



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGHENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE  
GENERAL DEBATE, AS NECESSARY (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Kiilu (Kenya)  
Mr. Lingama-Toloque (Central African Republic)  
Sister Keenan (Holy-See)  
Mr. Manda-Loundhet (Congo)  
Mr. Al-Nassar (Qatar)  
Miss Fauziah (Malaysia)

\*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.2/50, 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.27  
4 November 1987  
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE, AS NECESSARY

Mr. KILILU (Kenya): Permit me to take this opportunity to extend to you, Sir, my delegation's congratulations on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. We are happy to see you, the representative of Zaire, a country with which Kenya has maintained and enjoyed long-standing ties of fraternity, friendship and co-operation, presiding over our deliberations. I should like to assure you of my delegation's full co-operation in the discharge of your responsibilities.

I also extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

One of the paradoxical developments of our time has been the replacement of colonialism and foreign domination by super-Power rivalry and competition for spheres of political and economic influence. As a consequence, the world has been faced with worsening international relations coupled with a fierce and open arms race. The build-up of armaments has surpassed legitimate defence needs and, instead of providing deterrence, the extension of this competition to nuclear arms has posed the threatening spectre of the complete annihilation of the whole human race. It is against this backdrop that the Committee is convened every year to explore and deliberate on the cardinal problems of our time, namely, the elimination of the nuclear danger, ridding mankind of the burden of nuclear and other armaments, strengthening international security, and developing international co-operation. No one can doubt that this has been a difficult process, and the hope that one day the international community will harmonize its security differences remains the only motivating factor.

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

In this context, we cannot lose sight of the reassuring optimism that emanates from the ongoing bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both have agreed in principle to eliminate land-based intermediate-range and short-range nuclear weapons in Europe and elsewhere. The whole world welcomes this as the first real attempt to dismantle two categories of nuclear arms. Any success in this will, it is hoped, lead to further agreements on the more complex issues of space and strategic nuclear arms. My delegation, like many others, calls upon the two super-Powers to spare no effort in seeking the attainment of all their agreed objectives in their negotiations, in accordance with the security interests of the whole world and the universal desire for complete disarmament.

Of the many issues on the Committee's agenda for this session the prevention of nuclear war is the most prominent. Numerous proposals have been submitted on this subject, notably on non-first-use and a convention on the total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Immediate measures have been proposed as a first step towards the prevention of nuclear war, such as a nuclear-arms freeze which embraces a comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. This emphasis is as it should be, because the prevention of nuclear war remains our most urgent and immediate task, yet possibly the most difficult. With increased reliance on and advancement of technology, accidental nuclear war is no longer a hypothetical probability and thus every effort must be deployed towards the avoidance of nuclear war.

The first step towards preventing nuclear war and halting the arms race would be the early conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on the complete prohibition of the testing of all types of nuclear weapons in all environments by all States. While recognizing that there exist at present real and potential difficulties in

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

the way of the conclusion of a verifiable treaty banning all nuclear tests, I should like to reaffirm the importance that my country attaches to the Group of Seismic Experts in its efforts to overcome various technical verification problems. Similarly, we are equally convinced that whatever the differences on the issue of verification there are no insurmountable obstacles necessitating a delay in the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban with the existing seismological techniques, which could guarantee the first stages of compliance with the treaty pending other effective verification techniques. In this context, my delegation will continue to support the establishment of an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban as a subsidiary body of the Conference on Disarmament, with a view to taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives.

My delegation attaches great importance to the question of effective international arrangements to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. As I have just said, nuclear weapons constitute the gravest threat to humanity and, as in the case of a nuclear-test ban, negative security assurances should be viewed as a positive step towards the elimination of these weapons, pending other effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

Kenya shares the conviction that there is a need for urgent multilateral negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race through mutually negotiated measures. Multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament are long overdue and, in any event, bilateral negotiations, because of their limited scope, can never replace or nullify the genuine multilateral search for concrete disarmament measures that is envisaged if an ad hoc committee of the Conference on Disarmament is established with an appropriate mandate. My delegation subscribes fully to the view that the Conference on Disarmament should start serious consideration of all

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

issues related to the cessation of a nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, as prescribed in paragraphs 50 and 51 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

My Government considers that the time is ripe for early negotiation of a convention on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Outer space, which is designated in the 1967 outer space Treaty a common heritage of mankind, is being contemplated as a new frontier for the extension of the nuclear-arms race. This may prove to be the most extraordinary development in military history since the advent of the nuclear era and thus warrants universal concern. In recognition of the importance and urgency of preventing these ominous developments, discussions should be intensified, both at the bilateral level and in the Conference on Disarmament, on how best to attain a more comprehensive legal régime with sufficient guarantees to prevent the militarization of outer space. Such a régime should enhance effectiveness and establish the importance of strict compliance with existing agreements.

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

We share the opinion that a comprehensive chemical weapons convention is in sight. My delegation is encouraged by the recent convergence of views registered in the elaboration of draft articles governing challenge inspections and control to ensure non-production of chemical weapons by civil industry. However, even taking into account the political sensitivity of the issues involved, the pace of the already long-overdue negotiating process has been very slow. We believe that on the basis of the present preliminary structure of the convention, complemented by strong political will and trust between the major chemical-weapons States, a treaty could be completed at an early date. We firmly share the view that the Conference on Disarmament should pursue vigorously its negotiations on this multilateral draft convention, which will close all loopholes and guarantee forever the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. Pending such a convention, all States should co-operate in efforts to prevent the use of chemical weapons, in accordance with the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

For over two decades African States have continued to demonstrate their peaceful intentions through their proclaimed commitment to the cause of denuclearization of the continent as espoused by the 1964 Cairo Declaration of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Over the years African delegations have initiated resolutions calling upon all States to consider and respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Similarly, African delegations have sought the international community's condemnation of South Africa's nuclear capability and all forms of nuclear collaboration by any State, corporation, institution or individual with the racist South African régime. Despite tireless support and the recognition that acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability by the racist régime constitutes a very grave danger to the continent and to international

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

peace and security, collaboration in all forms by certain States is very evident and widely reported in conservative international media.

We strongly believe that the attainment of military nuclear capability by South Africa could be designed to hold the whole of Africa hostage and hence delay Namibia's independence and the dismantling of the abhorrent policies of apartheid. In view of this, we reaffirm our support for the African peoples' appeal to the countries concerned to terminate forthwith all forms of collaboration with the racist régime in the military and nuclear fields. We also request the Security Council to conclude expeditiously consideration of the recommendations of the Committee established by its resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa, with a view to blocking the existing loopholes in the arms embargo so as to render it more effective and prohibitive.

Kenya continues to attach particular importance to the establishment of zone of peace in various parts of the world. Such zones could strengthen the fabric of regional peace and stability and prevent extraregional interference, thereby creating conditions conducive to regional co-operation in the field of economic and social development. In the light of this fact, the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace reflects the hopes and aspirations of littoral and hinterland States to enhance the prospects of peace, stability, security and the promotion of economic well-being of the respective States. We feel that the first step towards the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region is the convening of the long overdue International Conference. The Conference would harmonize the interests and viewpoints of the countries in the region and the major naval Powers and maritime users. We deeply regret that the Ad Hoc Committee entrusted with the attainment of this objective has not yet been able to achieve any meaningful progress in either the substantive or the organizational field. The volatile

(Mr. Kiilu, Kenya)

political and security climate in the region has increased the urgency of convening the Conference at an early date.

The recently concluded Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development adopted a Final Document in which it was recognized that, considering the present resource constraints on both developed and developing countries, reduced world military spending could contribute significantly to development. But the most significant outcome of the Conference was the recommendations in the action programme to foster the interrelated perspective on disarmament, development and security and to strengthen the central role of the United Nations in this regard. Kenya views the achievements of this Conference as most significant and calls for implementation of its recommendations.

Finally, as the preparatory work for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is at an advanced stage, we feel very strongly that it is necessary to determine specific dates during 1988 at which the special session should take place. We hope that the third special session will be able to improve on the outcome of the two previous special sessions, of 1978 and 1982, in order to arrive at a realistic consensus document that will be unassailable for the next decade. We view this session as a very important one at which a definitive approach to the current status of disarmament initiatives and their future course will be evaluated.

Mr. LINGAMA-TOLEQUE (Central African Republic) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of the Central African Republic, I should like to express our pride at seeing you leading the work of this Committee. I am particularly pleased in that our two countries - the Central African Republic and the Republic of Zaire - maintain excellent brotherly relations. Thus I am convinced that, thanks to your proved diplomatic skills and



(Mr. Lingama-Toleque, Central  
African Republic)

the enlightened assistance of the other officers of the Committee, to whom I also extend my delegation's congratulations, the work of our Committee will have the desired results.

The United Nations Charter envisaged disarmament as an element of the collective establishment of an international security system, but the manufacture and use of sophisticated weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, runs counter to this vision, making the possibility of a world of peace very doubtful. Thus, the international community has made disarmament one of its major concerns.

(Mr. Lingama-Toleque, Central  
African Republic)

Forty years have elapsed and the results attained in this area have not always lived up to one's hopes. In the mean time, in the name of finding a balanced force, the major Powers have become engaged in an unbridled arms race and new arsenals with massive destruction capabilities have accumulated, driving mankind to the brink of disaster.

Numerous approaches have been conceived without success to establish a dialogue, both in order to avoid having recourse to war, ostensibly as an instrument of international politics, and in order to attain the ultimate objective, of general and complete disarmament.

The Central African Republic, a peace-loving country, is particularly aware of the complexity of the problems related to disarmament - which as we all know affect the vital interests of States - since we appreciate the various efforts undertaken within the framework of the United Nations as well as the new attitudes and policies, whatever their origin, designed to resolve these problems and thereby strengthen international peace and security.

The work of our Committee is taking place at a time when there seems to be a certain degree of détente in the international climate. This is due first of all to the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which have once again demonstrated genuine political will commensurate with their world responsibilities and have become convinced that, beyond their ideological differences, dialogue remains the only means of reaching agreement on nuclear disarmament measures.

The agreement in principle reached in September between the two super-Powers for the elimination of a whole range of nuclear weapons is a historic event. It marks a turning-point in East-West relations, thereby providing favourable conditions for disarmament.

(Mr. Lingama-Toleague, Central  
African Republic)

It is also encouraging to see that the way is open for further discussions that could lead to an agreement with regard to a 50 per cent reduction in offensive strategic arms and perhaps with regard to the deployment of weapons in space.

The great hope prompted throughout the world by this agreement in principle took form in a consensus decision of the General Assembly of 21 October 1987 in which the international community requested the two super-Powers to spare no effort to conclude a treaty on the elimination of their medium- and shorter-range missiles and to do everything possible to conclude a treaty on the reduction of their offensive strategic arms.

The Central African Republic joined in that consensus. Indeed, my delegation is gratified that the spirit of Reykjavik continues and augurs well for the sustained dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union, as is evidenced by the frequency of the meetings between them. My delegation also hopes that this dialogue will lead to a new summit meeting.

While the present situation offers excellent prospects for the two super-Powers to become involved in bilateral negotiations with a view to nuclear disarmament, it is no less necessary or urgent to undertake multilateral negotiations within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament with a view to the drafting of concrete disarmament measures, together with verification provisions that would take into account the aspirations of the parties concerned. This would have the advantage of establishing an atmosphere of trust between them and would thus contribute to international peace and security.

It is none the less regrettable that the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating body, is not yet able to play a dominant role in the disarmament process.

(Mr. Lingama-Toleque, Central  
African Republic)

The adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 41/46 A on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions has not been able to prevent these explosions. My delegation is deeply concerned because this trend can only strengthen the equilibrium of terror, which would on the one hand give States that have nuclear weapons the false impression that they were safe from any nuclear threat, and, on the other hand, would hang over the whole world the threat of permanent insecurity. My delegation therefore supports the disarmament measures advocated by the Conference on Disarmament in its report in respect of the nuclear-test ban. That document represents a significant contribution to the objective of putting an end to the perfecting - the qualitative perfecting - of nuclear arms, the development of new types of weapons, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Moreover, my delegation notes with satisfaction the progress achieved in the Conference on Disarmament on negotiations leading to a convention on the prohibition of the manufacture and use of chemical weapons. Consequently, it endorses the re-establishment by the Conference on Disarmament of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which received a mandate to continue negotiations and the drafting of this convention, which has become all the more necessary than ever.

The great interest in questions of nuclear disarmament and of the prevention of the arms race in outer space should not make us lose sight of the importance of conventional disarmament, notably in Europe. The great concentration of conventional forces in that area of the world, with the consequent climate of distrust which it engenders in the two blocs, requires more constructive negotiations with a view to their reduction.

(Mr. Lingama-Toleague, Central African Republic)

In his report on the activities of the Organization, the Secretary-General notes the nefarious effect of the acquisition by the developing countries of vast resources of perfected armaments, which are a financial burden on their economies and increase their indebtedness.

My delegation endorses the decision to create regional centres for the promotion of peace and disarmament which, in this respect, represents a promising initiative in our developing countries. We hope that these centres will contribute to promoting awareness in the third world of the idea of disarmament and of the need to devote resources to development, for their benefit.

During his statement to the General Assembly on 8 October 1987, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation of the Central African Republic commented on the conclusions of the work of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and stated:

"The arms race is thus a real threat to international peace and security and is certainly an obstacle to development, because major resources are devoted to it when they could have been used for development." (A/42/PV.31, p. 61)

My delegation commends the adoption by consensus of the Final Document of the Conference, despite its limitations. We hope that the measures advocated in that Final Document will not just prove to be pious wishes.

As for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, my delegation hopes, as the head of the Central African delegation indicated during the general debate, that it will provide an opportunity for the international community to identify the major strategies to be followed in making disarmament effective.

(Mr. Lingama-Toloque, Central  
African Republic)

The Central African Republic, faithful to the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted by the Heads of State and Government in the Organization of African Unity in 1964, and to resolutions 41/55 A and B on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, is seriously concerned over the nuclear capability of South Africa, which not only could become an instrument of a policy and threat against neighbouring States, but will increase the threat to international peace and security. We urgently appeal to the nuclear Powers to keep our continent free of nuclear weapons. This would be an important step on the way to the general and complete disarmament to which the international community aspires.

Sister KEENAN (Holy See): Before making this brief statement, the Holy See delegation would like to thank the Chairman for the privilege of addressing the First Committee and, at the same time, congratulate him and the other members of the Bureau.

Rarely has the fundamental solidarity and interdependence of States been cast into sharper relief than during this past year which has seen notable progress in bilateral, multilateral and regional disarmament negotiations.

(Sister Keenan, Holy See)

In the bilateral field the international community is filled with a realistic, if cautious, hope that the first true disarmament measure since the beginning of the nuclear age will be concluded. The significance of this event goes beyond its political or military importance. It represents a decision to halt, to stop, to eliminate. This step, once taken, opens the way for even more important reductions in nuclear weapons, tending towards their total elimination. The Holy See has consistently called for such measures. The removal of the overriding threat of the use of such weapons of mass destruction, provided that the legitimate security of States and hence of peoples were assured, would represent a highly positive contribution to the building of a peaceful world. Then, the international community could address with ever greater urgency those issues which directly touch the lives of people, such as conventional and chemical-weapons disarmament, the integral development of peoples, the dignity and liberty of each person.

Nuclear disarmament cannot stand alone. It must be accompanied by conventional disarmament measures, not only in those regions most directly affected by nuclear weapons but also in those areas where conflicts are causing so many deaths and leading to a tragic loss of hope in the future on the part of suffering populations. The effects on youth are particularly preoccupying.

Disarmament is the responsibility of all. It concerns all. It affects all. An integrated vision of disarmament, embracing all types of weapons, as well as the consideration of various means of conflict avoidance and resolution, must gradually move States, all States, towards a more peaceful, more secure world. This is a fundamental exigency of that international community which the United Nations is seeking to build and which exists already, not only in the shared humanity of so many peoples but also in the binding force of an increasing number of treaties and agreements. In this constantly developing community of nations no State is too small or too big to be safe from war and conflict wherever it may exist.

(Bisiter Keenan, Holy See)

There are still many well-known obstacles facing disarmament, and even to the establishment of dialogue in truth and liberty. Never, however, can there be an obstacle so great that States and peoples can escape the responsibility of doing all possible to prepare for and pursue dialogue and negotiations. All paths must be patiently explored and tested. This applies particularly to regions where the level of armaments far surpasses the requirements of legitimate self-defence.

In concluding, the Holy See would like once again to express its hopes in the possibilities for peace and disarmament that the present moment offers. It would particularly like to encourage the disarmament efforts of the United Nations, which both complement and complete other negotiations, thus giving full expression to the desires of the international community.

Mr. MANDA-LOUNDHEU (Congo) (interpretation from French): I should like to begin, Mr. Chairman, by expressing the satisfaction of the Congolese delegation that the work of the First Committee conducted at this forty-second session of the General Assembly is being conducted by you, a man whose knowledge of the problems with which we deal here and whose talents as an experienced diplomat have already been eloquently evoked by previous speakers. My delegation is all the more pleased in that you belong to a country of Central Africa, Zaire, to which my country, Congo, is bound by ties of blood, tradition, language and so on. The delegation of Congo is convinced that you will steer this ship safely to port.

I should also like to express to your predecessor, Ambassador Zachmann, the Congolese delegation's appreciation of the competence and effectiveness with which he fulfilled his functions.

To Mr. Akashi, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, whose visit to the Congo when he was still Under-Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Public Information, we still remember with pleasure, we should also



(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

like to express our gratitude and our encouragement in his pursuit of his dynamic promotion of disarmament.

Lastly, we assure all the other officers of the Committee and members of the Secretariat that they may rely upon the full co-operation of the Congolese delegation.

Many delegations which have preceded me have agreed in saying that the work of the First Committee this year began under the signs of hope and fear.

There was hope, because, after Reykjavik, which marked some progress along the road towards the reduction by 50 per cent of the strategic offensive weapons of both sides, the agreement in principle reached on 18 September 1987 by Mr. Shultz, the United States Secretary of State, and Mr. Shevardnadze, the Soviet Minister for Foreign Affairs, on the elimination of intermediate nuclear forces was immediately felt by the world public to be the beginning of an irreversible process towards general and complete disarmament. That agreement meets the concerns expressed by the General Assembly in resolutions 41/59 A to O, adopted on 3 December 1986, to which the People's Republic of the Congo gave its full support.

There was fear, because the history of Soviet-American relations remains fraught with uncertainty. There was fear that the delicate agreement in principle might be paralysed by preconceived ideas and thus stillborn, shattering all the hopes of the brilliant future that we all desire. For example, as a forewarning, is it not already being said that the presence of medium-range nuclear weapons offered public opinion reassurance, and that it was pointless to disturb it?

Man is today caught in a trap of his own making and is trying desperately to escape. Will he manage to do so? The future - his future - will tell.

Never has our planet been so over-armed, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Never has mankind been so close to the brink. Indeed, today there are more than 50,000 nuclear warheads, which, if detonated simultaneously, could,

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

according to Mr. Prvosla Davinic, special Assistant to the Under-Secretary-General of the Department of Disarmament Affairs, suffice to destroy the world 10 times over. According to that same expert, a single nuclear submarine could have fire-power equal to that of all the munitions exploded in all the wars throughout history.

Notwithstanding that terrifying prospect, the unbridled nuclear-arms race, as well as the conventional, chemical and other arms races, is continuing inexorably, threatening the very survival of mankind. Every day new technologies are being developed for the manufacture of new weapons and other systems of space weapons, giving an ever broader dimension to the arms race.

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

Europe, where the two great opposing military alliances face one another like wrestlers before a fight, contains the world's greatest concentration of weapons and armed forces. The threat stems also from man's desire to arm himself everywhere: on land, in the oceans and in outer space. In the view of my delegation, the doctrine that world peace can be maintained only through nuclear deterrence is dangerous and suicidal.

That is why Congo supports the idea of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East, in South Asia, in Latin America, in Africa and so forth and calls on all nuclear-weapon States to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

Unfortunately, we must note that, as regards Africa, the situation remains complex and deplorable: despite General Assembly resolution 41/55 A of 3 December 1986, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", the apartheid régime of Pretoria, hiding behind its so-called basic security requirements, refuses to abide by that Treaty and continues with impunity to build up its nuclear capability and military might. Without a doubt, this poses a grave threat to international and regional peace and security. Confident of its weapons and its alliances, South Africa shamelessly continues its attacks against the front-line States in order to destabilize their régimes.

In that disturbing general context, we are inevitably reminded of this observation, in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament:

"Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation". (resolution S-10/2, para. 18)

Likewise, Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting in September 1986 at Harare, Zimbabwe, judged the situation to be alarming and

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

"reiterated their view that the greatest peril facing the world is the threat to the survival of humanity posed by the existence of nuclear weapons. Since annihilation needs to happen only once, removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe is not one issue among many, but the most acute and urgent task of the present day". A/41/697, pp. 23-24)

We hope that thought and that appeal will have definite effects in all States. As to the two super-Powers, I would refer to their joint declaration issued at Geneva in November 1985 relating to the acceleration of their bilateral arms-limitation negotiations.

In any event, other States should be kept regularly informed on progress in the negotiations, and the United Nations should function as the most appropriate forum in which to find solutions to the problems that concern us all. Bilateral disarmament measures supplemented by multilateral agreements could help strengthen international peace and security.

My delegation shares the view that a worried or resigned world faces the threat of nuclear conflict and the unbridled race in military expenditure, while the third world, overwhelmed by its debt burden, is ever engaged in the struggle to make ends meet in an ever deteriorating climate.

World military expenditures have taken on frightening dimensions; in one of its reports, the Disarmament Commission has noted that the world trend continues to be one of acceleration and annual increases in these expenditures. In 1986 they were estimated at \$950,000 million, or 6 per cent of the world gross national product; today they have reached the staggering figure of \$1 trillion.

The link between disarmament and development can no longer be ignored. There is an opportunity to reallocate resources released by disarmament to development. That link was stressed in the Final Document adopted by consensus at the

(Mr. Manda-Loundhet, Congo)

International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, finally held, after many delays, in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987. We pay a tribute to France for having proposed the convening of that Conference.

Disarmament is everyone's business. We hope that all States, large or small, powerful or weak, will contribute to the World Disarmament Campaign. We hope too that the next world disarmament conference, to be held in 1988, will give particular impetus to the quest for solutions to disarmament problems.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation speaks today on one of the most crucial items before this Committee, namely Israeli nuclear armament. In the general debate, my delegation made clear its concern at Israel's development of its nuclear capability and its acquisition of highly destructive nuclear weapons. Qatar's permanent representative said in his statement that:

"Although the number of States acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is increasing - there were over 135 at the time of the 1985 Review Conference - Israel still persists in its refusal to accede to that Treaty and to open its nuclear installations to international inspection, unlike the States of the area that acceded to the Treaty and accepted international control over some of their nuclear installations."

Last year, the General Assembly adopted resolution 41/93 of 4 December 1986, in which it requested the Secretary-General:

"to follow closely Israeli nuclear activities in the light of the latest available information, to update the Study on Israeli Nuclear Armament and submit it to the General Assembly at its forty-second session". (resolution 41/93, para. 7)

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

In compliance with that resolution, the Secretary-General has submitted a report (A/42/581) in which he refers to an exposé in the London Sunday Times. Those who read the exposé will recall the numerous details concerning Israel's nuclear capability and the fact that, at the time of the Sunday Times report, it possessed more than 100 nuclear weapons. The Secretary-General quoted from the exposé, with special emphasis, details showing that the Dimona complex has a plutonium extraction plant and that that was the material which Israel probably used in the production of its nuclear weapons.

The Secretary-General also indicated in his report that from the nuclear experts whose opinions the British weekly published it is possible to assume that Israel has been able to manufacture between 100 and 200 nuclear weapons of varying destructive potential. I do not wish to recount in detail things we can read for ourselves in the Secretary-General's report or in the Sunday Times exposé. The Sunday Times piece is old news now and the Secretary-General's report is in our hands. What I want to do is pose a question which has been nagging the minds of many: Who are the targets for whom Israel is preparing those weapons in such great quantities, in direct contradiction to its affirmation that it will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East and the fact that it voted in favour of establishing a denuclearized zone in the Middle East? For what purpose has it developed the Jericho-II missile, a formidable delivery vehicle indeed for nuclear and non-nuclear devices, of great accuracy and a range of hundreds of miles?

There are many answers, which I shall not deal with. The most important issue I shall dwell on is that of nuclear deterrence which can be summed up in the conclusions of Sy Feldman, the author of the manual on Israel's nuclear strategy for the 1980s. He writes that nuclear deterrence promotes peace through a

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

heightened level of security in the international order as it enhances the security of States and assures their survival.

This means that Israel pursues a dangerous policy running counter to everything the international community, the General Assembly and the Security Council call for. Whereas efforts are being deployed internationally to eliminate nuclear weapons, Israel pursues a policy that is fraught with dangers for peace and security in the region, runs counter to international norms and international law and defies the international will expressed in Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which call upon Israel to place all its nuclear facilities under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

This also explains many of Israel's activities in the region, its intransigent refusal to withdraw from the territories which it occupies by force and the fact that it continues to disdain any attempt to bring peace and justice to the region.

All this strengthens our conviction that when Israel bombed the Iraqi nuclear facility it did so because, in its view, the Iraqi facility represented an obstacle to its designs and intentions even though the Iraqi plant was for peaceful purposes, as borne out and corroborated by all those involved in its development and regardless of the fact that Iraq is signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Israel's act of aggression was, therefore, a direct blow to the NPT safeguards system.

It is not superfluous to debate the wisdom of developing and acquiring nuclear weapons. All the States of the world agree that security cannot stem from such a destructive weapon. Israel's policy is based on delusions of grandeur which are mortally dangerous to all. It is the only fundamental cause of instability and tension in the region and is a serious disservice to the cause of non-proliferation which Israel claims to support.

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

In conclusion, I cannot but point out that Israel's progress in nuclearization was made possible through its direct collaboration with South Africa. This collaboration gives cause for grave concern on the part of the international community, as stated in the resolutions on        subject adopted each year by the General Assembly.

Miss FAUZIAH (Malaysia): My delegation has joined in sponsoring four draft resolution on specific disarmament issues: those on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the urgent need for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, verification in all its aspects, and regional disarmament.

International realities have hitherto subordinated the United Nations role in disarmament, constraining the world body to play a peripheral and supportive role, rather than taking the lead on this vital issue, progress on which has been substantively determined by major-power relationships, especially in the East-West context.

My delegation believes that such an order must stop; it must give way to more sharing of the burden among all members of the international community. The United Nations has a historical and fundamental role to promote global peace and security as defined in the Charter. It must now adopt a higher profile in the field of disarmament so that that multilateral discipline can be institutionalized. The United Nations should provide the foundation and framework to facilitate and encourage disarmament by all nations, large and small. We look to the Disarmament Commission to accelerate its efforts in this direction.

An immediate priority in the area of ending the nuclear-arms race, reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons is the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Malaysia is encouraged by recent efforts of the United States and the



(Miss Fauziah, Malaysia)

USSR to conclude negotiations on ending nuclear testing, but we are of the view that the global community can and must also play its role by working for the early conclusion of a verifiable, comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. The Conference on Disarmament should accord a high priority to this task, and we call upon nuclear States to co-operate with the Conference and take the necessary first steps towards ending nuclear testing.

In recent years the General Assembly has focused greater attention on verification in recognition of its being a key factor in the disarmament process, especially with regard to compliance in the implementation of disarmament agreements. We earnestly hope that all Member States, especially those with the requisite expertise, will make their contribution to this issue and that the Disarmament Commission, in recognition of the primordial role of verification, will give the subject the urgency it deserves in its deliberations.

Article 52, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter states:

"Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations."

While super-Power dialogue includes consideration of regional and bilateral disarmament issues, as evidenced by the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), more attention needs to be given to the promotion of regional disarmament by the international community as a means of reinforcing positive trends in the reduction of international tensions.

(Miss Fauziah, Malaysia)

The validity of regional solutions cannot be underestimated. It has been manifested in the Contadora plan in Central America. In South-East Asia the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) have been firm proponents of regional co-operation as a means of achieving regional stability and security.

ASEAN's foundation itself was premised on this concept; the principle was further enunciated in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration of 1971, in which the ASEAN countries made the commitment to the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia.

The zone concept envisages a blueprint for regional peace and provision for conflict management and a code of conduct in the interrelationship of regional and non-regional States, especially the major Powers, to exclude the possibility of the region's becoming embroiled in extraregional conflicts. Fundamental to the concept is the creation of mutual confidence among regional States through regional disarmament and the exclusion of foreign political-military interests. The mechanism would rule out military solutions in favour of negotiated settlements of regional issues. The creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone also is an essential component of the concept.

Malaysia is not advocating regional disarmament as a substitute for global effort. Rather, we believe that every endeavour for peace, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral, serves the pressing common cause. Taken together they represent a momentum that will bring positive results eventually.

For the sake of the future of humankind, no individual nation or region can ignore the obligation to disarm; nor can the global community itself. We believe that progress on the issues in the aforementioned resolutions will serve as useful building blocks in the overall edifice that we all so dearly wish to construct.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.