

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

to include outer space in the arms drive and war preparation. The rejection of all obligations likely to hinder this course is part and parcel of such a policy. The refusal to join the moratorium declared by the Soviet Union gives strong evidence of that conclusion.

Secondly, the delegation of the United States avoided any reference to the comprehensive plans known as the "Star Wars" concept which was proclaimed in March last year at the highest level, accompanied by a large propaganda campaign, and which became only recently, by Directive 119, a binding guideline of that country's policy. It stands to reason that in considering measures against an arms race in outer space, such dangerous plans deserve our special attention.

The following facts cannot be refuted. The creation of a space-based anti-ballistic missile system would upset the relationship between the limitation of strategic defensive and strategic offensive weapons and would thus inevitably increase the danger of nuclear war. This concern even became the subject of international agreements. The preamble of the Treaty between the United States and the USSR on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems of 26 May 1972 stresses that effective measures to limit anti-ballistic missile systems would lead to a decrease in the risk of outbreak of war involving nuclear weapons. That means, as a matter of logical thinking, that the envisaged anti-ballistic missile systems will render more probable a nuclear war. They are a firm part of a strategy of a nuclear first strike. This is in contradiction with international law. Article V, paragraph 1, of the aforementioned Treaty stipulates the fundamental obligation that "Each Party undertakes not to develop, test, or deploy anti-ballistic missile systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based -- I repeat space-based -- or mobile land-based." To our understanding, this is the basic norm of the Treaty, which has also to be the guideline for all the other concrete stipulations.

It cannot be contested that the Outer Space Treaty of 27 January 1967 stipulates the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. Moreover, it assures each individual State the concrete right to take part in these activities without any discrimination. The militarization of outer space as strived for by the United States will inevitably result in this right being restrained or even abolished. Therefore, we associate ourselves with all those delegations which regard the planned activities as incompatible with the Outer Space Treaty.

It should be possible to prevent an arms race in outer space since almost all States in supporting resolution 38/70 of the latest General Assembly favoured negotiations on the issue. It is our hope that in the United States too comprehension that the militarization of outer space will not bring the desired military and political advantages will gain the upper hand. The only feasible way towards strengthening national and international security is the cessation of the arms race and gradual disarmament by means of international agreements.

At this Conference, different approaches to the question became evident. The great majority of delegations request the establishment of a Committee with a negotiating mandate, as already provided for in resolution 38/70, which was also supported by my country. There is no "false bottom" to our policy. We, therefore, advocate the consistent implementation of that resolution. This applies, above all, to operative paragraph 7.

We may ask, what are the elements still to be identified or examined in non-committal discussions concerning the prevention of an arms race in outer space as suggested by the delegation of the United States. We have at our disposal the text