military, economic, political and social issues. There is no doubt that a gradual reduction of military budgets in terms of absolute figures or specific percentages, especially by the nuclear-weapon States, would contribute to the limitation of the arms race and to increased possibilities for reallocating resources now used for weapons to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

At last year's session of this Commission the Chairman submitted a working paper on the question of military expenditures (A/CN.10/1983/WG.1/WP.2). My delegation believes that that paper places all States on an equal footing as regards their commitment to reduce their military expenditures. We disagree with that approach. We consider that the primary responsibility rests with the nuclear-weapon States and those with massive military capabilities. While it is vitally necessary that third-world States channel all their resources into accelerated development and settlement of their continuing balance-of-payments deficits, still they must safeguard their security and independence. This is difficult, for many States believe, now more than ever before, that their security and independence are threatened. The balance of nuclear deterrence is a burden for those countries resulting from the ongoing strategic, defensive and offensive arms race.

We hope that at this session the Disarmament Commission will be able to reach agreement on a consensus formulation on principles and measures for agreed gradual reduction by States of their military budgets, to be implemented taking account of the international situation, thus moving towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We believe that the reduction of military budgets complements agreements on arms limitation and disarmament but is no substitute for these.

With regard to item 6, on South Africa's nuclear capability, the nuclear capability of the racist régime in South Africa poses a serious threat. All United Nations reports affirm that that State, whose régime acts in breach of international law, has the potential to produce a number of nuclear weapons and the means to launch them. This poses a threat to the African continent and to the declaration of that region as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The racist régime of South Africa is defying world public opinion and will use its nuclear capability to strengthen the dominance of the whites and to terrorize neighbouring States, thus threatening the entire continent.

As an African country, Egypt is deeply concerned about this. The acquisition by the racist régime of the capability to produce nuclear weapons poses a grave threat to international peace and security, undermining the security of African States and endangering the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation and general and

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

complete disarmament. That capability has grown thanks to the continued collaboration of certain States and transnational corporations with the racist régime of South Africa. Therefore, we call upon them to refrain from providing any assistance which could strengthen the nuclear capability of that régime, especially in light of its refusal to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to submit its facilities to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

My delegation deplores the actions of South Africa and of the transnational corporations, as manifested in the exploitation of Namibian uranium, in flagrant violation of principles of international law providing for the sovereignty of every State over its natural resources for the benefit of its economic and social development. We hope that the Working Group on the item concerning South Africa's nuclear capability will make specific recommendations based on resolutions adopted in 1981, 1982 and 1983, and especially on the working paper submitted on the subject by the African Group, as well as on any other constructive proposals which could be of benefit in this regard and could lead to speedy results.

Agenda item 7 concerns the elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level. The Egyptian delegation voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 38/71 A on confidence-building measures because we believe that such measures could play a part in furthering the disarmament process on the global and regional levels. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, affirmed the importance of that role and of the policy of adopting such measures in the disarmament process and the strengthening of international peace and security. Confidence-building measures constitute an important tool for improving the political climate and for making it easier to arrive at arrangements which could have a direct impact on international co-operation and security.

Egypt welcomes the convening of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, whose first stage was devoted to negotiations on the adoption of complementary sets of confidence-building and security-building measures. We hope that the second stage of the Conference will achieve concrete results that will lessen international tension in Europe and lead to the resumption of the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

Soviet Union on medium-range missiles in Europe and on the reduction of strategic weapons. Those negotiations are of vital importance to us; as a State on the Mediterranean Sea our security is closely linked with that of Europe. Egypt affirmed this in its statement at the Stockholm Conference in February, in which it indicated the linkage that exists between security in the Mediterranean and Europe.

Regarding our region of the world, Egypt has proposed the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This is one of the confidence-building measures on the regional level and a positive contribution to general and complete disarmament that could lead to peace and confidence. We shall give further details of our proposal in the course of the meetings of the Working Group.

While Egypt regards confidence-building measures on the regional level as highly important, we are also concerned with such measures at the international level, for confidence cannot be strengthened at the regional level unless constructive measures for confidence-building in international relations are adopted with a view to improving the international political situation, strengthening international peace and security and working towards the just solution of disputes, thereby lessening the threat of a surprise attack. Egypt will play a serious part in this work.

With regard to the eighth item on the agenda, on consideration of proposals concerning the relationship between disarmament and development, Egypt regards that relationship as being closely linked to the positive desire to achieve the goal of disarmament and as one of the results of disarmament. That relationship takes on increased importance and becomes more necessary in the light of the unbridled increase in military expenditures at the expense of natural and human resources, particularly in developing countries. The deterioration of the world economic situation and the present crisis in the world economy, have had an especially deleterious effect on the economies of developing countries, thus emphasizing the relationship between disarmament, development and international security. Military expenditures have increased to such an extent that we can no longer ignore the adverse effects on efforts being made by the international community to guarantee economic recovery and establish a new international economic order. Egypt voted in

6504
652

include
2.
→

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

favour of General Assembly resolutions 38/71 A and B on the relationship between disarmament and development because of its belief that we can neither ignore nor overlook that relationship in the world of today.

In his statement at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, on 28 September 1983, President Hosni Mubarak referred to the increased threat created by expenditures on armaments and the effect on the economies of the peoples of the third world. He said:

"The issue of general and complete disarmament cannot be ignored. ... It suffices to point out here that the world expenditure on armaments in 1982 exceeded \$650 billion - which equals the revenue of 2 billion people living in the poorest 50 countries on our planet." (A/38/PV.10, p. 7)

My delegation believes that the reduction of military expenditures on a mutually agreed basis, in particular by the nuclear-weapon States, would lead to the release of additional resources that could be used in economic and social development, especially in the developing countries. We support the efforts of the United Nations Institute on Disarmament Research to establish a development fund that could be fed by the savings realized through the process of disarmament. We suggest that such savings could result from the reduction of the vast arsenals of the developed countries.

In spite of the efforts of the Disarmament Commission at its last session, in 1983, the goals we seek have not been achieved. We hope, Sir, to continue such efforts and to intensify them at this session of the Commission under your able chairmanship. I believe in the role of this Commission as an international forum with responsibility for assessing and evaluating the world situation. Needless to say, we shall express Egypt's position on the items on our agenda in the appropriate Working Groups.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): On the occasion of your election to the position of Chairman of this Commission late last year my delegation expressed to you, Sir, its gratification and warm welcome. Let me reiterate that welcome now. We are pleased to find the standards of excellence which you set as Chairman of the First Committee during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly already reaffirmed in your management of your present office. This will be of great benefit to our work.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

The Ambassador of France, speaking on behalf of the 10 countries members of the European Community, has already with the requisite brevity sketched out the position with which the Ten approach our present annual session. My delegation identifies itself fully with the views expressed, and for that reason I do not wish to dwell on substance in my statement. I would, however, like to make a number of procedural observations.

Last year, in the wake of General Assembly resolution 37/78 H, and under the most competent leadership of Ambassador Souza e Silva of Brazil, the Disarmament Commission took a considerable step forward. Indeed, the resolution required the Commission to direct its attention to a limited number of specific subjects from its agenda and to attempt to make concrete recommendations for the benefit of the subsequent session of the Assembly. That was an important attempt at restructuring our work.

My delegation had hoped that under your leadership we might continue along that path, which would require us to cut out from our proceedings all activities which would not be immediately conducive to the production of concrete recommendations on specific items. In line with that purpose, Ambassador Souza e Silva succeeded last year in virtually eliminating a broad general debate and in making us embark on concrete work in appropriate working units at a very early point. You, Mr. Chairman, despite your valiant efforts, have not been so lucky.

My delegation sees with concern that more than 40 speakers have inscribed themselves for a full-scale general debate on substance, despite your urgent wish that this not be done. The course of the debate so far as confirmed our fear that too many delegations, especially those from a particular group of countries, departing from our mandate and prescribed working method, take the floor to give a broad, general description of their policy such as they make annually in the First Committee of the General Assembly or in collective political pronouncements of their own group. While it is desirable to hear brief, work-related statements - and we have already had a number of excellent ones - so as to set the stage for our concrete work, these presentations have largely been unrelated to our immediate work assignment. In addition, they have introduced polemics - and even

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

unsubstantiated express accusations against at least one member of this Commission. That, in the opinion of my delegation, is unhelpful to our work and to an appropriate atmosphere. We formulate the wish that the statements which we are going to hear during our proceedings today will not fall into that unfortunate trap and that greater care will be taken to abide by your wishes, Mr. Chairman, and those of the vast majority of this Commission.

I have another procedural concern at heart. When, in the discussion of General Assembly resolution 37/78 H, we all agreed that the work of the Commission needed to be restructured, one of the essential features of the new system appeared to be that agenda items should not remain under consideration for an interminable period but should be dealt with quickly and then removed from the agenda. In that manner, happily, the Commission succeeded in providing final recommendations for at least one of the agenda items on its list last year. In discussing the items we have before us this year and in probing the consensus potential for concrete recommendations, the Commission should, in the view of my delegation, keep this concern very much in mind.

In this vein I would strongly support the view already expressed by a number of delegations that under the leadership of a Chairman from Africa we should make a particularly substantial effort to grind out a final work project on agenda item 6 concerning the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. Forceful action by the international community is required in order to prevent South Africa from possessing an operational military capability in this field. The necessary momentum can be generated only if we muster the available consensus potential in this Commission and thus provide the General Assembly at its forthcoming session with a text that can meet with the broadest possible support.

Last year my delegation took it upon itself to introduce a working paper on agenda item 6. We intend to make renewed and vigorous input in good faith with the hope of contributing to a set of reasonable and effective recommendations on the item.

My delegation is privileged to preside over the Commission's work in a special working group on item 7, on confidence-building measures. Here again it appears important that the work on guidelines in this field be concluded at a definite, foreseeable time. In introducing the idea of guidelines on confidence-building

(Mr. Wegener, Federal Republic
of Germany)

measures and proposing that they be elaborated by the United Nations Disarmament Commission, it had been our plan to limit this exercise to a two-year effort. The second year has come. My delegation has no intention to see the exercise prolonged and to devote yet another year of the Disarmament Commission's effort to the desired outcome. Therefore, in my capacity both as a representative of the Federal Republic of Germany and as the forthcoming Chairman of the Working Group on Confidence-Building Measures, I should like to appeal to all delegations to join forces and to help produce a consensus on the principles to govern confidence-building measures so that we may achieve a rapid and effective conclusion of that item of our work programme.

In conclusion let me depart ever so briefly from the purely procedural viewpoint. Several of the statements we have heard yesterday and today have dealt with the issue of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe, unfortunately in a particularly one-sided manner. This issue has nothing to do with our present agenda. It belongs to a different negotiating forum. The delegations that have addressed themselves to it would not have had to air their views here if the Soviet Union had not one-sidedly left the negotiating table at which solutions to that particularly pressing problem were to be worked out. There is a better way for the Soviet Union to prove its love of peace and its determination to prevent hostility and exacerbation than to cite long lists of declaratory policies. The negotiating table in Geneva still exists. At its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly by an overwhelming majority of votes called for the nuclear Powers concerned to resume their negotiations without pre-conditions. It would be a most welcome signal to all of us who are here sharing in the ardent search for more disarmament and a more stable and peaceful order in parts of the world if the Soviet Union would heed that appeal.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his very pertinent statement. There was much in his statement that I can agree with as Chairman of this Commission. I can only once again launch an appeal to my colleagues here to avoid a general debate. We have no provision for a general debate in our calendar of work; this is supposed to be an exchange of views on the specific issues on our agenda. However, I do admit that, the international

(The Chairman)

situation being what it is, it might require a word or two from delegations. But the length of some of the statements we have been hearing is a little worrying to me as Chairman. I have refrained from filibustering because I do not want to ruin the mood of this Commission, but I hope I can remind members that this is supposed to be an exchange of views among Commission members on the specific items on our agenda and not a general debate on disarmament as a whole. I hope I shall not have to revert to this matter.

Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand): Since I am speaking for the first time, I should like to join other delegations in offering you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues on the Bureau my delegation's congratulations on your election to the responsible offices you now hold. In your own case, Sir, your experience and your achievements in other bodies give us good ground for believing that under your chairmanship the Commission will have a successful and productive session this year. We will do our best to support your effort to keep the general debate limited by making this statement brief and, I hope, to the point.

New Zealand welcomes the opportunity that the Disarmament Commission provides for all Members of the United Nations to meet outside the regular session of the General Assembly to contribute to multilateral discussions on disarmament. There has been some difference of opinion about how the Commission can best discharge the rather broad mandate assigned to it at the first special session of the General Assembly, in 1978. In its resolutions 37/78 H and 38/183 E the Assembly has recommended that the Commission concentrate on the specific questions on its agenda, with the aim of making concrete proposals to the General Assembly. My Government agrees that this approach is the one that is most likely to produce useful results. It also believes that real progress can only be made when there is general agreement on the measures to be proposed. We continue, therefore, to support the principle accepted in 1978 that the Commission should, wherever possible, take decisions on substantive issues by consensus.

It is not necessary to comment in detail at this stage on the specific questions that are to be dealt with by separate working groups - that is, the reduction of military budgets, South Africa's nuclear capability, confidence-building measures and disarmament and development. I do, however, wish to make it clear that New Zealand is very interested in the new item on disarmament

(Mr. Harland, New Zealand)

and development and that we attach particular importance to the related questions of confidence-building measures and the reduction of military budgets. If agreement could be reached on specific measures in this latter field, it would help to reduce the suspicion and distrust that continue to hamper disarmament discussions, multilateral as well as bilateral.

The most practical initial step that Governments can take at this stage towards the reduction of military budgets is to report regularly on their own military expenditures. For several years the General Assembly has been asking all Member States to take part in this exercise. New Zealand has reported since the beginning; we hope that the number of countries doing so will continue to grow.

The General Assembly has set the Commission a formidable task by asking it to complete its elaboration of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures in time for submission to the thirty-ninth session. Last year the approaches advocated by various delegations to this problem differed widely. If we are to meet the deadline set by the General Assembly, a good deal of flexibility will be required from those most actively involved.

These questions are important; all questions relating to disarmament are important. But few would question that the most important question confronting the world today is how to stop the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race.

New Zealanders share the deep concern felt all round the world at the impasse that has been reached in negotiations on nuclear disarmament, at virtually every level. The rapid proliferation of nuclear arms, vertically if not horizontally, has reached the point where all countries stand exposed to the most appalling consequences in the event of nuclear war. Each new development in nuclear technology increases the danger and also increases the waste of resources. There is more reason than ever before to stop the arms race; but at present little, if any, progress is being made in this direction.

Two issues stand out as requiring urgent attention: one is the need for balanced and verifiable reductions in nuclear arsenals and the other is the urgent need for a comprehensive ban on all nuclear tests.

If the build-up of nuclear arms is to be stopped, the lead must come from the two super-Powers. They hold by far the largest proportion of all the nuclear weapons already in existence. By the same token, they can make the greatest

(Mr. Harland, New Zealand)

contribution to halting the arms race and reducing the risk of nuclear war. New Zealand shares the world-wide concern at the suspension of the talks in Geneva on both strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. We welcome the agreement that has recently been reached to reopen the talks in Vienna on the reduction of forces in Europe. We devoutly hope that this agreement will shortly be followed by the reopening of talks on nuclear weapons.

The banning of nuclear tests has long been the special objective of New Zealand's efforts in the field of disarmament. There is no step that the nuclear Powers could take that would demonstrate more clearly their commitment to ending the arms race than the conclusion of a treaty for the comprehensive banning of nuclear testing, with appropriate verification provisions. I would add that there is no step that the nuclear Powers could take that would do more to achieve what appears to be their joint goal of preventing world security from being undermined by the further spread of nuclear weapons.

At the last session of the General Assembly New Zealand took the lead, with Australia, in putting forward yet another resolution calling for the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. That resolution was adopted by the General Assembly without a single dissenting vote. The General Assembly requested the Conference on Disarmament to resume its examination of issues relating to a comprehensive test ban with a view to the negotiation of a treaty on the subject, and the Assembly requested the Conference on Disarmament to take up at its 1984 session the question of a revised mandate for its Working Group on a nuclear test ban. After meeting for 12 weeks in Geneva, the Conference on Disarmament has adjourned without reaching agreement on the issue referred to it by the Assembly. My Government has instructed me to register in this Commission New Zealand's deep concern at the lack of movement on this issue in Geneva.

There has been some movement in the Conference on Disarmament on another question that is of great importance - the elimination of chemical weapons. We warmly welcome the flexibility that has recently been shown by members of the Conference on Disarmament on this subject. We hope that they will soon show the same flexibility in their approach to the question of a nuclear test ban so that agreement can be reached before long on the mandate for the test-ban Group.

(Mr. Harland, New Zealand)

Unlike the Conference on Disarmament, this Commission does not have authority to negotiate disarmament agreements. Last year we were unable to reach agreement even on a set of recommendations to the General Assembly about the nuclear arms race. We hope that the session now beginning will produce more practical results and that it will encourage the Conference on Disarmament to do likewise. We look forward to reviewing the work of both bodies at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): As the United Nations Disarmament Commission begins its 1984 session, I should like to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's warmest congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman. We all know of the diplomatic skill and experiences which you have shown in United Nations diplomacy, including in the field of disarmament. My delegation is very pleased to see this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) under your guidance and expresses its readiness to co-operate with you in the successful conclusion of the current session.

The agenda for this session includes those familiar items which have been before us for deliberation for a long time. As a matter of fact many, if not all, of these disarmament-related items have been dealt with by this world body from its first days. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armament were established in 1946 and 1947 respectively for the very purpose of enhancing the cause of international control of the new technology and thus of disarmament and international security, and were later integrated into one - that is, the predecessor organ of this Commission originally set up in 1952.

During these nearly 40 years of the post-war period, the work of the United Nations has been directed to the creation and maintenance of a peaceful and stable world, which we all know is the common objective set forth in the United Nations Charter.

In the field of disarmament we have earnestly endeavoured to reduce and eventually eliminate all armaments - both nuclear and conventional - under effective international control. How much of this ideal we have been able to achieve, however, is questionable. Indeed, throughout this period nuclear war has been avoided and some significant and meaningful arms control and disarmament

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

agreements have been concluded, including those in the nuclear field involving major nuclear-weapon States. While we may be allowed to congratulate ourselves in this regard, the world has nevertheless witnessed ever-increasing arsenals, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, of nuclear and conventional weapons which, in anyone's view, go far beyond even the maximum perceived needs for self-defence. We are also all too well aware that military conflicts on a regional level have never ceased despite the strenuous efforts of the United Nations and other bodies.

Certainly, it is easy to look back to the past and regret how little has been accomplished towards our goal. But this is not the intention of my delegation. Rather, it is to stress the importance for all of us of recognizing this as a fact, to appreciate that things could have been far worse without these joint efforts and to try to move forward, even if only by one inch, towards the achievement of the goal of disarmament.

The first of the substantive items on our agenda deals with the prevention of nuclear war and a general approach to disarmament negotiations. Needless to say, a nuclear war, once started, would certainly be a catastrophe for the whole human race, and the 1980 United Nations report on a comprehensive study on nuclear weapons makes this point abundantly clear. As one of the authors of that report, I cannot stress enough the incalculable disaster that a nuclear war even of limited scope would bring upon us. At the same time, one cannot discuss such questions in isolation from the actual state of the political and security situations prevailing in today's world. Mere declarations and expressions of political intent cannot serve the purpose of preventing war, in particular nuclear war, and of promoting disarmament in the real world of complicated interdependences, linkages and high technology.

In fact, what we see is the failure of that same human wisdom that brought about the great advances in science and technology to exercise effective control over them. It is the view of my delegation that effective control over modern science and technology can be achieved if there is sufficient confidence among nations that their awesome power will not be employed for the purpose of mutual destruction. The absence of such confidence and the fact that such principles as those in the United Nations Charter have occasionally been ignored have contributed

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

to the notable lack of progress in the field of disarmament, in particular in the past several years. This, together with the ever-growing spiral of the arms build-up, has given rise to concern in various sectors of the world community about the imminent danger of nuclear war.

Japan has emphasized time and again that the approach best suited to disarmament would be the accumulation of concrete and effective measures, one after the other, such measures being accompanied by feasible verification procedures, so that every participating State could be assured of an increased sense of security. I should like to reiterate once again that only through such an approach, however slow and tedious the progress may seem, can we come closer to the final objective. In other words, the experience of decades of disarmament efforts in the United Nations has made it abundantly clear that, unfortunately, we do not live in an ideal world.

There is no need to repeat that the nuclear-weapon States have unique and special responsibilities in this regard. The reduction of nuclear weapons and putting an effective brake on what has been traditionally called vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons are vital elements in preserving the nuclear non-proliferation régime. As all members are aware, the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is only a year ahead. It is no exaggeration to say that the entire NPT régime may be in great jeopardy unless the obligation in article VI to pursue negotiations on nuclear disarmament is implemented sincerely and in good faith. Should there be a serious deterioration in the basic credibility of the NPT régime we would simultaneously lose the system of horizontal non-proliferation, which has so far been functioning effectively and which the world has come to take more or less for granted. This is a point which needs special emphasis. We should all be aware that horizontal nuclear proliferation will lead to an unmanageable world. In this connection I feel duty-bound to reiterate again our strong appeal for the bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR on the reduction of nuclear weapons to be resumed at the earliest possible date.

The reduction of military budgets and confidence-building measures have sometimes been referred to as collateral measures in the disarmament context. This

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

is possibly a correct description of their nature in the sense that they do not in themselves constitute genuine disarmament steps in the full sense of the word. However, my delegation does not consider them to be of secondary importance. As I have just said, no disarmament negotiations can be expected to make progress when there is no confidence among States.

With respect to agenda item 5, "Reduction of military budgets", the United Nations General Assembly has already for some years now adopted relevant resolutions, including one calling upon all Member States to make annual reports to the Secretary-General on the status of their militarily related budgets according to the established standardized method and format. My delegation views such regular reporting as an essential point of departure on this subject. We think that reliable data on military expenditures must be made available by every State in order to form an objective platform from which to assess the situation and examine effective ways and means of solving questions related to military expenditures. I should also like to point out that such openness and transparency of military budgets and expenditures, as well as of all the militarily related behaviour of States, is in fact an important step towards confidence-building.

In considering ways of building confidence among States, the first is undoubtedly the honouring of existing international agreements and obligations, notably those basic principles of conduct between States which are clearly spelled out in the Charter of the United Nations. We could point out that, if they were observed in full in good faith, our task would be a much easier one.

The community of nations with which we are dealing today has now expanded to cover every corner of the earth. This inevitably makes us all aware of the heterogeneous nature of the world - heterogeneous in terms of historical, cultural, political and economic background as well as politico-military and social situations. It is this inherent heterogeneity of the international community that we have to keep in mind when we talk about regional approaches to confidence-building measures. We firmly maintain that really meaningful measures for building confidence can be introduced into a regional situation only when and where each and every State concerned is convinced of their desirability and feasibility.

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

In this regard, political, military and other characteristics peculiar to a region must be taken fully into consideration, rather than thinking that a set of confidence-building measures suitable for one region can be automatically transferred to another region. Here again I should like to stress that what counts for confidence building is not words or measures as such, but rather the behaviour of States based on rules governing inter-State relationships.

I have so far stated a few of Japan's basic ideas with regard to some of our agenda items. I should like to think that they have been of use in advancing our deliberations this time. As I come from the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament, the negotiating body on disarmament measures, I must confess my own unfortunate impression that too much time and effort have been devoted to determining what is wrong or who is wrong, a sort of political game of blame and counter-blame. But 40 years is too long a time just for doing that and I have noted already that there have been some useful results also. I am convinced that we would all want to make use of this forum - the United Nations Disarmament Commission - to give momentum to more substantive progress, however small it may seem at the time as individual steps.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, I should like first to express my country's admiration for the work that you did previously as Chairman of the First Committee and for your wise approach to world problems in a manner that is consistent with what we need at the present time.

The purpose of my intervention is not to deal with any of the problems that are before the Commission as part of the agenda, nor with the controversies heard here about one thing and another, but fundamentally with what is needed to deal with the present very serious situation of an escalating arms race which has reached almost the point of no return, with billions spent on first-strike strategic nuclear weapons in preparation for a war that can never be waged without the complete destruction of all. There can be no victor; there can be no victim other than the whole of humanity.

The Commission which you, Sir, are presiding over was established by the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament as a deliberative body, with the duty to deliberate - which means to consider fully and in depth the problems of

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

the arms race at the time when it meets. We are concerned not with last year or the year before, or with looking back to see what was on the agenda then or on the agenda today, but with the situation of the world today.

Never before has the world been in such a difficult position, with a nuclear war almost looming on the horizon. This is felt by all people everywhere. It is realized by everyone, and I want to speak to this Commission now on the need for a change in approach. The whole approach to disarmament is taking the wrong path: quite simply, even though we reaffirm that the United Nations has a central role and the primary responsibility concerning disarmament, all disarmament negotiations ignore the United Nations and the Charter; indeed, for decades those negotiations have been sterile, because they have ignored and bypassed the need for international security concurrently with efforts towards disarmament. This need for collective security is basic to the United Nations, as expressed in the Charter; it comes first in the declaration of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which says in its paragraph 13:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and" - this is given priority in the Declaration; only then follows - "the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement" - through negotiations. (A/S-10/4, para. 13)

What we have been doing all these years is the opposite - that is, proceeding directly to negotiations and ignoring the first part - the need for international security to make negotiations productive, not sterile, as they are now and as they have been for decades and we want to continue with the agenda, which again deals with futile negotiations on disarmament. We know very well why the negotiations cannot get anywhere: it is because they are conducted as if the United Nations did not exist.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

If the Security Council - the only body of the United Nations whose decisions are enforceable, is deprived of the means to give effect to its decisions, then the system of security provided for in the Charter and which the Final Document emphasizes, is non-existent, resulting in no security; there can hardly be disarmament in a vacuum.

So I call on this Commission - which is a deliberative body with more responsibility than any other body, because it has a duty to deliberate - to do so: at this time, on the present situation, at this juncture, and see what has to be done. I am sure everybody here agrees that we are at the most critical juncture in the whole history of mankind through the years and through the ages; we are in danger of eclipse. Now, this body has the time allotted to it and the duty to deliberate. The General Assembly has too many things to do; it cannot fully consider or deliberate on the arms race. The First Committee, which deals with disarmament, is busy adopting resolutions - 50 or 60, most of them repetitive except for a few. How can it have time to deliberate? But here we have both the time and the duty to do so.

Therefore, I call on this Commission to deliberate on the need for a change in approach. How can such a change be made? By conforming to the Charter. We do not want a change that is outside the Charter; we want to bring the negotiations within the provisions of the Charter, within the United Nations - particularly as it is generally recognized that the United Nations has a central role and a primary responsibility. Everybody agrees and everybody accepts the fact that the United Nations is being bypassed and laid aside on disarmament. We confine our efforts at disarmament to asking the two super-Powers to meet and agree between them on disarmament steps. Yet they hardly agree. They have never agreed before. Why? Because there is the idea of parity in weapons. Parity in weapons is not possible when each side regards parity as a situation in which it has an edge of superiority, because without such an edge each suspects that the other side will supposedly dominate. So each wants an edge of superiority. Hence the two can never agree on the existence of parity, and the arms race continues to escalate.

In the last analysis, it has to be borne in mind that the arms race is a negative concept. The doctrines of deterrence and of pursuit of parity in weapons

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

are also within the negativity of the arms race. The only way to counter the negativity of the arms race is to proceed to the positiveness of international security through the United Nations and attain the international security system by rendering the Security Council effective in its decisions. This can be done if Article 43 is complied with, if there is a peace force available to the United Nations Security Council to be used with the assistance and advice of the Military Staff Committee.

The Military Staff Committee has been idle for 38 years now - doing nothing, except meeting twice a month perfunctorily. It reports that it met but could do nothing. Why does this go on? Because there is no United Nations force in actual existence, for the Charter is not complied with. If we do not comply with the Charter, how can we expect the Centre for Disarmament to do its work as it should and as it wants to, when we deprive it of the opportunity to proceed to the confidence-building measures? How can we have confidence-building measures in a world of insecurity, and an arms race when there is no confidence in the United Nations as an effectively functioning organization?

If the Security Council, and particularly the permanent members, comply with Article 43 and give the Council the means to enforce its resolutions, the system of international security will come alive, there will be confidence in the United Nations, and therefore confidence among its members. Confidence will make it possible for even the major Powers to agree - not on the reduction of this or that weapon but on the effectiveness of the United Nations as the means to create the conditions for productive negotiations on peace and security in the world.

This is a first introduction to the idea. I hope that all members will agree that we need a change of approach in the sense of complying with the Charter, instead of working hopelessly behind the United Nations.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): First, Sir, on behalf of the Chinese delegation I extend our warm congratulations to you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the current session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. I hope that under your dynamic guidance this session will be a success. I assure you that in discharging your duties you will have the full support and co-operation of the Chinese delegation.

The present international situation is marked by tension and turbulence in which world peace and security are under a grave threat and disarmament

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

negotiations are at a deadlock. Confronted with these circumstances, the current session of the Disarmament Commission has naturally been loaded with tremendously difficult tasks. We are therefore all concerned about how to make our work effective and fruitful. Most of the items on our agenda have been considered for years. Experience tells us that disarmament discussions, if separated from reality, will be nothing more than mere formalities, incapable of solving any real problem. Only when problems are attacked at their essence and core can we make our work really meaningful.

It is known to all that the root cause of the deterioration in the international situation and the stagnation of the disarmament negotiations is the fierce rivalry and the intensifying arms race between the super-Powers, which possess the biggest military capabilities. They talk about arms reduction, but their deeds do not match their words. What is lacking is a true will to preserve world peace and achieve genuine disarmament. The current session of this Commission should therefore proceed from this key point, call on the super-Powers truly to assume their special responsibilities in disarmament and formulate guiding principles for concrete measures to this end.

Item 4 occupies a prominent place on our agenda. It covers a wide range of issues encompassing almost all the aspects of disarmament. The item has been discussed for a number of years, but no substantive progress has been achieved so far, which cannot but be disappointing. Under this item, people attach the greatest importance to the cessation of the nuclear arms race, to nuclear disarmament and to the prevention of a nuclear war. These issues have become all the more pressing as a result of the suspension of the bilateral talks on nuclear arms reduction and the deployment of new nuclear weapons by the super-Powers.

China's position with regard to nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war is well known. We have always stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons, and consider this to be the fundamental way to prevent nuclear war. Of course, we realize that this cannot be achieved overnight, and that is why we have proposed that the super-Powers, which possess the largest nuclear arsenals, take the lead in halting the testing, refinement and production of nuclear weapons and reach an agreement on reducing by

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

half their existing nuclear weapons and means of delivery of all types; and that thereafter a widely representative international conference be convened, with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, to negotiate the general reduction of nuclear weapons by all nuclear-weapon States. Once this is achieved, the danger of nuclear war will be drastically reduced and favourable conditions for the attainment of the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament will be created.

We also support the call of many countries that the two super-Powers stop deployment of new nuclear weapons and resume as soon as possible their bilateral negotiations on nuclear arms reduction. We believe that the super-Powers should act in good faith and reach agreement on drastically reducing nuclear weapons, in conformity with the aspirations of the peoples of the world.

Adequate attention should also be given to the other aspects of disarmament contained in agenda item 4. The super-Powers have never ceased using conventional weapons as a means of pursuing their hegemonist policies and are even locked in a new round of the conventional arms race, in both quality and quantity. This Commission should therefore continue its endeavours and play a positive role in promoting conventional disarmament.

Outer space, a common heritage of mankind, is also being exploited by the two super-Powers as a new arena for their arms race. This has become an issue of great urgency which calls for serious attention. Efforts must be made to check the development of this dangerous trend.

However, we are somewhat pleased to note that progress has been made in the Geneva negotiations on banning chemical weapons. We hope that the Conference on Disarmament will be able to work out at an early date a convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons, so as to eliminate this dreadful type of weapon once and for all from our planet.

With regard to agenda item 7, the Chinese delegation shares the view that this Commission should continue its efforts to formulate the guidelines for confidence-building measures. Some countries stress that the focus should be on measures relating to the military field, while some other countries believe that the measures should also include those relating to the political and economic fields. We see no conflict in these approaches. Confidence-building can comprise a wide range of measures. What I want to emphasize here is that confidence-building measures should be closely linked with the process of disarmament and that the two

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

things should complement each other. Confidence-building measures must not be a substitute for disarmament measures, even less for the fundamental measure of drastic arms reduction by the countries with the largest arsenals.

It should also be pointed out that genuine confidence-building measures must be based on the United Nations Charter and the basic norms of international law, which include mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and non-establishment of foreign rule or hegemony in any part of the world. Only when the above basic norms are observed, foreign aggression and intervention stopped, and all foreign occupation troops withdrawn can there be any sense of security and confidence to speak of. No confidence-building measures could be better than removing the obstacles that lead to mistrust.

Agenda item 5 concerns the reduction of military expenditures, another subject that has been under United Nations consideration for years. Nothing, however, has come out of it due to well-known reasons. We maintain that the fundamental principle for military expenditure reduction is that the responsibilities of different countries should be determined according to their specific conditions. Being the countries with the largest military expenditures, and bearing special responsibilities for stopping the arms race, the super-Powers should naturally be the first to reduce military spending. It is obviously unfair to ask all nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States to freeze and reduce their military spending regardless of their different conditions. Whether or not the super-Powers are willing to cut their military spending is, in fact, a test of their will for genuine disarmament.

With regard to agenda item 6, the Chinese delegation will, as it has done in the past, resolutely support the African countries in their just struggle against the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the South African racist régime, and will actively participate in the drafting of relevant documents. Guided by basic human conscience and righteousness, we should have no difficulty in reaching consensus on this issue.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

Agenda item 8 is a new one. The Chinese delegation appreciates the efforts by countries that have sponsored this proposal. The super-Powers' arms race has an adverse impact on the development of many countries, and it is incumbent upon them to take the lead in reducing their armaments and military expenditures to contribute, in particular, to the development of the developing countries.

Needless to say, we have to face squarely the difficulties in the quest for disarmament. We are, however, convinced that so long as all the peace-loving countries and peoples unite in making unremitting efforts, world peace can be preserved.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): I am particularly pleased to be able to congratulate you most warmly, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and to greet you, the representative of an African country with which Romania maintains close relations of friendship and co-operation. I should like also to congratulate the other officers and to assure you, Sir, of the full support and co-operation of the Romanian delegation in the successful completion of the work of the Commission.

The Commission's current session has been convened at a time when the international situation is extremely grave. That gravity may be traced directly to the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, to the intensification of disagreements between States and groups of States, to the exacerbation of long-standing conflicts and the emergence of new ones, to the policy of maintaining and carving out spheres of influence, to the use and threat of force and to interference in the internal affairs of other States. The arms race is undergoing unprecedented comprehensive intensification; almost no aspect of the arms race has remained untouched by quantitative and qualitative growth of a particularly costly and dangerous kind.

Now that scientists are warning us that a nuclear war - even a limited one, if such is conceivable - would lead to the destruction of life itself on our planet, the fundamental problem of our time is, more than ever, that of halting the nuclear arms race, of averting the threat of war, and of guaranteeing and strengthening international peace and security.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In light of that grave danger, President Nicolae Ceausescu stated recently that

"We consider it impossible to accept the excuse that the manufacture and deployment of new nuclear weapons could be a way of strengthening the security and peace of peoples; on the contrary, any new nuclear weapon can only heighten further the insecurity of peoples and increase the danger of the destruction of human civilization and the very conditions for life on our planet."

The beginnings of United States deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in certain Western European countries and the Soviet Union's subsequent adoption of nuclear counter-measures have led to particular exacerbation of the situation on the continent, to an increased threat of nuclear war, and to the launching of a new phase of the nuclear arms race.

Throughout the last session of the General Assembly, the Romanian delegation tried to highlight this, stressing the reasons why the United Nations could not and should not stand aloof from the efforts of European peoples to halt the deterioration of the international situation, to protect mankind from a nuclear catastrophe, and to establish a climate of peace, co-operation, confidence and understanding in Europe and throughout the world. Since the suspension of that session those reasons have become even more relevant and urgent.

The gravity of the present situation requires that we make every effort to resume international dialogue and turn to effective negotiations on the halting of the arms race, reduction of military expenditure, and substantial reductions in weapons, first and foremost nuclear weapons.

The Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania recently made an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, to the Congress of the United States of America, to the parliaments of European countries on whose territory medium-range nuclear missiles have been stationed, and to the parliaments of other European countries and Canada. In that appeal, it called upon them to take action to stop both the deployment of new American medium-range missiles and the implementation of the nuclear counter-measures announced by the Soviet Union, and on that basis to return to the negotiations of adequate agreements and arrangements on halting the stationing and deployment of nuclear missiles on the continent, on

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

the withdrawal of those already there, and on the elimination from the continent of all types of nuclear weapons. That appeal has been distributed as document A/39/175.

Since this problem affects not only those two Powers, but all European peoples, we believe that all European States should participate in one way or another in the achievement of such agreements.

Because of its particularly serious consequences for the world political climate and for international peace and security, the problem of medium-range missiles in Europe is of concern to countries of other regions; in fact, to the entire international community. We therefore consider that the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the deliberative body of which all States of the world are members, should be aware of the profound concern voiced by the majority of Governments and by the masses of the peoples over the serious situation now facing us; it ought to take a suitable stand on this question and contribute by all means at its disposal to the surmounting of this impasse.

In this connection I stress the positive impact on freeing Europe from all nuclear weapons that the creation of denuclearized zones on the continent of Europe and throughout the world would have. Romania works consistently for the establishment in the Balkans of a zone of co-operation and good-neighbourliness, free from nuclear weapons, as an integral part of the process of achieving disarmament and security on the European continent.

In general terms we believe that the time has come for the Commission to move beyond the stage of general discussions on nuclear disarmament and embark upon the consideration of specific aspects which are really urgent and relevant to halting the spiralling nuclear arms race, the prevention of nuclear war and the creation of the conditions necessary for the opening of substantive negotiations on all the problems of nuclear disarmament.

In this context Romania supports the efforts of the non-aligned and neutral countries that have for several successive sessions attempted to give a specific orientation to the discussion on nuclear disarmament and break the present deadlock on this subject. We cannot refrain from stressing once again the gravity of this problem, particularly since today we seem to be experiencing a period of confusion

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

in the efforts designed to bring about disarmament. Plans to improve and produce new weapons systems based on the most recent scientific and technological discoveries and radically different from those that now exist are likely to lead to an expansion of the arms race to outer space and to substantive changes in strategic concepts. Such plans not only make the achievement of disarmament agreements more difficult, but also threaten to make disarmament impossible.

That is why it seems to us absolutely necessary to step up world action aimed at preventing the extension of the arms race to outer space and to strengthen and develop the legal framework guaranteeing broad international co-operation in the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes such as the economic and social development of all peoples. In the recommendations it adopts the Commission must therefore call upon States, and first of all the nuclear Powers, to show moderation in establishing their arms programmes in order not to compromise the essential basis for negotiations or destroy the hope that future generations will ultimately achieve disarmament and eradicate the threat of mankind's annihilation.

// Each year since 1979, when the United Nations Disarmament Commission resumed its activity, it has had on its agenda the problem of the reduction of military budgets. Like the work of the General Assembly, the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and other disarmament bodies, the work of the Commission has on each occasion reflected the profound concern of States in the face of the frenzied rate of growth in expenditures on armaments. According to the latest calculations the total of military expenditures has exceeded \$700 billion. We believe that that figure says it all and that it is not necessary to dwell on the harmful political, economic and social effects on people's lives of the waste of vast human and material resources for destructive ends. We have stressed this problem many times, both within the framework of this Commission and in the General Assembly. Reports and studies on this question constantly appear in the specialized literature and in the media. The basic notion they set forth, and one with which in our opinion it would be difficult to argue, demonstrates the need to reduce expenditures on weapons and highlights the positive effects that the speedy adoption of measures in this area could have on the international political situation and on the economic life of peoples. It is now a matter of turning to specific action, to the negotiation of agreements through which States would assume specific obligations to reduce their military budgets.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

As is well known, for three years in a row Romania has made reductions in its defence spending and has just decided to freeze its military budget at the 1982 level until 1985.

Similarly, my country has on several occasions proposed a reduction of from 10 per cent to 15 per cent in global military expenditures, which would lead to a massive flow of financial resources towards the developing countries, thus encouraging a resumption in those countries of the economic growth without which any lasting and widespread improvement in the economic situation is impossible.

In taking a stand in favour of dialogue and negotiations aimed at halting the arms race, building confidence and bringing about disarmament between the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Romania attaches particular importance to the opening of negotiations between the States of the two blocs in order to achieve the freezing and reduction of their military budgets, as called for in the recent proposal of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

I take this opportunity to stress the statement of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty in the context of that proposal, in which they express their readiness to make efforts, together with the States members of NATO, to achieve realistic, mutually acceptable solutions that would enable them to overcome the problems that might arise during the course of the examination of the problem of freezing and reducing military expenditures, and to guarantee that the commitments entered into will be carried out.

We hope that the countries members of NATO will respond positively to those proposals and will take action to create the conditions necessary for the opening of specific negotiations.

That hope has an even firmer basis since resolution 38/184 A, which the General Assembly adopted last year without a vote, appeals to all States, and in particular to the most heavily armed States, to reinforce their readiness to co-operate in a constructive manner with a view to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures.

Since 1981 our Commission has been pursuing on the basis of a proposal submitted by Romania and Sweden, the identification and formulation of the principles that should govern the future action of States in the area of the

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

freezing and reduction of military expenditures. The aim of this initiative is to promote genuine negotiations designed to achieve international agreements on the freezing and reduction of military budgets. The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly to this end recognize the contribution which the identification and formulation of such principles can make towards harmonizing the viewpoints of States and establishing the confidence necessary for the implementation of agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

We hope that the Working Group that has been reactivated to consider the agenda item dealing with the reduction of military budgets will continue the activity begun earlier and be able to move beyond the stage of general statements of position and embark upon specific negotiations on the wording of the various principles.

In our view the starting-point of the work should be the urgency involved in these measures to reduce military budgets and a clear understanding that the efforts of States and of the United Nations in this area must have as their goal the conclusion of agreements on a freeze and the reduction of such expenditures for weapons.

The identification of principles, and above all their formulation, must be in keeping with the fundamental objective: facilitating of the negotiation of such agreements. In the final analysis such principles will be useful only to the extent that they contribute to facilitating the beginning of negotiations and their effective conduct.

The continuing concern of my Government regarding the reduction of military expenditures, which is well known, explains the interest our delegation has shown in the proposal made by France on the relationship between disarmament and development, a question that is in our view closely linked with the reduction of military budgets. One of the principles proposed by Romania is, like those proposed by many other States, aimed precisely at the allocation of those resources released through the reduction of military budgets for purposes of economic and social development, and particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. We therefore support the French initiative, which is aimed at finally implementing an agreement on specific means for such a transfer of resources for economic and social development.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The Romanian delegation wishes to play an active part in the consideration of this question by the Working Group devoted to that issue. At this stage we should like to reaffirm two ideas that we believe are crucial to maintaining the fundamental meaning of the proposal and particularly relevant and significant from a political point of view: first, the source of development funds must above all be measures to reduce military expenditures and arms expenditures and, secondly, the assistance that will be given developing countries from these funds should facilitate the carrying out of projects or the finding of solutions to problems they encounter in the economic and social sphere. The funds should not be merely symbolic; they should release from destructive objectives a significant part of the resources thus wasted in immense expenditures for weapons, which continue to increase, above all those of the countries that have the greatest number of weapons, and those funds should be devoted to purposes of peaceful development.

In accordance with its position of principle of promoting the adoption of confidence-building measures, the Romanian delegation has actively participated in the consideration and working out of guideline ideas for the implementation of confidence-building measures between States.

At this session we should also like to make a concrete contribution to the conclusion of the consideration of this question and to see it end in positive results.

As is well known, we attach great importance to the negotiation and adoption of confidence-building measures, measures for security and disarmament in Europe in the context of the Conference which began this year in Stockholm. At the beginning of the Conference Romania submitted a working paper setting forth the measures it deems necessary for the building up of confidence between European States, aiming both at over-all actions to strengthen confidence and at measures to limit certain military activities and ensure notification of those that have taken place. The document to be produced and adopted by the Commission should in our view be general in nature and allow us to provide, within a comprehensive framework, for specific confidence-building measures specific to each area of the world, its overall objective being improvement of the international political climate and the strengthening of international peace and security.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We should like once again to stress the need to include in a very clear form among the principles to be produced the fundamental idea that the creation and building of confidence in any area of the world can take place only in a climate of respect for the principles of independence and national sovereignty, full equality of rights, non-interference in internal affairs, the elimination of the threat or use of force, and respect for the right of each people to organize its own life in accordance with its own desires. It is clear that confidence cannot be achieved through an increase in the quantity and quality of arms, escalation of the arms race or, least of all, escalation of the nuclear arms race. Genuine confidence sufficiently lasting to make all States feel secure can without a doubt be achieved only through the implementation of real measures designed to curb the arms race and achieve an arms reduction. That is why none of the measures designed to increase confidence can be substituted for disarmament agreements.

We support the position of the non-aligned countries that the broadest possible meaning should be given to confidence-building measures in order to meet the real causes of the distrust today existing between States, which are military in nature as well as political, economic and social.

Finally, we believe that the problem of South Africa's nuclear capability presents a particularly serious danger for the security of the countries of the African continent and for peace and international stability. We consider legitimate the insistence of the African countries that the United Nations adopt all necessary measures to stop the racist Pretoria régime from gaining access to nuclear weapons and to prevent the spreading of the nuclear arms race and nuclear weapons to the African continent.

Those are the considerations my delegation wished to present in the context of this exchange of general opinions. We reserve the right to speak on the Commission's agenda items when they are considered in plenary session and in the Working Groups.

I should like once again to assure you, Mr. Chairman, of our full co-operation in the Commission's work and to express the hope that the results we are able to achieve will make a contribution in promoting the cause of disarmament and of international peace and security.

Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam): First of all, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Commission. I believe that, with your wisdom and experience, you will lead the work of our Commission to success. My congratulations go also to the other members of the Bureau.

The delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shares your view, and that of many other delegations, that the present international situation is exceptionally alarming. At this time we prefer merely to underscore the cause of this situation. In our view the most bellicose circles of imperialism must be held responsible for this predicament.

The United States Administration has set as its goal ever-increasing defence spending, escalating the all-out arms race into another spiral. The current United States military budget has reached nearly \$250 billion and the Administration is now pushing for allocations in the 1985 fiscal year of \$1.7 billion and \$1.1 billion for its space-based defence system and chemical warfare programme respectively. To further their policy of sabotaging détente and seeking military supremacy and world dominance, the United States has started the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles in some member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and stepped up the build-up of its military installations and naked intervention in many parts of the world.

This assessment explains why since the late 1970s the United States has unilaterally discontinued many important disarmament talks with the Soviet Union - such as those on chemical weapons, the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, conventional weapons - and adopted an obstructionist position in multilateral disarmament bodies.

Some recent hollow gestures of goodwill have been made by the United States, such as the sending of a high-ranking official to the Conference in Geneva to try his luck with the so-called comprehensive treaty banning chemical weapons. But those are simply hackneyed tricks employed to tart up the image of the United States hawk and make it look like a dove. Obviously, he did not bring home much success and managed to deceive only the very few lighthearted persons. Instead of checking the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the United States continue its nuclear collaboration with the racist régime of South Africa, thus posing a real threat not only to the African continent but also to the whole world.

(Mr. Le Kim Chung, Viet Nam)

The recent nuclear co-operation accord concluded between the United States and an Asian country which has claimed to be "the NATO in the East" is a new development giving cause for concern. Viet Nam and the other Asian and Pacific countries will have to increase their vigilance further owing to the fact that that expansionist Asian Power is intensifying its troublesome collusion with the United States and the other militaristic and reactionary forces in North-East Asia and resorting to open threat or the use of force in pursuit of its hegemonist schemes in South-East Asia.

The more fully we comprehend the negative developments of the present-day international situation, the more vigorously we should intensify our efforts for peace and disarmament. My delegation is convinced that the Disarmament Commission can make no small contribution to that end.

It is perfectly clear from the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament that

"... effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority." (resolution S-10/2, para. 20)

Measured against the experience of the past several years, that assertion has proved ever more correct. Hence, item 4 of our present agenda should be given special priority. In this regard, our delegation favours thorough consideration of the working paper presented by the non-aligned countries at the last substantive session of the Commission and hopes that their proposals will be used effectively in formulating recommendations to the General Assembly. At the same time, we should pay appropriate attention to new, constructive and relevant suggestions. We perceive the ideas put forward in March 1984 by the Soviet Union on certain norms regulating relations between nuclear-weapon Powers to be of this sort.

Turning to the question of reducing military budgets, my delegation regrets that resolution 3093 A (XXVIII) on reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries has not been adequately followed up. With that in mind, we are much interested in the proposals put forward by Romania on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty countries on talks with the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on a freeze on, followed by a reduction of, military spending so as to reach a low-level balance of power.

(Mr. Le Kim Chung, Viet Nam)

My delegation believes that confidence is indispensable in building normal and healthy relations among States. But it is our opinion that confidence-building measures should not be narrowly confined to the very vague concepts of "openness", "transparency" and "mutual calculability in security matters". Confidence-building measures encompass all fields of inter-State relations, including the military field, and must be based on the political will of the parties concerned. In the same vein, confidence-building measures cannot supersede disarmament.

Viet Nam has been following attentively the process of confidence-building pursued by the European countries. Coming from an Asian country, my delegation wishes to reiterate its full support for the proposal of the Mongolian People's Republic on the conclusion of a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific. For their part, the Indo-Chinese countries have time and again set forth proposals for dialogue with the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), so that the two groups of countries may together build South-East Asia into an area of peace, stability, friendship and co-operation.

Our proposals have been given an increasingly positive response in various circles in the ASEAN countries. Our policy has also been encouraged by many friendly countries outside the region.

Viet Nam, with its modest experience in this field, will join the socialist, non-aligned and other progressive countries that cherish peace and justice in doing its utmost to contribute to the success of this session.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, those of us who had occasion to appreciate the exemplary manner in which you presided over the debates in the First Committee in 1982 cannot but welcome your having been chosen to guide the work of the Disarmament Commission in 1984. You can count on the full co-operation of the Mexican delegation.

In this statement I shall follow the recommendation you made to us at our first meeting, and I am convinced that I shall not only not go beyond the 10-minute limit but in all likelihood not even reach it. I shall limit my statement to agenda item 4, since my delegation will have an opportunity to state its positions on the other agenda items in the various Working Groups.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The working paper on agenda item 4 (A/CN.10/48) which the Mexican delegation submitted to the Disarmament Commission at its substantive session in 1983 recalled that the General Assembly, in the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, approved by consensus in 1978 and solemnly and categorically reaffirmed in 1982, defined a series of objectives, principles, priorities, measures and mechanisms which, taken together, constituted what could be called an excellent philosophy of disarmament.

In that working document it is pointed out that, notwithstanding this fact and even though the General Assembly itself emphasized the urgency of

"putting the provisions of the Final Document into practice and continuing along the path of obligatory and effective international agreements in matters of disarmament, it is an undeniable fact that almost all of those provisions have remained a dead letter up to the present time and that during the five years [that have] elapsed since then it has not been possible to conclude a single new treaty or convention on nuclear disarmament."

What we said last year is even more true today. Indeed, not only has no new agreement on disarmament emerged but this year in the Conference on Disarmament it has not even been possible to set up subsidiary bodies - which used to be called "ad hoc working groups" and are now called "ad hoc committees" - as the General Assembly expressly requested in numerous 1983 resolutions, on the most important items on its agenda: the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, which takes first place; the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, second; the prevention of nuclear war, third; and, finally, prevention of the arms race in outer space, fifth.

Moreover, the two series of bilateral negotiations which the super-Powers had been holding in Geneva have been cancelled, as we all know.

Hence we should like now to focus on the need for the Disarmament Commission to adopt without further delay some concrete recommendations, beginning with the first three recommendations of the compilation in annex VIII of the Commission's report to the Assembly at its thirty-eighth session (A/38/42). These recommendations, together with the modifications which the Conference on Disarmament may wish to make during its debates this spring, could perhaps be combined in a single recommendation reading as follows:

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

"All States are urged to contribute effectively to the strengthening of the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. In this context, all States members of the Conference on Disarmament, in particular the nuclear-weapon States, should do everything possible to ensure that the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, may be able to fulfil its mandate to negotiate and adopt specific disarmament measures, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament, as follows:

"Immediate multilateral negotiation of a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapon tests;

"Negotiation on an urgent basis of the agreements foreseen in paragraph 50 of the Final Document with a view to halting and reversing the nuclear arms race and bringing about as soon as possible the achievement of the final objective defined therein, namely, the ultimate and complete elimination of nuclear weapons;

"Speedy negotiation of appropriate practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war, such as a freeze on nuclear weapons, which could begin with those of the two super-Powers; the conclusion of an agreement giving complete and legally binding force to a commitment by all nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use these terrible tools of mass destruction; and the merging into a single forum of the bilateral negotiations known as START and INF, broadening their scope to include also tactical or battlefield nuclear weapons.

"Immediate multilateral negotiation of one or more agreements, as appropriate, with a view to preventing an arms race in outer space in all its aspects."

This, in our view, would be an excellent text for the first recommendation to be formulated by the Disarmament Commission in 1984.

The bleak picture of the international situation and the patent fact that, as the Assembly emphasized in its resolutions 37/78 A and 38/183 N, it is not only the national interests of the nuclear super-Powers that are at stake in this matter, but also - in the words of the resolutions - "the vital interests of all the peoples of the world". This undoubtedly shows the need for the Disarmament Commission to adopt recommendations of the kind that we have ventured to propose

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

today, without waiting to reach agreement on an exhaustive recompilation that would of necessity encompass other points, which obviously do not have the same degree of importance and urgency.

Mr. KEISALO (Finland): Mr. Chairman, may I first extend my warmest congratulations to you and the other members of the Bureau on your election. While wishing you every success in your important task, I pledge the full co-operation of my delegation in ensuring the successful outcome of this session.

The Disarmament Commission has a number of important issues before it, but in order to comply with your wish, Sir, I shall limit myself to one of them.

The item "Elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures" is of particular interest to my delegation. As a reflection of this interest we have prepared a working paper on the subject. This paper has been given to the Secretariat today for distribution. It is not my intention to go into the details of this paper at this meeting. Instead, I hope that we can introduce it in more elaborate terms in the first meeting of the appropriate working group. We hope that our contribution will facilitate the Commission's arriving at a successful conclusion of this item - in other words, the elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for their implementation on a global or regional level.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Allow me, Sir, to begin my statement by congratulating you on your election to the post of Chairman of the Disarmament Commission and to wish you great success in carrying out your responsible tasks. I am particularly pleased to do this because I have had the honour of working under your guidance and have been able to appreciate for myself your qualities as a skilled and experienced diplomat from the friendly country of Ghana. We congratulate the Vice-Chairmen and our Rapporteur, Comrade Martynov of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, on their election to the Bureau of the Commission.

The year which has elapsed since the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission has once again brought to the forefront the acute problems of preventing nuclear war, curbing the nuclear-arms race and achieving disarmament. The peoples of the world are profoundly alarmed by the new, dangerous escalation of the arms race. The major target of militarist preparations is now

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

the territories of several countries of Western Europe, where the United States has begun the deployment of new nuclear devices, Pershing-II and cruise missiles. This is fraught with great danger not only for the peace of Europe but also for world peace.

The arms race is now acquiring ominous dimensions, threatening to overflow into outer space. The once fantastic projects of "Star Wars" are today being launched as practical policies.

As has been stressed by the Mongolian Head of State, Mr. Tsedenbal, today United States imperialism is revealing itself to mankind in all its aggressive reactionary forms. It sets itself an unattainable, extremely adventuristic objective; the destruction of socialism as a social system, the crushing of the national liberation movements of peoples and the achievement of world domination. To achieve this global objective the Reagan Administration is trying to change the world balance of forces in its own favour, upset the military-strategic balance and achieve supremacy over the socialist countries.

It is necessary to stress here that the present extremely complex situation demands the redoubling by all States of efforts to achieve concrete, tangible measures to halt the nuclear arms race and to reduce and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons.

Numerous initiatives and proposals of the socialist countries are directed at precisely this objective. They encompass a broad range of practical measures in the area of halting the arms race and achieving disarmament, confidence-building and the development of mutually advantageous co-operation between States.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic fully supports the constructive proposals in the communiqué of the meeting of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty held recently in Budapest. In our view, the new initiative of the Soviet Union concerning the establishment of specific norms for relations between nuclear Powers is of the greatest significance. The essence of this initiative is the effort to prevent the emergence of situations that might lead to nuclear war and to put relations between the nuclear Powers on a more healthy and reliable basis. A positive response from other nuclear Powers would be in keeping with the vital interests not only of the peoples of these countries but of the peoples of the world as a whole.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

In conditions in which confidence between States is at one of the lowest levels in the post-war period, it is important to take specific steps to create conditions conducive to dialogue and negotiations. This objective is promoted by the commitment undertaken unilaterally by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, so far there has been no positive response to this unilateral commitment. From the Western countries, which speak more than any others of strengthening mutual confidence, there has been no answer to the proposal of the socialist countries concerning the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a treaty that would be open to all other countries.

Two days ago to this end the socialist countries took yet one more important step aimed at the practical implementation of this proposal. They proposed to the NATO countries that they take part in direct, concrete multilateral consultations on that question. We hope that the Western countries will adopt a truly serious attitude towards this constructive proposal. A step which would be comparatively easy to take but which would be effective in the cause of strengthening confidence and limiting nuclear weapons would be a freeze on nuclear arsenals, both qualitative and quantitative. This is what world public opinion demands today.

A successful conclusion to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe would be of a significance going far beyond the borders of that continent. We believe it important to increase the efforts of all States to ensure that the various confidence-building measures encompass other regions of the world as well. It was precisely this principle that guided our country when it put forward in May 1981 a proposal on the conclusion of a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific Ocean. This proposal is on the same lines as many concrete proposals and initiatives of other States of the Asian continent.

In accordance with the above principles, the Mongolian delegation in its approach to the question of confidence-building measures - the topic before us - will base itself on the fact that confidence-building and disarmament measures are closely linked and supplement each other.

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

An important place in the Commission's work should be taken by the consideration of South Africa's nuclear potential. The acquisition by the racist régime of the potential to produce nuclear weapons certainly represents a serious threat to international peace and security and continues to increase the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons. In accordance with its mandate, the Commission must carefully consider this question in order to make concrete recommendations on it.

In connection with the discussion of the reduction of military budgets, the Mongolian delegation would like to stress the importance of the new proposal by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty to the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty concerning negotiations on the non-increase and reduction of military expenditures. This contains a series of new measures to promote the speedy achievement of agreement on the non-increase and consequent reduction of military expenditures to ensure that the funds thus released are used for the needs of economic and social development of, inter alia, the developing countries. The Mongolian delegation attaches great significance to the consideration of the question of the link between disarmament and development. What is most important here, in our view, is the fact that only genuine, tangible disarmament measures can release the resources needed for the development of the developing countries.

Those, in brief, are some of the general views that the Mongolian delegation wished to express at this stage of the Commission's work.

The CHAIRMAN: It is only fair to give our interpreters a rest now. I therefore intend to transfer the other speakers on my list to this afternoon's meeting, which we shall begin at 3 p.m. on the dot. I ask representatives kindly to try to be here on time.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.