

time pursuing illusion. The United States recognizes that even the most effective verification system that can be conceived does not eliminate all risks that any deliberate violation of obligations undertaken will not be detected. The United States is prepared to accept such risks.

There is another fantasy that must be avoided — the notion that an effective verification system can be designed to eliminate all risks that that system might be abused or that some confidential information might be disclosed. While steps can and should be taken to minimize the potential for abuse and for disclosure of confidential information, it is inevitable that risks will remain. The United States is willing accept these risks to obtain the benefits of an effective verification system. Those countries that desire effective verification should also be willing to accept such risks.

If an effective verifiable chemical-weapons ban is to be achieved, all States must be willing to accept risks. But we must not let the twin fantasies of absolute verification and risk-free verification consume our energies. Let there be no doubt however that we will press for the most effective and verifiable convention that can be negotiated.

CD/PV.287

p.19

GDR/Rose

31.8.84

CW

First, we share the assessments given by the delegations of the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sri Lanka and many others with regard to this draft treaty. As far as its scope is concerned, the document contains loopholes to safeguard well-known United States interests and intentions. Many of its verification provisions, especially the so-called open invitation concept, are in flagrant contravention of basic principles of international law and represent a complete departure from the consensus that had been emerging on challenge inspection. Small wonder, therefore, that this concept has been dismissed by many delegations. In fact, we have not heard any delegation clearly supporting this concept, apart, of course, from the United States delegation.

Second, as far as the work of the committee on chemical weapons is concerned, we have not been able to discern any sign of the promised flexibility on the part of the United States delegation. Instead of advancing the negotiations by joining in the efforts to search for mutually acceptable compromises the United States is stubbornly sticking to positions which are not acceptable to many delegations. This attitude became clear again when the report of this committee was drafted, with the United States delegation insisting by all means on the insertion of the notorious Article X into this report.

Let us be quite frank with each other: negotiations are a give-and-take process. No delegation is allowed to impose its will on others.

Therefore, we appeal to the United States to review its approach to the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Otherwise, the prospects for progress may be rather gloomy.

