

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

United States has never submitted any such proposals. Finally, if the United States was sincere and actually feared the Soviet space programmes, then they would have supported the specific proposals of other States which have been submitted here in the Conference, with a view to restricting military activities in space. Many States have made such proposals, including States which are close military and political allies of the United States. Specific proposals have been made by France and by neutral Sweden (including at this session of the Conference on Disarmament); proposals on this issue have been made by other States, and finally, the Soviet Union has made well-known proposals. We are, to put it bluntly, astonished that the United States delegation has rushed to reject our new proposal without even having been interested in the details. Why is there this discrepancy between the United States alleged fear and its refusal to ban or prevent the development of space weapons? Why? I ask. The answer is very simple. Because the United States wishes to carry the arms race into outer space, because it is trying to achieve military superiority, because it wants to obtain the right and possibility to carry out a nuclear first strike with impunity, and everything the United States delegation has said only serves to convince us that the United States does not want to prohibit space attack weapons, does not want to hold negotiations on the prohibition or prevention of an arms race in space.

The distinguished representative of the United States rightly said that the Conference must deal with the question of the prevention of an arms race in space, and therefore should establish or re-establish a subsidiary body with a restricted, exploratory, non-negotiating mandate on item 5. But one would think that if the United States wanted to safeguard itself against the "threat", why is it not prepared to hold specific negotiations on this issue? We are told "We need a more broadly accepted and clearer understanding of many terms. These include the 'militarization of outer space' and 'peaceful uses of outer space'."

Each of us should ask himself these questions, and compare the "fears" depicted by the United States with its actual position. For the United States, evidently, we should engage in a protracted and sterile process of definition of terms such as "the militarization of space" and "the peaceful uses of outer space" rather than find ways of preventing an arms race in that environment.

(Mr. Lowitz, USA)

I sense by the vigour of the response of the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union that my remarks have touched a somewhat sensitive cord. It seems to me that the distinguished representative has in his response attempted to divert your attention from the heart of my statement. It seems he would like you to ignore the threat posed by Soviet offensive strategic forces, especially ICBMs and the mutual commitment to a 50 per cent reduction in those forces. I respectfully commend him to a more careful reading, at a more leisurely time, of the full statement.