

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**FORTY-SECOND SESSION**

**Official Records\***



**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
**6th meeting**  
**held on**  
**Thursday, 15 October 1987**  
**at 10 a.m.**  
**New York**

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 6th MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)**

**CONTENTS**

**GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)**

**Statements were made by:**

**Mr. Yamada (Japan)**  
**Ms. Gjestebj (Norway)**  
**Mr. Fan Guoxiang (China)**  
**Mr. Fonder (Belgium)**  
**Mr. Kouassi (Togo)**

\*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 DC 2.250, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): May I first of all extend to you, Sir, my delegation's heartfelt felicitations on your assumption of the chairmanship of this body. With the wide experience you have acquired in the field of disarmament in Geneva as well as here in New York and with your outstanding diplomatic skill, you will, I am convinced, guide us through fruitful and successful deliberations on the important issues of disarmament in this Committee.

My congratulations and best wishes go also to the officers of the Committee, Ambassador Carlos Jose Gutierrez, Minister Nashashibi and Mr. Tomaszewski.

Today the United States-Soviet relationship, in particular the progress in the nuclear and space talks, is an important factor affecting world peace and disarmament.

The meeting between the United States Secretary of State and the Soviet Foreign Minister last September when an agreement was reached in principle to conclude an intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) treaty on the global elimination of this entire class of weapons marked an important step towards a United States-Soviet summit later this autumn. Japan welcomes this as a move that is truly conducive to world peace and stability. We especially appreciate the realization of the global elimination of I F which we have been urging from the outset of the negotiations.

When the INF treaty is finalized and put into effect, the actual process of eliminating United States and Soviet nuclear weapons will begin. Although intermediate-range nuclear forces represent only a small portion of United States and Soviet nuclear arsenals, we are at a historic turning-point: since the emergence of nuclear weapons some 40 years ago, the process of a negotiated reduction of those weapons will be launched for the first time.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

As my Prime Minister, Mr. Nakasone, stated in his address to the General Assembly at its forty-second session, it is precisely because:

"... the earnest desire of people everywhere to escape swiftly from the persistent threat of nuclear weapons transcends all ideologies"

(A/42/PV.4, p. 61)

that mankind is about to take this major step forward.

We earnestly hope that the negotiations in Geneva will be completed smoothly so that the INF treaty with effective verification provisions may be concluded and thus inaugurate the actual process of elimination of nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

It is fitting that we are meeting here in the First Committee of the General Assembly at the very moment when the United States of America and the Soviet Union, with the impetus of another bilateral summit meeting, are moving forward in the historic process of disarmament. On this auspicious occasion, we should ensure that the global elimination of INF provides us with the momentum to tackle the important tasks that remain, that is, deep reductions in strategic nuclear weapons, the total prohibition of chemical weapons, redressing of conventional imbalances, and so forth. Let us appeal to the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, who bear special responsibilities for world peace and security, to strive even further towards these goals. Let us, on our own part, continue with renewed vigour and determination to promote these disarmament efforts.

The elimination of INF is but a first step in the long and arduous disarmament process. In going forward, it is important that the security of each State, as well as strategic stability, not be jeopardized but rather enhanced. Bearing this point firmly in mind, should we not seize any opportunity to accelerate the disarmament process, even if it is a long shot? The realities of the world simply do not permit us to hold out for a miracle or a panacea. Instead, accumulated

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

wisdom has taught us that it is only through persistent hard work based on a balanced consideration of various factors affecting security that we can bring about tangible, workable and verifiable results in each area of disarmament. It is thus essential to keep on building steadily on concrete results with an unflagging political will for the realization of disarmament. Japan, for its part, pledges even greater efforts than before to translate the present favourable conditions into tangible results.

The agreement in principle to conclude an INF treaty would not have been possible without the mutual confidence between the United States and the Soviet Union fostered so assiduously by the leaders, the Foreign Ministers, the negotiators, and others concerned, through innumerable intensive contacts at all levels. There is a valuable lesson to be learned here. It can readily be imagined that the United States-Soviet dialogue in its entirety, not just in disarmament but in other fields, is facilitating the agreement on INF. Solutions to regional human rights and other issues are essential for the stabilization of bilateral and international relations; solving these issues will also enhance mutual trust among nations and thus facilitate the solution of problems relating to disarmament. To this end, it is necessary to consider seriously what we should do, not in abstract or general terms but in terms of practical steps, in order to lessen, and indeed eliminate, the mutual distrust among nations which lies at the root of the regional tensions and the arms race. In Asia, where regional conflicts, territorial problems and other sources of tension abound, we believe that we need first to work steadily to resolve those outstanding problems one by one, building mutual trust in the process.

I have so far described how the recent positive developments in United States-Soviet relations are opening up brighter prospects for our common task, namely, the promotion of disarmament. At the same time, we should not resign

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

ourselves to thinking that the disarmament process is determined solely by the actions of the two super-Powers. We should, instead, think seriously about the interrelationship between bilateral and multilateral negotiations, and explore how we can best advance the disarmament process through multilateral deliberations and negotiations in the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament, and other forums.

There is no question that an essential ingredient of a viable agreement on disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, is a concurrence of the United States and the Soviet Union, which possess the world's most powerful arsenals. It is also clear, though, that disarmament can truly contribute to global peace and security only when all nuclear-weapon States, not just the two super-Powers, and other States also strive through multilateral efforts to ensure their security at reduced levels of armaments. In short, global disarmament can be achieved only when the best possible use is made of the organic interaction between bilateral and multilateral negotiations. Now is the time to work towards concrete results on disarmament in a concrete fashion and on diverse, but interrelated fronts: United States-Soviet bilateral talks, multilateral negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament, deliberations in United Nations forums, and regional negotiations, such as the Conference on Disarmament in Europe.

In this context, I should like to draw the attention of representatives to the potential of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. States representing every region of the world, as well as various economic and social systems gather there to work seriously for disarmament. The Conference benefits from the many interesting ideas put forward by various States, as well as accumulated expertise and experience in the field of disarmament. Furthermore, particularly of late, the views and concerns of individual States on major developments related to global security and

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

disarmament, including United States-Soviet bilateral negotiations, have been clearly reflected in the Conference. I believe that if we skilfully call upon the valuable resources of the Conference, and with wisdom and determination maximize the favourable momentum created by the United States-Soviet bilateral negotiations, the potential for achieving concrete multilateral agreements is great. It is important, however, not to dwell on abstraction and generalities, but to focus our ingenuity and efforts to bringing about tangible and feasible results, however few in number they may be.

From this point of view, I should like to touch upon some major disarmament subjects under consideration in multilateral forums.

Japan considers the early realization of a comprehensive nuclear test ban as a step of high priority in the promotion of nuclear disarmament, and has been working consistently towards this goal.

We warmly welcome the United States-Soviet agreement reached at the meeting of foreign ministers in September to begin full-scale, stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing, and earnestly hope that the negotiations will be fruitful.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

At the same time, we strongly hope that at this session the General Assembly will in turn sustain the momentum generated at the beginning of the United States-Soviet negotiations, by indicating its consensus support of the realistic step-by-step approach envisaged by the United States and the Soviet Union: that is, to agree first upon effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the United States-Soviet Threshold Test-Ban Treaty of 1974 and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosion Treaty of 1976, and then to proceed to negotiating further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing, leading to the ultimate goal of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

In 1984 Japan proposed at the Conference on Disarmament a similar step-by-step approach on a complete test ban. Our proposal is to ban test explosions over a certain threshold, at a yield now considered to be technically verifiable, and then to lower the threshold as we improve the verification capability, thus leading ultimately to a comprehensive test ban. This proposal has gained the support of a number of countries concerned as one of the soundest and most technically feasible approaches, and I hope that, in the wake of the United States-Soviet agreement on nuclear testing negotiations, it will be seriously studied at the Conference on Disarmament, along with proposals submitted by a number of other countries.

When a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty finally becomes a reality, a verification mechanism with an international seismic monitoring network will be indispensable in order to ensure compliance. With this in mind, and as a follow-up to the step-by-step proposal, last December Japan undertook an experimental project on the exchange of level II wave form data with interested countries, and submitted a report on the results of the project to the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and to Identify Seismic Events this year.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

We should recall at this time that the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts has an indispensable role to play in providing the basis for our consideration of the verification question. It is now incumbent upon the Conference on Disarmament to give an appropriate orientation to the work of the Ad Hoc Group. From this perspective also, it is of urgent importance for the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee on a nuclear test ban and to initiate substantive work on the many problems relating to a comprehensive test ban at the earliest possible date. In the light of the new situation where United States-Soviet bilateral negotiations on the subject are starting, my delegation would like to appeal to all those concerned to work flexibly towards the early initiation of substantive work on a complete test ban, without clinging to officially pronounced positions, and thus to establish an ad hoc committee on this agenda item in next year's session of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the present session of the General Assembly, we should concentrate our efforts on the adoption of a resolution based on a broad consensus, which would foster the progress on substantive work towards a comprehensive nuclear test ban at the coming session of the Conference on Disarmament.

While nuclear disarmament is undoubtedly the most urgent and crucial issue before us, we should not forget that progress in other areas of disarmament is also of vital importance. I should like now to turn to the prohibition of chemical weapons, which is a matter of high priority in the field of non-nuclear disarmament.

Chemical weapons, which are weapons of mass destruction, exist in many varieties, and can be developed and produced in necessary quantities and secretly, with relative ease and at low cost, by any country that has reached a certain industrial and technological level. This being the case, and as is clear from the history of negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament, the two major tasks in the drafting of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons are, first, how



(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

to ensure, with effective verification, the complete elimination of chemical weapons stocks and, secondly, how to prohibit their future production, that is, non-production.

The negotiations are highly complex and involve detailed technicalities. Thanks to their tireless, persistent and positive efforts, participating States have in recent years narrowed down the differences among them. We can thus note with pride that substantial progress has been made in the actual work of drafting.

As we approach the final stage of the negotiations, Japan believes it is important that we should not fail to see the forest for the trees. We should remind ourselves that the two main objectives, that is, "elimination of existing chemical weapons stocks" and "non-production", be ensured in a balanced manner by the convention régime.

With regard to "non-production", Japan will continue to work positively with a view to establishing a verification régime that would be truly effective without unnecessarily impeding the chemical industry's legitimate activities for peaceful purposes.

In the light of the aforementioned characteristics of chemical weapons, it is important for confidence-building and for the drafting of the treaty, that full information be provided concerning the stocks, production facilities and non-production of such weapons. Useful steps have been taken in this direction: for example, the workshops held at facilities in the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as the recent visit of the delegations of the Conference on Disarmament to chemical weapons facilities in Shikhan, in the USSR. But more needs to be done, and I hope that progress will continue to be made in this regard.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

I should like to add that Japan, as a country which does not possess chemical weapons, will continue to co-operate positively by providing information that will facilitate the treaty negotiations.

I would now like to touch upon the question of preventing an arms race in outer space.

In view of the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union play a predominant role in current space activities, the progress of their bilateral negotiations will have a critical bearing on our discussions in the Conference on Disarmament. Japan therefore urges both the United States and the Soviet Union to make yet further efforts for early progress in their negotiations. At the same time, outer space is open to all and is not the possession of any country. An arms race in outer space would directly affect the security not only of the two Powers but of all other countries in the world as well. We cannot afford to be indifferent to this important issue. In view also of the rapid progress in space development activities recently made by countries other than the United States and the Soviet Union, we should not wait but should proceed with our work in the Conference on Disarmament and examine fully what kind of multilateral agreements would be useful.

Specifically, we should intensify our efforts to gain an accurate picture of exactly how outer space is being used in many areas. Only then can we objectively assess the dangers to international peace and security that may be posed by the various activities in outer space and consider measures that will be mutually acceptable, effective and realizable on a multilateral basis.

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

The question of verification needs to be considered from a broad variety of angles. It would not be realistic to take a sweeping, generalized approach in the name of non-militarization or prevention of militarization of outer space without delving into these related issues. To do so would not ensure our security.

My delegation believes that this session of the General Assembly is an occasion of crucial importance in ensuring the success of the third special session devoted to disarmament scheduled for 1988. Towards this end, the momentum of the progress in intermediate nuclear forces and other bilateral United States-Soviet negotiations should stimulate our renewed efforts in a number of disarmament fields. Also, because preparations for the special session should proceed steadily and expeditiously in order to achieve tangible results, Japan believes it is important that we should set a precise date for the third special session at this General Assembly. In concluding, I pledge that Japan, for its part, will co-operate to ensure the success of the third special session.

Ms. GJESTEBY (Norway): Allow me first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. My congratulations also go to the other officers of the Committee.

The First Committee is meeting this year at an auspicious moment in international relations. The two major military Powers of the world are at present engaged in a constructive dialogue on a number of issues, in particular in the area of disarmament. This development has a positive effect on East-West relations in general and contributes significantly to the efforts to limit and reduce military armaments.

An agreement on the elimination of a substantial number of intermediate-range nuclear missiles now appears to be within reach. Such an agreement would also be an important step towards the reduction of other categories of nuclear arms. These efforts enjoy the full support of my Government.

(Ms. Gjestebj, Norway)

There are encouraging indications that, as a next step, progress can be made reducing strategic missiles and preventing the deployment of weapons in outer space. It is the view of my Government that the anti-ballistic missile Treaty should be maintained as a building block for more ambitious arms control agreements on the basis of a restrictive interpretation.

However important the nuclear arms issues are, it must also be taken into account that developments in this field make it more important to strengthen conventional stability at lower levels of military forces. In these efforts all States, and not only the main military Powers, can make important contributions. The States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have, in informal East-West contacts in Vienna, submitted elements for a mandate for new arms control talks in the field of conventional military forces. My Government is hopeful that constructive progress will be made in these contacts and that agreement on a mandate will soon be reached.

Although a number of obstacles remain, there is real hope that decisive action might now be taken to do away with some of the serious problems that have haunted us for decades. Whereas the present process should be viewed primarily in an East-West perspective, the results will be of the utmost importance to all nations of the world. The process now under way therefore poses both new opportunities and challenges to the multilateral disarmament forums.

Progress in the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union should create a momentum that could be exploited at the multilateral level. At the same time, the multilateral disarmament forums can supplement the bilateral negotiations in a concrete and constructive manner.

One area in which the multilateral disarmament efforts are showing promising signs, is that of the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention in the

(Ms. Gjestebj, Norway)

Conference on Disarmament. Here important progress was registered during the 1987 session.

Although major problems have been tackled and a treaty seems to be within reach, sensitive political and difficult technical problems still remain to be solved. We must keep in mind that the negotiations on a global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons are a complex undertaking, which requires elaboration of detailed verification and implementation procedures. In fact, such a global convention will contain more comprehensive verification measures than in any existing arms control and disarmament treaty.

On the basis of a major research programme, my country has submitted to the Conference on Disarmament several working papers concerning the verification of a global chemical-weapons ban. This year Canada and Norway presented a joint proposal concerning procedures for verification of alleged use of chemical weapons. I do hope that the Canadian-Norwegian proposal, the first of its kind, will prove a useful basis for further negotiations on the verification question. The repeated use of these weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, a use strongly condemned by my country, underscores the need to include such verification procedures in the convention.

The question of the declaration of chemical-weapon stocks and production facilities remains one of the main problems to be solved. So far, only two countries - the United States of America and the Soviet Union - have confirmed that they possess chemical weapons, but only the United States has given detailed information about existing stocks. Recently, representatives from 45 countries were invited to the Soviet chemical weapons facility in Shikhan. We welcome this visit as a step towards greater transparency in an area of vital concern in the ongoing negotiations.

Another question that will need to be addressed as a matter of priority, is

(Ms. Gjestebj, Norway)

that of the establishment of régimes for comprehensive routine and challenge on-site inspection. Such compulsory inspections would represent the ultimate source of confidence in the convention.

The most important challenge before us, is to sustain the momentum in these negotiations. This Committee has an important rôle to play by demonstrating the support of the world community for the negotiations. Time has come for the General Assembly to send a powerful signal to the Conference on Disarmament to speed up the process towards a convention, banning these weapons once and for all.

The question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban is one of the most important items on the international disarmament agenda. An agreement to halt nuclear testing would represent a major contribution to the nuclear disarmament efforts. Such an agreement would constitute a considerable obstacle in the way of any further vertical and horizontal spread of nuclear arms and would signal a commitment eventually to do away with these weapons.

Therefore, the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to begin full-scale, stage-by-stage, nuclear-testing negotiations before 1 December 1987 is a highly welcome development. It is our hope that, after their initial phases, these negotiations will lead as early as possible to the complete cessation of all nuclear testing.

A comprehensive test ban is, however, a question that concerns not only the United States and the Soviet Union, but the whole international community. Such a ban should prohibit both nuclear-weapon tests and peaceful nuclear explosions by all States in all environments for all time. This underlines the necessity of establishing, in the Conference on Disarmament, a committee on a nuclear-test ban, which would enable the Conference to undertake substantive work on relevant questions, such as scope, compliance and verification of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Ms. Gjestebj, Norway)

A global seismological network should represent the corner-stone of the verification measures of such a treaty. Norway is happy to be in a position to be able to contribute to the development of enhanced seismological verification methods through the seismic arrays of NORSAR and NORESS. We will continue our research in areas relevant to seismic detection with a view to taking a full part in the verification of compliance with a future comprehensive test ban.

It must be a matter of the highest priority for this Committee to underline the commitment of the world community to the concept of a nuclear-test ban. We do hope that the draft resolutions put before the Committee this year will establish a basis on which all countries can agree to start practical work in the Conference on Disarmament on this important question.

Outer space, as the common heritage of mankind, should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Accordingly, the efforts to prevent such an arms race must be pursued in both bilateral and multilateral forums. The multilateral work should supplement the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on space arms. In fact, both this Committee and the Conference on Disarmament have a responsibility to contribute to the fulfilment of the task preventing an arms race in outer space.

Since its establishment in 1985 the Committee on Outer Space in the Conference on Disarmament has done useful work in examining and identifying issues relevant to outer space. The deliberations have so far indicated that confidence-building measures in this area could create an atmosphere conducive to the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space.

The Conference on Disarmament should now seek a common understanding on the scope and specific objectives of multilateral efforts for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. That process would be facilitated by the adoption in this Committee of a single resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Ms. Gjestebj, Norway)

My Government was pleased to note that the recent International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development was able to achieve consensus on a final document. Considering the complexity of the questions involved, the rather general nature of the document is hardly surprising. The document does, however, reflect the significance attributed by the world community to the disarmament/development question and lays down guidelines for further work in this field.

We consider it important that the problem of non-military threats to security was dealt with by the Conference. This reflects the growing awareness, as recently expressed in the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, that real security encompasses far more than security in the traditional military sense. Factors such as poverty, unsustainable development, environmental stress and human rights are highly relevant in this context.

Thus, the outcome of the Conference on disarmament and development should in our view be noted as a positive contribution to international co-operation at the multilateral level. In our further work on this subject we should take care to preserve and develop what has been achieved. We therefore see no point at this stage of opening up once again the more general debate on the relationship between disarmament and development.

The preparations for the third special session devoted to disarmament are well under way. Norway firmly shares the view that the special session should take place next year as already decided.

We see this as important, not least because the special session will offer a welcome opportunity to address, in a comprehensive way, important disarmament issues at a multilateral level. In this context, efforts should be made to concentrate the work on a limited number of issues.



(Ms. Grestebj, Norway)

Such an endeavour aiming at a forward-looking and topical debate based on the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, will no doubt influence, to a considerable degree, the future role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Every effort must therefore be made to ensure the success of the session.

The positive atmosphere prevailing in international disarmament affairs today confronts us with challenges and possibilities. At the forty-second session of the General Assembly we shall have the opportunity to demonstrate the ability of the multilateral disarmament community to play an active part in the process now under way.

Mr. FAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At the outset, Sir, please allow me to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee of the General Assembly at its current session. Your outstanding ability and rich experience will surely enable you to guide the work of this Committee to success. My congratulations also go to the other officers of the Committee on their election to their important posts. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation and gratitude to His Excellency Ambassador Zachmann for his excellent performance in discharging his duty as Chairman of the First Committee at the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

Over the past year, the people of the world have made unremitting efforts with a view to the relaxation of international tension and the maintenance of world peace. Disarmament, as an important part of the efforts to bring about international peace and security, continues to receive attention. The year 1987 saw some positive progress in the sphere of disarmament. The negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces between the United States of America and the Soviet Union have made important progress. The International Conference on the

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

Relationship between Disarmament and Development was convened for the first time under the auspices of the United Nations. The in-depth negotiations conducted at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on the convention prohibiting chemical weapons are proceeding. In addition to Latin America, a second nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world, the South Pacific, was established in the Southern Hemisphere. All this has injected an atmosphere of relaxation into the international situation. However, we cannot but be soberly aware that real disarmament is still far from being realized, that the arms race is still going on and even extending into outer space, and that the danger of a world war still remains. The yearning of the people of the world for peace and development, and their voices against war and in favour of disarmament have grown ever louder.

I should like now to share with you our views on some relevant questions in the light of developments over the past year.

To bring the nuclear arms race to a halt and to realize nuclear disarmament remains one of the issues of the day causing most concern to the people of the world.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

Since the beginning of this year, the United States and the Soviet Union have conducted frequent dialogues on disarmament, and each has put forward some new proposals and propositions. After nearly six years of negotiations, the two sides have now agreed to eliminate all their medium- and shorter-range missiles world-wide, so as to achieve the "double zero". Not long ago, the Foreign Ministers of the United States and the Soviet Union met and reached agreement in principle on the elimination of the intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) - a move we welcome.

As the INF question directly involves the security of the European and Asian countries, it has all along attracted concern and attention from the relevant countries. Proceeding on the basis of the interests of safeguarding world peace and security, they in one way or another put forward their own positive proposals and reasonable demands, which, to a certain degree, served as an impetus for the INF talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. That fact shows that on the question of nuclear disarmament, which bears on world peace and the security of all countries, the small- and medium-sized countries not only are entitled to have a say but can play a positive role as well. If the United States and the Soviet Union could indeed destroy their intermediate-range nuclear forces that are slated for reduction, that would be the first concrete measure since the Second World War to effect a quantitative reduction of nuclear weapons; this would represent a step forward in the course of nuclear disarmament.

Yet the intermediate-range nuclear forces account for only a tiny portion of their huge modern arsenals. Even after the complete destruction of those forces, the two countries will still retain their overkill capability of destroying the world many times over. Their huge stockpiles of strategic nuclear weapons have not been touched at all. The goal of the complete and thorough destruction of nuclear

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

weapons is still far from being achieved. The arms race between the two major nuclear Powers is still going on at an even higher level.

With a view to maintaining world peace and security, the international community ardently hopes that the United States and the Soviet Union will not stop at this point but will accelerate the pace of their arms reductions.

During the general debate in the General Assembly and this Committee, many representatives have correctly pointed out that after concluding the INF agreement, the United States and the Soviet Union should conduct further negotiations to reach agreement on drastic reductions of other types of nuclear weapons, especially strategic nuclear weapons. So far no substantive progress has been achieved in the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons. We hope that they will take practical action as soon as possible to fulfil in earnest their obligation to take the lead in drastic nuclear arms reduction. They should not on the one hand conclude an INF agreement, but on the other hand step up the arms race, focusing on the improvement of the quality of nuclear weapons, or continue their contention for military superiority with even more sophisticated weapon systems. Many signs, however, indicate that such a trend does exist, and people are greatly concerned about this, for compelling reasons.

China has all along stood for the complete prohibition and the thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. It is our consistent view that the two major nuclear-weapon States, which possess more than 95 per cent of the world's total nuclear weapons, should take the lead in halting the testing, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and in drastically reducing and destroying all types of nuclear weapons deployed both at home and abroad. Only by doing so could conditions be created for the convening of a broadly representative international conference on nuclear disarmament, with the participation of all

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

nuclear-weapon States, to work out measures for further nuclear disarmament by all nuclear States. That is the only realistic and feasible way that can lead to complete nuclear disarmament. As a nuclear-weapon State, China will not evade its responsibility. What is important, however, is that the international community has already confirmed this principle - namely, that the United States and the Soviet Union should take the lead in halting the nuclear-arms race and drastically reducing nuclear weapons. That fact is reflected in resolution 41/59 F, adopted by consensus by the General Assembly last year. It is extremely necessary, in our view, that this principle be reaffirmed by the current session of the General Assembly.

We believe also that - with the existence of huge nuclear stockpiles and the absence of a let-up in the nuclear-arms race - in order to reduce the risk of a nuclear flare-up and create conditions for the thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, it is still of practical significance for nuclear-weapon States to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in any circumstances, and to pledge unconditionally not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is public knowledge that China has long since undertaken those two obligations. It is our hope that all nuclear-weapon States, and the United States and the Soviet Union in particular, will do likewise, without any conditions.

While according top priority to nuclear disarmament, many countries have given increasing attention to conventional disarmament in recent years. The close relationship between nuclear and conventional disarmament has come to be recognized. This year, for the first time, substantive discussions were held in the United Nations Disarmament Commission on the issue of conventional disarmament. The reasons for focusing more on conventional disarmament are obvious. They can be summarized as follows:

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

First, like nuclear armament, conventional armament is a principal arena for the global arms race between the two super-Powers. The conventional-arms race also constitutes a real threat to world peace and stability. That is especially so in Europe, where the United States and the Soviet Union, plus the two major military alliances of the East and the West, have concentrated large amounts of nuclear and conventional arms and are locked in a state of prolonged confrontation.

Secondly, as science and technology advance, conventional weapons tend to become more and more sophisticated, and hence more and more lethal and destructive.

Thirdly, the conventional armaments of a few countries far exceed the need for national defence, and such arms have been used as a tool for aggression, occupation, intervention and subversion against some small- and medium-sized countries.

Fourthly, the money spent on conventional armament is increasing rapidly. More than half of the world's nearly \$US 1 trillion military expenditure is spent on conventional armament.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

In view of the above, it is absolutely necessary to carry out drastic reductions in conventional armaments along with the reduction in the nuclear armaments. It goes without saying that the super-Powers, which possess the largest and the most advanced conventional arsenals, and the military alliances to which they belong should take the lead in drastically reducing their conventional armaments, with the offensive conventional forces as the first target. At the same time, we believe that other countries should also exercise restraint so as to ensure that their military forces would not exceed their reasonable need for defence.

China has consistently held that conventional disarmament must be stressed along with nuclear disarmament. Last year, China sponsored for the first time a draft resolution on conventional disarmament, which won the support of an overwhelming majority of countries. We also took an active part in the relevant deliberations in the Disarmament Commission this year and submitted our working document. The Chinese delegation will once again submit a draft resolution on conventional disarmament to the General Assembly at its current session.

The arms race in outer space represents a new form of arms race in the present high technology era - although it is not the inevitable outcome of the "high-tech" progress - as well as a qualitative escalation of the arms race. Although they are still at a fledgling stage, the potential impact of outer space weapons on the world political, military and economic situations has already given rise to increasing concern. If not halted in time, the arms race in outer space will inevitably trigger a spiralling escalation of offensive nuclear weapons and defensive weapon systems, thus making the process of nuclear disarmament more complicated and difficult and further destabilizing the international situation. Halting the arms race in outer space has therefore become an imperative task.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

The exploration and utilization of outer space, which is the common wealth of humanity, must be geared to bringing benefit to mankind. Development, testing, production and deployment of outer-space weapons in any form by any country will go against the popular aspiration for a peaceful international environment. At present, the United States of America and the Soviet Union are the only countries that possess, test and develop outer-space weapons. They should heed the common cry of the people of all countries and take concrete steps immediately to stop the outer-space arms race in any form. Not only should they refrain from developing, testing and deploying space weapons, but they should also destroy all the existing ones. The Conference on Disarmament at Geneva should speed up its work in order to begin negotiations as early as possible with a view to concluding an international convention on the complete prohibition of all outer-space weapons.

People of the world urgently demand the complete elimination of chemical weapons from the globe and have made unremitting efforts to this end. Over the past few years, marked progress has been made in the negotiations on the convention banning chemical weapons, which has become an item holding out greater promise for achievement in the multilateral disarmament efforts. This year in particular, with the joint efforts of all the members of the Conference on Disarmament, we have taken another step towards this goal. Of course, what we need now is not unrealistic optimism but the redoubling of our efforts. In fact, there still exist quite sharp differences on some key questions, which requires all countries, especially those that possess the largest chemical arsenals and the greatest production capacity, to continue their efforts to facilitate the process of negotiation.

China was once the victim of chemical weapons, the cruelty of which remains fresh in its memory. We have consistently stood for the complete prohibition of



(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

chemical weapons and believed that an effective international convention must, first, ensure the thorough destruction of the existing chemical weapons and their production facilities and non-production of new chemical weapons; secondly, effect the complete prohibition of chemical weapons, including the prohibition of testing, production, transfer, deployment and use of these weapons; thirdly, not harm or affect the development of any country's civilian chemical industry; and fourthly, provide for necessary and effective verification measures. We have already made, and will continue to make, our contributions to the conclusion of such an international convention.

The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held not long ago is of great importance. With the joint efforts of all the participants, and in the spirit of seeking common ground while reserving differences and reaching consensus through consultations, the Conference formulated the Final Document, which represents the concrete result of its work. In spite of its certain deficiencies, the Final Document is a positive one, which has basically reflected the desire of the people of the world for disarmament and development, and is conducive to arousing the attention of the international community to the relationship between disarmament and development.

How to handle properly the relationship between disarmament and development has a bearing, not only on international peace and security, but also on the security and development of each individual country. The experience of China has demonstrated that it is both necessary and feasible to deal, reasonably and appropriately, with the relationship between national defence and economic development. We will resolutely march in this direction.

The third special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament is an important issue facing our Committee this year. The first session of the

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

Preparatory Committee was held last June. At its current session, the General Assembly will consider the relevant questions and decide on them.

There are still different opinions and ideas on the convocation of the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. In our view, the third special session must achieve positive results, and, on the basis of summing up the development of the situation since the second special session on disarmament, reaffirm and substantiate the principles and programme of action in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, especially the two key principles, namely:

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility." (Resolution S-10/2, para. 48)

and

"... States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions." (Resolution S-10/2, para. 81)

At the third special session on disarmament the General Assembly should also seek more effective measures for the prevention of the arms race in outer space and for the prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons. In addition, it should further strengthen and encourage the role of the United Nations and other multilateral disarmament machinery in the field of disarmament. Along with helping to advance the preparatory work, we will put forward further views on the subject for discussion with other countries. To sum up, in view of the great importance of the third special session on disarmament, we must strive to ensure its success. China is willing to join hands with other countries to this end.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

An Asia-Pacific regional conference under the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign was convened in Beijing last March, to which the Chinese Government lent its active support. Proceeding from the purpose of maintaining world peace, the diplomats, experts on disarmament issues, scholars and eminent figures from 18 countries gathered there in a joint effort to explore ways of realizing disarmament and maintaining peace. The Conference was crowned with success.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

The Conference on Disarmament is the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, which shoulders the important task of negotiating international treaties on disarmament. China attaches great importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament and has taken an active part in it. Last March, Chinese Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian made an important statement at the Conference on Disarmament, expounding the Chinese Government's views on the question of disarmament.

Improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament has been an issue of common concern to all. For years, several working groups have been successively set up for this purpose. This year, with the support of all quarters, the Conference on Disarmament decided to re-establish a Group of Seven, with the Ambassadors of Mexico, India, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Canada, Australia and China to the Conference on Disarmament as its members. I have the honour to have been elected to the Chair of the Group. The Group started its work in the middle of June. Owing to a lack of time, the Group deemed it appropriate first to concentrate in its deliberations on the auxiliary bodies and the annual report to the General Assembly.

After serious deliberations, members of the Group reached a consensus on the simplification and improvement of these two issues, and a report was accordingly submitted to the Conference on Disarmament. As some delegations are of the view that further consultations are needed, the Conference on Disarmament did not take any decisions. I hope that the work of the Group of Seven will continue to receive support from all sides so as to achieve positive results in the future.

On the issue of safeguarding international peace and security and realizing disarmament, China has not only put forward a series of reasonable proposals but also taken concrete action. We have on the whole accomplished the task of cutting the size of our armed forces by 1 million and declared that China will conduct no further atmospheric nuclear tests.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

Military expenditures have been cut and our military industry has been reoriented on a large scale to civilian production, which has produced some preliminary economic benefits. We signed the relevant Protocols to the South Pacific nuclear-free-zone Treaty this year. All this has given full expression to China's sincere desire for peace. While supporting all proposals that genuinely contribute to the cause of disarmament, we welcome all the more warmly concrete actions leading to a drastic reduction of armaments.

At present, the Chinese people are striving towards the magnificent goal of economic development. The forthcoming 13th National Congress of the Communist Party of China will further deepen our policy of reform and opening to the outside world so as to accelerate national economic development. In order to facilitate the advance of the international situation in a direction favourable to peace and development, China is ready to continue its efforts together with all peace-loving countries to oppose the arms race and hasten the realization of disarmament.

Mr. FONDER (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Allow me, Sir, warmly to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the Committee and to assure you of my delegation's co-operation.

The 12 member States of the European Community have already expressed through their spokesman, Denmark, their views on a whole series of questions relating to disarmament and security. Needless to say, Belgium fully supports that statement. I should none the less like to develop further certain points my country considers of particular importance.

Everything indicates that the work of the First Committee should this year take place in a climate that is more favourable to constructive dialogue, which would open the way to positive developments. That such a climate is more evident this year than in previous years is undoubtedly largely the result of improvements

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

in East-West relations, more specifically in the key area of arms control and disarmament.

The entire world welcomed the agreement in principle reached by the two super-Powers on the total elimination of a specific category of nuclear weapons, namely, intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

That agreement, which has been termed historic, has not yet been finalized since a good number of problems - including verification - still remain to be resolved. The agreement will form an important stage towards a balance of forces likely to guarantee the security of all at the lowest possible level of forces. That agreement shows that, where there is sufficient will, significant results can be obtained within time periods which only a year ago would have been considered unrealistic.

That being the case, a great deal remains to be done. Efforts must be stepped up so that negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the reduction of strategic arsenals may succeed. Here again, an agreement in principle exists on a 50-per-cent reduction. It must become reality. These negotiations are of crucial importance for the development of super-Power relations. They will also have a decisive influence on the whole set of problems relating to the control of weapons and to disarmament.

Disarmament is a process that can only evolve through successive stages. But security must be maintained - or even improved - at each stage. Agreements that are of necessity partial agreements cannot challenge existing balances, nor can they worsen real or potential imbalances. Security must be seen as a whole, as must our disarmament strategy. Priorities must of course be established, but they must take into account the effect they may have on security as a whole.

In this context, the problem of conventional disarmament is of increasing

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

importance and particular urgency - first of all in Europe, where we are faced with the greatest concentration of armed forces in the world. In this area, which we consider crucial and of the greatest importance, stagnation could have the effect of slowing down or compromising efforts being taken in other fields.

In the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), and after the Stockholm Conference, which produced a new generation of confidence and security measures, we hope it will be possible rapidly to reach agreement in Vienna among the countries members of both alliances on a mandate to negotiate on conventional stability in Europe at a reduced level of forces. My country will spare no effort to ensure that these negotiations might begin next year.

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

In a broader context the United Nations specialized agencies have been evidencing a greater interest in the concept of conventional disarmament. This year, the subject of conventional disarmament was on the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, where useful work was done. The armed conflicts that exist in many parts of the world today remind us how urgent it is to make progress in this field.

We are of the opinion that a regional approach to disarmament in general and to conventional disarmament in particular is indispensable in the context of any comprehensive and world-wide disarmament effort. It is encouraging to note that this approach is being taken in efforts under way in several regions of the world.

Turning to the question of the military uses of outer space, we would note that the super-Powers recognize the importance of preserving the authority of the only international legal instrument that exists, namely, the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, and that they are working towards an agreed interpretation while awaiting a future definitive solution that takes security requirements into account. In this area as well, the super-Powers are aware of the need for greater transparency.

The question of a nuclear-test ban continues to be the area of nuclear disarmament in which stagnation has been the most evident. The results of contacts between the two super-Powers on this point do, however, indicate that their respective positions are moving closer together with regard to a gradual approach to the problem. As Belgium has already explained here, debate on this question must be realistic if we wish to progress towards concrete and achievable results. I would recall the proposals made last year by the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement to the General Assembly. Those proposals were aimed at



(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

the development of a system of data exchange and the establishment of a verification régime for limiting testing, with regard to both number and magnitude. It is important for the super-Powers to begin to explore this way of achieving greater transparency, which of itself would lead to increased confidence. The idea of one super-Power conducting a nuclear test on the territory of the other for verification purposes deserves more thorough consideration. The fact that such ideas are being expressed indicates that the discussion has become more open. Belgium welcomes that.

That being said, the work of the Conference on Disarmament on a nuclear-test ban has not made progress in the absence of agreement on a mandate to establish an ad hoc group. However, the international group of seismological experts was able to pursue its useful activity in exchanging seismological data, which is a point of departure for the establishment of a reliable verification system. Belgium would encourage all participants to make a constructive contribution to that work and welcomes all efforts to ensure that it continues.

The status of the work on a future convention on the total prohibition on chemical weapons gives rise to more optimism regarding final results. Such a convention is more than ever necessary, as was demonstrated again this year. Once more, incontrovertible proof of the use of such weapons in the Iran-Iraq conflict was gathered through the intermediary of the United Nations Secretary-General. A new element was brought to light, and it indicates a disturbing escalation: these weapons were used against civilian populations. This is a new and particularly shocking violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which, we should recall, remains the sole norm of international law in this field. Belgium, in close co-operation with its partners and with a growing number of other countries, is endeavouring to halt the proliferation of such weapons through strict control measures while awaiting a definitive and lasting solution, which should be found as soon as

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

possible. Here we would note that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee entrusted with preparing a draft convention has made progress on a number of crucial points. That progress was made possible by bilateral contacts which led to the surmounting of major obstacles.

Belgium, which is Chairman of one of the working groups of the Ad Hoc Committee, welcomes the positive developments that have enabled us to break the deadlock, of which I would mention particularly the acceptance by all participating countries of the principle of verification by challenge in all circumstances. Everyone agrees that the outlines of a future convention are becoming increasingly clear. Obviously, important chapters remain to be completed: the list of chemical substances that must be made subject to the authority of the convention; the question of future non-production of chemical weapons; the role of the chemical industry in the verification régime; the preparation of modalities for verification by challenge and the international institution that will be entrusted with supervising the implementation of the future convention.

Belgium, through the statements of its Minister for Foreign Affairs at the plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament on 23 July and during the general debate of the General Assembly at its forty-second session, has offered to act as host to the projected international institution.

Belgium considers it imperative that as complete a convention as possible be achieved as soon as possible.

A climate of confidence and greater transparency are elements that obviously had a bearing on the positive developments in the Conference's work in this regard. There is therefore room to believe that other steps designed to increase confidence will provide an impetus for further work towards the prohibition of chemical weapons, thereby enabling us to move closer to a final agreement in the form of a convention.

(M Fonder, Belgium)

The visit to a chemical weapons installation in Shikhany, in the Soviet Union, earlier this month shows that that country also is beginning to become aware of the need for greater transparency, a basic condition for a climate of confidence.

(Mr. Fonder, Belgium)

Belgium welcomes such initiatives and supports all constructive ideas intended to create and increase confidence. In this context, my country is in favour of the idea that the two super-Powers should voluntarily declare, to facilitate agreement on a convention, the volume and composition of their stockpiles of chemical weapons, which would encourage the other chemical-weapon countries to follow suit.

The Conference on the Relationship between Development and Disarmament ended its work a few weeks ago with the production of a Final Document. In itself, that result is the expression of a will to deal with this very complex matter in an open and realistic way. The participants demonstrated wisdom, agreeing to avoid sterile polemics and pointless, even counter-productive, antagonism. Nevertheless, the question of a better balanced distribution of available resources between security needs and the needs of development at the regional and international levels deserves further consideration, in a way that avoids biased analyses or hasty conclusions. The relationship between the concepts of disarmament and development is far from being exclusively financial. The transfer of financial resources released by disarmament or arms reduction agreements - assuming that that would always be possible - would not of itself resolve the problem of under-development.

In order better to assess the impact of military expenditures on economic and social development, we must have reliable data and statistics. Here, too, confidence and transparency have a role to play, and imagination and good will must be shown if we are to be able to develop certain initiatives.

Those are the few priority points I wanted to make. I knew that in making them I risked making an incomplete statement, but I am convinced that on the vast subject of disarmament it is better to limit oneself to the matters that are most urgent and most useful in our debates.

Mr. KOUASSI (Togo) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, your competence, discipline and skill guarantee that the work of the First Committee during the forty-second session of the General Assembly will have authority and be effective and successful. Those are the simple, but natural, feelings of my delegation on your unanimous election to your high office in this important Committee. We hold those feelings with confidence. Let me add my fraternal pleasure that special relations of friendship and close co-operation link your great country, Zaire, and my country, Togo, relations that are, happily, developing.

My delegation warmly congratulates you, sir, and the other officers of the Committee, and pays tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Siegfried Zachmann, of the German Democratic Republic. We assure you of our readiness to co-operate with you in carrying out your lofty tasks, however delicate they may be.

The scope of disarmament efforts is worthy of the commitment we made, when subscribing to the Charter, to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

However, the slow progress towards reaching general and complete disarmament is explained by the fact that petty geo-political calculations, mistrust and the desire to dominate continue to inspire a search for security through the unbridled arms race.

Thus today the pursuit and intensification of military competition and the increase in regional conflicts show that our world is very little concerned about, or even defies, the dilemma rightly mentioned in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament that mankind

"must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation."

(S-10/2, para. 18)

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

Certainly, since the adoption of the first resolution on disarmament important bilateral and multilateral agreements have been reached. However, as they mostly involve partial or collateral measures, those agreements are more non-armament agreements than disarmament agreements.

Moreover, since the end of the Second World War we have been living under the threat of nuclear weapons. The size of the threat is shown by expert estimates that the power of the strategic arsenals of the two super-Powers alone is equivalent to 500,000 times that of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima.

Furthermore, according to well-established scientific facts:

"An atomic conflict between the two super-Powers would result in the following months in a glacier that would extend over the whole planet. A large part of the flora and fauna would disappear, victims of a climatic upheaval. Human populations that avoided the conflict or escaped the bombings would then find themselves without food resources and would in turn be threatened with extinction."

Now to those risks we must add the overriding need to use nuclear energy with extreme caution, our awareness of which stems from the Draconian safety measures and measures for radiological protection imposed following the accidents that have occurred in the past 20 years at some nuclear power plants.

The persistence of the threat to the survival of the human species presented by nuclear weapons strengthens the validity of the special priority given to nuclear disarmament by the Programme of Action in the Final Document of the tenth special session.

It is somewhat comforting to note today that, responding to the Programme of Action, the United States and the Soviet Union have reached agreement in principle to dismantle their short-range and intermediate-range missiles in Europe. To be

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

sure, the signing and implementation of the agreement do not mean the complete denuclearization of Europe, because in the old continent there will continue to be based 4,000 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) warheads and other nuclear arsenals. Nevertheless, it is a historic decision of great political significance, because it makes a reality of the common desire for peace and negotiation of the two super-Powers.

If the agreement is to have a genuine and lasting impact on the process of general and complete disarmament, it is important that it inaugurate a new concept of security without nuclear weapons. The agreement should also be a valuable stepping-stone to subsequent negotiations, which should deal successively with tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, conventional and other weapons, projects for the militarization of space, nuclear tests and the settlement of regional conflicts.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

In the interest of international peace and security it is not only desirable but also essential that the United States-Soviet initiative serve as an example and a stimulus for the other nuclear Powers and point to a new stage in the negotiations with a view to concluding other disarmament agreements.

To the extent that disarmament is a multidimensional goal and an evolving process, it is up to us to follow with sustained interest and actively encourage all concrete initiatives that would reverse the trend towards the accumulation of military arsenals.

That is why the delegation of Togo welcomes the fact that for the first time in history the United States of America and the Soviet Union, aware of their primary responsibility in this matter, are preparing to conclude a genuine agreement even if, for the time being, it is partial in nature.

Because of the political influence and military power of the two signatories and because of its geographical scope, the forthcoming nuclear disarmament agreement will be a double factor for East-West détente and for balance in Europe. Moreover, it illustrates the important contribution that defending and achieving regional security can make to the consolidation of international peace and security.

This consideration fully justifies having the international community continue to give complete attention and support to the various efforts made by the developing countries to promote regional disarmament. These countries, moreover, have always demonstrated their political will and commitment in this regard through their stand in favour of peace and especially through their initiatives to bring about the peaceful settlement of disputes of which they have become the central focus, and to bring about the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

By adopting in 1964 the Declaration on the denuclearization of Africa, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) intended to indicate its commitment to nuclear



(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

disarmament and to the prevention of nuclear war in general as well as its commitment to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, especially to the prevention of the introduction of nuclear weapons into Africa.

Scrupulously respecting that Declaration and going beyond it, a majority of African States - 37 of them - have thus far become parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to which South Africa is very wary of becoming a party, and not without reason.

In this regard, the justice and relevance of the African initiative justifies the fact that it has since that time received the constant support of the United Nations.

The validity of this important Declaration was moreover strengthened when, at its tenth special session, the General Assembly felt it desirable for the Security Council to take the necessary effective measures each time that it was necessary to ensure that this goal of the denuclearization of Africa should not be compromised. Thanks to the vigilance and sense of responsibility that our regional organization has demonstrated, it was possible to establish objective reports on the nuclear capacity of South Africa and in this case I am referring to the relevant reports of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. It has been shown that for many years the racist régime of South Africa has tried to undermine the implementation of the Declaration on the denuclearization of Africa and it is therefore much to be regretted that the Disarmament Commission has still not reached a consensus on the nuclear capacity of South Africa.

In the light of our common concern to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the disarmament field, it is becoming indispensable for the specific studies undertaken under the auspices of the United Nations to serve as a guide for our efforts to promote disarmament.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

While the validity of the disarmament studies is put in question, disputes about the nuclear capacity of South Africa by some Powers is such as to encourage the racist régime in its persistent refusal to submit all its nuclear installations to the guarantees provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Now, while already constituting a serious threat to international peace and security, nuclear capacity is becoming a means of permanent blackmail when that capacity is acquired by a régime which, in defiance of international law and relevant United Nations resolutions, continually and systematically tramples upon fundamental freedoms and human rights, a régime which persists in its illegal occupation and systematic pillaging of the resources of Namibia and multiplies its acts of aggression and manoeuvres of destabilization against its neighbours.

With regard to the valuable contribution which the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones can make to world balance, it is more than ever urgent for the Security Council to envisage taking the necessary measures to force the apartheid régime to heed the provisions of the Declaration on the denuclearization of Africa as well as to heed the relevant United Nations resolutions.

Since the establishment of the United Nations, the development and disarmament Decades have been proclaimed in order to realize the two essential goals of our Organization. Unfortunately we note that the results achieved are hardly in keeping with our legitimate expectations. Indeed, security and international co-operation policies undertaken since then have shown a striking contrast between the sustained vigour of armament efforts and the increasing relative gap separating the rich and poor countries.

Now, according to one of the conclusions of a study done in 1981 by experts on the relationship between disarmament and development,

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

"The world can either pursue the arms race with singular energy or it can deliberately and promptly turn to stable and balanced social and economic development within the framework of a more stable international economic and political order. It cannot pursue these two goals at the same time."

In this regard, it is a timely sign that, thanks to the ever growing support of the Member States, the idea of determining the link between disarmament and development has reached a point where it allowed for the convening of the recent International Conference on the relationship between these two matters. In the long process of multilateral study of the relationship between disarmament and development, the holding of this Conference represents a historic event the scope of which will be judged in the light of the political will of Member States to study and spell out the guidelines contained in the Final Document, because the laborious and difficult consensus arrived at constitutes not so much an agreement or firm commitment as a minimum platform from which to start undertaking subsequent negotiations. These negotiations should determine the specific implications and modalities involved when we try to cut out and transfer resources from the arms race for the benefit of development.

In any case, the consensus achieved by the Conference should be confirmed and strengthened by study of the report of the Conference at the present session of the General Assembly and in the course of the third special session devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Kouassi, Togo)

The first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament had historic merit in that it adopted Final Document laying down the guidelines and precise framework for efforts and initiatives on disarmament.

We are talking about an important programme of action whose realization should have been facilitated by the second special session on disarmament. At that session the General Assembly initiated an essential task - the launching of a world campaign for disarmament - but it proved unable to renew the consensus that had been achieved at the first special session on disarmament. That failure poses a challenge to the promotion of disarmament efforts, and the third special session on disarmament must meet it resolutely, inspired by the favourable prospects for the conclusion of a nuclear disarmament agreement, and it should achieve the broad consensus necessary to speed up the process of general and complete disarmament.

If our commitment to peace and disarmament is manifested in mere ritual at each session of the General Assembly, we run the risk of leaving the way clear for the triumph of militarism and the use of force.

The complexity of the question and the importance of what is at stake may often explain the slow progress in disarmament matters, but we have commitments under the Charter and it is our obligation to pursue and increase our efforts to promote international peace and security, consolidating what has already been achieved, transcending political and ideological barriers and strengthening solidarity among peoples.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Members will recall that on 13 October the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Representative of Romania, Mr. Petre Tanasie, introduced a draft resolution on agenda item 62 (d), which is contained in document A/C.1/42/L.1. It relates to the importance and urgency of this matter, and I would propose that if possible the decision-making process on that draft resolution begin at our afternoon meeting tomorrow, Friday, 16 October 1987. The Committee would then submit its recommendations to the General Assembly, so that the Assembly could consider it, if possible at the beginning of next week. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee approves my proposal.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.