

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTY-FIRST SESSION

*Official Records**



UN Doc. A/41/PV.17

MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
17th meeting
held on
22 October 1986
at 3 p.m.
New York

17 OCTOBER 1986

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 17th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Fischer (Uruguay)
Mr. Nufiez Mosquera (Cuba)
Mr. Franceschi (Italy)
Mrs. Laohaphan (Thailand)
Mr. Engo (Cameroon)
Mr. Zahid (Morocco)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): We wish to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee on your election and to pledge our support.

The delegation of Uruguay wishes to convey to the delegation of Mozambique its most heartfelt condolences on the recent tragic death of the President of Mozambique, Mr. Samora Machel.

My delegation hopes in the course of the work of the First Committee to give proof of its historic commitment to the question of disarmament. Uruguay demonstrated early in its history its dedication to universal peace through law and its dedication to the eradication of the arms race from international life. No grand design for peace or ambitious disarmament programme can be undertaken without taking account of the realities of our time.

Poor, weak nations are allowed little or no part in decision-making in the field of disarmament, to which they have no access. A dominant feature of contemporary reality is that the nuclear Powers, and the super-Powers in particular, establish, resolve, confront and negotiate their arms policies essentially in terms of their relations of force, and each day increasingly outside the framework of the Organization.

Another dominant feature of world affairs is that there is not a single State on Earth whose security, existence and peace do not in the final analysis depend on possible decisions by the super-Powers. Therefore, the super-Powers bear the

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

primary political and moral responsibility with regard to nuclear disarmament. However, the rest of us in the international community have an increasing, inescapable responsibility to monitor disarmament processes and measures and demand that these be put into effect. And the international community inevitably works through the United Nations, which is its natural institutional embodiment.

As can be seen from the present debate, all Member States have been following with interest developments in negotiations between statesmen of the two super-Powers. The international community naturally cannot accept the statement that those negotiations have failed without profound disappointment. Despite the lack of understanding so far displayed in those negotiations, the matters discussed in Iceland and the scope of the measures proposed there give rise to great expectations.

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

It is important to note that as the super-Powers were reaching this critical stage in their negotiations there has been in recent months a commendable strengthening of multilateral disarmament negotiations. We are gratified at the Stockholm agreements on confidence-building measures regarding the conventional forces of both military alliances. We should also encourage pursuit of the significant progress made in the Conference on Disarmament, the United Nations negotiating body, with a view to agreement on a convention on chemical weapons.

As stated here many times, including by my own delegation, multilateral disarmament negotiations are a useful complement to bilateral negotiations between the super-Powers. They neither compete with nor exclude such negotiations.

Other nuclear Powers come before the General Assembly to reaffirm their will to commit themselves to a process of nuclear disarmament.

Rays of hope are discerned, but the major protagonists bear an increasingly heavy responsibility. That is why we urge both sides to make the fullest use of their commitment, their imagination, their determination and their capacity for understanding so that their efforts can lead to sound, effective and substantive agreements on world disarmament.

We reaffirm our strong support for the proposal made at Ixtapa, Mexico, by the Heads of State of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, calling upon the super-Powers immediately to declare a bilateral mutual moratorium on nuclear testing. To promote such a measure, the unprecedented initiative of the six statesmen proposes specific verification procedures, suggests instruments to ensure true compliance, and states the willingness of those six States to participate, as a guarantee of neutrality and observance.

The delegation of Uruguay reiterates its concern that outer space not become an arena for arms rivalry; that would take mankind into a new, more complex and

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

wider dimension of world strategic confrontation. This could be prevented by joint efforts by the super-Powers undertaken with that aim in mind and in keeping with the aspirations of the whole international community.

For countries such as mine, action aimed at promoting conventional disarmament, especially regional action, are particularly relevant. In that connection, Uruguay is pleased that given the weapon-oriented context prevailing throughout the planet, the advent of democracies in Latin America has helped in our region to suppress the trend towards massive increases in military expenditure. Recent statistics clearly reveal a containment and reduction of those expenditures. We hope that reorientation continues and that the excessive resources now spent on weaponry can be reallocated to the peaceful development of our societies and to meeting their pressing development financing requirements.

Such a transfer of resources on the universal level is a fundamental requirement of our time, as clearly noted at Ixtapa. We need only recall that world military expenditures for 1985 reached \$900 billion. This amounts to more than 5 per cent of world production, according to a group appointed to evaluate the relationship between disarmament and development. It is eight times the total flow of official and private resources to the developing countries, according to a World Bank estimate, and 25 times the official development assistance to developing countries. That evidence alone underscores the urgent need to convene the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. My country joined in sponsoring the call for that Conference, which, unfortunately, could not be convened in 1986.

As the delegation of a country that has worked long and tirelessly to bring an ethical and humanitarian dimension to international relations, we are deeply alarmed at the reappearance of chemical weapons. After 60 years during which they were not used, the international community has recently seen frightful evidence of

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

the growing employment of such weapons in wars which are destroying peoples in several parts of the world. Moreover, with the reappraisal of conventional combat techniques, chemical weapons have become a supplementary device in world strategic confrontation. Another equally alarming incentive to use chemical weapons is that technological improvements allow them to be handled without danger - without danger to the potential aggressor, of course.

It is therefore necessary to make every effort to prohibit the production and use of these new forms of horror. We welcome the progress made in recent weeks in the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a legal framework to form the basis for a convention to eliminate chemical weapons. We urge the speedy completion of those efforts, and stress the need to include the most effective possible means of verification to ensure compliance with these prohibitions.

My delegation is also fundamentally concerned with renewal of the United Nations role in the disarmament process. In this area, which is of vital interest to all mankind, giving renewed impact to the decisions of United Nations bodies is more a question of substance than of form. It requires of Members an effort of organization and concentration with respect to definitions, with a view to strengthening the Organization's significance in the eyes of Governments and world opinion. Otherwise, there will be a further reduction of the already limited capacity of the United Nations to influence the crude realities of force now prevailing in international relations.

In that context, we must insist on strengthening the role of information on various aspects of disarmament, either in connection with the weaponry of various States or with negotiations on reductions in such weaponry.

(Mr. Fischer, Uruguay)

My delegation also feels that the United Nations should expand its role in the field of verification since it can offer impartiality and the guarantee of its machinery, procedures and membership, which are necessary to ensure compliance with the obligations agreed on in respect of the various aspects of disarmament.

To sum up, my delegation's action will be aimed at strengthening fundamental guidelines which Uruguay has always supported; defence of the vital interests of the international community in the face of the powerful national interests prevailing in the world today; democratic participation by all States in negotiations and decisions on the common fate of mankind; consolidation of all disarmament measures through binding legal instruments and insistence on guarantees of their effective observance; recognition of the importance of the regional framework; and the strengthening of this Organization in the field of disarmament, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, which cannot be divorced from the strengthening of its role in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like first to place on record my delegation's heartfelt condolences on the tragic death of the President of Mozambique, Samora Machel. With the death of our comrade Samora Machel my country has lost a brother, the people of Mozambique has lost its far-sighted leader and the international community has lost a strong champion of the struggle against apartheid.

Since this is the first time I have spoken in this general debate, I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee on your election to your various posts in the Committee this year. I pledge the full collaboration of the Cuban delegation.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

When, in November of last year, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, met in Geneva, the international community welcomed that summit meeting and expressed the hope that it would lead to concrete agreements in the field of disarmament.

In Geneva the United States and the Soviet Union agreed at the highest level that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. They agreed to speed up bilateral negotiations on the limitation of weapons in order to conclude agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and ending the arms race on earth. Great hopes were aroused by the meeting in Geneva that the process of détente would be resumed and that international peace and security would be strengthened in a relatively short span of time.

Since then, however, we have witnessed the continued accumulation of ever more sophisticated weapons, repeated efforts to militarize outer space and the reaffirmation of doctrines based on the use of nuclear weapons. Military budgets have been increased. The main disarmament proposals, many of which were made and reiterated by the General Assembly itself, still lack support. Multilateral and bilateral negotiations on the priority aspects of nuclear disarmament are stagnating, and the world continues to confront a lethal dilemma: peace or destruction.

That is the framework in which the First Committee of the General Assembly is again meeting. The option before us is not a choice between peace and war but rather between life and death, and this compels us to speak very clearly.

Document A/41/27 contains the report which the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament, has submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration at the forty-first session. A quick glance at this

(Mr. Núñez Mosquera, Cuba)

reveals the alarming fact that yet again a very small number of countries have taken a position against the rapid initiation of negotiations on questions which are vital for the international community and whose priority cannot be called into question.

Concerning the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the report of the Conference on Disarmament clearly states that there was no consensus on the adoption of a negotiating mandate that would allow for the creation of an ad hoc committee on the subject in order to begin the relevant negotiations with a view to elaborating a test-ban treaty. The reasons for the lack of consensus are given in the report itself, and this is undoubtedly a repetition of the situation we have been facing for many years, namely the absence of the political will to negotiate on the part of some countries.

A similar situation arises when we consider that part of the report that relates to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament has for a number of years now been considering the best way to deal with this important agenda item. The members of the Group of 21 and the socialist countries have put forward concrete proposals aimed at the establishment of an ad hoc committee with a clear negotiating mandate, but the United States and other countries oppose them. They try to convince us that the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States are sufficient. To them, that is the only suitable framework for the conclusion of nuclear disarmament agreements. Thus they disregard the proposals of the General Assembly itself to the effect that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations and that therefore all States have the duty to contribute to efforts in that field.

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

It is undeniable that bilateral negotiations are important, and should be pursued as speedily as possible, but they cannot be used to impede the work of the multilateral negotiating body. The two forums, the bilateral and the multilateral, must complement each other and, moreover, must take into account the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly, the views of the international community and world public opinion, for nuclear weapons are the greatest danger confronting mankind.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

The item relating to the prevention of nuclear war has not met with any better fate in the Conference on Disarmament. Here again, attempts are being made to distort the priorities set forth in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That is precisely why some countries have opposed the adoption of objective and practical measures designed to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war. What other reason can there be for the obsessive objection to the freezing of nuclear weapons, to the renunciation of the first use of such weapons or to the prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests?

A calm and objective analysis of events in the field of disarmament in 1985 and 1986 clearly reveals the greatest obstacle in the path to peace. It is worth dwelling briefly on the facts of the matter. In April 1985 the Soviet Union declared a unilateral moratorium on its deployment of medium-range missiles and suspended the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe that it had initiated as a consequence of the arrival of the "Euromissiles". On 6 August of that year, on the fortieth anniversary of the United States atomic massacre at Hiroshima, the USSR declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear-weapon testing, which has since been extended on four occasions and has now been in effect for 14 months. During his visit to France on 2-5 October 1985 the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, announced new Soviet arms proposals, including a 50 per cent reduction in the number of Soviet and North American weapons capable of reaching the territories of the other side. In addition, on 24 October 1985, the Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania signed another joint communiqué reaffirming the proposals put forward in January and proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union suspend all nuclear-weapon testing for a period of 12 months.

(Mr. Nuffez Mosquera, Cuba)

And what was the United States reaction to all those proposals? With respect to the Soviet moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles, they responded with a continuation of their deployment of their "Euromissiles". To the Soviet moratorium on nuclear-weapons testing and the request of the six Heads of State to which I have just referred, the United States responded with further testing of such weapons. As for the Soviet proposal for missile reduction, the United States responded with increased military spending for research and development of new weapons, including space weapons.

In 1986, the same situation prevailed. On 15 January, Mikhail Gorbachev made a broad proposal containing a concrete programme for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons over a 15-year period and at preventing the militarization of outer space while reducing the potential for conventional confrontation on Earth. Regrettably, however, the United States attitude in recent months has not been consonant with détente. At Geneva the United States agreed that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, but it still refuses to commit itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and adheres to its doctrine of nuclear deterrence; at Geneva the United States agreed that it would not seek military supremacy, but it still refuses to accept a nuclear-test ban and is still increasing its military expenditures and arms programmes; at Geneva the United States agreed that an arms race in outer space should be prevented, but it is still going ahead with its Star Wars plans and increasing the budgetary allocations for that purpose.

More recently, statements have been made at the highest levels in Washington that point to a rejection of the disarmament agreements already arrived at, such as the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and SALT II. Those statements were a cause of concern to the international community. At the recent summit meeting of non-aligned countries held at Harare from 1 to 6 September

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

of this year, the Heads of State or Government urged all States to adhere strictly to the existing legal restrictions and limitations on space weapons, including those contained in the outer space Treaty and the 1972 anti-ballistic missile Treaty, and, in particular - and this is important - they urged all States "to refrain from taking any measures aimed at developing, testing or deploying, weapons and weapons systems in outer space".

A few days ago the Reykjavik summit meeting took place, between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States of America, Ronald Reagan, and, as we were informed, it was precisely the insistence of the United States on its right to test weapons and weapons systems in outer space that killed any possibility of arriving at important agreements - even though the Heads of State or Government of over 100 countries had just urged that such tests should not be carried out.

As for SALT II, the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries expressed themselves as

"greatly perturbed by the announcement by the Government of the United States of America that it no longer considers itself bound by the provisions of the Second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) of 1979. They urged the Government of the United States of America to reconsider its position".

Thus this it is not just a question of political propaganda; these are not unfounded opinions. We are dealing with the legitimate concern of the peoples of the world at the steps Washington has been taking for some time, for what is at stake is the very survival of mankind. We do not want people to use soft words and tell us that nuclear weapons will become obsolete. We want to be told that we are going to ban the production and development of nuclear weapons and that we are

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

going to eliminate them. We want to be told that we are going to prohibit the extension of the arms race to outer space. What point is there in spending thousands of millions of dollars to make nuclear weapons obsolete by developing weapons systems, this time in outer space? Is it not easier to go ahead with a freeze on nuclear weapons and their subsequent destruction and to use the resources thus saved, together with those that would otherwise be spent on Star Wars programmes, for economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries?

One does not need to be particularly bright to understand what underlies the United States attitude. It is seeking military supremacy in order to impose conditions from positions of strength. To that end, it does not hesitate to violate the 1972 anti-ballistic missile Treaty, by virtue of which the United States and the Soviet Union, under article V, undertook

"not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based".

The other important obstacle in the search for military supremacy, SALT II, is something else the United States is attempting to reject. This is because that agreement objectively assessed the specific characteristics of the strategic weapons of the USSR and the United States and definitively established the existence of approximate military parity between the two countries. In order to achieve supremacy, they must act to alter that parity, and that is exactly what the so-called Star Wars programme is: a quest for supremacy, for the capacity to make the first nuclear strike.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

We agree with those delegations that have stated in this debate that the so-called space shield - if it is in any way effective, which we doubt - would be a shield only for the State that had it. But what would happen to the vast majority of mankind - those who do not have sufficient resources and who see how resources are being squandered on insane plans? It is obvious that nuclear disarmament allows for no alternative.

We also agree with those delegations that have emphasized the need to respect the agreements on arms control already achieved. This Committee cannot fail to endorse that request or other requests for urgent nuclear disarmament negotiations, the banning of nuclear-weapon testing and the prevention of nuclear war, which they have been insisting on for years.

We must emphasize in our proposals the need to freeze nuclear weapons. We must insist that the world become aware of the real dangers of a nuclear winter. And now more than ever, we must demand that an end be put to any step aimed at extending the arms race into outer space.

We heard with keen interest that the adoption of important agreements was very close at hand in Reykjavik. We have heard that the Soviet Union maintains its proposals. We share the hopes of world public opinion that reason will prevail and that the quest for supremacy will yield before the imperatives of survival. We trust that the views of the majority will prevail.

Mr. FRANCESCHI (Italy): May I first of all congratulate you, Sir, and the other officers of the Committee on your unanimous election. You belong to a country with which Italy entertains friendly and mutually beneficial relations. Moreover, your long personal experience with the United Nations gives us hope that under your guidance the Committee will be able to achieve those organizational improvements and substantive results which everyone desires but which, for some reason, always fail to materialize.

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

At a time when such results are particularly desirable because of the financial difficulties of the Organization, I should like to assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation towards that end.

The Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom has already expressed the views of the 12 member States of the European Community on the main issues on the agenda of this Committee. Italy fully shares those views. I should merely like to add some considerations on behalf of my delegation at this particular juncture when crucial developments for the future of disarmament and for the prospects of world security in general are taking place.

It has become somewhat of a habit in United Nations debates to describe the world situation in terms of gloom and doom. This is particularly true when we deal with disarmament issues. We hear, year after year, that the world is on the brink of self-destruction and that the nuclear arms race imperils the survival of mankind as a whole, while there is no significant progress in the major disarmament negotiations.

One therefore feels almost uneasy in contradicting that sombre analysis of the world security situation and attempting to introduce a more optimistic note into our debates. Yet world peace has been preserved for over 40 years and continues to be preserved, thanks to the stability ensured by the existing balance of forces. Prospects for decisive progress in the disarmament progress are improving. Indeed, my Government feels that developments which have taken place over the past 12 months, since we last met in this room, give good reason for hope and that, for the first time in years, breakthroughs in disarmament negotiations are potentially at hand.

As a matter of fact, the first of such breakthroughs has already occurred. It is the agreement reached on 21 September at the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and on Disarmament in Europe. That agreement is

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

specifically aimed at increasing openness and transparency in military activities in Europe and will consequently reduce the possibility of a surprise attack in a region where there is the highest concentration of armaments - both nuclear and conventional - in the world. It is therefore an agreement which, in spite of its imperfections, does not have merely symbolic value. On the contrary, it will make a far from negligible contribution to stability in Europe and will for that reason have positive effects on world peace and stability.

The Reykjavik meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev has for its part shown the potential which exists for major agreements in the field of strategic and intermediate-range nuclear arms reductions. Anyone who has been following the Geneva negotiations over the past few years can appreciate the importance of what was achieved at Reykjavik in spite of the fact that all differences could not be reconciled and no formal agreements could be reached.

In fact, as stated by the two leaders, the proposals that could make those potential agreements a reality remain on the negotiating table. It is now up to the negotiators in Geneva to build on them and to work out solutions to the complex issues which prevented an over-all breakthrough in Reykjavik. We believe that this can be achieved through hard and serious negotiations and we feel encouraged by the determination shown by the two leaders to pursue the process initiated last year in Geneva.

We are particularly gratified at the progress achieved towards an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear weapons. These armaments have direct and threatening implications for European security and are therefore a matter of considerable concern to my Government. All the main elements of an intermediate-range nuclear forces agreement are now on the table and it has been our understanding for almost one year that such an agreement could be reached and signed independent of

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

the degree of progress achieved at the other negotiating tables in Geneva. We are therefore confident that this major step on the path to nuclear disarmament will soon be accomplished.

May I add that if significant agreements are reached in the field of nuclear arms reductions, the problem of conventional disarmament will become an increasingly crucial one in relations between the two major military alliances. Conventional disarmament is indeed a universal problem, and the General Assembly will have to confront it in a more serious and concrete way than it has so far done if it wants to make a substantive contribution to world security and stability and to the reduction of the appalling burden of military expenditure.

When it comes to Europe, however, there is no doubt that the problem of nuclear arms reduction is inextricably linked to the problem of conventional disarmament, to the point that lack of adequate progress in the latter would sooner or later hamper further progress in the former. My Government therefore welcomed the willingness shown by the Soviet Union and by the Warsaw Pact to confront this crucial problem. We are convinced of the need to include in the disarmament process all the factors which contribute to determining on a global basis the balance of forces between the two major military alliances if the process is to go as far as we would wish.

Accordingly, we look with great interest to recent developments, and we will not fail to make a positive and constructive contribution to the elaboration of new ideas in this field, taking Eastern European proposals into account as well.

I realize that I have so far spoken of the disarmament process only in terms of current and future negotiations between the major Powers or the two major military alliances. This is largely due to the fact that the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union and the state of the most important bilateral disarmament negotiations are decisive factors for world security.

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

It must also be recognized, however, that the General Assembly has overemphasized the absolute priority of nuclear disarmament over other forms of disarmament and other means to bring about armaments reductions. By stressing the primary responsibility of the major military Powers, the General Assembly has greatly contributed to removing the multilateral process from the limelight.

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

We regret that, because we are deeply committed to multilateralism and believe that the United Nations has an important role to play in the consideration of disarmament issues, which are of concern to mankind as a whole and deeply affect international security and stability.

In our view, the debates in the General Assembly are the expression of the political and security views of the international community. Its pronouncements therefore deserve attention, and they should probably get more than they actually do. We also feel that it is reasonable for the international community to express impatience at the relatively slow pace of disarmament negotiations. However, that impatience should be expressed in a more balanced and more realistic way than is often the case, if the pronouncements of the Committee and the General Assembly are to be implemented, or at least heard. The Secretary-General has made some useful remarks in his report to the General Assembly at the forty-first session, and we should all try to follow his suggestions and focus our attention in a constructive and non-antagonistic way on the specific matters on which the United Nations can do a useful job.

We think that an example of such a sober and constructive approach to disarmament issues was provided by the Disarmament Commission at its last session, when some progress was achieved on very difficult issues. But, above all, I have in mind what could become the success story of the United Nations in the field of disarmament - namely, the negotiations in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on a global and verifiable ban on the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. We are not yet on the verge of an agreement and major issues still need to be satisfactorily settled. However, the Conference on Disarmament worked hard during its last session and progress has indeed already been made, while more could be in sight if the changes which seem to be taking place in established positions

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

concerning such crucial issues as verification are confirmed in Geneva. My Government attaches the greatest importance and gives the highest priority to the early, positive conclusion of those negotiations and we hope that no effort will be spared to achieve an objective which would have highly stabilizing effects in Europe and world-wide and whose urgency has been amply demonstrated by recent events.

These are very important issues on which the Organization has been able to achieve concrete results. We must, however, recognize that unfortunately this has not always been the case. The way in which we have been handling the complex question of the prevention of war is a relevant example. As long as nuclear armaments exist and have not been eliminated through negotiations under conditions that would guarantee global security, it is an illusion to imagine that a major world conflict would not entail their use. The strategy of deterrence was conceived with precisely the purpose of preventing such a conflict. In the context of that strategy, nuclear weapons are retained at the lowest level necessary to make their use, as well as the large-scale use of conventional armaments, unthinkable. The resolutions adopted so far by the General Assembly on the prevention of nuclear war have distinctively ignored the validity of this restrained approach to the realities of a world in which not only do nuclear weapons exist, and cannot be dis-invented, but conventional armaments have acquired unprecedented destructive capabilities, and their massive use must be prevented. For this reason, those resolutions do not provide valid alternatives to the existing strategic conceptions; nor do they constitute the basis for a constructive discussion of effective ways to prevent war, including nuclear war.

Another example of a basically unproductive approach is that followed on the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. There is no doubt that all

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

Governments are ideally in favour of the early achievement of a comprehensive test ban. Italy also attaches great importance to a comprehensive test ban under appropriate conditions which would enhance security and stability. However, the problem cannot be dealt with in isolation from other issues and negotiations concerning the reduction of offensive nuclear weapons and, in general, the maintenance of stability and a balance of forces.

Accordingly, in my Government's view the goal of a comprehensive test ban treaty can be effectively pursued through a realistic and gradual approach and the progressive establishment of the necessary conditions for its achievement. In the context of such a gradual process, there are steps that should be taken rapidly in order to open the way to further progress. The early ratification of the threshold test-ban Treaty, of 1974, and of the peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty, of 1976, would certainly be a significant starting point in the process. We noted with interest that a considerable measure of agreement was achieved in Reykjavik on the question of the ratification of the two Treaties and on how to proceed from there. These are very positive developments and the international community should encourage them without insisting on immediate and comprehensive solutions, which are clearly out of reach.

The Conference on Disarmament, for its part, should endeavour to overcome the divergences that, regrettably, prevented an agreement on the necessary procedural arrangements at its last session. The Conference must be enabled to start working on the substantive issues related to a comprehensive test ban, including those of scope, compliance and verification. An important contribution to the solution of verification problems can be made, in our view, by the Group of Scientific Experts on seismic events.

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

My Government is firmly convinced that an arms race in outer space must be prevented. We share the general awareness that a competitive drive towards the deployment of armaments in outer space would be a costly and probably destabilizing endeavour. We welcome the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union recognized the need to prevent such a competitive race in the Shultz-Gromyko communiqué of January 1985. Indeed, looking forward to our common long-term objective of general and complete disarmament, we believe that in that context outer space should be used for exclusively peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

However, it is clearly premature, in our view, to try at this preliminary stage to make an assessment of the political and strategic implications of the research conducted into new ballistic missile defence technologies as well as of the validity of the strategic concepts associated with that research. In fact, we do not know the extent to which such defensive systems will prove feasible and effective, nor, consequently, do we know their potential impact on stability and security. It would in many respects be futile to try to pre-empt now decisions that will take years to make and whose content is largely unknown at this stage.

We know for sure, on the contrary, that there has been and still is a continuing advance in the technology related to offensive weapons, both nuclear and conventional, and that this steady process is bound to have destabilizing implications for world security. If we want to proceed towards a different brand of international relations based on peace and co-operation, it would be imprudent to rule out the possibility of using innovative technologies not to serve destabilizing purposes but to promote security at lower levels of offensive weapons and the adoption of defensive military doctrines and postures.

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

We therefore think that it is of the highest importance at this stage for the major space Powers to agree on a co-operative approach in dealing with these problems, particularly the issues related to the evolution which is likely to take place in the offence-defence relationship. It is also essential to ensure that space research and activities are conducted in a way that is consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter, that they respond solely to defensive requirements and that they contribute to stabilizing the existing strategic balance. These objectives can certainly be achieved through negotiations, and our efforts should be directed at favouring a positive conclusion of those negotiations rather than indulging in illusory attempts to place constraints on technological progress.

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

The Conference on Disarmament, through its Ad Hoc Committee, has started very useful work on the question of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Despite a regrettable delay in getting down to substantive work owing to procedural difficulties, at its last session the Conference was able to clarify some important aspects of the existing legal régime concerning arms control and outer space and to consider substantive issues. We therefore hope that the Ad Hoc Committee will be reconvened at an early stage of the next session of the Conference on Disarmament to continue its important work.

To conclude, I wish to address myself to another very important item on our agenda, namely, the preparation and convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. My delegation participated actively in the work of the second and third sessions of the Preparatory Committee and wish to express our satisfaction for the good work done so far. The Committee was in fact able to agree on a number of elements that provide a good basis for the drafting of the Conference's final document. Moreover, in spite of the existence of divergent views, the atmosphere in the Committee was good and constructive, thanks also to the masterly guidance provided by its Chairman, Mr. Dubei.

At the same time, we think there is still much preparatory work to be done if we wish the International Conference to be an orderly event and, more important, a successful manifestation of international solidarity. Drafting the Conference's final document or documents is likely to be a time-consuming exercise. As far as we are concerned, we believe that the final document should address itself to the question of reducing the levels of armaments and military expenditures - a goal which can be achieved through disarmament agreements but also by other means, such as regional and subregional security arrangements, economic co-operation and integration, confidence and security-building agreements, diversion of military

(Mr. Franceschi, Italy)

personnel and equipment for disaster-assistance purposes, to mention a few. We have noted with interest that many of these ideas are reflected in the Lomé Declaration of 16 August 1985, which has been circulated in document A/40/761. The Preparatory Committee did not have the time to consider those additional elements; it is therefore our intention to resubmit them to the Committee when it reconvenes in 1987.

For all those reasons, in joining the consensus on the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee that the International Conference be held in 1987, we insisted on the need for further preparation. We think that it would be appropriate for the General Assembly to authorize the Preparatory Committee to hold another session before the date to be set for the Conference and to entrust it with the authority to convene a further session if the need arises. This solution was chosen last year by the General Assembly, and we think it could greatly help in ensuring the successful conclusion of the Conference.

Mrs. LAOHAPHAN (Thailand): On behalf of the Thai delegation and on my own behalf, may I join the preceding speakers in extending our sincerest congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the Committee, as well as to the other officers of the Committee. The Thai delegation pledges its full support and co-operation to you in the performance of your duties.

Man has too often, in the past and at present, known the devastating effects of war. It is undeniable that wars of the twentieth century have introduced new methods and levels of destruction. In particular, it is already clear that nuclear weapons are capable of killing all human beings on this planet, and that other weapons of mass destruction are threatening to bring an incalculable catastrophe to mankind's doorstep. Yet the arms race has grown both qualitatively and quantitatively and seems to remain a permanent feature of modern times. The cycle

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

of fear begins when a nation feels insecure; it then needs effective defensive weapons and enough offensive weapons to match or surpass those in the hands of its opponent. That vicious cycle would continue as countries would feel more insecure and develop, produce and stockpile more arms.

Having experienced the cold war for many decades, man realizes that the nuclear arms race has become a balance of terror. Nuclear weapons are not only a deterrent against one's immediate opponent but also create a costly burden for achieving and maintaining parity with all comers. Such a balance will not be stable, because each nation that attempts to keep up with the balance is likely to upset it as it remains unsure of future technological developments or the eventual power equation; thus, it must ensure for itself a certain margin of safety which inevitably upsets the balance.

There is no other option to save humanity from self-destruction than disarmament. Thailand's positions on various disarmament issues are firm and consistent. Thailand has always supported constructive, practical and effective proposals or initiatives aimed at disarmament, especially the cessation of both the nuclear and the conventional arms races, and the realization of the ultimate goal of complete disarmament. The Thai delegation shares with the majority of the delegations represented here the concern over the absence of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, the possible spread of nuclear weapons to outer space, and the slow progress in other disarmament fields.

Thailand also shares with its fellow members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) similar views and positions on disarmament issues, as expressed in the joint communiqué of the nineteenth ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Manila held on 23-24 June 1986 as follows:

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

"The Foreign Ministers viewed with deep concern the continuing escalation of the global arms race, particularly in the nuclear dimension. They expressed their sincere hope that the resumed negotiations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Geneva will yield early and concrete results and welcomed the constructive proposal recently tabled at the forum to bring about genuine, verifiable and balanced arms reductions. The Foreign Ministers called on the nuclear-weapon States, especially the two major Powers, in their negotiations to build on past agreements rather than to abandon them. They specially appealed to the major Powers to continue to abide by their unilateral commitments to observe the terms of the 1979 SALT II accord. The Foreign Ministers reiterated their call on the nuclear-weapon States to take into account, not only their own security concerns, but also those of the entire international community, especially the non-nuclear-weapon States."

Nowadays we still see an escalating arms race in many parts of the world. The arms race affects both rich and poor nations alike. While the great Powers continue to engage in the development of more sophisticated weapons - conventional, nuclear, radiological, chemical, bacteriological and so on - small States continue to spend huge sums of their own limited financial resources on military equipment. It is a fact that some small countries feel the need to strengthen their defence capabilities while they are facing hostile and more powerful neighbours. However, we all wish that the resources expended for armaments could be utilized for more constructive purposes.

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

For this reason my delegation hopes that the First Committee will continue to pay attention to the question of military expenditures and make greater efforts to increase the possibilities for the reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

In this regard the Thai delegation wishes to reaffirm its support for the decision to convene the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was scheduled to take place in July this year, as called for in General Assembly resolution 40/155, of 16 December 1985. Unfortunately the Conference was postponed until 1987. The Thai delegation hopes that great strides will be made in this direction in conformity with the aims and objectives of that resolution.

Another issue that is of great concern to my delegation is the alleged use of chemical and biological weapons in certain parts of the world, including South-East Asia. As a neighbouring State, Thailand is seriously concerned over the reported use of such weapons in certain South-East Asian countries, as it threatens the lives and livelihood of Thai civilians as well as Indo-Chinese refugees in or near the area.

With advanced science and modern technology, new types of chemical, biological and toxin weapons are increasingly difficult to detect. Moreover the international instruments governing the development and production of these weapons - namely, the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the 1972 Convention - contain no provisions on verification. My delegation therefore looks forward to the speedy elaboration and conclusion of a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of such weapons. We are pleased to take note of the progress in negotiations achieved during the summer session of the

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

Conference on Disarmament and hope that the existing problems, such as the questions regarding verification, will soon be resolved.

The Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, which was held in Geneva between 8 and 26 September, represents another effort of the international community to strengthen existing multilateral agreements on arms control and disarmament. We welcome the final declaration, adopted by consensus, consisting of several concrete measures to enhance further the purview of the Convention. Thailand values this Convention highly, for it has provided a standard by which actions of alleged violators can be ascertained. We believe that its effectiveness depends on co-operation in both letter and spirit by parties and non-parties alike. My delegation is convinced that measures such as information sharing, consultative meetings of experts and speedy international on-site inspection of alleged improper use of toxin agents would also contribute to the effectiveness of the Convention. In this regard Thailand stands ready to co-operate with the Secretary-General and interested Governments in the investigation of any activities which might constitute violations of the 1925 Protocol and the 1972 Convention.

My delegation believes that the establishment of peace zones, including nuclear-weapon-free zones, in various parts of the globe would serve as an important step towards limiting the proliferation of nuclear arms and promoting international peace and security. It is now the feeling among the ASEAN countries that the creation of a regional order in South-East Asia is not only desirable but also feasible compared to the prospect a decade ago. It should be stated at the outset that a regional order in South-East Asia rests upon the convergence of the felt needs of the countries of the region. This interest in creating some form of regional order exists in the region and in the proposal to establish a zone of peace

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

freedom and neutrality, known as ZOPFAN. The proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia also falls within this same context, which has been endorsed by ASEAN since July 1983. Once again I wish to refer to the joint communiqué of the nineteenth ASEAN Ministerial Meeting, which stated, inter alia:

"The Foreign Ministers reaffirmed ASEAN's determination to pursue efforts towards the realization of the zone of peace, freedom and neutrality (ZOPFAN) in South-East Asia. While recognizing that the Kampuchean problem remains an obstacle to the attainment of this objective, they noted with satisfaction the progress report of the Working Group on ZOPFAN, which has been entrusted with the task of studying the concept of a South-East Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone as a component of ZOPFAN. The Foreign Ministers requested the senior officials and the Working Group to continue with the consideration of the subject in all its aspects, including a comprehensive definition of the principles, objectives and elements involved, with a view to drafting as soon as possible a treaty on the South-East Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone, taking into account all its implications. In this context the Foreign Ministers noted with special interest the conclusion of the South Pacific nuclear-free-zone Treaty at Rarotonga on 6 August 1985."

My delegation is aware that the establishment of peace zones is a complex question involving in particular the willingness of extraregional Powers to co-operate and forgo political and military rivalries in such areas. It is equally important that every country in the region should have the farsightedness to realize the value of peace zones and nuclear-weapon-free zones. Therefore the Thai delegation hopes that ASEAN's aspiration to create a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia will be supported by the international community, particularly the major Powers and all our neighbours.

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

Fifteen years have already passed since, in 1971, at its twenty-fifth session, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Today we are nowhere near the fulfilment of the worthy aims of the Declaration. Furthermore, the proposed Conference on the Indian Ocean has had to be postponed for a second time. We believe that failure to convene the Conference by 1988 would not only diminish any chance of bringing peace and stability to that strategic area of the world but also adversely affect future efforts towards the creation of peace zones in other regions.

Nowadays we live in a world of interdependence. In an attempt to foster a just and peaceful environment within a region it is desirable to co-ordinate peace efforts with those of other like-minded nations in other regions around the globe. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to commend the so-called five-continent initiative of the Presidents of Argentina, Mexico and Tanzania and the Prime Ministers of Greece, India and Sweden, which is an example of interregional peace initiative. We also welcome their Mexico Declaration of 7 August 1986, including the document on verification measures, which might prove to be a basis on which the problems concerning verification could be resolved. We believe that the content of that Declaration echoes the yearnings of the peoples of the world for peace through disarmament. The Thai delegation wishes to join the five-continent initiative in urging the leaders of the United States of America and the Soviet Union to respond to the hopes for nuclear disarmament placed by the international community in the outcome of recent meetings and negotiations between the two super-Powers.

(Mrs. Laohaphan, Thailand)

It has been my delegation's fervent hope that the day when the States with the largest nuclear arsenals will agree on nuclear-arms reductions and complete disarmament will soon come. That will give humanity the time to breathe more easily. Unfortunately, the outcome of the Reykjavik meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev has not yet confirmed our expectations. We are heartened, however, that the proposals put forward at that meeting still remain on the table. We call upon the two parties to concentrate their efforts and to reinvigorate the dialogue they have begun, in order to ensure that future dialogues will lead to more tangible results.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): Africa, as members know, is in mourning at this moment for the loss of a great son, a fighter for freedom, a man whose moderation typifies the spirit of Africa and its desire to resolve its problems quietly but surely. We want once again to express our condolences to our brothers from Mozambique and, through them, to that country's Government and peoples, for this irreparable loss.

In order to respect your wishes, Mr. Chairman, I shall only briefly say how pleased we are to see you in the Chair. We have no doubt whatsoever that our work will progress thanks to having you as Chairman to guide us.

Once again the nations of the world have gathered to consider perhaps the most urgent issues of our time, namely, the concern for arms limitation and disarmament. Regrettably, it is our impression that the debate on these critical issues has become rather perfunctory and routine, as if arms limitation and disarmament constitute just another item on the international agenda. Arms limitation and disarmament efforts have come to generate a momentum of their own through a diverse series of bilateral, regional and multilateral meetings, summits, deliberations and negotiations. Yet those efforts, those gatherings, are only instruments, not goals; means, not ends. The desired objective of our collective endeavours in this and other disarmament-related forums should be the patient and

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

concrete construction of a workable framework for enduring peace and security - security for all, not simply for some; stable conditions of security that will be beneficial for this as well as for future generations.

In a historical perspective four decades cannot be categorized, normally, as long. Yet it is in the past four decades, with the advent of nuclear weapons, that traditional notions of war and peace have undergone some radical changes. No one would seriously contemplate war and peace in contemporary times on the same terms as was visualized in the pre-Second World War period. If there were a global conflict of any magnitude today, it would indeed be global, all-embracing, unmanageable, uncontrollable and the consequences, totally cataclysmic for all mankind.

In the prevailing absence of serious and concrete results attended by real progress in the exchanges between the principal participants in the global nuclear-arms race, it is not only regrettable but, indeed, incomprehensible that the dark cloud of nuclear holocaust continues to hover over the survival of mankind. It cannot be acceptable to the vast majority of concerned mankind that a few nuclear-weapon States should unilaterally claim and, in fact, assume a permanent right to hold to ransom the basic security interests of other sovereign States.

We are of the considered opinion that the time has come for the international community to address the critical choices between a nuclear-weapon-free world and a world in which all nations freely aspire to possess them, like children enthralled by the prospect of owning firecrackers. If the argument that nuclear weapons are indispensable or essential for security is upheld, then we must be prepared to face a dreadful world in which every capable State should, without non-proliferation constraints, be free to make the same choice as the nuclear big guns under the same false sense of security.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We must ask ourselves seriously what kind of world we wish to leave for future generations, for our children and grandchildren. A world of only a few nuclear weapons, as some have argued, is safer than a world of nuclear weapons everywhere. That assessment may be condemned as subjective, but the more important aspect is that it is not tenable in today's nuclear age. It is universally recognized that, whatever the quantity or quality, all nuclear weapons are potentially dangerous. Experience over the past decade has established the fact that even the most advanced of technologists and other specialists cannot guarantee the complete safety of unused nuclear weapons, that they threaten man with various environmental dangers that are not within his complete control.

It is clear that the greatest peril facing the world today is the survival of mankind posed by the very existence of nuclear weapons. Everyone everywhere now understands that in one quick sweep nuclear warfare can annihilate the entire human race, including those who do as well as those who do not possess nuclear weapons. The current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Prime Minister Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, has articulately and convincingly pointed out that the threat of nuclear annihilation is not just another issue but the single most important problem before the international community. That ultimate folly of continuing the arms race ought to be crystal clear to all.

Besides the threat of total annihilation, the arms race also constitutes a grave threat to the economic security of the international community, especially of the developing countries. The escalating consumption by the military of the world's limited and dwindling resources is awe inspiring. In the nuclear age, the impossibility of drawing a dividing line between conventional conflicts and nuclear war should lead, in the first instance, to assessing the validity of military doctrines on the basis of their defensive character and of their proved capacity to prevent war. Moreover, since balanced and verifiable arms reductions are the only

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

effective way to ensure true stability and security, conventional disarmament should not continue to be relegated to the rank of secondary issues and its importance should be fully recognized. Conventional disarmament, particularly in a region like ours in Africa where there is unprecedented concentration of conventional armaments, must be adequately recognized in relation to nuclear disarmament.

This is the sombre background against which Cameroon approached the problem of disarmament. We see the arms race in its multifarious challenge to peace, and we support disarmament as a necessary investment in the pursuit of peace - peace meaning more than the absence of war. This involves a secure and stable international environment in which benefits may accrue to the international community as a whole, that is, benefits to all of mankind.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

In an increasingly interdependent world, peace is indivisible. It must be viewed in a general and all-embracing context covering the entire spectrum of the human condition across the globe. It would be dangerous not to recognize the truth that there can be no stable peace anywhere unless the conditions of peace exist everywhere.

I shall now turn to the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security and of disarmament. The Government of the Republic of Cameroon firmly believes that the United Nations continues to provide the most appropriate forum for the co-ordination and harmonization of the international community's efforts in pursuit of world peace and security. As an organization committed to universality in its membership, the United Nations provides the opportunity to build an international security policy that on the one hand recognizes the commonality of threat posed to mankind as a whole by the nuclear-arms race and at the same time takes fully into account the unique and special concerns and interests existing in specific countries and regions. We believe that such an approach provides for the evolution of a realistic and comprehensive policy, essential if peace and security are to be viable and durable.

Furthermore, the United Nations, within the framework of the noble and time-tested prescriptions of its Charter for a new world order of peaceful and co-operative international relations, attempts to provide a shield, especially for small developing countries, against negative fall-out from the conflictual pressures of bloc rivalry. It also actively seeks to reduce such rivalry and to form an international consensus based on collective security in the interest of all. That is why my Government attaches the utmost importance to an effective United Nations role in the field of disarmament. We place emphasis on the word "effective".

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Frequently, as justifiably reflected in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, the international community has overwhelmingly reaffirmed the global consensus that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. The reality - what happens in practice - is of course sadly different. While the United Nations has played a key role in giving the problem of disarmament the necessary prominence on the international agenda, the fact is that the world body has itself rarely been the primary or central forum for negotiations of major disarmament agreements. This is generally true, although it has been used to confer international legitimacy on agreements elaborated or concluded elsewhere - often in smaller, limited forums, even when the issues dealt with have been of universal concern.

By-passing the United Nations in practice while at the same time continuing to adopt declarations on the Organization's central role and primary responsibility in the field of disarmament tends at best further to undermine the Organization's credibility in the eyes of the public. At worst, it could create an undesirable, false sense of hope in countries that look to the United Nations as the primary organ for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We deem it fit to recognize early signs of change in the practices of the two super-Powers. The recent mini-summit in Reykjavik, Iceland explained to the world some of the areas touched upon by the United States leader, President Reagan, and the Soviet leader, General Secretary Gorbachev, in a critical effort at reducing tension between them in the arms race.

We welcome the follow-up presented by the representatives of both nations in this Committee in their speeches this week. We would request that both our colleagues, Mr. Belonogov and the Director of the United States Arms Control and

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Disarmament Agency, Mr. Kenneth Adelman, take back to their respective capitals the profound hope of this delegation that this practice heralds greater co-operation with and use of this universal body in the imperative global organization of disarmament.

We have in the past expressed the view that all efforts at disarmament should be seen within this Organization to complement one another. The international community as a whole should share not only the concerns of common threats to mankind but also the sense of failure and success that attend each effort to remove the menace.

As we review disarmament and arms control issues and initiatives covering the past few years, we cannot help but note with deep apprehension that progress has not always been satisfactory. This development, it can be argued, has accentuated perceptions of peace: security and disarmament continue to differ or to be interpreted in different ways by the major nuclear Powers. Worse still, the legitimate views, concerns and aspirations of small, militarily weak and economically undeveloped States tend to be drowned by the more loudly expressed preoccupations with the grandiose interests of a powerful few.

It is important to accept the basic premise that the continuous and consistent development, production and accumulation, and the potential for deployment, of deadly nuclear weapons have not in fact brought about the quality of peace we all claim to seek, notwithstanding the arguments of some regarding the deterrent effects of those weapons. On the contrary, it unfortunately confirms that we are armed not so much because we are insecure but rather, that we are today insecure because we are over-armed. The feeling of insecurity on the part of States is thus so pervasive that war and conflict are becoming a constant and characteristic feature of today's international relations.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Perhaps the most obvious manifestation of the international community's feelings on the vital issues of war and peace has come from world public opinion. My delegation notes that insufficient attention has been paid to increased public reaction to the dangers of nuclear war and the consequent need for disarmament. Nor has much serious thought been given to the public outcry over issues of relevance to the First Committee's work pertaining to the motivation, causation and dynamics of armaments, whether nuclear or conventional.

In a way, and for a long time now, we seem to have ignored the public's scepticism over security concepts that, far from preventing the arms race, enhance the imperial and rapacious military ambitions of some States. In short, the views and concerns of a frightened public over today's heightened insecurity have not always been congruent with the actual conduct of some Governments in the field of disarmament.

Admittedly, the primary responsibility for action in the field of disarmament rests with the nuclear-weapon Powers, which have themselves chosen to assume that obligation by their pursuit of the nuclear option. But because the nuclear threat concerns mankind as a whole, the international community must also be involved in disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

A whole panoply of excuses has been advanced as to why the United Nations has been largely sidelined, even ignored, in serious disarmament efforts. It has been said that the Organization is too large for the sort of in-depth discussions on complex technical issues that disarmament negotiations require. It has been said, too, that there is no political will for disarmament on the part of the major military Powers. It has been presumptuously suggested that the majority of United Nations Member States do not understand the technical details of the disarmament problem and that, therefore, to centralize consideration of the subject within the United Nations would mean to over-simplify an otherwise serious problem. As I have already said, those are all excuses.

Indeed, maybe it is time to simplify the problem over and over again: to say that more and more weapons mean less and less security, less and less development, more and more conflict, more and more poverty and more and more danger to the very survival of the human race. Maybe the time has come for disarmament to be taken away from the so-called experts, who earn their living from further complicating the problem with their too frequently unnecessarily esoteric theories, hypotheses and analyses, and handed back to the people, the world's public, for whom the problem in its simplest form is a choice between life and death. Never has so much intellectual and diplomatic effort been expended by so many, over so long a time, on one subject, with so few positive results. Instead, nuclear weapons have increased and become more destructive than ever; the conventional arms race threatens to engulf the whole world; and the threshold between life and death has narrowed ominously to the split-second action of pushing a button somewhere.

During the past 40 years, in a world of constant and dramatic change, a common conviction has nevertheless emerged that there is no place for the use of force in international relations. In particular, a global consensus has solidified around a

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

firm conviction against nuclear war. The United Nations, as the only universal political Organization, has been the major instrument for the development and realization of that fundamental international consensus, for only the United Nations is able to view the issues of war and peace in the global perspective that, especially in today's interdependent world, they deserve.

Cameroon has always favoured a realistic and pragmatic approach that recognizes the obstacles and opportunities and seeks to build on those opportunities as a matter of priority. We should not allow ourselves to become overwhelmed by the obstacles that may exist, or to be cowed into fatalistic indifference or passivity, because the quest for peace leaves little time for excuses or despair.

The United Nations certainly cannot achieve its disarmament objectives without the appropriate exercise of the political will of States. The United Nations is only an instrument, a tool created voluntarily by the international community, to deal with issues facing mankind as a whole. The extent to which this tool, this instrument, is used to good effect lies with Member States. As the Secretary-General has justifiably remarked, the full potential of the world body has not yet been fully exploited in the field of disarmament. That is the point of our initiative concerning a comprehensive review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament - to find ways and means of enabling this unique Organization to play a more effective role in this critically important field.

I turn to the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We regret that it was once again unable to conclude its work on this item at its session earlier this year. We hope that the Commission will, as a matter of the highest priority, proceed to the finalization of its work on the subject at its next substantive session in 1987 and submit to the forty-second session of the General Assembly a

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

report containing concrete, practical recommendations aimed at preventing the Organization from lapsing into permanent paralysis and irrelevance in this important field. In this connection I wish to reiterate our expressed conviction that the results of the work of the Disarmament Commission will surely have a bearing one way or another on the judgement of Member States and the international public regarding the role and credibility not only of the Commission, but also of the United Nations as a whole.

Some have claimed that there is nothing wrong with the machinery and that the only obstacle preventing the effective exercise of the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is the absence of political will. Others argue that some adjustments in the machinery might facilitate political progress. Whatever may be the case, it seems clear to my delegation that there should be no sacred cows in a comprehensive review. All relevant factors and elements should be taken into account. The United Nations is a man-made institution; man can change it or improve upon it, as appropriate. Certainly, change for the sake of change alone can sometimes be more destructive than helpful, and should be avoided. Similarly, failure to change in order not to upset habit or routine can lead to potentially crippling complacency and inflexibility.

A variety of circumstances have imposed upon the international community the prospect of a changed, restructured or reformed United Nations somewhat different from the one most of us have been used to. We may not all agree with the reasons or even with the motives behind the proposed changes in the Organization. But we must be realistic, we must be flexible, fixing our attention squarely on our objective - namely, an effective United Nations role in the promotion of peace and security, including disarmament.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

How can the world body make the most effective and efficient use of dwindling resources to deal constructively with such an increasingly complex problem? Maybe some old habits will have to change. For instance, might it not be better for the credibility of certain United Nations organs to abandon routine and ritualistic formal meetings, where fixed official positions are often repeated, in favour of more informal consultations? It seems to us that the time has come to replace the public image of the United Nations as an ineffective, paper-pushing, talking shop - in a sense, a toothless bulldog - by a new reputation for constructive action. Meetings for the sake of meetings or studies for the sake of studies can result in waste, disappointment and confusion. On the other hand, carefully selected and well-prepared United Nations activities, including meetings at which agreements are reached, the views of Governments are harmonized and the prospects for constructive action can be enhanced, can inspire international confidence in the United Nations, encourage positive movement in other fields and help improve the overall international climate.

In other words, we should aim at concentrating our efforts in those areas where prospects for agreement and progress appear encouraging and at avoiding situations that we know from the beginning do not as yet lend themselves to positive action. The pursuit of peace is too important, too urgent and too universal in scope to be constantly traumatized by failure or to become fractionalized for the limited political advantage of certain States or groups of States.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We believe that interest in disarmament should be a matter of course, not of choice. We see disarmament as an essential component in the quest for peace, prosperity and human survival and, together with self-defence, as vital for the maintenance of our national security, sovereignty and independence. A rational and realistic approach to security cannot ignore the fundamental value of disarmament. Similarly, disarmament cannot ignore the requirements of national security. My Government has limited resources and no inclination or desire to waste them on the arms race. But it has a responsibility and a duty to protect its people, its territorial integrity, and its independence. Those are some of the grim realities of the imperfect world in which we live. Those are some of the reasons why it is fruitless to attempt to seek security or disarmament in isolation one from the other or at the expense of either. The search for both, on the other hand, is imperative, in our view.

Cameroon continues to believe that the United Nations provides the most appropriate forum for the harmonization and co-ordination of our collective endeavours in this field. We therefore once again call upon the General Assembly to take the necessary measures to enable the world body to discharge more effectively its central role and primary responsibility in this sphere, taking into account, inter alia, the consensus resolutions of the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth and fortieth sessions - resolutions 39/151 G and 40/92 O, respectively - the views of Member States and the work already accomplished by the Disarmament Commission on the item "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament", as reflected in the Commission's reports to the fortieth and forty-first sessions of the General Assembly. We think it is time for the Assembly of sovereign States to take a bold and urgent decision to breathe new life into the United Nations multilateral disarmament effort and arouse it from its debilitating slumber.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

I turn next to the Conference on Disarmament. We wish to submit, with all due respect, that the results on the items before the Conference on Disarmament fall far short of our expectations. It is our sincere hope that the Conference will make substantive progress in 1987 and we believe that the super-Powers' progress in such specific areas as a chemical-weapon ban, conventional disarmament, the militarization of outer space, security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States and a comprehensive nuclear-test ban could prove indispensable for progress in multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament.

The lack of a complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons constitutes another serious menace to peace. The urgent need to destroy permanently those weapons has been recognized in numerous General Assembly resolutions, including the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament.

My Government attaches great importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and looks forward to the opportunity of continuing to follow up and actively contribute its modest efforts to the endeavour. In this regard, we shall support any concrete action in the Conference on the question of additional membership pursuant to the recommendations contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

With regard to regional efforts, for us in Africa there are certain fundamental principles, certain basic elements, that any serious comprehensive disarmament strategy must include to be credible or viable. Africa stands for peace; indeed, Africa urgently needs peace. The Organization of African Unity (OAU), in its quest for peace and progress in our region, has always taken an unwavering stand in favour of general and complete disarmament that would promote peace and security for all and enhance prospects and opportunities for development

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

and constructive co-operative relations among States. Yet - and painfully so too - our region faces the grim challenge of trying to maintain peace and security without further weakening our already fragile economies through the increasing diversion of our limited resources to defence requirements to meet the threats that confront us - principally the multiple threats of armed repression, sabotage, nuclear blackmail and aggression - indeed the State terrorism mounted against Africa and its people by the minority racist apartheid régime. Despite the socio-economic sacrifices that may be required, we are not prepared to capitulate or weaken our commitment to the total elimination of apartheid and colonialism from Africa. For us, those are among the fundamental ingredients that must be part of any effort to realize a comprehensive international security system.

It is not surprising that much of the hope for peace and arms restraint in recent times has come from regional initiatives. From Africa to Central America to the subregion of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and to Europe, the countries of the regions concerned have been making fervent and encouraging efforts to enhance mutual confidence and trust with their neighbours in order to promote prospects for arms restraint, peace and co-operation in the respective areas. We commend the recent achievements within the framework of the Stockholm Conference on Security and Confidence Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, which we hope will also inspire similar efforts in other regions.

While the problems of peace, security and disarmament are of interest to all countries, we feel that in certain cases those problems can be dealt with more easily within an appropriate regional or subregional context that takes into account the specific conditions existing in the region or subregion concerned. Countries located in the same region and often sharing common historical and

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

fraternal bonds are better placed to identify their concerns and interests and to formulate a plan or strategy for promoting peace and security in their area. Outside parties can assist by refraining from interfering or taking measures that might otherwise negatively affect prospects and opportunities for agreement among the regional countries involved.

The key purpose of regional efforts is to build mutual confidence among regional States. Such confidence is essential for predictability in the relations between States. It is for this reason that my delegation supports appropriate verification measures to ensure compliance with multilateral disarmament agreements. Such measures - which should not be seen as disarmament measures in themselves - can contribute to building confidence among States parties to such agreements by ensuring that the parties are complying with their respective obligations. The absence of such confidence can introduce unnecessarily harmful bickering, and charges and counter-charges of alleged violations as we find elsewhere. Durable processes of peaceful and co-operative inter-State relations would be difficult to realize in such a climate of suspicion and uncertainty.

We are therefore disturbed that the Disarmament Commission, which has been seized of the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, has thus far abdicated its supreme responsibility by refusing to adopt unanimously specific and practical recommendations. We have nevertheless taken note of the understanding shown by some nuclear-weapon States and the widespread willingness of many members to break the current impasse on negotiations in the Disarmament Commission. We hope that at its next session the deliberations of the Group on the Nuclear Capability of South Africa will lead to the adoption by the Commission of concrete recommendations that will permanently eliminate the security threat which South Africa's nuclear potential poses to African States and the world as a whole.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Peace in southern Africa is directly linked to another of the highest priority aspirations of the African continent, namely, development. Just as peace cannot endure without justice and freedom, so peace cannot endure without development. Conversely, it would be difficult, if at all possible, to achieve genuine development in the absence of conditions of peace. The relationship between disarmament and development is clearly evident in our region, where South Africa's sabotage and aggression against neighbouring African States encourage African States to undertake an understandable diversion of their limited resources to ensure their self-defence.

Earlier this year my Government, in co-operation with the International Relations Institute of Cameroon (IRIC), convened a national seminar on the relationship between disarmament and development. The interest of the participants was matched only by their profound sense of justifiable outrage at the vast disparity between the global spending for destruction and spending for constructive development-related activities. It was for this reason that we welcomed the General Assembly's decision to convene the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was to have been held this year. Cameroon participated actively in the preparatory process. We deeply regret the postponement of that important Conference and look forward to its being convened in 1987.

As this Committee is also aware, the General Assembly has on several occasions expressed its serious concern at the continuous testing of nuclear weapons by a number of nuclear-weapon States. The Assembly has also called for the immediate cessation of such tests. This sentiment was recently echoed by the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Harare.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

Our nation noted with keen interest the decision of the Soviet Union to declare a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. In welcoming this decision by one of the major nuclear Powers, it is our hope that it will open at least a little door to increased negotiations among all nuclear Powers, including potential members of the nuclear club, with a view to ensuring not only a universal moratorium but the total elimination of those deadly weapons.

Like other States around the world, Cameroon has followed with concentrated attention developments in super-Power relations, especially in recent weeks. Clearly the policies and actions of those Powers have an enormous, and in some cases critical, bearing on prospects or possibilities for enduring peace throughout the globe. This is the current international geopolitical reality.

Consequently we welcomed the summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Reykjavik, Iceland. We are persuaded that, having regard to the limited goal set by both sides before that summit, the sheer willingness of the two leaders to discuss ways and means of reducing the threat of nuclear weapons on Earth and in outer space is in itself welcome and that continuing efforts must be encouraged universally.

Our hopes must not be vitiated by fatalistic indifference or despair. We must continue to implore the nuclear-weapon Powers, in particular the super-Powers, to save the human race from the threatening scourge of extinction. In particular, we hope that the leaders of the two super-Powers will continue to intensify their dialogue and that future encounters will not simply provide a catalogue of lost opportunities but rather present occasions for constructive undertakings towards concrete and effective measures of disarmament. The super-Powers have the responsibility and the duty to take that first step. They can and must demonstrate restraint and resolve and, above all, provide responsible leadership, especially in the field of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

We should like to end on a note of hope. Disarmament, once within the exclusive domain of big-Power politics, has now begun a determined march into the consciousness of the peoples of all nations, large and small. Some may describe the current international disarmament picture as one of gloom, but they cannot deny the fact that there now exists for all mankind a community of interest in fighting the odds against survival in the field.

Security is a sensitive issue attended by subjectivity. Peace, another component of stability and progress, tends to be illusory. Yet the pursuit of both, in the interests of survival and of development, must continue and be intensified. It is in the face of the grave odds associated with survival that the finest in man seems to fire his creative imagination.

Let us forge ahead. Let us not despair. Let us not tarry. For the exercise of all the rights we claim to freedom and sovereignty depends on our success in organizing international peace and security for all.

Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Moroccan delegation, I wish first to address to you and to the other officers of the Committee our very sincere congratulations. We are convinced that your wealth of experience and your human qualities and skill augur well for the smooth conduct and success of the work of our Committee.

We should also like to convey to Ambassador Alatas our thanks for the excellent and skilful way in which he guided the work of this Committee at the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

My delegation shares the disappointment voiced by a number of delegations regarding the outcome of the meeting at Reykjavik between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. Many hopes were placed in that meeting and it was viewed as the inception of a new phase in East-West relations. Nevertheless, it is heartening to know that both parties are prepared to continue the dialogue and

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

that the progress achieved thus far remains on the negotiating table. It is our sincere hope that future negotiations will be able to yield concrete, positive results commensurate with the expectations of mankind as a whole, which has always hoped for the advent of a world free from the nuclear nightmare.

Now that the International Year of Peace is drawing to a close we can only express our serious, profound concern at the persistence of many conflicts and tensions that threaten international peace and security. Furthermore the international economic situation continues to suffer from a structural crisis that threatens multilateral co-operation.

The glimmer of hope that appeared just before the meeting in Reykjavik was swiftly quenched by the absence of concrete measures that might have reduced the nuclear threat of the annihilation of all mankind. Despite this, the attention of the international community remaining focused on the two super-Powers, which bear the main responsibility regarding nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, those two Powers stated in January 1985 that they had agreed to undertake negotiations on a set of questions relating to space and nuclear weapons for the purpose of the preparation of effective agreements designed to prevent an arms race in outer space and put an end to the arms race that continues on Earth. The Reykjavik meeting surely proves that when the political will is there all obstacles can be overcome and progress can be achieved in the field of disarmament. For we were very close to a historic agreement on this subject in Reykjavik. We should encourage the pursuit of such bilateral meetings, which cannot but help to bring about détente and create the climate of confidence necessary for any progress in disarmament.

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

Bilateral negotiations must not detract from the importance and urgency of multilateral negotiations on disarmament. Indeed, these should complement each other. Furthermore, mankind as a whole is now concerned by the nuclear-arms race, which threatens it with annihilation, for if a nuclear war were to break out no State, nuclear or non-nuclear, would be spared. The persistence of the arms race increases the risk of nuclear war and thus threatens the security of all States, therefore they should contribute to progress in nuclear disarmament. The Moroccan delegation, for its part, will spare no effort to contribute to achievement of the objective agreed upon by the international community, namely, to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in all its aspects, and completely eliminate nuclear weapons. As the General Assembly rightly emphasized in the Final Declaration of the tenth special session - the first special session devoted to disarmament - the nuclear-arms race only serves to weaken international security and increase the threat of nuclear war. Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons are in themselves already sufficient to destroy all life on Earth.

The Moroccan delegation regrets the absence of any progress in the Conference on Disarmament with regard to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race, notwithstanding the universally expressed interest in that question. It is to be hoped that at the next session the members of the Conference on Disarmament will demonstrate greater flexibility and political willingness to enter into substantive negotiations on the matter.

Outer space must not become the arena for a new arms race. As the common heritage of mankind, it must be preserved for peaceful uses to serve economic and social development. In this connection, we welcome the re-establishment in the Conference on Disarmament of the Ad Hoc Committee to consider this matter. We hope that the Ad Hoc Committee will reach agreements that will make it possible to

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

prevent the militarization of outer space. Pending such agreements, the space Powers should refrain from any activity at variance with the peaceful use of outer space and abide by existing international instruments in this field. Space activities can contribute to uniting or to dividing men, depending upon their orientation.

Resolution 40/80 A, which was adopted by the General Assembly at its fortieth session, recalled in its first preambular paragraph that

"the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, which has been examined for more than 25 years and on which the Assembly has adopted nearly 50 resolutions, is a basic objective of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, to the attainment of which it has repeatedly assigned the highest priority".

The resolution went on to appeal to the States members of the Conference on Disarmament to promote the establishment by the Conference of an ad hoc committee to carry out multilateral negotiations on a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. Unfortunately, once again the Conference on Disarmament was not successful in achieving a consensus that would make it possible to take up substantive consideration of the question of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The Moroccan delegation continues to believe that the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests should be considered seriously and as a matter of urgency by the Conference on Disarmament in accordance with the desires so often expressed by the international community through the General Assembly.

It is our very sincere hope that at the beginning of its 1987 session the Conference on Disarmament will be able to establish an ad hoc committee to carry out negotiations on a treaty banning all nuclear tests. We believe that existing

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

means of verification are adequate to ensure respect for such a nuclear-test ban. In this connection we must set aside any pretexts that could be used to justify the further refinement of nuclear weapons and the development of new weapons systems.

While the economic situation is still characterized by the critical foreign debt situation of the developing countries, falling commodity prices, high rates of interest, instability of exchange rates, increasing protectionism, a reduction in official development assistance and low growth-rates in the developing countries, military expenditure continues to siphon off vast financial, material and human resources. This situation is the more disturbing in that it is now clear that the economic and social progress of the developing countries is essential to the maintenance of international peace and security. Hence, the international community should increase its aid for development. As stated by the Group of Experts entrusted with studying the relationship between disarmament and development:

"Socio-economic tensions created by underdevelopment, lack of development and development errors are tantamount to non-military threats to international peace and security."

That eloquent conclusion confirms the fact that the maintenance of international peace and security requires, as well as general and complete disarmament, increased development assistance. Aware of the importance of the interaction of these two matters, the General Assembly decided to convene an International Conference

"To undertake an examination of the implications of the level and magnitude of the continuing military expenditures, in particular those of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily important States, for the world economy and international economic and social situation, particularly for the developing countries, and to make recommendations for remedial measures.

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

"To consider ways and means of releasing additional resources, through disarmament measures, for development purposes, in particular in favour of developing countries". (resolution 39/160, para. 2 (b), (c))

To that end, a Preparatory Committee was set up, which held three sessions in 1985 and 1986. However, the International Conference, which was to have been held at Paris in July 1986, did not, unfortunately, take place.

The Moroccan delegation, which believes that if that vital Conference is to be successful extremely careful preparation is necessary, would like to express its support for the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee in paragraphs 31, 32 and 33 of its report (A/41/51).

The Moroccan delegation attaches great importance to the adoption of a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. We welcome the progress achieved on this subject in the Conference on Disarmament. A great deal undoubtedly remains to be done, but the progress already achieved is encouraging and we are convinced that, given the spirit of compromise and flexibility that has made this possible, the Conference can overcome the difficulties that may arise in its further consideration of the question.

The Moroccan delegation believes that a total ban on nuclear-weapon tests under effective international control, together with respect for the nuclear non-proliferation régime and encouragement of the creation of denuclearized zones, as well as the establishment of international safeguards for the non-nuclear countries, are effective disarmament measures that would help to create an atmosphere conducive to general and complete nuclear disarmament. The creation of nuclear-free zones would strengthen the security of States in such areas and contribute to reducing the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

connection, we are seriously concerned by the obstacles to the establishment of such zones in Africa and the Middle East created by the nuclear capabilities of Israel and South Africa.

The fact that South Africa and Israel are intent on acquiring nuclear capabilities not only impedes the establishment of denuclearized zones in those regions but also constitutes a threat to the security of States situated therein. The international community should therefore take appropriate steps to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons in those regions by, among other things, compelling South Africa and Israel to submit their nuclear activities to the international control provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and ceasing any co-operation with those two Powers in this field.

The implementation of the non-proliferation régime should in no way restrict the right of every State to develop its nuclear programme for peaceful purposes. Indeed, the Final Declaration of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament made that quite clear when it stated:

"Non-proliferation measures should not jeopardize the full exercise of the inalienable rights of all States to apply and develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development in conformity with their priorities, interests and needs. All States should also have access to and be free to acquire technology, equipment and materials for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. ... Internatinal co-operation in this field should be under agreed and appropriate internatinal safeguards applied through the International Atomic Energy Agency." (S-10/2, para. 68).

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

To be sure, international co-operation in this area should be subject to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

I wish in conclusion to speak of the financial crisis afflicting the United Nations. The crisis should prompt us to rationalize our work without, however, reducing the Organization's role in the field of disarmament and international security. After all, the primary purpose of the Organization is the maintenance of international peace and security, a purpose that can be achieved only through general and complete disarmament and through the effective implementation of the system of collective security set out in the Charter. Disarmament is an indispensable means of establishing international peace and security, and the international community has rightly given it top priority. The United Nations has always dealt with it in that way and should continue to do so until all the threats posed to international peace and security are eliminated. All of us should help in the achievement of that noble purpose, thus contributing towards saving future generations from the scourge of war.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of the United States of America has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind members that, with respect to statements in right of reply, the Committee will follow the procedures to which I alluded on an earlier occasion.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): My delegation listened with great care to the remarks of the Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics earlier today. I must say that I was pleased to hear that, for the Soviet Union, verification presents no obstacle to reaching agreement with my country, when there is a genuine willingness to come to agreement. The United States will look forward to a translation of that statement into action in the

(Mr. Lowitz, United States)

chemical-weapon negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, in particular on the question of challenge inspection.

However, I must say also that my Government finds without merit the charge that it is the United States that is undermining bilateral strategic arms limitation agreements. We reject such a charge. The United States remains in full compliance with its international obligation. In reality, with regard to the anti-ballistic missile Treaty, the United States has on many occasions called attention to the violation of that Treaty represented by the large radar facility at Krasnoyarsk in the Soviet Union. It still awaits action by the Soviet Union to rectify the situation. Likewise, it was not the United States that engaged in action such as the encryption of telemetry from missile tests, contrary to the provisions of the second strategic arms limitation agreement (SALT II), an agreement that, had it entered into force, by its own terms would now have expired.

The United States policy of interim restraint with regard to strategic offensive forces is one designed to elicit similar restraint on the part of the Soviet Union pending conclusion of an effective agreement on the reduction of these armaments. It is not helpful when so-called violations are fabricated in order to shift attention from the real problems of non-compliance with existing undertakings in the field of arms control and disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform the Committee that the following delegations are scheduled to speak at tomorrow morning's meeting: Sudan, Democratic Yemen, Finland, Chile, Bahamas and Uganda, and the Observer of the League of Arab States.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.