

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
11th meeting
held on
Monday, 19 October 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 11th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)
later: Mr. OUTIERREZ (Vice-Chairman) (Costa Rica)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Castritto de Azambuja (Brazil)
Mr. Azikiwe (Nigeria)
Ms. Abulhasan (Kuwait)
Mr. Gurinovich (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Bayart (Mongolia)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)

*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/2/20, 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/42/PV.11
26 October 1987
ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 48-69 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. CASTRIOTO DE AZAMBUJA (Brazil): I should like first of all, Sir, to join my colleagues in congratulating you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I am sure we shall benefit from your able and skilful guidance in discharging the difficult task entrusted to us.

We are meeting in hopeful circumstances. I need not list in detail the achievements and promises in respect of disarmament that have been made over the last few months. Suffice it to say that there is now momentum where before there was inertia; optimism where there was skepticism; constructive action and language where before rhetoric and confrontation set the tone. We have reason to be encouraged both on the regional and on the global scale.

We shall be speaking under the appropriate item of our agenda on the declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation, as well as on other matters that directly or indirectly affect disarmament negotiations and the political climate in which they are conducted.

We join all those who have expressed satisfaction at the news of the agreement in principle reached by the United States of America and the Soviet Union on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. We have reason to believe that the agreement between those two Powers will extend to other significant areas of disarmament. We are confident that this process, of legitimate concern to the international community, will not entail the geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons; that is, that the elimination of certain types of nuclear weapons

(Castrioto de Azambuja, Brazil)

from specific geographical settings will not be followed by an increase of nuclear weapons in other land or sea areas of the globe. We are also confident that those bilateral efforts will be linked to, and take fully into account, the ongoing efforts in the multilateral forums.

We are happy with the results of the Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held recently. It was an encouraging expression of a general desire to find balance and consensus. We could describe it as a meeting that reflected a growing maturity in the United Nations.

(Mr. Castrioto de Azambuja, Brazil)

I cannot fail to mention two other recent developments in our field that, although very different in nature, represent signs of a new era. I am referring to the entry into force of the Treaty of Rarotonga and the recent visit paid by a group of international observers - in which I took part - to the chemical military facilities in Shikhan'y in the Soviet Union. Both events nourish our hope of a sounder political environment and a safer world.

We are less happy with the pace and direction of our negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. I shall address myself to its work in this statement. It is obvious that we have failed so far in our essential task: in the course of the last decade we have not produced any visible international agreements to reverse the arms race and reduce the risk of armed conflicts.

I do not wish to derogate from the extremely valuable and important work that the Conference on Disarmament has done over the past few years. Brazil has been an active agent in this process and we fully intend to continue to act forcefully in the only multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament questions.

Nuclear armaments are in the forefront of the concerns of the international community. It is therefore only natural that most of the items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament deal with this question and its multiple aspects. Despite years of continuing efforts by the overwhelming majority of nations, it seems that we are doomed to see progress in this area only by virtue of bilateral talks between the two super-Powers - as if the question of putting an end to nuclear weapons affected only a handful of countries. We regret therefore that once again this year the Conference on Disarmament could not work meaningfully on the subject, owing again to the absence of an ad hoc committee entrusted with a clear mandate.

(Mr. Castrioto de Azambuja, Brazil)

A closely related matter, namely the conclusion of a nuclear-weapon test ban, in our view, remains an important practical step towards halting and reversing the arms race. Efforts were made during this year to work out a mandate that would enable the Conference on Disarmament to establish the overdue ad hoc committee to examine the question. It is our considered opinion - one which arises from the overall mandate of the Conference on Disarmament, and the letter and the spirit of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - that the Ad Hoc Committee should be mandated to negotiate fully a nuclear-weapon test-ban treaty. In this case, too, we have heard that the two super-Powers are considering negotiating new thresholds and limits to those tests. Once more the importance of this question clearly transcends the exclusive interests of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The militarization of outer space has, unfortunately, been a clearly discernible trend from the beginning of the space era; this trend has evolved in the past few years to sombre prospects of using outer space as a new arena for armed confrontation. This unhappy movement, so far unchecked, has not yet been adequately dealt with by the Conference on Disarmament. First, that was due to the absence of a specific organ to work on the problem; now that we have the Ad Hoc Committee it still lacks a precise mandate. We all know that outer space is being utilized for purposes other than peaceful co-operation among States, linked to the logic of the confrontation between the super-Powers. The legitimate interests of all mankind in keeping outer space as its province cannot be subdued by perceptions of a strategic order nourished by and fuelling the East-West competition.

Finally, I should like to join my voice to those of other speakers who have highlighted the current progress of the Conference on Disarmament in the field of chemical weapons. The Ad Hoc Committee - with an adequate mandate - is at a

(Mr. Castrioto de Azambuja, Brazil)

crucial point in its work on a draft convention. That legal instrument, when concluded, will ban those weapons and provide for the destruction of existing arsenals.

Doubtless, that will constitute a major achievement for the Conference on Disarmament and mean a real and concrete disarmament measure. Brazil has been participating and will continue to participate actively in the negotiating process with a clear sense of responsibility and flexibility. We have consistently maintained in this context that a chemical-weapon-elimination convention should in no way be used as a hindrance to the development of a sound and peaceful chemical industry in any State. In the same vein, we have also maintained that provisions of the text should be applicable to every country, without creating discriminatory régimes unfortunately present in other areas of our endeavours.

We believe that the First Committee could and should streamline its procedures and do more work in less time. Several worth-while ideas and proposals to this effect have been presented to us. We particularly value that contained in document A/C.1/39/9, proposed by the Chairman of the First Committee in 1984.

We are called upon to hold the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1988. Let us act here, in the Preparatory Committee and in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva in such a manner that this great opportunity for confidence building and constructive action is not thrown away. It may be a long time before conditions are as favourable as we have now are offered again.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): I share the warm sentiments expressed by earlier speakers on your well-deserved election, Sir, as Chairman of the First Committee at the forty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly. I pledge to you the full support and co-operation of the Nigerian delegation.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

Our debate at this session is taking place during a most opportune period for positive action in the field of disarmament. With a significantly improved international climate for disarmament efforts, the international community is witnessing an unprecedented and unique period of great momentum and a special sense of urgency in the efforts of the two super-Powers to reach concrete disarmament measures in their bilateral talks on nuclear and space weapons.

The recent disclosure that the two super-Powers have agreed in principle on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and the prospect that the actual agreement could be signed this year is a most welcome development and should be commended by all peace-loving nations. This development brings the entire world to the threshold of a new era - an era of fulfilment in the field of disarmament, an era in which disarmament will cease to be perceived as Utopian but as one in which every human being and every nation have the right to live and develop their social and economic potential.

Nigeria has always held the view that for a breakthrough to be possible in the field of disarmament the super-Powers, which hold the key in the process, would have to make a radical change in their attitudes to each other's intentions and their perceptions of them. The enhanced degree of mutual hostility and suspicion which traditionally characterizes their relations has succeeded only in impeding negotiations and preventing agreement. That is the reason why the Nigerian delegation welcomes the growing spirit of understanding and mutual respect that now seeks to prevail between the two super-Powers. We also welcome the positive outcome so far of their bilateral efforts in the intermediate nuclear forces (INF) negotiations.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

It is our hope that when the agreement is eventually signed and enters into force it will have a multiplier effect, providing a launching-pad for effective negotiations and the successful conclusion of agreements in other disarmament areas now being considered at both the bilateral and multilateral levels. It is our hope that this development will indeed serve as the harbinger of concrete agreements in the future. For that purpose, the Nigerian delegation would like to see this Committee give further impetus to the ongoing bilateral and stagnating multilateral negotiations during this session.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

Much as progress in the bilateral negotiations between the super-Powers on issues of nuclear disarmament is commendable, the same cannot be said about the state of affairs in the multilateral forum, especially on the priority question of nuclear disarmament and nuclear-related issues. For instance, the report of the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament would readily reveal that its record on the first three issues of nuclear disarmament on its agenda, which are accorded the highest priority, has been anything but satisfactory.

During the last session of the General Assembly, my delegation was greatly encouraged by the friendly atmosphere which prevailed, resulting in positive changes in the voting pattern of several delegations on the priority issues of nuclear disarmament. My delegation was optimistic that a convergence of views would be reflected on the floor of the Conference on Disarmament. As it turned out, this was not the case. The Conference was unable to set up an ad hoc committee on any of the first three priority items on its agenda on nuclear disarmament owing to the attitude of some nuclear-weapon States, which preferred that negotiations on issues of nuclear disarmament be confined exclusively to a bilateral framework.

The Nigerian delegation has always held the view that bilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament are helpful. At the same time we believe that however useful and necessary bilateral efforts might be, they are by no means a substitute for multilateral negotiations. These efforts must mutually facilitate and complement each other in order to be purposeful and effective. They should not hinder, preclude or compete with each other. To create obstacles that deliberately hinder multilateral negotiations is to deny, even to bilateral negotiations, any universal input in the seeking of solutions to issues of global concern. Such input should provide a base for ensuring the universality of disarmament agreements and thus help to create confidence for adherence.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

My delegation hopes that, with the spectacular advance being made in the bilateral negotiations, it will now be possible to allow the Conference on Disarmament to perform its role as envisaged in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

For the past 42 years international public opinion, as represented by the United Nations General Assembly, has been calling for an end to the arms race, especially nuclear disarmament. Successive numerous resolutions of the General Assembly attest to this.

A comprehensive nuclear-test ban is the first and most urgent step towards a cessation of the nuclear-arms race. The impact such a ban would have on nuclear disarmament is clearly underlined in paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Moreover, a nuclear-test ban would also create a favourable political atmosphere conducive to negotiations on other measures of nuclear disarmament. The argument that testing is required to maintain the reliability of existing nuclear stockpiles is used to justify the continued arms race in its qualitative sense. In view of the fact that considerable advances have been made in detection capabilities, all technical or scientific obstacles to a verifiable ban would seem superfluous and would render indefensible all arguments that put the blame for lack of progress on inadequate means of verification. A step-by-step approach to the question of a nuclear-test ban, such as that which is being contemplated by the super-Powers in their bilateral talks and which is aimed at allowing testing at agreed and defined intervals of time and within agreed yields, falls short of the objectives of a test ban and could in fact be counter-productive. Such an approach would amount to licensing nuclear testing within the permitted yield range and at permitted intervals. It would therefore not prevent qualitative improvement of nuclear

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

weapons. Moreover, it would defer indefinitely the goal of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

My delegation would like to call for a greater sense of urgency in dealing with the question of a nuclear-test ban. We should not tolerate a situation that calls for a sense of urgency only when some non-nuclear-weapon States decide to commence testing.

Currently there are strong indications that many threshold countries are deeply engaged in nuclear-weapon programmes. In fact it has been speculated that quite a number of them have actually commenced stockpiling nuclear weapons. Coming from Africa, where the efforts of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to retain the continent as a denuclearized zone are being seriously frustrated by the nuclear-weapons programme of the racist apartheid régime of South Africa, my delegation cannot but view with the utmost concern the lack of urgency with which the question of a nuclear-test ban has continued to be handled. It is common knowledge that the apartheid régime in South Africa has not only acquired nuclear capability, but has actually embarked upon the development of nuclear weapons with the intention of terrorizing and destabilizing African States. No African would consider himself safe if nuclear weapons attain a dominant role in South Africa's aggressive strategy. It would be morally wrong for apartheid South Africa to be permitted to pursue its ominous desire. Unless effective international action is taken to prevent South Africa from acquiring nuclear weapons, other countries might be forced to take protective measures, which could be disastrous to the non-proliferation Treaty.

In addition to nuclear weapons, chemical weapons constitute the most dangerous weapon of mass destruction. A convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons should be

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

brought into effect. This would not only outlaw the acquisition of an entire category of weapons of mass destruction, but would also further advance the contribution that the Geneva Protocol of 1925 made towards efforts to control weapons of war.

It is within this context that my delegation has taken due note of the considerable progress made so far on this issue by the Conference on Disarmament. We would therefore like to appeal to all members of the Conference to intensify their efforts to ensure the conclusion of a convention prohibiting chemical weapons. To achieve a breakthrough in ongoing negotiations, the draft convention must recognize the sovereign equality of all States.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

Much ground has already been covered in this area, and a convention on chemical weapons is now in the home stretch. It is the hope of my delegation that the few outstanding issues, especially the complicated question of on-site inspection by challenge, will soon be resolved.

Although the Nigerian Delegation to the recently concluded International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development expressed its disappointment at the Conference's inability to achieve its ultimate objective, we welcome the adoption of a framework for future deliberation of the basic issues. For many years the entire world has channelled a disproportionate amount of valuable human and material resources into the non-productive military sector. The Conference would have achieved a major degree of success if it had put in place an organizational or institutional framework to rechannel military expenditure back to the productive sector of global economic recovery. Instead, new and tangential concepts were introduced to justify the arms race. Under the pretext of ensuring security, it was argued that increased military expenditure could be tolerated. We cannot agree with this logic.

Security cannot be achieved through stockpiling arms. Indeed, the increased use of arms further endangers the security it was meant to guarantee. Consequently, security cannot be given an over-riding priority over disarmament and development; rather, they should be complementary. Besides, there are several non-military threats to security, such as the imbalance in global economic relations and outside interference in the internal affairs of other States. Indeed, the quest for security through armaments has resulted in the distraction of attention from vital priorities for the improvement of human well-being through development. It is for this reason that my delegation is opposed to any concept that tends to elevate armed security over other considerations, such as disarmament and development.

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide another opportunity to address these issues. My delegation appeals for a more realistic approach to the subject. It is to be hoped that at that session the General Assembly will consider in more detail the concept of a mechanism to release additional resources through disarmament measures for the purpose of socio-economic development. There should be no doubt that less armament would mean additional resources for the world community.

A significant outcome of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was the establishment of the programme of fellowships on disarmament. It is gratifying to note that the programme has continued to achieve the desired objectives, in creating a cadre of public officials with in-depth knowledge on disarmament issues from Member States, particularly the developing countries. The increasing interest shown further attests to the programme's success.

It will be recalled that at the fortieth session of the General Assembly the Organization, by resolution 40/151 H, expanded the programme to include advisory services and training programmes in the field of disarmament.

Although the Assembly has already authorized limited funds for the new programmes, the Secretary-General was unable to start them because of the Organization's financial position. It is our hope that, because of the immense benefits to Member States, the Secretary-General will be in a position to commence the programmes next year.

I wish to place on record our deep appreciation of the kind gestures of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic and Sweden in inviting the 1987 Fellows to study selected activities in the field of

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

arms limitation and disarmament. The Fellows found the visits very instructive, and their experience during the tours have further widened their knowledge in the sphere of disarmament.

Extending the arms race to outer space is, in my delegation's view, too dangerous to condone. Nigeria has consistently held the view that outer space should remain the heritage of all mankind, and should be utilized purely for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind. My delegation urges the super-Powers to pursue intensively their bilateral negotiations in a constructive spirit, to reach early agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Prevention now is better than seeking later the elimination of an arms race in outer space. Indeed, extending the arms race into outer space would certainly have an adverse effect on current agreements in other fields.

The peaceful and equitable use of outer space calls for co-operation and not confrontation, development rather than destruction. While the Nigerian delegation deplores any attempt to use outer space for military purposes, we applaud all States which have advanced the frontiers of human knowledge by peaceful uses of outer space.

Permit me now to turn to the question of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use, or threat of the use, of nuclear weapons. This is an issue to which Nigeria attaches priority importance, and on which I believe an early conclusion is possible, if there is determination to treat it with the objectivity and seriousness it deserves.

Pending the attainment of total verifiable and permanent nuclear disarmament and effective guarantees against the use, or threat of the use, of nuclear weapons, the means of safeguarding the security of non-nuclear States must remain an overriding concern of the international community. This is particularly so since most non-nuclear-weapon States have, in a legally binding international instrument,

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

relinquished the nuclear option, without a complementary commitment by the nuclear-weapon States to ensure that the non-nuclear-weapon States are not placed at a permanent military disadvantage.

I mentioned earlier that the General Assembly would next year hold its third special session devoted to disarmament. During that session the progress made in the past nine years in the field of disarmament will be reviewed. It is hoped that the session will provide a forum for breaking new ground that could also serve as input to the bilateral arms negotiations between the super-Powers. The opportunity further to solidify the achievements of the first two special sessions should not be allowed to slip away.

It will be recalled that at the first special session the international community resolved to pursue the attainment of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At that session the Conference on Disarmament was recognized as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. The important role that bilateral and regional negotiations could play to facilitate the negotiation of multilateral agreements in the field of disarmament was also recognized in paragraph 121 of the Final Document.

In concluding, I pledge that the Nigerian delegation will co-operate positively towards the success of the third special session.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwaic) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure at the outset to extend to you, on behalf of my delegation, congratulations on your election to head this important Committee of the General Assembly, which is attributable to your prudence, experience and expertise in the international and diplomatic sphere.

I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee and wish them success in their work.

I must also take this occasion to congratulate my friend Mr. Yasushi Akashi, Under-Secretary-General, on his assumption of his important post. I know of his competence and experience, and am confident he will fulfil his task successfully.

The forty-second session has been convened at a time of concrete and promising progress in the positions of the two super-Powers on substantive questions and aspects of the disarmament situation.

The fact that a number of constructive initiatives by the leaders of the two major Powers have emerged is in itself considerable ground for optimism and for faith in the possibility of reaching an agreement that would eliminate the horrifying spectre of human annihilation. Since this vital issue falls within the purview of this Committee, members are following these developments with great interest.

The fact is that concern is not limited to bodies of international action and international negotiating mechanisms. Concern is felt more widely than that, by popular organizations and individuals throughout the world, for in nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike, people realize that the nuclear threat has become a sword of Damocles hanging over humanity. General Assembly resolution 41/61 of last year on the inclusion of the item entitled "World Disarmament Conference" on the agenda of the current session represents yet another demonstration of that

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

concern and is further evidence of the resolve of the international majority to achieve progress on this issue before catastrophe strikes.

The State of Kuwait's firm and keen desire to contribute to the invigoration of international efforts in the disarmament field basically derives from our belief that the world's security and peace are at present held hostage to agreement between the two nuclear blocs and that there will be no stability for mankind unless the super-Powers undertake seriously and effectively to eliminate all the weapons that threaten us with total annihilation. We are therefore anxious and hopeful that further constructive steps will be taken, including a Soviet-United States summit meeting that takes advantage of the current atmosphere and responds to the international will and serves human survival.

In this connection we must also refer to the other side of the disarmament question, which has recently been accorded international attention with the convening of the important International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development. The world community's insistence that that conference be held despite the withdrawal of the most influential party was a clear message about a bitter contemporary anomaly: the contrast between the generous sums spent on weapons of destruction and the developing world's lack of basic needs such as food and shelter and resources for development.

By holding that Conference, the international majority wished to argue its case on this issue, using evidence, figures and proof, and to rebut the justifications put forward for the nuclear race that contend that weapons are a security imperative; for as the result of that contention, our world is today engaged in a dangerous, spiralling arms race of increasing intensity, against which attempts at containment have proved futile. The position of the State of Kuwait in the Conference was clear, consistent with its philosophy and policies, and supportive of the purposes and motives of the Conference.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Since my country, Kuwait, is at present Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, we are honoured to recall what the Chairman of the Conference, His Highness the Emir of the State of Kuwait, Shaikh Jaber Al-Ahmed Al-Sabah, called for at the summit meeting last January, when he demanded security for all countries, big and small, the reduction of armaments budgets and the release of a portion of those budgets for development purposes.

Guided by the call of the Chairman of the Islamic Conference, and taking advantage of our presence here, on behalf of the Islamic world, I would urge the super-Powers to halt all nuclear tests, to conclude a treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests, to prevent an arms race in outer space and to break the barriers that obstruct agreement on a verification system to oversee the parties' observation of nuclear disarmament agreements. We also urge all countries to prohibit chemical and biological weapons and immediately to halt their use, development or storage.

If Kuwait consistently encourages nuclear non-proliferation and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, its main motive is its intense awareness of the threatening nuclear shadow cast over our region by the Zionist entity, which in the early years of its occupation of Palestine embarked on a course of mobilizing the energy and resources it seized and plundered from the usurped land and dislocated nation in order to develop a nuclear military capability, thus intensifying the terrorism and regional intimidation that Israel had imposed. Suffice it to mention the official reports from both East and West and the affair of Vanunu, the Israeli technician who is still on trial for exposing details of Israel's nuclear arsenal. And six years ago the world was profoundly shocked when Israel bombed the Iraqi peaceful nuclear reactor, and was dismayed by that act's implications for international efforts with regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

That is not the only bitter reality underlying the many international resolutions on this question, for Israel's nuclear threat and its flagrant defiance of relevant international laws have had serious implications that have spread to its peer in vice and usurpation, South Africa, whose nuclear co-operation, in the light of now-established fact, constitutes a major aspect of that disgraceful relationship, every element of which has been condemned and rejected by the international community.

Our strong calls for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones have not been limited to the Middle East and Africa. They have included Asia, and we still unwaveringly support the implementation of the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. We also support the holding of a conference on that question.

I wish to express Kuwait's support for the formulation of effective international arrangements to enhance the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons, arrangements we have supported since our Organization began deliberating them in 1974.

We also join the Committee in all its efforts to implement the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and the resolution on strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region and making it free of military manoeuvres. My country's delegation also supports the establishment of a new comprehensive system of international peace and security, as proposed last year.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): First, I should like to express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other officers of the Committee, my congratulations on your election to the responsible posts you hold and to wish you success in your work.

I should like also to express publicly what I have already communicated in a private conversation and to congratulate Mr. Akashi on his new post and to wish him success in his work.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

We are sure that the Committee's Rapporteur will be able to report that our deliberations on the questions before us on disarmament and international security have been productive.

The past week of general debate on disarmament questions has allowed us to identify at least two characteristics that have not always been present in past years and that were a part of virtually all the statements. First, there is optimism, generated by the prospects of fruitful developments in the field of Soviet-United States disarmament negotiations and, secondly, there is the constructive and non-confrontational atmosphere of our discussions.

Those two factors can substantively promote a third, namely, the fostering of multilateral efforts in respect of arms limitation and disarmament. Progress in this sphere is both possible and necessary for strengthening international security and making it comprehensive and irreversible. This is borne out by today's realities. Mutually complementary and mutually enriching, all of these factors can together prepare the way for a reliable and non-violent peace without wars or weapons.

Indeed, if we take the problem of preventing nuclear war, many of those sitting in this Hall will recall how hard it was a few years ago to gain acceptance for the idea of condemning nuclear war and for resolutions declaring nuclear war the gravest crime against humanity, a crime contrary to human conscience and reason, the most monstrous crime against peoples, and an infringement of the primary human right, the right to life. Today, those multilateral efforts are bearing fruit. Today, the formula, "A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought," has been signed by the leaders of the two biggest nuclear Powers of the world and enjoys, for all practical purposes, the boundless support of the entire world community.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

The importance of this change, albeit so far only conceptual, should not be belittled. Without it, there can be no practical steps.

A year ago the Secretary-General of the United Nations proposed setting up a multilateral centre for preventing nuclear war. A month ago a Soviet-United States agreement was signed to establish such centres on a bilateral basis. This, in turn, will further improve chances for implementing the Secretary-General's proposal, for which we reiterate our support.

Let us take the problems of halting and curtailing the arms race. In the relatively recent past, attempts were made to convince us that that was not a road leading to security. In the "Study on deterrence" (A/.../432) the advocates of one of those views alleged that the arms race was merely - to use his words - "a misleading metaphor". Today, in the light of Reykjavik and in the light of the USSR-United States agreement in principle to eliminate two classes of their nuclear missiles, that assertion is perceived as an amusing oddity.

The emerging Soviet-American agreement constitutes the first stage of a powerful booster that can take us to the lofty goal of the full elimination of nuclear weapons. The next stage should encompass a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms of the USSR and United States coupled with guarantees against the introduction of the arms race into outer space. The specific proposals by the USSR in this connection made at the Geneva talks, of which the delegation of the Soviet Union informed the First Committee on 12 October of this year, attest to the seriousness of its approach, which is designed to ensure rapid advancement towards that goal and to take into account the security interests of the partners and universal security.

One occasionally hears that the concept of complete elimination of nuclear weapons is neither practicable nor feasible. Yet we have heard the very same things said about other disarmament ideas that have today already begun to

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

materialize. The Byelorussian SSR is firmly convinced that the coming years will witness a practical triumph for this concept as well. Mankind has no other way to of securing true freedom of life in conditions of peace and of delivering itself from the constant fear of annihilation. The year 2000, projected in the integrated stage-by-stage programme of security through disarmament proposed by the USSR, is a very realistic date.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

What is needed to achieve this goal are efforts by all the nuclear States and the support of other countries. We hope that the initial success in the nuclear disarmament efforts of the USSR and the United States of America will also prompt the other nuclear-weapon States to opt for the path of nuclear disarmament, rather than for proceeding with programmes to build up stockpiles of nuclear death.

We are perturbed by some statements such as "We are a little nuclear Power", "Let only the USSR and the US disarm", "We have always been right", or that the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development has, allegedly, undermined the prestige of the United Nations. In our view, a small nuclear threat can result in a universal disaster just as the initial stage of pregnancy can result in a birth. Nuclear disarmament must be universal and complete, and conventional armaments should be at a balanced minimum level. To strike a pose as the possessor of the "ultimate truth" means blocking the way to dialogue, compromises and agreements. The Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development is a generally recognized United Nations success which, provided that consensus agreements are complied with, makes it possible to move further towards shaping a more secure world, resolving the problem of economic development, and overcoming the backwardness of developing countries.

Two nuclear Powers - the USSR and China - have pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The contribution of those unilateral actions to cementing international security can be significantly stronger if all other nuclear States heed the call of the General Assembly and undertake similar commitments which can be embodied in a legally binding document. A convention banning the use of nuclear weapons altogether could become an important element.

A measure of great importance from the perspective of strengthening security could also be a larger step - such as the renunciation by the nuclear States and

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

their allies of the first use of nuclear and conventional weapons and of the use of force in inter-State - inter-bloc - relations in any conditions and under any circumstances. This is something being proposed by the Warsaw Treaty member States.

It is necessary to achieve fruitful completion of the efforts undertaken over many years to strengthen the security guarantees for non-nuclear countries which do not have nuclear weapons on their territory - guarantees that would rule out the threat or use of such weapons.

Multilateral efforts are a promising and essential means of ensuring nuclear disarmament. The stagnation which still persists in this direction, including at the Conference on Disarmament, and the failure to initiate specific talks are causing dissatisfaction and bewilderment, to say the least. For, indeed, much is being said here about the need for strict compliance with the obligations undertaken and the importance of consensus decisions. Yet we have before us the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which contains a consensus-approved obligation of all United Nations Members to seek nuclear disarmament. How can this be achieved? It can be done by appropriate negotiations. Hence the need to launch such negotiations - in addition to bilateral talks - at the Conference on Disarmament. Let us finally begin to respond to our own appeals and fulfil the consensus obligations assumed previously.

At the same time, it is also possible to search for new forms of making headway in the area of nuclear disarmament. A special meeting of the Security Council on this matter could become such a forum.

The aforementioned applies equally to multilateral talks on the prohibition of nuclear testing. The chronic failure to begin negotiating in earnest at the Conference on Disarmament on the substance of that problem casts a shadow on the sincerity of the declared aspiration for nuclear disarmament. The only real

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

obstacle to banning nuclear tests is the desire to build up and improve nuclear arms and to develop new types of weapons using nuclear-explosion energy.

As is well known, the Soviet Union has not only declared its desire to negotiate a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, both bilateral with the United States and multilateral, but has also undertaken quite a few major steps to create the best possible conditions for that. The planned initiation of full-scale, stage-by-stage Soviet-United States talks on nuclear testing, which will be held in a single forum, is an important result of such steps.

The Byelorussian SSR is convinced that the Conference on Disarmament should undertake parallel negotiations which would be aimed at a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests by all States. The socialist States participating in the work of the Conference submitted at its last session a document entitled "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests" and other proposals, including that on strict, effective, mutual and reliable verification, which are called upon to ensure that the negotiations get off to a serious start from the very outset.

The international community should not ignore a single constructive way of achieving a general and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests. In this connection, the Byelorussian SSR holds a positive view of the proposal contained in General Assembly resolution 41/46 B to convene a conference with a view to expanding the scope of the prohibitions provided for in the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in three environments, to which it is a party. Incidentally, this would be in line also with the obligations under that treaty. A more detailed presentation of the position of the Byelorussian SSR on the question of nuclear tests is set out in document A/C.1/42/2.

The Byelorussian SSR fully supports the proposals on establishing zones of peace and co-operation in the Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, South-East Asia and

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

the South Atlantic, denuclearized zones and corridors, zones free of chemical weapons, zones with lesser concentration of armed forces and armaments, and other measures along these lines.

We applaud the entry into force of the Treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific and call upon the United States, Britain and France to follow the example of the USSR and the People's Republic of China and sign the Protocols to that Treaty. Such a step would consolidate the régime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and promote the process of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

With reference to the goal of full elimination of nuclear weapons, the question is occasionally asked how it is possible to ensure that they will not reappear in a nuclear-free world. This can obviously be done if there is a sincere desire to achieve this goal. It can be said even now that strengthening the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, supplementing it with a full-scale ban on the testing of those weapons, and introducing a strict system of appropriate verification are precisely those measures which, given the elimination of nuclear arsenals, can, together with other steps, ensure effective guarantees against their reconstitution.

With reference to the problem of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we take note with great alarm of disquieting reports about their possible spread and we cannot fail to note that the assertions made over many years about the "productiveness" and "usefulness" of nuclear deterrence - assertions made with misguided persistence worthy of better use - have played a considerable negative role in this regard.

What is needed to ensure mankind's survival is the complete elimination not only of nuclear but also of other types of weapons of mass destruction. This applies, first and foremost, to chemical weapons. We have been closely following the work of the Conference on Disarmament and we welcome the progress made over the past few years in the negotiations on the convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. Ultimate success calls for a serious concentration of constructive efforts to further the negotiations and for deliberate restraint so as not to harm the negotiations through ill-considered actions. This is how some participants in the negotiations are acting. In particular, the declaration by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on discontinuing its production of chemical weapons, the fact that it has set about

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

building a plant to destroy chemical munitions, the measures of strict and mutual verification it has proposed, and finally the recent invitation to participants in the Conference on Disarmament to visit the military facility in Shikhany all attest to the sincerity of Soviet intentions and the concord between its words and its deeds and, in addition, facilitate progress at the negotiations themselves.

We are, however, getting the impression that as the pace of drawing up the convention quickens, some other participants in these negotiations are showing a desire to step on the brakes. That impression is based primarily on the intention to resume production of chemical munitions and in a new, binary form at that. Production of binary weapons would substantially complicate the work of the Conference on Disarmament with regard to a ban on chemical weapons.

Prevention of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and of new systems of such weapons is one of the major problems that must be resolved to shape a safe world. The Byelorussian SSR will submit to the Assembly for its consideration a draft resolution on that subject.

Much is being said these days about the importance of issues pertaining to conventional armaments. It is important, however, to move from words to practical deeds. Guided by precisely such a businesslike approach, the socialist countries are supplementing the programme for the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction with a specific programme for strengthening security in Europe through a mutual stage-by-stage and substantial reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in combination with tactical nuclear systems. The time has come to reach agreement on a mandate for the second stage of the Stockholm Conference with a view to initiating talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Given a sincere interest on the part of both sides, it might be possible quickly to resolve the problem of "asymmetries" wherever they exist and to proceed within an agreed time frame to redressing them, at a lower level of course. This is the goal of the socialist countries. In these conditions legitimate concern is being expressed over the intention to make up for the forthcoming reductions in medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles on which there is agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States of America by building up conventional arms and in particular by re-equipping a considerable number of B-52 strategic bombers with long-range cruise missiles tipped with powerful non-nuclear warheads. Let alone the fact that this would complicate the issue of monitoring an agreement on nuclear missiles, to "offset" one type of instrument of sure death by another is incompatible with mankind's desire for peace and disarmament.

This year the Disarmament Commission has begun to deal with the problem of reductions in conventional arms. There has been an interesting and useful discussion on a relevant draft document on this issue and we expect that it will be continued successfully.

The Disarmament Commission has also made an important beginning with regard to verification in all its aspects. The relevant work on the subject in the Commission vividly proves that a constructive atmosphere, a spirit of co-operation, and regard for realities can in fact ensure successful headway in such an important, complex and delicate area as verification.

Progress in the field of disarmament is closely linked to confidence building. The attainment, and now the actual beginning, of the implementation of the 1986 Stockholm agreement also attest to the great opportunities opened up by the sincere desire for co-operation. The first on-demand, on-site inspection under the Stockholm agreement carried out by the United States in the territory of

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

Byelorussia has demonstrated the efficiency of that agreement and will contribute, we hope, to further progress in building and strengthening confidence. We are satisfied with the positive statements made by several delegations on this issue. The valuable experience gained at Stockholm should be utilized in other parts of our planet as well. It stands to reason that it is impossible blindly to apply detailed prescriptions to other regions. That is indisputable. Similarly, a skilled physician will not use exactly the same methods in treating different people. But as a general remedy for the ailment of enmity and suspicion, the administering of which benefits States and improves the situation in the region and consequently throughout the world, the experience accumulated in the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) can be usefully applied beyond Europe as well.

The attitude of the Byelorussian SSR to the upcoming third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has been set out in document A/AC.230/2/Add.6. We believe that relying on the experience acquired and the results achieved, the special session will have to outline a programme of action clearly oriented towards practical disarmament measures, primarily in the field of nuclear disarmament. Real disarmament cannot be "shelved". Putting it off till tomorrow entails the risk of catastrophe today.

Disarmament is the surest and most direct road to security - security for all and consequently for each and every one.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Allow me first, Sir, to congratulate you on your unanimous election to the high post of Chairman of the First Committee and to wish you every success. I also congratulate the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur on their election. Finally, I congratulate the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akashi, and wish him success in his important new post.

I have just learned with great regret of the untimely death in London of Mr. Ian Cromartie, who until recently had for several years represented the United Kingdom at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Ambassador Cromartie was an outstanding representative of his country. As Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, he made a great contribution to the negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons. I ask the delegation of the United Kingdom to accept our sincere condolences and to convey to Mr. Cromartie's wife and family our most sincere feelings of sympathy and friendship.

It is now a year since the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik. Today we have an even better basis for asserting that Reykjavik was a turning-point in the present positive developments in world policy, whose harvest we are beginning to reap. There is a real possibility of a radical shift from the dangerous arms race to phased disarmament and the beginning of a movement towards a non-nuclear world. For the first time in history an agreement in principle has been reached between the Soviet Union and the United States on the elimination of two types of nuclear weapons - medium-range missiles and tactical missiles - on a global scale. Mongolia, like all other States throughout the world, views the agreement with great satisfaction and expresses the hope that its direct and most immediate consequence will be the conclusion of an appropriate agreement as the practical realization of new political thinking and action, the first real nuclear disarmament

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

measure. It will undoubtedly give a powerful impetus to the implementation of further, even more important measures of nuclear disarmament and of the decision made at Reykjavik regarding a 50 per cent reduction in the strategic offensive weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States, while preserving and strengthening the anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

We also welcome the agreement reached by the two Powers on the establishment of centres to consider ways of decreasing the danger of nuclear war, which is also in keeping with the interest of strengthening world security. It should also be emphasized that the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to begin full-scale, phased negotiations on a nuclear-weapon-test ban. All these important measures should be strengthened and consistently developed, as the realities of the nuclear and space age demand.

At the forty-first session of the General Assembly, the socialist countries, including Mongolia, put forward the idea of establishing a comprehensive system of international security. That idea can be implemented primarily through disarmament, first and foremost nuclear disarmament. Given the existing level of arms, a global nuclear conflict would mean the annihilation of civilization and perhaps of life itself on this earth. However, the mere recognition of this fact is insufficient. What is required is well-conceived joint action by the international community to preserve peace. In other words, the highest wisdom is today expressed above all by a refusal to use military force as an instrument of foreign policy and by the adoption of practical disarmament measures leading to a situation in which military guarantees of security, which dominate today, are replaced by non-military ones, and security itself is ensured not unilaterally and at the expense of others but on a multilateral basis.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Of great significance in preventing not only nuclear but also conventional war would be the renunciation by nuclear Powers and States parties to military-political alliances of the first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons and the use of force or the threat of its use in inter-State relations. In this connection, particular attention should be paid to the fact that the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have declared, in a document on the military doctrine of those States adopted at their meeting at the end of May this year in Berlin, that in no circumstances will they ever begin military action against any State or alliance of States if they are not themselves the target of a military attack, and that they will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. Attention should also be given to another provision of the document to the effect that the military policy of the Warsaw Treaty and each of the parties to it is dedicated to the prevention of war, whether nuclear or conventional. In our view, those principled provisions are extremely important and make a constructive contribution to the cause of strengthening trust. In present conditions, giving the military doctrines and measures of States and military alliances a defensive character is a substantive factor in strengthening trust and ensuring general security.*

In his statements in the Committee during the past week, the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Petrovsky, has put forward a whole series of realistic proposals and new ideas on ways to ensure international security, strengthen trust and carry out verification in the disarmament field. Those proposals and ideas are distinguished by their innovative quality and their bold formulation of the questions, and they reflect the spirit of new political thinking and glasnost, or openness. We believe that they deserve serious consideration and action by all States.

*Mr. Gutierrez (Costa Rica), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Mongolia believes that the fact that major progress has been made in Soviet-American negotiations is no reason for complacency or inaction. On the contrary, it should serve as a powerful stimulus to stepping up efforts by the international community in all areas of the struggle to strengthen international security and disarmament. Every State, whatever its size and affiliation to one or other military-political alliance, must make its contribution to the achievement of those objectives. Because of their bilateral nature, the Soviet-American negotiations cannot ensure the full and comprehensive resolution of problems of nuclear disarmament and other pressing problems. Therefore, we believe it is necessary to engage in practical dialogue and negotiations at all forums and to make full use of their possibilities and potential.

It would be in no way contradictory to conduct bilateral and multilateral negotiations in parallel. On the contrary, such negotiations would enrich each other and lead to more rapid attainment of the ultimate objective. Therefore, Mongolia considers the suggestion that a special meeting or special meetings of the Security Council be convened to discuss ideas and objectives in the field of nuclear disarmament to be extremely constructive. Naturally, we are in favour of raising multilateral negotiations within the context of the Conference on Disarmament to a new level of effectiveness and practical results.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

Mongolia fully shares the view that conclusion of an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear missiles should not be followed by a build-up of weapons in other areas. Quantitative reductions in nuclear weapons should not be replaced by a qualitative build-up or by the development of new types of weapons and weapon systems.

Thus, in the light of the nuclear disarmament process that has now begun, a ban on nuclear-weapon tests is becoming more urgent. We believe that multilateral negotiations on this issue should supplement the bilateral Soviet-United States negotiations. In that way we would certainly reach the ultimate goal of a final, world-wide halt to all nuclear-weapon-test explosions. In our view, a possible basis for such negotiations is provided by the document entitled "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests", submitted by the socialist countries in June 1987 for consideration by the Conference on Disarmament. The merit of the document is that it takes into account the experience gained through many years of discussion of the question and the specific views and ideas of many other States, including the leaders of the States of the New Delhi Six, and provides for a wide range of forms and methods of verification.

Developments in the process of nuclear disarmament are inextricably linked with the need to keep outer space peaceful and weapon-free. It is generally held that strict and complete compliance with the anti-ballistic missile Treaty - a document that can be the fundamental basis for agreements on substantive reductions in strategic offensive weapons - is of great importance in carrying out this task.

We hope that concrete results will come out of the discussion of these questions at the forthcoming Moscow meeting between the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze, and the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. George Shultz.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

The prevention of an arms race in outer space is a problem of world-wide significance; it affects the security and development interests of all States. Therefore, Mongolia believes it necessary to negotiate practical, effective measures eliminating forever the threat of outer space being transformed into an arena of military rivalry. One such measure could be a system of international verification to prevent the deployment in outer space of weapons of any kind; this could provide for international inspection machinery. The on-site monitoring of the launching of objects into space is of great practical significance now, when no weapons able to strike specific targets have yet been deployed in space.

In short, we must do everything in our power to prevent a future situation where we are discussing disarmament in outer space.

Mongolia is a convinced proponent of a complete prohibition of chemical weapons and of their destruction, and of the elimination of the industrial facilities that manufacture them. In our view, negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a convention on this subject could be successfully concluded in the near future if all States involved in the negotiations were to demonstrate the political will needed to reach agreements, and if they were to be open and trustful towards their partners. An example of such behaviour was recently provided by the Soviet Union at its military facility at Shikhany, where it showed the parties to the chemical weapons negotiations its existing chemical weapons and the technology for their destruction.

As a country which does not possess chemical weapons and which does not intend to produce them, Mongolia is working towards the speedy conclusion of an international convention on the total prohibition and destruction of such weapons. To that end, it has put forward, at the Geneva negotiations, a proposal on a procedure for the destruction of chemical-weapon stockpiles.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

In my statement I have touched on only a few of what are in our view the most important problems on the First Committee's agenda. To be sure, we have comments to make on other issues as well, issues on whose resolution the future of the world depends. I hope later to have the opportunity to speak of these in greater detail.

I wish to end with a quotation from General Secretary Gorbachev's article "Reality and Safeguards for a Secure World" which is, in the words of my Foreign Minister, an integrated programme of measures to eliminate the danger of war and establish a reliable system of international security through the collective efforts of all States under United Nations auspices:

"People can talk as much as they like about the need for halting the arms race, and eliminating militarism, and about co-operation, but nothing will change unless we start to act". (A/42/574, p. 11)

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like to convey to the Chairman my congratulations on his unanimous election to his high post. It is fortunate that a personage of his calibre is presiding over our deliberations on the problems of disarmament.

The agreement in principle between the two super-Powers on the elimination of all medium-range missiles is indeed a reason for optimism - and surely a reason for hope, for it signals a breakthrough on the fundamental issue of the nuclear age; whether the super-Powers can safeguard their security by themselves or whether they must do so through co-operation. It also signals their political intention to dampen their rivalry, and to collaborate. That in itself is a great step forward.

Another hopeful sign for peace is the fact that the Soviet leader, Mr. Gorbachev, called for a strengthening of the United Nations peace-keeping role in the world and for invigorating the Security Council. That is a very significant step, for to build collective security our primary concern should be to restore to

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

the United Nations its intended effectiveness as required by the Charter, through a United Nations force. It is only when nations can conduct their international relations in an atmosphere of mutual trust and security that they will be able to take steps towards actual disarmament and put an end to the arms race.

The preamble to the Charter declares the determination of the peoples of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and to that end to unite their strength in collective action for the maintenance of international peace and security.

This is a time of historic transformations, with all manner of possibilities. We must not let those possibilities remain unexplored. An open-minded pursuit of agreements, away from mutual fear and distrust, is necessary now. Both super-Powers have abundant grounds for confidence. A basic change of approach is imperative.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

We should move away from the extreme antagonisms of the arms race that have brought us to the very brink of self-destruction and towards co-operation for collective security in the common interest for peace and survival.

The way to disarmament is not through mere negotiations on disarmament. The philosophy and process of how to reach the objectives of a non-nuclear world are to be found in a system of international security in an improved world order.

Developing events in the international field have brought into sharp focus the inability of the Security Council to give effect to its decisions owing to the lack of a United Nations force. Why should we be left without a United Nations force? I have never understood that, and I still do not. In recent years a series of unanimously adopted Security Council decisions have been ignored and bypassed with impunity by those concerned. The characteristic importance of Security Council decisions derives from the fact that it is the only organ of the United Nations - I repeat, the only organ - whose decisions are enforceable and must be implemented.

The actual operation of the system of international security, however, has been aborted from the very start of the United Nations owing to the original default of the Security Council, and particularly of its permanent members, to conclude the agreements for a United Nations force, as expressly required by Article 43 of the Charter, which is fundamental. As a result, the whole structure of security through the United Nations has remained paralysed and inoperative.

In the present circumstances, in which the Security Council is left without the means of enforcement action, there being no United Nations force, its decisions, by remaining unimplemented, lose their validity and become a pretence. It is a well-known adage that law without the means of enforcement is no law. Similarly, a Security Council without the means of enforcement is no Security Council, but a pretence.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The practice hitherto of proceeding directly to disarmament negotiations without any reference to concurrent measures for security through the United Nations is a sterile exercise, as has been amply demonstrated by unproductive negotiations on disarmament over decades. Such a practice, moreover, causes many to have the misguided impression that international security is meant to be the outcome of disarmament. That is not true at all. It is a notion that is contrary not only to the Charter but also to all logic. It is putting the cart before the horse and expecting it to move. The result is stagnation. In order to be productive negotiations on disarmament must proceed with due regard for the concomittant requirements of effective international security.

It has to be fully recognized that a closely interdependent world of numerous sovereign nations cannot function towards peace and survival without an effective international organization. We have one. We have the United Nations. But the United Nations has to become effective by being enabled to answer to its primary purpose. The first step in that direction is for the Security Council, and particularly its permanent members, to rectify their original error by proceeding to implement the provisions of Article 43, in Chapter VII of the Charter. This has not been done, and it should be done as possible.

Article 26 of the Charter specifically provides that Security Council shall - I repeat, "shall" - deal with disarmament. It uses the word "shall." When the Charter speaks about the General Assembly dealing with disarmament, it says "may", not "shall." The Security Council, therefore, has a duty to proceed with regard to disarmament. Whereas the General Assembly may or may not, it is mandatory for the Security Council to do so. I raised this issue the year before last in the hope that something would be done in this direction - that is, that the Security Council would undertake to deal with disarmament, complying with the provisions of the Charter, Article 26 of which uses the word "shall".

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

understand that nothing has been done in this direction, and I want to bring this to the Committee's attention. Nothing has been done - unless 't is something that has not come to my knowledge. That may be so, of course. But if nothing has been done, I ask that the situation be remedied and that Article 26 be complied with. It uses the word "shall", and is therefore mandatory.

General Assembly resolution 40/151 A, introduced by Cyprus in 1985, was adopted overwhelmingly. It calls upon the Security Council to conform with the provisions of the Charter and deal with the question of disarmament, with which the Security Council has never dealt, although the Charter provides that it "shall" do so. It ignores the Charter by not doing so, and it ignores also the resolution adopted at the suggestion of Cyprus, which calls on it to deal with the question of disarmament.

My delegation has been dedicated and committed to the quest for the best ways and means towards progress on disarmament and related international security, particularly towards overcoming the inertia in negotiating bodies and the resulting abnormality of the situation.

We strongly believe that the only way to halt the arms race is - and I stress this - through the collective security provided for in the Charter. The arms race, which is a preparation for war, is a negative approach to the attainment of a peaceful world. It cannot be countered by another negative, such as parity in weapons or the doctrine of deterrence. Those doctrines, in effect, engender and intensify the arms race.

Because of the wide extent of its radioactive effects, the nuclear weapon can no longer hit part of the globe without destroying or at least damaging other parts. It is thus illusory to think that the target of any attack can be a particular country or group of countries. The target is the Earth itself. Thus,

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

the nuclear weapon serves to create awareness of the close link of interdependence among all nations and peoples that transcends all their differences. Seen as the potential moralizer of man, the nuclear weapon has in a sense become a call for co-operation and peace. The implications of non-co-operation have made evident the necessity of co-operation for peace and security.

True national interests are best served by serving the interest of the world community. Such concepts as "the brotherhood of man," which a few years ago were considered remote and unattainable ideals, have now become a practical reality and a demanding necessity.

In our time and in this age of the United Nations a truly realistic approach to problems is one guided by principles. As Dag Hammarskjöld said, "In our present day the United Nations sheds upon the world of practical policies the light of moral principles written in the Charter. It is in this light that mankind can find its way to peace."

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.