



General Assembly

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.95
30 May 1985

ENGLISH

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 21 May 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. AHMAD

Pakistan

- Review and appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade: preliminary assessment and suggestions to ensure progress

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.

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE 1980S AS THE SECOND DISARMAMENT DECADE: PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT AND SUGGESTIONS TO ENSURE PROGRESS

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): The Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 35/46, followed the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament by about two and a half years. At the time of the adoption of the Declaration, in late 1980, the goals and principles set forth therein, accepted unanimously by the international community, still seemed to be in the forefront of the concerns of all States Members of this Organization.

The Declaration is a remarkably short document and, like the Final Document, it was adopted unanimously. The goals that it sets for the 1980s are set forth in paragraph 7. Not surprisingly, the very first of those goals is

"Halting and reversing the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race".

(resolution 35/46, annex, para. 7)

The document goes on to describe negotiations to be undertaken urgently and as a matter of priority by the Conference on Disarmament, then known as the Committee on Disarmament, to be concluded, it was hoped, before 1982. Those negotiations were to be on matters such as a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, a treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on their destruction, a treaty on radiological weapons, and, finally, effective international arrangements on negative security assurances. That priority list of four items was followed by other steps to be taken outside the purview of the negotiating body, with varying degrees of priority.

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

Today, less than five years after its adoption, the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade stands, like other solemn United Nations documents before it, as a silent witness to the dashed hopes of the vast majority of Member States. My delegation does not believe that this is the appropriate time to ascribe responsibilities for the disappointment of our collective expectations. But it should suffice to note that in the course of these five years the nuclear test ban has been down-graded to a "long-term goal", subsequently described by one of the super-Powers as "counterproductive"; the negotiation of a convention on chemical weapons, after some promising signs, seems to be on the verge of falling prey to the confrontation, rivalry and mistrust between the super-Powers; work on the radiological weapons convention has been slowed by the lack of a suitable definition of its subject matter; and, finally, the conditions and qualifications imposed by the nuclear-weapon Powers on assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States have convinced the international community that the non-nuclear-weapon States are in fact being called upon to assure the nuclear-weapon Powers that their privileged status will remain forever recognized.

The same situation obtains with regard to the majority of other measures prescribed by the Declaration for completion, or at least substantial achievement, during the current Decade. On some of those measures the situation remains exactly as it was five years ago. On others, the status of consideration shows a net retrogression. Perhaps none of those measures shows a more marked backward movement than those relating to nuclear disarmament, especially to the implementation of paragraph 50 of the Final Document, and the items on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. On both those issues, the international community has been reduced to the role of witness to the continuation of the nuclear arms race by the present five nuclear-weapon Powers, that is to say, to the unbridled proliferation of nuclear weapons by those who already possess them. This is done under the protection of international arrangements entered into in good faith by the non-nuclear-weapon nations, but used to condone vertical and geographical proliferation and to justify the imposition and maintenance of a discriminatory régime whereby the structure of world power would be frozen forever.

While the non-nuclear-weapon nations have scrupulously and responsibly kept their part of the bargain, even when they did not support a juridical commitment to perpetual privilege by a handful of the powerful, the nuclear-weapon Powers have to this very day relentlessly pursued the dangerous course of confrontation and the

(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

continuing proliferation of the most destructive weapons ever invented. Soon, the two super-Powers will take their military rivalry into outer space, thus opening up yet another avenue of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It is against that background that the international community, assembled in this Commission, is called upon to review and appraise the first five years of what it has christened the Second Disarmament Decade. One could, of course, extend the analysis of the many unfulfilled commitments and the description of the many lost opportunities which constitute the history of those few years. The result of such an exercise would certainly be the realization that the quest for absolute security by a few has brought about absolute insecurity for all.

My delegation still hopes that it will be possible for the Commission to break the vicious circle of confrontation and rivalry imposed on the multilateral disarmament organs by the inexorable logic of the nuclear arms race, so that the review and appraisal of the Second Disarmament Decade may signify the beginning of a new commitment and the exercise at last by the nuclear-weapon Powers of their responsibilities regarding concrete disarmament measures.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The views of the Soviet Union on the current review and appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade have been set out in a letter from the Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (A/CN.10/68/Add.1).

The Soviet Union regards the goals and principles set forth in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade as an indication of the important tasks and objectives facing the international community. In the years since the adoption of the Declaration, the Soviet Union has done its utmost to ensure that fulfilment of those tasks is expedited.

Although the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade was adopted by the General Assembly without a vote, not all States Members of the United Nations, unfortunately, have shown themselves ready to promote in deeds as well as words its implementation. Consequently, in some spheres there has even been retrogression. We regret to note that the first half of the Decade of the 1980s has been marked by an increase in international tension and by a growing threat of nuclear war.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

But the Soviet Union is convinced that a further slide into the abyss of confrontation and nuclear agony is not inevitable. The fact is that there is a real possibility of a turn for the better in international affairs. The experience of the 1960s and 1970s has shown that genuine results in the field of arms limitation and disarmament are possible.

Initiatives put forward in the 1980s by the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community in various international forums, both multilateral and bilateral, have laid a solid foundation for further progress in the major areas of preventing nuclear war, curbing and ending the arms race, and achieving disarmament. In any area we might mention, it is clear that the past five years have been marked by important proposals made and major steps taken by the Soviet Union.

Let us begin with the most important question: the prevention of nuclear war. Soviet initiatives in 1981 and 1983, taken in an attempt to ban nuclear war, led to the adoption by the General Assembly of its Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe and of a resolution condemning nuclear war.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Yet certain doctrines and concepts have given rise to indignation on the part of the international community. These are based on the "admissibility" of nuclear war of any kind, and on the "justifiability" of a nuclear first strike. These have all been deemed unacceptable.

The Soviet Union has been very consistent in its initiatives. In 1981, it put forward the initiative of condemning the first use of nuclear weapons, and in 1982, at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, unilaterally shouldered the solemn obligation not to be the first to use such weapons. That was not only a major step towards increased international security, but an initiative which could effectively open the way for an overall ban on nuclear weapons. If all nuclear-weapon States without exception were to follow this path, the threat of nuclear catastrophe would be lifted.

In 1984, our country, in the interest of security for all peoples, proposed that agreement be reached on norms for relations among nuclear Powers, which, as set out in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, bear the major responsibility in this connection. Indeed, the Final Document recommended adoption of a code of peaceful conduct of nations in international affairs, to include a broad range of obligations, beginning with refraining from propaganda in favour of nuclear war and entering into emergency consultations in dangerous situations, and ending with strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation régime and engaging in efforts to reduce and eliminate these weapons.

In accordance with General Assembly resolutions, the Soviet Union has consistently attempted to begin detailed negotiations at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on specific, concrete measures to prevent nuclear war.

In the first half of the 1980s, the Soviet Union took a host of major steps opening up prospects for genuine tangible measures aimed at halting the momentum of the nuclear-arms race, whose alarming pace poses a threat not only to the States directly concerned, but to all States without exception. The Soviet Union proposes that this dangerous momentum meet with a red light, for all mankind would be the victim; we propose that this "locomotive" be turned back.

In the 1980s, here in New York, at the General Assembly, and in Geneva, at the Conference on Disarmament, the Soviet Union has consistently tried to achieve a stage-by-stage programme of nuclear disarmament, to include the complete elimination of nuclear stockpiles. Our country, in fact, is urgently requesting

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

that discussions and resolutions not be limited to this subject alone, but that there be concrete negotiations on the development and implementation of such a programme in the body which is assigned by General Assembly resolutions a special negotiating mandate: the Conference on Disarmament.

In response to the demands of the anti-nuclear and anti-war movements, involving millions of people in our country and abroad, the Soviet Union proposed in 1982 that the production and spread of nuclear stockpiles and weapons be halted by all nuclear Powers, along with the production of fissionable material for nuclear arms. In 1983, the Government of the Soviet Union appealed to the Governments of the United States, China, the United Kingdom and France to freeze their nuclear arsenals. At the 1984 session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union called once again upon all nuclear Powers to freeze, qualitatively and quantitatively, their nuclear arsenals, under appropriate controls. It proposed, in fact, that the Soviet Union and the United States be the first, simultaneously implementing such a freeze, so as to set an example for other nuclear Powers. That Soviet position has been repeatedly reaffirmed and still remains in force. We must note that the Soviet Union is the only nuclear Power to have declared itself ready for an immediate freeze on nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has reacted positively to the initiative by the leaders of six non-aligned and neutral countries, an initiative which has come to be known as the "four-continent appeal". As stated on 18 May this year by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, in an interview for an Indian press service:

"We highly value these initiatives. The ideas expressed in the documents released by the six countries, in fact, point in the same direction as Soviet initiatives."

We are by no means saying that a freeze is a goal in itself. The Soviet Union is in favour of the adoption of effective measures leading to true reductions of nuclear weaponry. Such measures were proposed during the Soviet-American negotiations which took place at Geneva in 1982 and 1983. They have also been proposed at the current bilateral talks which began in March 1985.

Looking back to the beginning of the 1980s, we must also remember that the Soviet Union is the only nuclear Power to have expressed its readiness to consider the proposal made by Sweden to remove battlefield nuclear weapons from the demarcation line between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty. Moreover, we suggested that that idea be given more prominence.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The goal of limiting the arms race is linked directly to the banning of nuclear-weapon tests. In the 1980s, true to its commitments, our nation has made new efforts towards that end. In 1980 the USSR proposed that a moratorium be declared on nuclear testing in order to establish more favourable conditions for the conclusion of a treaty on a general and complete test ban. In 1983, at the Conference on Disarmament, the Soviet Union proposed the basis for such a treaty and, once again, called for an immediate moratorium by all nuclear Powers on all nuclear explosions, to remain in effect until the conclusion of the treaty. Finally, quite recently, in April 1985, the Soviet Union once more reaffirmed its readiness to institute, along with other nuclear Powers, a moratorium on all nuclear explosions beginning on 6 August 1985 - the fortieth anniversary of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima - or on any other agreed date.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Moreover, the Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it favours speedy mutual ratification of two Soviet-United States agreements signed as long ago as 1974 and 1976, on the limitation of underground nuclear testing and underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

The Soviet proposals and initiatives that I have mentioned today also bear witness to the fact that the Soviet Union remains faithful to all its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We would add that in 1984, as an act of goodwill, the Soviet Union placed some of its peaceful nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

The interrelationship of the questions of nuclear weapons and outer-space weapons has been reflected in the new Soviet-United States talks in Geneva. In the face of the major threat posed to mankind by outer-space adventurism, the position of my country is quite clear: we must both end the arms race on earth and prevent one in outer space. To that end, the Soviet Union proposed last April a joint Soviet-United States moratorium for the entire period of the Geneva talks, to cover research on and the testing and deployment of United States medium-range missiles in Europe and similar action by the Soviet Union. The seriousness, sincerity and goodwill of the Soviet approach are once again demonstrated by the fact that the Soviet Union accompanied its proposals with a unilateral moratorium until November of this year on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and on other measures in Europe.

In the context of the implementation during the first half of the 1980s of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, it is appropriate to point out that the steps I have mentioned are far from being the first taken by the Soviet Union to prevent an arms race in outer space. As early as 1981 the Soviet Union proposed the conclusion of a treaty banning the emplacement of weapons of any kind in outer space, and submitted a draft treaty. In 1983 there was another new initiative in the form of a proposal for the conclusion of a treaty banning the use of force in outer space and from outer space against the earth. That proposal too was accompanied by a draft treaty. In an attempt to give a momentum to progress to this end, the Soviet Union stated in 1983 that it would declare a unilateral moratorium on the launching into space of anti-satellite weapons as long as other States did not deploy such weapons. In 1984, the Soviet Union put forward a proposal on the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind. Throughout these years, the Soviet Union has been striving actively in the Conference on Disarmament for the establishment of a working group for direct negotiations on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Today we

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

express the hope that it will be possible for the Ad Hoc Committee set up at the end of the last session of the Conference on Disarmament to carry out effective, businesslike work.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance also to efforts aimed at banning chemical weapons, and gives constant attention to that issue. In 1982, at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Soviet Union made a detailed proposal on the basic provisions of a convention banning weapons of mass destruction of this kind.

These years have also seen Soviet efforts to bring about the prohibition of radiological weapons, measures to ensure the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and the banning of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

The Soviet Union has devoted a great deal of attention to the limitation of conventional weapons, and in 1982 it ratified the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects and its three Protocols. We are in favour of the development of further measures in the same direction. In past years the Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed that the strength of armed forces should not be increased. At the Vienna talks and at the Stockholm Conference the Soviet Union, both independently and jointly with other socialist countries and taking account of both the global and regional approaches, put forward a whole series of quite specific proposals, which could meet the desires of the other side and might ensure the necessary progress.

In today's statement the Soviet Union has touched only on the key problems of disarmament and the major proposals made by the Soviet Union in order to solve them. In summing up what we have said, I would point out that in the first five years of the 1980s, as previously, the Soviet Union has made a conscientious, honest contribution to the efforts to achieve these disarmament goals.

The Soviet Union claims no monopoly on disarmament proposals. It is prepared to study carefully and react positively to any proposal from any source. The only criterion is the effectiveness of the steps proposed and their ability to guarantee the security of each side and of mankind as a whole.

We feel that the groundwork has been laid by a whole series of resolutions on disarmament adopted by the General Assembly in the 1980s. It is urgently necessary that we take steps to implement the provisions of those resolutions.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

A positive factor of great significance that has become apparent during the 1980s is the growing recognition by all States, large and small, of the need for active participation in the campaign against threats to the peace and security of mankind. The Soviet Union welcomes the growing role played by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in that campaign.

Wide sectors of the public in many countries and the anti-nuclear and anti-war movements of recent years have given a significant impetus to efforts towards achievement of the goals of the Second Disarmament Decade.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The Soviet Union proceeds from the conviction that the proposals, resolutions and agreements on which our delegation has dwelt today give us a broad and hopeful basis for a turn towards effective, really tangible measures to prevent nuclear war, limit the arms race and achieve disarmament. We have all the necessary preconditions for a decisive step in that direction. What we need now is the political will. The Soviet Union has that will and it intends in future to do its utmost so that we can achieve a real turn for the better in international affairs.

As Mikhail Gorbachev stated in an interview with a Pravda editor:

"The development of the international situation has now come to a new benchmark whereby the question arises: Where do we go from here? Is it not time for statesmen who determine the policies of States to ponder and dwell on the situation and not take decisions that might bring the world to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe? There is an urgent need for the international community to establish a dialogue so as to find realistic ways that might lessen tensions in the world and bar the way to nuclear weaponry."

Mr. BAY ROSSI (Italy) (interpretation from French): I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the 10 countries members of the European Community on agenda item 9 on the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade.

The 10 States members of the European Community continue to subscribe to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and consider that they must work to that end with patience and resolve. They are quite aware of the obstacles in the way of disarmament that have so far allowed only limited progress in that process. Nevertheless they are convinced that all States must continue to play an active and constructive role to overcome those obstacles and, for their part, have endeavoured to shoulder their responsibilities in that field.

The States members of the European Community recently made numerous efforts to achieve a resumption of dialogue and negotiations on disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union. They hope that those negotiations will lead to concrete agreements on the reduction of current armaments and the prevention of the development of new weapons in the absence of all control.

The active role the Ten play in the process of arms limitation and disarmament can be seen in the position they have taken and the views they have expressed at the United Nations in the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission. The Ten welcome the progress of work on the relationship between disarmament and development, the

(Mr. Bay Rossi, Italy)

support received by resolutions they have submitted on bilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament and chemical weapons, the progress made in the drafting of guidelines for the implementation of confidence-building measures, and the positive conclusion of the work on the study of conventional disarmament. They support the efforts made by the United Nations, in particular by the Disarmament Commission, to reach agreements on to the important problem of reduction of military budgets, and deeply regret that limited progress has been made so far towards a greater transparency in military expenditures and a wider use of the standard instrument designed to contribute to that transparency.

The 10 States members of the European Community have been actively involved in the work of multilateral disarmament forums, including the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. They welcome the efforts that are taking place within the context of that Conference's work in order to reach agreement on the text of a convention on a global and verifiable ban on the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. They believe that the Conference should continue to attach the highest priority to the conclusion of such an agreement and stand ready, as in the past, to make an active and constructive contribution to the achievement of that goal.

The Ten also welcome the agreement recently reached at the Conference on the establishment of an ad hoc committee with a mandate to consider issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They believe that this development, which was the result of lengthy negotiations, could set a favourable precedent for the Conference's work on other issues as well.

The Ten have constantly promoted and actively supported the pursuit of agreements on confidence and security building measures and on disarmament measures in regional forums. They attach particular importance to the work of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. They are firmly convinced that a positive outcome of its work would significantly strengthen security and mutual trust on the European continent, thus reducing the risks of conflict in an area with the largest accumulation of weapons in the world.

Those of the Ten which take part in the Vienna talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe, while regretting the slow pace of the negotiations and the limited progress achieved on basic issues which are essential to a positive result of those negotiations, are fully prepared to continue to seek with patience and goodwill mutually acceptable solutions, in the belief that

(Mr. Bay Rossi, Italy)

security and stability in the European continent should be ensured at a lower level of conventional forces through balanced and verifiable reductions.

Those of the 10 States members of the European Community which are signatories of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques and of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof confirm their positive assessment of the results achieved over the last five years by these instruments and express their satisfaction at the successful outcomes of the relevant review conferences in which they have taken an active part.

The 10 States members of the European Community consider as significant to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

Those of the Ten which are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons believe that that Treaty has been of significant benefit to all States in terms of security and in the field of technical assistance for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They express the hope that the forthcoming Third Review Conference will make a contribution to improving the effectiveness of the Treaty, and they are prepared to work actively to that end.

In the Ten's view, a fuller understanding by public opinion of disarmament issues, of their relationship with a number of factors connected with international stability and of their consideration within the framework of the United Nations and at other multilateral and bilateral forums, would be an important element in the pursuit of substantive progress towards disarmament. This goal can be achieved through wider dissemination in all member countries of objective information on disarmament, through publications of various kinds, seminars and conferences with the active participation of scholars and experts, government reports to parliaments and contacts with non-governmental organizations. Public opinion in all countries needs objective and detailed information on disarmament issues, and it has a right to it.

(Mr. Bay Rossi, Italy)

The 10 member States of the European Community firmly believe in the urgent need to stop and reverse the arms race and to take serious steps on the road to disarmament. They are convinced that each Member of the United Nations should make its own contribution to the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. Efforts must continue to be made gradually to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The international community should focus on the search for practical, balanced and verifiable ways to reduce armaments and preserve international security at the same time.

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): I need hardly recall the reasons why Poland attaches such special importance to steps that may contribute to halting the arms race and disarmament. Two weeks ago we commemorated, including here in the United Nations, the fortieth anniversary of the victory over fascism and nazism. Poland's role in that victory is well known. The sufferings and losses that Poland endured in the Second World War alone remain untold.

It is therefore not surprising that the Polish People's Republic, from its very first days, has endeavoured to ensure lasting peace on the European continent, first within the framework of regional efforts, but also throughout the world. Starting from the well-known Rapacki Plan for creating a non-nuclear zone in Central Europe, through efforts that led to the historical Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to numerous proposals made jointly with our Warsaw Treaty allies, we have never stopped our active and constructive efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace.

Today's review of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade gives us an opportunity to look back on what was achieved during the first half of the Decade and what remains to be done. I should like to bring to the Commission's attention only some of my delegation's views.

First, the degree of implementation of the objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 35/46, cannot but cause deep concern. The first half of the Decade, unfortunately, has witnessed an accelerated arms race and a serious increase in tensions in international relations, resulting in a political climate in which multilateral and bilateral disarmament negotiations have encountered serious obstacles and a failure to reach concrete results.

With the beginning of the deployment in Western Europe of the most recent and sophisticated American missiles, Pershing II and Cruise - a step totally

(Mr. Tomaszewski, Poland)

incompatible with the spirit and objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade - there has been a breakdown of the Vienna negotiations on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, the suspension of the Geneva strategic arms reduction talks, as well as the total disruption in great-Power dialogue on nuclear arms limitation so crucially important for the security of Europe and the world.

During these first years of the Second Disarmament Decade we heard proclamations of dangerous military doctrines that would have allowed the possible unleashing of a nuclear war, and we are still witnessing efforts to gain military superiority that additionally poison the international climate.

New programmes of military build-up by the United States and other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) go beyond the Second Disarmament Decade and create a prospect of constant danger and tension. The innocently named strategic defence initiative is in fact nothing more than giving one side the ability to strike first and to be immune from the retaliatory strike of the other side. The obvious aim of such a policy is to obtain military and strategic dominance over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty countries and, consequently, to destabilize the existing military balance so crucial today for the security of the world. In our view, an effort to halt the arms race in outer space should become an integral part of the Second Disarmament Decade.

Most important is the fact that the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States determines the overall international disarmament efforts. Those relations have also had a major impact on the results of the Second Disarmament Decade. That is why Poland welcomed with satisfaction the reopening in Geneva at the beginning of this year of the Soviet-American disarmament negotiations. A positive outcome of those talks would certainly represent a major accomplishment of the Second Disarmament Decade.

Poland has made numerous efforts to translate the goals of the Second Disarmament Decade into reality. We, together with other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, have proved our determination in this regard by our activities at the United Nations, in the Conference on Disarmament, at the Stockholm Conference and in the Vienna negotiations. Poland highly values the role and efforts of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and will continue to strive to ensure that implementation of the objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade will also serve the interest of further consolidating the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): The views of my delegation on the item under discussion have been set out in the reply sent by my Government to the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 39/148 Q (A/CN.10/68). They were also set forth in the statement made by the Head of our delegation during the general exchange of views at the beginning of this session. I shall therefore not repeat the general comments that we have already made.

I think it suffices for me to say that, during the five years since the adoption of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, no significant progress has been made towards its implementation. On the contrary, the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race has escalated as never before, military expenditures have reached a record high, and the accumulation of huge quantities of weapons over and above those needed for security reasons have led to increased risks of another world war which, in present circumstances, would inevitably be a nuclear catastrophe. It is a fact that throughout this period - and I am referring to the last five years - disarmament negotiations, regrettably, have not resulted in any substantial agreement on disarmament.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

An honest evaluation of the results of the Second Disarmament Decade at its mid-point makes it evident that the objectives and measures contemplated in the Declaration adopted five years ago are far from being realized. Despite the totally unsatisfactory situation prevailing at present, we believe - and I should like to emphasize this - that the Second Disarmament Decade may still prove to be a useful framework for stimulating the efforts of all States to initiate a real disarmament process.

The review and appraisal in which the Commission is engaged at the present session should, in our opinion, be focused on the identification of new ways and means to revive the implementation process of the objectives and measures set out in the Declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade. For us of the Romanian delegation, the starting-point in this exercise is certainly our conviction that the cessation of the arms race, the transition to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, the elimination of the risk of another world war and the maintenance of lasting peace and security in the world are the fundamental problems of the contemporary era.

The Romanian delegation would very much like to see the following ideas among the recommendations the Commission will submit to the General Assembly on this particular item. First, reaffirmation of the interest of member States in the objectives and measures of the Decade, together with reconfirmation of the commitment of all States to work firmly for their realization. We would very much prefer that this reaffirmation, or recommitment, be substantiated by concrete deeds that might include, inter alia, increased efforts by all States, particularly nuclear-weapon and other heavily armed States, to halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament.

Secondly, during the period since the proclamation of the Second Disarmament Decade changes have occurred with regard to armaments. They have increased the priority of certain measures or have focused attention on other, new measures. Therefore, it would appear desirable to suggest that the General Assembly proceed to update and supplement the provisions of the Declaration adopted in 1980. The Romanian delegation has in mind appropriate emphasis on the extreme urgency of measures for the prevention of nuclear war and, in that connection, the priority that should be given to banning nuclear weapons and in general the threat or use of force in international relations. It is also urgent, in our opinion, to halt the

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

testing and production of nuclear weapons and to phase out those weapons until they have been completely eliminated. In view of the current danger in Europe, Romania feels that the priority measures of the Decade should include those dealing with the immediate cessation of the deployment of additional nuclear missiles in Europe and withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from that continent.

Thirdly, in the recommendations the Commission should refer to the current negotiations in Geneva between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, which were welcomed by all delegations which have spoken in the general exchange of views held in this Commission. In view of the special importance of those talks in Geneva, it should be appropriate to emphasize that they must be conducted in a spirit of heightened responsibility so that they may lead to appropriate agreements on halting the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, reduction of nuclear weapons until they have been totally eliminated and halting the militarization of outer space.

As I have approached this subject, let me reiterate our view that during the Geneva negotiations halting the testing and production of new weapons, discontinuance of the deployment of additional nuclear missiles in Europe and the cessation of all activities connected with the militarization of outer space would create an atmosphere of confidence conducive to the development and successful conclusion of these negotiations.

Fourthly, we believe that our recommendations to the General Assembly should also refer to the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the achievement of disarmament and, in this context, to step up efforts to make the public and the masses aware of disarmament problems and to inform public opinion more widely and objectively about the current armaments situation and about the objectives and measures contemplated in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. Accordingly, we believe that the activities carried out within the framework of the World Disarmament Campaign should be co-ordinated with those undertaken for the realization of the objectives of the Decade. Special attention should be paid to stimulating the interest of the younger generation and of scientists in questions arising out of the continued arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Fifthly, the Disarmament Commission could also recommend that the General Assembly should renew its appeal to all States, especially the nuclear-weapon and other heavily armed States, to contribute effectively by all available means to the realization of the objectives and measures contemplated within the framework of the Decade.

I have indicated some ideas the Commission might include in drafting its recommendations to the General Assembly. Certainly the reflection of this item in the final recommendations we shall adopt depends on the negotiations and consultations that we must engage in. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, of our co-operation and flexibility in drafting those recommendations, and I hope you will consider my delegation as a friend.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): In 1969 the United Nations declared the 1970s to be a Disarmament Decade. By 1978 the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament had to acknowledge that the objectives of the Decade had not been reached and were as elusive as ever. The lack of success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament served to confirm that situation.

In 1979 a Second Disarmament Decade was declared and a detailed check-list of measures was incorporated into the Declaration which emerged and which we are studying today.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

We have been asked now to make a preliminary assessment at this mid-point in the Decade. We have to report our assessment to the General Assembly at its fortieth session with suggestions to ensure progress. As my delegation has pointed out previously, in the past five years there has been no substantial progress on any nuclear-arms control and disarmament issue. In fact, the nuclear-arms race is proceeding at an ever-increasing pace in both its qualitative and its quantitative aspects. In addition, the trilateral comprehensive test-ban talks have been abandoned.

Although there has been continuing effort in virtually all the areas touched on in the Declaration, the various objectives, goals and priorities set out in that document have yet to be realized. That message has certainly come through quite clearly in the various statements by all groups and representatives of all shades of opinion that we have heard in the debate in the plenary Commission. The one bright spot in a generally bleak year is the decision by the two super-Powers to resume their dialogue. The agreement last January by the United States and the Soviet Union to initiate bilateral negotiations in Geneva on nuclear arms and space weapons is certainly a positive step. The Canadian Government has welcomed both the decision to negotiate and the agreed objectives, which, as we know, are the prevention of an arms race in space and the termination of the arms race on earth, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms and the strengthening of strategic stability, leading ultimately to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Those themes have long been central elements of Canadian foreign policy.

We continue to hope that there will be a spill-over effect in multilateral arms-control forums such as this one, so that negotiations which have been stalled during the period of tension may show some progress. But I am afraid that, as this session of the Disarmament Commission shows, consensus has continued to elude us on the three ongoing items and procedural differences have held up discussions on our three new items. However, we detect some welcome softening of attitudes. We share the sentiment expressed by our Soviet colleague during the opening debate when he recalled the co-operation which characterized the efforts of the allies during the Second World War, and I can assure the Commission that Canada also hopes that it will be possible to return to those earlier times and have our efforts directed against today's nuclear threat.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

We have also noted with satisfaction the determination expressed by the United States delegation during the opening debate to find again the spirit of co-operation that existed during the Second World War. We would strongly endorse the appeal made by the United States delegation that we join together and reflect on the spirit that led to the establishment of the United Nations. We hope that the spirit of co-operation that both sides seek can be reflected in the bilateral negotiations in Geneva between the two super-Powers and that it will lead to significant and verifiable arms reduction agreements.

At the fortieth session of the General Assembly Members of the United Nations will be deciding when to hold the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We know that it must be held by 1988, but Canada hopes that that special session can take place sooner rather than later and that preparations for it can build on the emerging improvement that we now note in the international atmosphere. A successful such session might provide the spark that is needed to sustain a revitalized disarmament negotiating process.

The Second Disarmament Decade has failed to produce concrete results so far for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the dissipation of United Nations efforts among a large number of activities. Like Nigeria, we agree that it is necessary to map out a strategy to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We also agree with the point that the representative of Nigeria has made on the Second Disarmament Decade that greater precision is required in defining those priority questions on which the United Nations should focus in the last half of this Disarmament Decade.

It will be recalled that in our statement made in plenary meeting on 8 May we outlined Canadian priorities, and I will not repeat them all in this statement. But essentially our objective is the prevention of all war in the nuclear age, not just nuclear war, but conventional war. The task of preventing war requires all States to do their utmost to ensure that force is no longer viewed as an appropriate instrument for settling international disputes and that both its use and the threat of its use are eliminated from international relations, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

It is our intention to contribute first and foremost to the extent that we can to improving the political atmosphere, in particular between East and West, in an effort to encourage the creation of trust and the political will essential for progress on these issues. Discussions have already taken place at the highest political levels between Canada and the super-Powers, and we have reinforced these

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

with bilateral discussions at the official level with other countries of the East and West as well as with the various geographical groupings. We regard such discussions and consultations as essential, and will encourage greater activity along these lines by all members.

It is also our intention to work towards practical proposals and to develop technical back-up for negotiations, for the essential reality of the situation today is the continuing sense of mistrust, particularly between East and West, which results in large part from and in turn engenders continued increases in armaments. We think that there is a need for an improved climate of confidence, for concrete disarmament commitments and for respect for them. But effective disarmament commitments will be achieved only through negotiations that ensure international stability and security at the lowest level of arms. So disarmament agreements, to be accepted, will, in our view, require effective verification systems that will provide the necessary confidence and trust.

Unfortunately the concept of verification has been questioned by some who charge that it is simply a diversion on the part of those who do not truly want disarmament. We disagree with that point of view. On the contrary, we consider verification to be an essential ingredient in any significant arms control agreement. We regard verification as a means of facilitating the conclusion of agreements on disarmament, not of dragging them out or preventing them. Both the Final Document of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the Declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade have emphasized the necessity of adequate measures of verification in disarmament negotiations. To show our seriousness about this, the Canadian Government has allotted \$1 million annually to a verification research programme in order to provide the back-up technical support to disarmament negotiations.

Verification is an area in which we have undertaken conceptual and theoretical as well as technical research. We have been active within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament in a group of seismic experts and the international seismic data exchange, which is an important step towards establishing the verifiability of a nuclear-test-ban treaty. We have initiated a number of basic research projects regarding outer space. On the legal side, the Centre for Research on Air and Space Law at McGill University, in Montreal, has undertaken an extensive survey of existing treaties and agreements. It is also monitoring this question in support of Canada's negotiating responsibilities.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

On the technical side, we have initiated a number of projects studying the possible application of Canadian space and remote sensing technology to verification relating to weapons systems in space. A detailed technical feasibility study on space through space surveillance has also been undertaken.

In the field of chemical weapons, on which attention has increasingly been focused, we have undertaken not only studies on proposals and negotiating texts on verification, but also investigation of allegations of use and the development of practical application based on our experience.

Finally, it has been said in various contexts that it is the major military Powers, in particular the super-Powers, which bear primary responsibility in achieving progress in disarmament. That may be so, but we believe that all States have a contribution to make. We hope that through our efforts as regards verification Canadians will be able to make their own unique contribution to the negotiating process which will help create the confidence and trust that may move us closer to the objectives of the Second Disarmament Decade.

Mrs. URIBE de LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The subjects figuring in items 7 and 9 offer us incentives to take part in the deliberations of this Disarmament Commission. The review of the role of the United Nations and its multilateral organs in the field of disarmament could no doubt shed new light to dispel the shadows that have accumulated over the past few years. It is also the item which, by unanimous consensus of all peoples on earth, should be given the least possibility at this time of continuing to be adorned with insubstantial rhetoric, commonplaces, repetitive formulas and other statements made for effect. It is thus a paradox that the immense majority of States represented in this hall, despite their interest in the topic and deep concern over the threat of nuclear weapons, military expenditures, the naval arms race, South Africa's nuclear capability, the arms trade and the whole gamut of problems arising from the arms race, feel incapable to frame solutions and propose machinery or instruments to bring us closer to the desired goal of disarmament.

This feeling of impotence stems from the realistic analysis of what has happened on the international scene in the last 40 years, when all mankind's aspirations for disarmament, all the declarations by statesmen and all the hopes of those who do not accept a world based on mistrust, suspicion and aggression have been systematically shattered against the hard reality of power relationships between the members of the international community.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

Despite the frustrations and the considerations that might lead to disenchantment, the human race cannot resign itself to living under a perpetual threat. That refusal to accept a destiny neutralizing the vast possibilities for the social progress and scientific and technological development of all nations is the reason for the review and appraisal we shall have to make of what has been and of what will have to be the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

The replies received from Governments on the item we are discussing reflect events since the founding of the United Nations, which owes its raison d'être and main goal to the fear of war and destruction among nations. They recount in detail, since the establishment of the first multilateral disarmament forums, the history of United Nations efforts and measures on what is unanimously considered as mankind's most important problem. We cannot conceal the obvious scepticism in this inventory; however, the results of such efforts may lead to a line of action capable of dispelling the fears caused by the frantic arms race.

Unfortunately, developing countries whose economic and social problems demand solutions other than military have taken part in this frenzied arms race, and they have done so at times with an enthusiasm worthy of a better cause. The figures given in the study on conventional weapons are alarming indeed; and if the data for the past five years is added, it becomes clear that one of the sure characteristics in the world is the increased trade in conventional weapons.

There is growing concern in my country over the trends and projections of trade in conventional weapons and the countries and regions which most benefit or are hurt the most by this established pattern in international relations based on the exploiting of death and violence.

The production of this type of weapons is in fact one of the most lucrative industries and in many cases represents the most significant factor for the prosperity of various industrialized countries. The development of world trade, the refinement of advertising and marketing techniques, the apparently open credit which is not easily obtained for development programmes and the cruel exploitation of internal difficulties in third-world countries have guaranteed for States manufacturing conventional weapons captive markets that grow and are strengthened by the fluctuating pressures of the major industrial centres.

We cannot ignore the fact that the growing trade in conventional weapons is closely linked to acts of violence taking place daily in many parts of the world and that conventional weapons are behind all wars and, therefore, all deaths that have resulted therefrom in the post-war era.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

In opposition to the attainment of the noble goals of disarmament, we have to contend with the profit motive, which promotes false perceptions of security that are insistently repeated adducing that any attempt at disarmament endangers the security of States, implicitly based upon the argument that there is no form of security, regional or international, other than military security. As long as this thesis persists it will not be easy to advance firmly along the path of disarmament.

The excessive growth in the arms traffic not only fosters insecurity in vast regions of the world, thwarting efforts at international détente, but also constitutes an unacceptable drain on the meagre resources that should be devoted to the development programmes of our countries.

Hence general and complete disarmament will continue to be one of our objectives, in spite of the Utopian character sceptics give to this ideal. To attain this goal, it will be necessary to go through various stages and to overcome the innumerable obstacles that are encountered in the process; we shall have to create conditions favourable to strengthening the political will of States, in particular in what should lead them to overcome present obstacles to the attainment of disarmament.

The task is not easy, but it is essential. We must face it immediately in complete honesty. Furthermore, my delegation believes that we the weaker nations should above all devote ourselves to this task, so as to avoid having conditions placed on the exercise of our independence.

Mr. PEREZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): In keeping with its policy of peace, Cuba offers co-operation and increased contribution to all efforts being made at regional and international levels in the quest for solutions and agreements leading to the establishment of a climate of peace that will extend to all regions, benefit all peoples and thereby bring about an improvement in international security so that, in a climate of détente, concrete disarmament measures may be taken. In that respect, in forums where disarmament and international security matters are discussed, our delegation has always been in favour of the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the cessation of the arms race, including the naval arms race, as well as the reallocation to the economic and social development of peoples, particularly those in the developing countries, of resources currently devoted to the arms race. An example of this was the full backing that the people of Cuba gave to resolution 35/46, adopted by the General Assembly on 3 December 1980, which contained the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade.

Although appraisal of the First Disarmament Decade - from 1970 to 1979 - showed that it had not been possible to achieve the objectives set, at least, as a result of the process of international détente, agreement was reached in many spheres which led to the adoption of some specific measures legally embodied in international instruments of undeniable importance. Nevertheless, halfway through the Second Disarmament Decade it has not been possible to achieve a single concrete measure in this field at the international level.

Our Government considers that the governing circles of all countries must pay greater attention to the dangerous international situation that exists at present and to the need to show the necessary political will so that, without detriment to the interests of any State, concrete measures may be taken that will help to improve international relations and establish a climate of peace and security at the global level.

The arrogant and warmongering attitude displayed by the present United States Administration, starting from the very beginning of the Decade, is no doubt the main element that has impeded progress in the negotiations initiated in this period. That Administration, instead of adopting a more conciliatory attitude that would contribute towards attainment of the objectives and purposes set out by the international community in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, is assuming an obstructive position in the work of the various

(Mr. Perez, Cuba)

disarmament organs of the United Nations, and at the same time displaying, within the framework of international relations, imperialist warmongering attitudes which, far from fostering trust, create further tension.

It suffices to mention that in the current year the present United States Administration has continued to carry out threatening and intimidating naval manoeuvres in the Caribbean Sea. It has declared a criminal, economic blockade against Nicaragua and, as the most recent example of the escalation against our country, has initiated subversive radio broadcasts, starting yesterday, 20 May, a shameful and infamous date, which brings to mind Cuba's military occupation by the United States and the establishment of the mediatized Republic, with an amendment imposed on its Constitution granting the United States the right to intervene in Cuba at will and to maintain naval bases, such as the Guantánamo naval base, against the will of our people. It comes to our attention that these subversive radio broadcasts are beginning at a time when constructive steps had been initiated to reduce tensions between the two countries.

There is no doubt that the present United States Administration intends through these measures to create new tensions and conflicts that will further exacerbate the present dangerous international situation and seriously affect the attainment of the goals of disarmament. We draw the attention of the Commission to all these matters.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.