DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 7 May 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan)

- General exchange of views

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 DC2-750, 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.
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GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind members of the Commission that the deadline for inscription on the list of speakers is 1 p.m. today. We shall have three more plenary meetings for the general exchange of views - two on Wednesday and one on Thursday morning.

Mr. GOLD (Yugoslavia): At the outset I would like to greet you, Sir, in your capacity as Chairman of this Commission. I think it augurs well for our work that a person of your wisdom and knowledge of the subject of disarmament is to guide our proceedings.

The general atmosphere in the year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations is not what we would have wished. Bloc divisions and rivalry, in particular in the sphere of the arms race, still prevail in the world. The numerous crises and, especially, the precarious economic situation in the greater part of the world continue to deteriorate. The independence and freedom of action of countries are being suppressed. The most powerful ones are using political, sometimes military and especially economic means to strengthen their influence and serve their aspirations.

Multilateralism is one of the most significant achievements in post-war international relations and at the same time one of the prerequisites for the strengthening of peace and security in the world. However, there is an increasing trend towards circumventing, limiting and even abandoning multilateralism in solving the problems of the contemporary world. This trend is in effect an attempt to prevent the members of the international community from participating in and contributing to the solution of international issues on an equal footing. Attempts to restrict the channels of multilateralism and in the final analysis to close them pose a threat not only to the United Nations but also to the independence and political equality of the members of the international community.

The loudest critics accusing the United Nations of inefficiency are usually those who are themselves ever more frequently turning to bilateral channels and who deem it to be in their interest to weaken multilateralism. This trend has been apparent for a number of years, but lately there have been efforts to remake the United Nations into a forum for debate only, a place where issues are to be considered but not necessarily negotiated and resolved. On the subject of
disarmament the United Nations should, according to this school of thought, serve as a debating forum and not as a forum for negotiations and harmonization of views or even for the control of the implementation of agreements on disarmament. If this were to happen an enormous potential of the world Organization would be lost.

Let us recall here that the United Nations, at 40, is an elaborate instrument, a well-developed mechanism and an all-encompassing forum for negotiations on disarmament. It is, we feel, indispensable to put this mechanism and forum to full use.

Crucial international issues require international co-operation under the auspices of international organizations, above all the United Nations. Today, global interests are inseparable from national ones, and vice versa. This applies particularly to disarmament and international security.

Throughout the world there is growing insecurity caused by the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race. The accumulation of military power and decision-making on the fate of the world is increasingly in the hands of a few countries, and this makes international peace and security highly uncertain. Awareness of the possibility of a nuclear war is deeply rooted in the consciousness of the people. It is becoming ever more clear that if a new world war were to break out wherein nuclear weapons were used the self-destruction of mankind would be inevitable.

On the other hand, the present situation in international relations has none the less given rise to some positive trends.

The agreement between the two super-Powers on the negotiations that have recently begun in Geneva was generally welcomed. However, experience shows that negotiations on that subject of vital interest to all countries can produce lasting results only if they are aimed at achieving universal détente.

It is rightly expected that the negotiations between the two super-Powers will lead to an agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and on the reduction of the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons. It is to be hoped that this dialogue, albeit still limited and restricted, will have a positive impact towards a general relaxation of tensions.

With this in mind, the significance of keeping the United Nations informed about the course of these negotiations should be stressed. The General Assembly has on several occasions called attention to that issue and invited the two big Powers to keep the international community informed on their negotiations. We feel
that this is in the legitimate interests of mankind and is not, as some are saying, a demand that might thwart or even block the current negotiations. We believe that the big powers, in conformity with their special responsibilities, will respond positively to the appeals of the General Assembly.

There are some other signs as well that indicate that the negotiating mechanism on disarmament has gained a modest, but positive, momentum. The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has achieved agreement on beginning negotiations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. These negotiations must be effective in order to be in time to prevent the spreading of the arms race into outer space. In this case the only possible solution would be to prevent the spreading of the arms race. Experience teaches us that when the arms race begins to run in a certain direction agreements are more difficult to achieve.

Next, negotiations on chemical weapons are under way within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. It remains only to repeat that those negotiations should be brought to successful completion as soon as possible. An important encouragement and impetus would be provided were a comprehensive convention on chemical weapons to be adopted at the forthcoming fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

We feel that there is a positive atmosphere at the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. We feel that it is realistic to expect that Conference to make at least some headway in comparison with what has been made so far. This is particularly so in that it has become evident that the Conference's potential is not to be neglected and that it could yield some positive and concrete results. This assessment was most clearly stated last week at Stockholm at the meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of nine European neutral and non-aligned countries members of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

All of this is undoubtedly an important incentive to more resolute international action aimed at maintaining and strengthening international peace and co-operation. However, there is a disappointing fact that causes concern that there is no progress in multilateral negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on the prevention of nuclear war, nuclear disarmament, the comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban, the comprehensive programme of disarmament and other important issues.
Lastly, consistent implementation of all the articles of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, particularly those that deal with the halting of the nuclear-arms race, nuclear disarmament and the transfer of technology, is essential. The nuclear-weapon States signatories to the Treaty must, in our view, co-operate in the fulfilment of their obligations if the Treaty is to survive.

Three years ago the non-aligned countries submitted draft recommendations on the issues of nuclear disarmament, the prevention of nuclear war and the general approaches to the negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. During the negotiations on those recommendations at the last two sessions of this Commission some significant differences became evident.

This time we have before us prepared proposals for recommendations on this agenda item. However, we find it surprising that some positions on the issues that were, as we recall, acceptable to all at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament are now challenged.

For years the Commission has been unable to adopt recommendations on the issue of the nuclear capability of South Africa. The racist régime in Pretoria poses a threat to the security of Africa and to the security of the world at large. The only possible response to the aggressive policy of the racist régime is strong condemnation and resolute measures by the international community in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the relevant decisions and recommendations of the General Assembly and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

An extraordinary meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of non-aligned countries held recently at the ministerial level in New Delhi adopted a unanimous decision on the further actions by the non-aligned countries in support of the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia, that people's inalienable right to self-determination and independence, and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), its sole and authentic representative. We expect that this year the Commission will emulate this spirit of resolve displayed by the non-aligned countries and that it will adopt concrete recommendations for the adoption of measures designed to prevent South Africa from becoming a fully-fledged nuclear military Power.

There are deep differences in the approaches to the issue of the reduction of the military budgets of States, and we are all aware of this. However, we hope that this year the Commission will be able to adopt suitable recommendations on the reduction of military budgets, thereby removing that issue from our agenda.
Finally, the Commission should reaffirm its authority by achieving concrete, tangible results. It should promote and speed up agreements in the multilateral and bilateral negotiations on disarmament as well as launch new initiatives. This task of the Commission is of even greater importance in the year marking the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations.

Mr. Alessi (Italy) (interpretation from French): I am speaking today on behalf of the delegations of the ten countries members of the European Community.

I should like first to congratulate you, Sir, upon your election as Chairman of this session of the Disarmament Commission and to express to you our sincere wishes for every success in your most important task. Your talent, wisdom and experience give us special reason to welcome your assumption of the Chair.

The delegations on whose behalf I am speaking today firmly believe in the importance of the role of the Disarmament Commission. The Commission occupies a unique place among the institutions established under the auspices of the United Nations to deal with disarmament questions. It is a body with universal membership whose task it is to exercise special responsibility in the drawing up of recommendations on particularly complex problems that require in-depth consideration on a multilateral level.

The Ten believe that, in the interest of all, the Commission must continue to show its effectiveness by carrying out specific actions and elaborating appropriate recommendations on the basis of a measured and balanced agenda.

The delegations of the Ten are ready to participate actively and constructively to the work of the session which has just opened and to contribute as best they can to the pursuit of specific results which could promote a consensus on the problems being considered.

The item concerning the general approach to nuclear and conventional disarmament problems is of particular importance. We strongly hope that, in spite of the different approaches of which all are aware, the Commission will be able to find common ground on this subject.

For our part, we believe that the resumption of bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a factor favourable to the development and progress of the disarmament process on the multilateral level.

The delegations of the Ten are aware of the risks of a continuing arms race,
particularly in the nuclear sector, but also in other areas, such as those of chemical weapons - the evident proliferation of which must cause fear - and conventional weapons. We are convinced that the disarmament process would be greatly facilitated in an international context of stability and balance. The implementation of specific, balanced measures of arms reduction would reinforce international confidence. The basic prerequisites for disarmament are the general application of the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and respect for the security requirements and independence of all States.

Negotiation is the best way of making progress in the disarmament process. Therefore it is urgently necessary to give a greater impetus to the negotiation process, whether bilateral, regional or multilateral, especially in areas in which there is a high concentration of armaments, taking into account regional characteristics and the need to guarantee respect for agreements already achieved. That is why the Ten attach particular importance to the problem of verification.

Since the Ten consider that it is necessary to increase international stability and trust between States, they naturally attach great importance to both the elaboration of confidence-building measures and the achievement of agreements on the reduction of military budgets.

The reduction of military budgets has been on our agenda for many years. The delegations of the Ten regret that several countries have shown no political will to contribute to real progress in this area. The ten delegations hope that the exchange of views on this point will enable some encouraging process to be made this year. We continue to believe that the reduction of military budgets necessitates procedures which would make transparency and comparability possible, and that the system of standardized presentation is an important first step in this context.

The delegations of the Ten are ready to participate actively in the debate on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and in this respect we welcome the initiative taken by the delegation of Cameroon. We are fully convinced that one of the fundamental tasks of the United Nations is to contribute in a decisive way to the achievement of the objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In the view of the Ten, scrupulous compliance with the principles of the Charter by all Member States would enhance the authority and the effectiveness of the Organization in the area
of disarmament. It is also necessary for everyone to have a better knowledge of
the nature and objectives of multilateral negotiation activities and of the
security concepts and principles which determine the positions of the different
countries or groups of countries.

It would be useful meanwhile, following the periodic re-examinations of
United Nations disarmament machinery, to promote the necessary further work
regarding the possibilities and prospects of improving that machinery in order to
strengthen the role of the United Nations.

The delegations of the Ten support the objectives of the Declaration of the
1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. Thus, we consider it useful and timely to
hold a debate within the Disarmament Commission on what has been accomplished
during the first half of that Decade and on ways of promoting more rapid progress
during the remaining five years. We also believe that each State Member of the
United Nations can make its constructive contribution to the achievement of the
objectives of that Declaration.

On this point, as on that of strengthening the role of the United Nations in
the area of disarmament, the detailed views of the Ten have just been submitted to
the Secretariat in the form of a response to resolutions 39/148 Q and 39/151 G.

The item on South Africa's nuclear capability was the subject of intensive
efforts last year. Some of the obstacles could not be overcome, but they are now
limited in number and clearly identified. Last year the Commission expressly
rejected anything that could contribute to the acquisition or increase of a South
African nuclear capability which could threaten peace and stability in Africa and
the non-proliferation system in general.

With regard to the limitation and reduction of naval armaments, the Ten note
that this question is currently being studied by a United Nations group of
experts. The Ten consider therefore that it would not be desirable or appropriate
to begin discussion of this point before the study group reaches its conclusions.

The delegations of the Ten earnestly hope that within the context of the work
of this session it will be possible to make progress towards a wider consensus and
are ready to make their constructive contribution to this end. It is by no means
impossible that if a general sense of realism, moderation and flexibility is shown
it will be possible to find solutions acceptable to all on the points which remain
outstanding and for the Commission to adopt by consensus a final report for
submission to the General Assembly.
Mr. CANALES (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): At the beginning of the work of this session of the Disarmament Commission our delegation would like to convey to you, Sir, our most cordial congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of the Commission. We also congratulate your colleagues. We hope that under your efficient and able guidance we shall be able to take some decisive steps in the difficult, slow and unfruitful work on disarmament. Unfortunately, in the process that has continued for almost 40 years now we cannot point to any significant results that have contributed to stemming the unbridled arms race, which is watched with anxiety by the members of the international community, particularly in those areas of the world where constant tension prevails or where the scourge of war has caused irreparable loss of human life and great material damage.

You may rest assured, Sir, that our delegation will co-operate with you most enthusiastically in any initiative that may stem from this deliberative session leading to the submission of draft resolutions which would make an effective contribution to improving the documents referred to in our provisional agenda (A/CN.10/L.16).

While it is true that there is fierce competition to build up already large nuclear and conventional arsenals, this is fundamentally the responsibility of the great military Powers, rivals in the attempt to achieve military supremacy. They alone can adopt agreements to freeze, reduce and eliminate the stockpiles of weapons which give them the power to destroy the world in another world war. The small countries would be mere spectators, powerless to impose measures forcing the great Powers to desist from their purpose.

However, our delegation believes that, morally speaking, and considering the legal equality of States as set out in the Charter of the United Nations, we have the right to state with determination, integrity and conviction our opposition to the continuation of this grim arms race, heedless of the cry of our peoples, peoples truly wishing to preserve peace as the most valuable heritage we can leave to future generations.

To remain silent in these forums is guilty complicity. Just as the military Powers zealously safeguard other principles of the Charter such as respect for human rights throughout the world, they should be tenacious in supporting disarmament, showing by their example that these weapons, which are capable of denuding our planet of human life, threaten the most important of these rights: "the right to life ... and security of person". 
Countries like ours, with no ambition to hegemony, and which desire only to keep intact their sovereignty and territorial integrity and the internal order necessary for sufficient social and economic development, maintain the minimal armed forces indispensable for the achievement of these vital aims. Our military budgets are limited, and we acquire only weapons necessary to replace obsolete matériel.

That is why we are determined advocates of general and complete disarmament under strict international control. That is why we can speak, rejecting pressure which would still our protests, engaging in no form of guilty servility. We are not trying to please the mightiest. Chile is a country in which national dignity is a tradition; that is why we can state and explain our ideas with absolute independence: We are not and never shall be docile satellites of international interests.

Without a propitious international climate or the political will needed to take advantage of that climate, our efforts will continue to be sterile, as they have been thus far, while the arms race continues its inexorable path upward.

There is no question but that the highest priority in the achievement of the goals of disarmament is represented by item 4 (a) of our agenda: the elimination of the danger of nuclear war — and, then, conventional disarmament. These are of concern to all States Members of this Organization. These efforts should go forward simultaneously to be truly effective, since all matters relating to disarmament share a common urgency.

The most important question is that of nuclear war, because although limiting such a war to a given region of the world is possible, there would always be the risk of its spread, which would mean global catastrophe.

Without doubt, that is the most dangerous course of events. But it is also the least likely, as long as there exists a super-Power balance in such weaponry. It is inconceivable that the super-Powers could in any circumstances decide to use these weapons, for that would mean mutual catastrophe owing to the retaliatory capability of both powers.

This strategy is possible in practice owing to the vast number of nuclear weapons deployed throughout the world: on nuclear submarines; at strategic launch sites for intercontinental missiles; in nuclear bombs to be dropped from strategic long-range aircraft; or in the form of tactical weapons deployed in the theatre of operations in accordance with military agreements among nations.
On the other hand, conventional war is the only foreseeable kind. Unfortunately, it is inevitable, owing to the constant violation by some States of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We must regret the fact that since the end of the Second World War more than 120 conventional armed conflicts have been unleashed, causing enormous loss of human life and material damage. It has proved impossible to avoid or halt these conflicts until one of the belligerents achieved the aims that brought them about or until exhaustion forced the nations to enter into a duly signed armistice.

Our Organization has demonstrated an inability to foresee and forestall armed conflicts, which makes it increasingly urgent that we develop more effective machinery and grant greater powers to the Secretary-General and the Security Council, so that they may act with greater effectiveness.

How are we to make progress in disarmament matters, or at least to slow down the arms race, if the East-West confrontation is gradually worsening; if one of the super-Powers flouts resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in its undeniable ambitious drive for world hegemony; if the sporadic attempts at bilateral nuclear disarmament talks break down, whatever the pretext, in the present atmosphere of permanent tension; if the sale of conventional weapons continues to account for a large percentage of the income of certain countries, being one of the most profitable forms of trade; if no agreement is reached on a genuinely reliable system of verification, including on-site inspections; if the most elementary principles of our Charter are constantly violated with impunity; if international terrorism continues to be systematically fomented?

International terrorism is the worst scourge of modern times, since certain States and organizations are known to finance it, provide training for it and direct it. How can we make progress if certain ideologies continue to employ violence and subversion, with the acknowledged intention of destabilizing Governments that do not agree to do what they are told, a phenomenon to which the Latin American countries are also prey? This new kind of dirty war—terrorism and subversion—contributes to the arms race, since it is necessary to strengthen those forces that have to fight it.

How can progress be made if the sale of arms to Governments, which have to protect their national security, is tied to political aspects, compelling third-world countries to develop their own arms industry, and contributing to the
increased production of arms for those countries' land, air and naval forces; and if the Conference on Disarmament draws out interminably the negotiation of treaties that urgently require adoption, such as treaties on weapons of mass destruction, whether chemical, bacteriological or radiological, and on nuclear tests and so on?

To draw up new confidence-building measures between countries; to call every year for repetitive reports on the relationship between disarmament and development and for the reduction of military budgets; and to include on our agenda every year unnecessary items, put there by those concerned solely with the propaganda aim of appearing peace-loving - all this serves only to inform world public opinion, demonstrating the consequences of the arms race and the horrors of war, but not contributing in any way to cutting down the production of ever more sophisticated weapons.

It is supposed that those of us who take part in these discussions need more background material and statistics to enable us to evaluate properly the progress made in our work and the political will of States to achieve a consensus in our reports to the General Assembly.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty has not achieved its aim of limiting nuclear weapons. The resolutions piled up at every General Assembly - more and more of them each year - in no way contribute to slowing down both the nuclear and the conventional arms race. Therefore, we do not have the benefit of substantive goals. The quantitative proliferation of nuclear weapons has resulted in a qualitative vertical increase, thus alarmingly increasing the power of destruction and therefore also the danger of the final holocaust.

There is now the possibility that a more sophisticated nuclear weapon, launched from a more favourable spot, can make existing nuclear weapons obsolete. I believe that in fact we have gone beyond the limits of science fiction, daily making more effective the power of deterrence, which has succeeded in preventing a third world war.

Nuclear and space science and technology have become so efficient that the future will surely present us with big surprises in the form of methods to exterminate the human race. In any case, this does not slow down the arms race; on the contrary, the trend is towards its speeding up, unless definitive agreements between the big Powers are reached.
The solution is to create an atmosphere propitious for peace, turning the attempts at world supremacy into sensible initiatives for co-operation between the rich and poor countries, in order to create a better world for all, with a new, more just and equitable world economic order.

Our maximum efforts should now be aimed at preventing horizontal proliferation. It is well known that countries making progress in the peaceful use of nuclear energy can acquire the capacity to manufacture nuclear devices or bombs. During this decade, devoted to disarmament, dozens of countries could become members of the terror club, by becoming the possessors of such weapons. Therefore, it is necessary to create new nuclear-weapon-free zones, following the example set by Latin America with the Tlatelolco Treaty. We long for the time when Africa, the Middle East and South Asia can reach an agreement, which has been awaited for so many years.

In any case, nothing must obstruct the inalienable right of all countries to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, as has been done so far, under the sole condition of accepting the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

There must be compliance with the partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty, which should be adopted as soon as possible, with the addition of a ban on underground testing. Without this, the nuclear-arms race will continue unchecked.

The member countries of the permanent secretariat of the Pacific have collectively called for an end to the atomic tests on Mururoa Atoll and the danger of nuclear radiation that they pose. If that danger is not real, why do not the countries concerned carry out the tests in their area of jurisdiction, including their own maritime limits?

Conventional disarmament is our second priority. Weapons of mass destruction for use in a conventional war - the land, air and naval weapons that exist today - make war so cruel and deadly that it threatens with destruction all countries involved in a modern conflict. Therefore, the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva daily assumes more importance. Failure or delay in achieving success in the negotiations will contribute to the way in which chemical and bacteriological warfare, lack of a general and complete ban on nuclear tests and the production of many kinds of weapons add to the existing cruelty and terror afflicting mankind today.
The principles of the Charter of our Organization acquire greater validity every day. The peaceful settlement of disputes is possible if the Governments and peoples have the will to solve their problems. Chile and Argentina recently set the world an example by ratifying a treaty of peace and friendship which has established peace between two countries that stood on the verge of war in 1978 as a result of frontier disputes in the southernmost tip of the Latin American continent. Through the mediation of Pope John Paul II, after six years of negotiations a happy conclusion was reached which has not only put an end to the threat of a conflict but also means that in the future both countries, which have similar origins and share the same language and religion, will be able to draw up plans for international co-operation that will have a positive affect on the development of our economies.

Item 5 of our agenda deals with the reduction of military budgets, which fluctuate between 8 per cent and 40 per cent of the overall budgets of the different States in terms of national and foreign currency.

A few years after the signing of this Organization's Charter both super-Powers proposed draft resolutions requiring a small percentage of military expenditures to be devoted to the social and economic development of the countries of the third world. More than three decades have passed without anything specific having been achieved. On the contrary, military expenditure is increasing by $100 billion a year and it has been estimated that more than $700 billion a year is now spent on armaments, which means that a figure of $1,000 billion will probably be reached by the end of this decade.

Is this truly conceivable? Is it justifiable? What is the point of our concern? Shall we be able to bend the will of those on whom the survival of the human race depends? I leave those questions to be answered by those who have the major responsibility in the arms race. Let us be pragmatic, not theoretical, because we must face our responsibilities fully and squarely.

The countries of the third world, which are fighting poverty and hunger, have to look after their own security. Interests established in a pitiless world have converted those countries into puppets so that they can serve the ambitions of major Powers. It is a new form of neo-colonialism, and unless a new, balanced world economic order is established, without protectionism, with lower interest rates and with fairer prices for the countries possessing raw materials, the present crisis will never be overcome but will merely lead to new conflicts.
Our delegation advocates the strengthening of the role of our Organization; otherwise its influence will be totally undermined. The new disarmament control mechanisms created at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament have not yet shown themselves to be effective or indicated whether the former régime was sufficient.

The Disarmament Commission and the results of its deliberations must be studied to determine whether these contribute to the strengthening of our work or merely to reinforcing a bureaucracy that in any case has no future. We must be realistic and carry out an impartial analysis under item 7 of our agenda.

Agenda item 8, which I have already mentioned, necessitates valid, well-substantiated statistics; perhaps we shall require the assistance of technical experts in this matter. Nuclear submarines, with their great speed and their ability to remain submerged for months without surfacing and to carry nuclear missiles, are very effective weapons since they can choose their launching sites near the coast of any country. Today it is even possible for submarines to launch nuclear weapons from beneath the ice of the Arctic continent. Science fiction is being overtaken by everyday events, as we have already said. Defensive weapons will be developed to counterbalance this type of action, and that will help to speed up the arms race.

I do not take up any more time with this statement; our agenda is very ambitious for the short time available to us.

I do not want to conclude on a note of frustration; that is not our purpose. Rather, we wish to say that for us the halting of the arms race is a goal that is a true challenge, a challenge that we hope we can face successfully.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is particularly happy that a person of your wisdom, distinction and ability is presiding over the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission, particularly since your country has on many occasions shown itself to be concerned about the need for international security as a means of opening the way to disarmament.

My thesis - which has been developed in the past, and will certainly be developed today - is that we cannot hope for disarmament unless we achieve international security. Disarmament is a negative concept; it is the idea of throwing away arms. There is nothing positive about it because even if arms are thrown away some kind of weapon will always be used if their disposition is to use force.
(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The idea of the United Nations and of the Charter is replacement of the use of force by the exercise of reason. This Commission, which is a deliberative body, is the only one of all the organs of the United Nations designated as a deliberative body for consideration of the whole problem of disarmament, the whole problem of international security.

The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, when it refers to the Disarmament Commission, does not say that that body is to deal with international security. However, that must necessarily be so, because from the start the overruling declaration in the Final Document refers to the dangers of the arms race, and states:

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry ... nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority."

Therefore we must not look to force as the way to achieve disarmament, peace and security. It continues:

"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 the speedy and substantial reduction of arms..."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

Thus, international security through the United Nations has to precede the speedy and substantial reduction of arms; reduction of armaments follows international security, it cannot precede it. That would be putting the cart before the horse. Therefore, all the efforts being exerted by the major and other Powers to achieve disarmament directly or to get agreements on disarmament and the control of armaments are futile, because they ignore the basic need to agree on the positiveness of international security through the United Nations so as to open the way to disarmament.

The realities support this. Is not the fact that for more than three decades repeated and continuous negotiations on disarmament have led nowhere enough to make the world community reconsider its approach to disarmament? The Disarmament Commission is a deliberative body and should therefore proceed on the fundamental principle that it has the duty and the power to examine why not a single step has been made towards disarmament after so many decades. There must be something wrong, and what is wrong is obvious - the lack of international security.
It may be said that this really concerns disarmament, not international security. But we must not forget, as I have said, that the declaration, which is the governing principle of the whole Final Document, says that genuine and lasting peace cannot be created without the system of international security provided for in the Charter.

Where today do we see any effort towards making the security system provided for in the Charter effective? From the very start of the United Nations the major Powers considered it sufficient for them to ignore Article 43 of the Charter, to deprive the United Nations of a force to give effect to the decisions of the Security Council, the only United Nations organ endowed with the power to take enforcement action to implement its decisions. If by depriving the United Nations of a force, we deprive the Security Council of the means of giving effect to its decisions, we make it not a security council at all. We have seen so many cases in which unanimous decisions adopted by the Security Council have been ignored by the parties concerned.

The Disarmament Commission, a deliberative body, is the only body that can enter into this question and point out that we are not functioning properly in the United Nations. The United Nations is losing ground every day because people think that it is not much use and has not achieved anything. What is the use of the United Nations, they ask? We have heard many such murmurs. It is not the fault of the United Nations, but of those of its Members which deprive it of the means of being effective. This Commission has a duty to see to it that the United Nations becomes effective, as it should be. That is why as a deliberative body it is meeting here now to consider what should be done to ensure that the decisions of the Security Council are effective and that the system of security provided for in the Charter and set out in the Final Document is made effective, so that the way to disarmament can be opened up in a reasonable way.

Only by the exercise of reason can we get rid of the arms race. It is hopeless to talk about stopping and reversing the arms race. How do we stop and reverse the arms race unless we offer a substitute to ensure security? The nations cannot disarm in a vacuum. Unless there is effective security through the United Nations, there can be no disarmament. That is not only a principle but a dictum.

Why is so much effort wasted on disarmament when we know that disarmament is impossible without international security? Why is not all this effort directed
(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)
towards international security? That question has not been answered, and it cannot be answered, because it is clearly stated in the Final Document that
"... peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter..."
The purpose of my statement today is to ask that this Commission, as a deliberative body, turn its attention to this matter and adopt a draft resolution pointing out the need to promote and make effective the system of international security provided for in the Charter, so that the Security Council may be effective - not as at present a body that is not a security council but an insecurity council, because its decisions are completely ignored.

I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, coming from a country which has shown its respect for international security, realize the importance of this Commission's adopting a draft resolution pointing to the need to open the way to disarmament by making the decisions of the Security Council effective and thus making the security system provided for in the Charter operative.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.