



**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 13th MEETING**

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

**CONTENTS**

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

**Statements were made by:**

Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic)  
Mr. Turkmen (Turkey)  
Mr. Djoudi (Algeria)  
Mr. In Sopheap (Democratic Kampuchea)  
Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba)  
Mr. Wengrahary (Afghanistan)  
Mr. Terrefe Tadesse (Ethiopia)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2.740, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48-69 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. VONGSAY (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): First, on behalf of my delegation, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this important Committee. I am sure that under your wise and able guidance the Committee's work will be successful. While wishing you every success, my delegation would also assure you of its full co-operation.

Everyone is aware that the peoples of the world ardently aspire to live in a better, safer world in which they can enjoy true peace and security, an aspiration that cannot be met unless their leaders strictly implement the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Unfortunately that wish remains but a vain hope since certain circles persist in seeking security not in disarmament but in military and strategic superiority, even in nuclear deterrence. Such circles do not take account of the realities of today's world, which has become increasingly interdependent and in which, in the nuclear and space age, security must be global and equal for all countries and peoples, whatever their size, socio-economic system and level of development. That doctrine of military offence, that anachronistic way of thinking and that outdated political position are impeding any meaningful progress in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, especially with regard to such crucial questions as halting the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, the prevention of nuclear war, the prohibition of nuclear testing, and so on. With regard to the latter, my delegation welcomes the persevering and creative efforts of the group of socialist countries which recently submitted to the Committee an important draft

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

document on fundamental provisions for a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear tests. It is to be hoped that the outcome of the forthcoming Soviet-American negotiations in that regard will give new impetus to the multilateral negotiations under way at Geneva.

It is often said that the agreement in principle recently reached by the Soviet Union and the United States on the total elimination of their medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles is a historic event welcomed by the international community, but it covers only a very small number of nuclear weapons. It may, however, act as a catalyst in the global process of arms limitation and nuclear disarmament. The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic expresses the hope that in the course of the meetings scheduled for this week at Moscow to prepare for the Soviet-American summit meeting the high officials and experts of both countries will achieve tangible results with regard to a substantial reduction of their offensive strategic arsenals, with regard to strengthening the régime of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and with regard to preventing the extension of the arms race to outer space.

In this connection we would note that the international community has few illusions, because it is not easy to erase preconceived notions and political and military philosophies that have prevailed for years in the minds of the leaders of the military-industrial complexes of a number of countries. We wonder whether the supporters of a limited nuclear conflict on Earth and even of the apocalyptic "scar wars" are really convinced that they could be victors. We doubt it, because those circles, and even President Reagan in his first summit meeting with Mr. Gorbachev at Geneva in November 1985, have clearly recognized - unless they were being hypocritical - that nuclear war, since it cannot be won, must never be fought. Such are the difficulties of disarmament.

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

In order gradually to resolve this crucial and pressing problem we must go to the heart of things and attempt to discern the underlying impediments to significant progress or a major breakthrough in the negotiations, both bilateral and multilateral. We must contend with fear, mistrust and suspicion. We must at all costs dispel the climate of fear and mistrust that leads to confrontation and replace it with an atmosphere of trust, mutual understanding and mutually advantageous co-operation.

The Lao Government therefore welcomes the constructive position and concrete, realistic proposals of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries members of the Warsaw Treaty, which include the comprehensive programme of peace through disarmament adopted by the Soviet Union in January 1986, under which the world would be free of nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000.

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

It may be recalled that the international community, the eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries, at Harare, and the six Heads of State or Government of five continents paid a fervent tribute to the Soviet Union for having unilaterally declared an 18-month moratorium on all nuclear explosions. This was a decisive and credible measure of confidence which bore witness to the goodwill and sincerity of the nuclear Power which took it, a measure which regrettably the other major nuclear Power did not have the political courage to adopt.

The Soviet Union, as revealed in the statement made here four days ago by the deputy head of the Soviet delegation, Mr. Petrovsky, has put forward several important, specific, new initiatives and proposals intended to promote a climate of confidence among States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. We only hope that the goodwill, sincerity and open diplomacy which the Soviet Union is displaying today by agreeing, for example, to submit to stricter on-site verification measures, in a spirit of reciprocity, are not exploited by the United States and its NATO member allies.

We also believe that the international community should step up all its efforts intended to halt and reverse the conventional-arms race, a problem which our delegation to the recent International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development emphasized.

With reference to the problem of nuclear and conventional arms reductions, my country would like to reaffirm its support for all the very constructive peace and disarmament proposals and initiatives adopted as a result of the summit meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Pact held last May in Berlin, the capital of the German Democratic Republic. As proposed by the socialist countries of Europe, it is desirable for the two military alliances to hold as soon as possible serious consultations and negotiations with

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

a view to carrying out, among other things, a comparative study of their respective military doctrines and strategies. Obviously, any imbalance in the area of armed forces, as in that of armaments, should be corrected and redressed in a spirit of equality and justice.

My country wishes also to reaffirm its support for the proposals put forward by the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia and other countries of that region for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in central Europe and for the Balkan peninsula to be made a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons. Furthermore the peace plan submitted by Poland, generally known as the Jaruzelski plan, whose implementation would contribute towards strengthening peace and security in the very sensitive continent of Europe, has the support of the Lao Government.

The peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America wish to live happily and prosperously in a world free from the violence and both nuclear and conventional weapons. They would like their respective regions and continents on our shared planet to become truly zones of peace, free from nuclear weapons. My country joins in the efforts of the international community to make the region of Asia and the Pacific a denuclearized zone. It thus reaffirms its resolute support for the proposals of General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, made public in Vladivostok in July last year, and the Rarotonga declaration. As for South-East Asia, the region in which my country lies, we are firmly in favour of the idea of making it an oasis of peace, stability and co-operation and a denuclearized zone.

These are the few comments and remarks which we want to make at this stage in our general debate on disarmament. The international community, and in our view more particularly the United Nations, should assert its authority more firmly and

(Mr. Vongsay, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

increase its role in promoting the process of nuclear disarmament for the overall purpose of eliminating the nuclear danger which looms grimly over the future of all mankind and is more threatening than the sword of Damocles.

A world without nuclear weapons and without violence is not a utopian idea but a real world in the building of which sincere efforts supported by all the States and peoples of this planet are essential. The materials, principles and essential guarantees needed by the international community to build such a world should be discussed at length and will be when the Committee takes up the item on the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey): I should like to extend to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. The Committee is called upon to discuss several vital issues at a crucial period and we are confident that your experience and wisdom will be invaluable in guiding its work towards constructive results. I wish you and the other officers of the Committee success in your endeavours.

The statements we have heard in the debate, in particular from the representatives of countries which play a key role in disarmament negotiations, reflect the new climate of optimism and expectation in international relations. We hope that this new atmosphere of dialogue, commitment to serious negotiations and constructive and imaginative approaches will exert a positive influence on our deliberations. A more secure and stable international environment, progress on East-West issues, greater confidence in mutual relations and comprehensive arms-control and disarmament agreements will benefit the whole world and reinforce international peace and security.

As we enter a more hopeful era in disarmament negotiations a new awareness of what is at stake should prevail. Security is a primordial consideration for all

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

countries. Disarmament will be beneficial to the extent that it does not diminish the security achieved through defence and deterrence but, on the contrary, provides a military and political relationship that enhances security. In evaluating disarmament measures Turkey will have in mind the fact that because of its geopolitical situation it has historically experienced serious threats to its security. Indeed, Turkey is in Europe, where the greatest concentration of military forces and armaments exists. On the other hand, it is adjacent to the Middle East, which is becoming more and more unpredictable, explosive and unstable. Conflicts, regional divisions and mistrust affect the whole political and military environment in the region.



(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

As far as nuclear weapons are concerned, Turkey is within the range, not only of long and intermediate-range missiles in Europe or Asia, but also of short-range missiles and nuclear weapons. It is therefore understandable that Turkey views arms control and disarmament as a comprehensive process encompassing nuclear as well as conventional forces and confidence-building measures.

The conclusion of an agreement between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles with a range of between 500 and 5500 kilometres will be significant in many respects. It will be the first nuclear arms agreement eliminating an entire category of nuclear weapons rather than setting a ceiling for them. It will also include substantial measures for verification and therefore prevent any deterioration in national confidence and security. It was recognition of the fact that the security interests of both parties can be preserved only if disparities are eliminated that made this agreement feasible. With all these elements, the agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) will be an important precedent for future disarmament negotiations. We hope that Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze will soon be able to conclude the historic INF agreement in Moscow.

Though the agreement on intermediate range missiles will cover only a small percentage of existing nuclear arsenals, we hope that the breakthrough in the Soviet-American dialogue will have a favourable influence on negotiations on strategic nuclear missiles and space systems. We consider that an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to reduce by 50 per cent strategic nuclear weapons will be a tremendous achievement. We also continue to believe that there should be strict compliance on the existing agreements on arms control by both sides. Furthermore, we are convinced that all countries possessing nuclear weapons should be willing to contribute to the elimination of nuclear

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

weapons and that non-nuclear countries should conform to policies of non-proliferation. The attempt by a country to achieve supremacy in any region of the world with nuclear weapons will have incalculable consequences.

The comprehensive test ban remains one of the most important and urgent tasks on the nuclear agenda. We note with satisfaction the agreement between the two major nuclear weapons States to embark on negotiations for limiting and eventually banning nuclear testing through a stage-by-stage process. However, it has not been possible to start substantive work on the comprehensive test ban at the multilateral level. We hope that the Conference on Disarmament will soon be able to arrive at an agreed mandate for an ad hoc committee in this field.

With regard to nuclear-weapon-free zones, we continue to support the establishment of such zones, with the agreement of all States concerned, in regions where nuclear weapons do not exist and where they can make a significant contribution to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, in regions saturated with nuclear weapons of all kinds, the establishment of such zones will not enhance security unless region-wide and effective disarmament measures are carried out simultaneously.

We firmly believe that outer space should be reserved for peaceful purposes and for the common interest of all mankind. The extension of the arms race into outer space must be prevented. The existing legal régime applicable to outer space must be scrupulously respected. We note the work which has so far been undertaken by the Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space of the Conference on Disarmament and support the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee by the Conference at the beginning of its session in 1988. Bilateral and multilateral agreements aimed at strengthening and complementing the present legal framework will undoubtedly be the subject of arduous negotiations. In this respect, we attach particular importance

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

to the declared objective of the United States and the Soviet Union, to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing the arms race in outer space.

Measures in the field of nuclear disarmament will constitute only a first step in the immense task of creating a safer world by establishing a balance at significantly lower levels of armaments. It is crucial for the success of future arms reduction efforts not to lose sight of the fact that arms control and disarmament efforts in the nuclear and conventional, as well as chemical, fields are closely linked to each other and form an integrated whole.

The elimination of intermediate-range nuclear forces will focus attention on the disparity between the conventional forces of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will accentuate the imperative need for addressing the question of balance in conventional forces in a more meaningful way. Nuclear weapons cannot be dealt with in isolation from other areas if we are to achieve enhanced security through lower levels of armaments. Consequently, Turkey attaches great importance to the conventional stability negotiations in Vienna. We hope that the parties will adopt a realistic and constructive approach, which will pave the way for the initiation of a process aimed at establishing and enhancing a lasting environment of confidence. Similarly, a more flexible approach is required at the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions in Vienna. Noteworthy progress in these negotiations will also constitute a sign of encouragement for the future of the conventional stability negotiations.

These efforts can only achieve the desired results if they are pursued without diminishing the security of the countries concerned. The geopolitical characteristics of specific regions will have to be taken into account in assessing the consequences of any given disarmament measure.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Any progress in the field of disarmament is directly linked to the security concerns and perceptions of the countries involved. Confidence-building measures have an important role to play in this respect. We attach particular importance to the confidence-building measures set forth in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference as well as to those adopted at the Stockholm Conference last year and to their strict implementation. As an expression of its strict adherence to the letter and spirit of those measures, Turkey responded swiftly and favourably to a request from the Soviet Union - in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Stockholm document - to dispatch a Soviet inspection team to a military manoeuvre which took place earlier this month in Thrace, Turkey, with the participation of some of our allies.

I should also stress the importance of greater openness in military matters. Transparency and comparability in military matters are essential elements of confidence building and a prerequisite of success in disarmament negotiations. It will also be indicative of the degree of sincerity of States in concluding and implementing disarmament agreements. We therefore call on all States concerned to make use of the annual United Nations reporting instrument on military expenditures, as one available mechanism in this field. We consider that the statement made by the Soviet representative on 16 October in this Committee contains interesting and positive elements in this respect.

We welcome the progress made this year by the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament in the field of chemical weapon. The use of chemical weapons has confirmed the urgency of the need for the completion of a convention on the complete prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of these weapons and on their destruction, with effective and reliable verification systems,

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

including on-site and challenge inspections. We maintain the view that only a global ban can rid the world of the chemical weapons systems.

We are pleased by the successful conclusion of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The Final Document, which was adopted by consensus thanks to the reason and flexibility shown by all groups concerned, will constitute a broad framework for our future efforts to achieve this dual objective of mankind.

(Mr. Turkmen, Turkey)

Finally, I should like to make a few remarks about the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Preparatory Committee, at its first substantive session from 25 May to 6 June 1987, adopted a broad agenda for the special session without being able, owing to time constraints, to dwell adequately on the items to be included in the agenda. We are confident that in its future work the Preparatory Committee will focus on the substance of the individual agenda items, thus determining the areas which are more promising for broadening the consensus.

While we continue to subscribe fully to the principles and priorities established in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, we hold the view that the third special session should be able to review and advance the goals set in the Final Document, in view of the opportunities and challenges presented by developments which have taken place since the first special session was convened nearly 10 years ago.

Mr. DIQUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): It is my great pleasure to express to you, Sir, the satisfaction of the Algerian delegation at seeing you presiding over the Committee's proceedings. In entrusting you with this responsible task our Committee has paid you and your country a well-deserved tribute. Your personal qualities, breadth of vision and remarkable professional attributes, which are familiar to us all, made you a natural candidate for your post, and I am sure that your efforts as Chairman will be extremely successful. I would assure you, Sir - a friend and the representative of a great fraternal African country - of the enthusiastic and whole-hearted co-operation of the Algerian delegation.

Although it still remains to be confirmed formally and definitively, the agreement in principle reached between the United States of America and the USSR on the withdrawal and elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles in

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Europe is a long-awaited event. It has been realized after a long period of dangerous tension in super-Power relations and, although it is not yet a that the détente for which we have longed prevails, it is a good augury for the prospects for dialogue and co-operation in international relations.

The considerable importance already attached to it derives naturally from the fact that it is the first authentic agreement on nuclear disarmament ever concluded. From that standpoint, it can only be warmly welcomed. But if the historic momentum is to be maintained that would place it above the normal vicissitudes of super-Power relations, it must have a multiplier effect which will promote the successful conclusion of bilateral and multilateral negotiations in the field of disarmament. The Algerian delegation therefore wishes to offer some comments we feel to be essential.

First, negotiations should continue with a view to concluding an agreement on the gradual reduction and ultimately the total elimination of strategic nuclear weapons. From that standpoint it is to be hoped that the two super-Powers will conduct negotiations with determination to achieve, as soon as possible, the objective that they have set by common accord at Reykjavik: the reduction of their strategic nuclear arsenals by 50 per cent.

Similarly, it is essential to activate negotiations for the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and resolutely and seriously to undertake negotiations to prevent an arms race in space. It goes without saying, of course, that this process requires respect for the 1974 and 1976 bilateral agreements on the limitation of underground nuclear-arms tests and, in its restrictive interpretation, the anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

Secondly, bilateral negotiations should not be allowed to overshadow, but should rather give a boost to, multilateral negotiations, particularly those taking place at the Conference on Disarmament. It is therefore unjustifiable that the

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Conference has so far been unable to make a meaningful start on negotiations on nuclear questions - an item that is before it - and has not even been able to this end to set up the appropriate framework for these negotiations through the creation of subsidiary organs. It is therefore imperative for negotiations to be embarked upon urgently so as to conclude an agreement on the banning of nuclear-weapon tests. Considerable technological progress has been made, accompanied for the first time by the acceptance of strict rules for inspection and monitoring that would make it possible to reach a broadly satisfactory threshold of verification for the prohibition of such tests. Comparable progress has been made in the field of verification of an agreement on the banning of chemical weapons, and we hope for its early conclusion.

Thirdly, if negotiations on disarmament are to guarantee increased security, it should be recalled that this is indivisible and must be sought for the benefit of all States. Accordingly, the withdrawal and elimination of short- and medium-range missiles deployed in Europe would leave untouched the problem posed by the formidable concentration of naval fleets and nuclear arms in the Mediterranean. It is necessary to recall that the Europe of the Conference on Security and Co-operation, so close geographically to the countries of the southern Mediterranean, still remains very far from the centre of their legitimate security concerns. That explains the initiative taken by the non-aligned Mediterranean countries at Brioni, Yugoslavia, last June once again to draw the attention of the two super-Powers and their respective allies to the need to embark on a dialogue to promote equal security for all Mediterranean States.

Fourthly, there can be no alternative to nuclear disarmament. Whatever assurances we get from one side, sure of its military superiority, and whatever the fears of the other side, locked as they are in the logic of deterrence, no defence



(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

system can make the nuclear weapon obsolete, or reduce the security concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States.

The persistence in claiming the contrary or fearing nuclear disarmament only serves to confirm the bipolar vision of international relations and the Euro-centrist conception of world security. It is not just a matter of calling into question the famous space shield, which continues to give rise to the greatest doubts as to its feasibility even among its original proponents. A space shield could not guarantee the elimination of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear-weapon State - even if a system of intercepting and destroying intercontinental missiles were feasible. It would actually make short-range nuclear weapons an everyday thing, rather than render them obsolete; they would retain their formidable power of annihilation, which would always threaten the non-nuclear-weapon States, particularly those that have chosen to remain outside the two major military alliances.

Thus, vulnerability to a nuclear attack might be a recent fear for certain militarily developed countries that once thought it possible to master to their advantage the instruments of deterrence. But for third-world countries that fear has been a major fact of international life for 40 years, given the impossibility of guaranteeing their security against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Let me refer to the two situations most easily imaginable today: what defence system, what guarantee - apart from the prohibition of nuclear weapons - can save the southern African front-line States or the Middle Eastern Arab countries from the threat of the nuclear weapons possessed by South Africa and Israel?

It is essential that the question of nuclear disarmament regain its high priority and that it therefore be the subject of appropriate negotiations. The nuclear question can no longer be approached only from peripheral or hypothetical angles. Horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons has proven limited, contrary to the alarmist estimates of 20 years ago, while vertical proliferation, by far the greater danger, continues to reach new heights of formidable sophistication. That does not legitimize horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons or minimize its risks; but it must be agreed that today it concerns mainly South Africa and Israel, which in the past two decades have joined the semi-clandestine, semi-official ranks of nuclear Powers.

Understood again in its original terms, the question of nuclear weapons leaves no alternative but nuclear disarmament. Only nuclear disarmament can once and for all protect mankind from the threat of extinction. Only nuclear disarmament can guarantee the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of these weapons. Only nuclear disarmament can ensure that nuclear energy is used only for peaceful purposes. Hence the challenge is not technological; it is not an arms race in outer space in response to the nuclear threat. It is a political challenge requiring a genuine process of nuclear disarmament through negotiation of binding, verifiable international agreements.

However important it may be, the question of nuclear disarmament cannot eclipse that of conventional disarmament. That question must be given the priority

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

it is rightly considered to merit. This is particularly true for Europe, which of all the world's regions has the highest concentration of conventional weapons. Thus, we welcome efforts in the framework of the dialogue between the major military alliances to promote measures to build confidence and begin negotiations on the reduction of conventional forces.

The importance of these efforts and what is at stake cannot be mistaken: this is a region where in the recent past world peace has been twice threatened and which remains today the potential arena for a major conflict. But it is there that we encounter a level of specificity that results from a special historic and military evolution that cannot be applied to the rest of the world. Although détente in Europe is highly desirable and although it should not be sought in ignorance of the security needs of the Mediterranean and, hence, the third world, it cannot give rise to universal implementation measures.

The problems of third-world security generally demand specific action. Thus, East-West relations bring in two military blocs that have existed face to face for 40 years, prepared for or afraid of a confrontation perceived as inevitable - but a confrontation whose risks could be eased, if not eliminated, through dialogue and détente. In third-world countries open conflicts are a reality due in large measure to recurring consequences of colonialism, often involving foreign interference and intervention in keeping with policies of power. Overcoming these conflicts thus places great demands on the international relations of the major States involved in the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

In other words, the problem of conventional disarmament and confidence-building measures, as it applies to the countries of the third world,

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

should not be posed in the First Committee or the Disarmament Commission exclusively in terms of an approach specific to Europe: notions of a surprise attack or offensive military doctrines, for example, are concepts that belong to the logic of East-West confrontation, which does not necessarily extend to regions where the Non-Aligned Movement is striving to assert its independence from the blocs.

The efforts of third-world countries, whether organized in a regional framework such as the Organization of African Unity or an inter-regional framework such as the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, are based on a perception that their future is an essentially common one. Those efforts are aimed at resolving local conflicts and at strengthening measures to increase joint security, promote collective autonomy and safeguard and strengthen the third world's ability to act on the international scene.

In spite of the difficulties it encountered initially, the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development concluded its work with the adoption of a Final Document. That was first and foremost a success of multilateralism, which has thus given timely proof of its vitality and eternal validity. But we must look beyond the symbolism and note the limitations of the document that was adopted; it can keep all the promises it contains only to the extent that implementation of its programme of action is ensured through suitable machinery and in a steady manner. From that point of view, the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide the first opportunity to evaluate with sufficient detachment the real commitment shown by States to the measures they agreed to adopt or consider.

Also as regards the third special session on disarmament, we hope that the fresh vitality that seems to be invigorating bilateral negotiations between the

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

United States and the Soviet Union and which we hope will have its effect on multilateral negotiations as well will result also in the formulation of appropriate conclusions to strengthen consensus on the principles, objectives and priorities established by the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and lead to new concrete measures aimed at their genuine implementation.

Increasingly, consensus is becoming the pre-eminent way to adopt draft resolutions before the First Committee. Consensus is the exclusive means of decision-making in the Conference on Disarmament, and is a practice hallowed by usage in the Disarmament Commission.

Consensus is a way of raising the lowest common denominator to its highest level. It undoubtedly offers inexhaustible potential for finding an optimal level of agreement on the most varied subjects. Above all, it can be an invaluable way of expressing the common will if this is truly to lead to agreed decisions that are not doomed to be dead letters. It is, however, regrettable that consensus - which designates both the method of decision-making and the negotiating process that makes such decision-making possible - is often utilized only for its ability to bring the view of the majority into line with that of the minority, if it does not actually grant a right of veto, thus fostering and perpetuating deadlock. That is why we deplore the fact that for several years now the Disarmament Commission has been unable to adopt a series of recommendations on the nuclear capability of South Africa: a small number of delegations has always opposed adoption of a text that is otherwise generally acceptable.

Furthermore, the underhanded challenge to the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, even though this was adopted by consensus, is certainly not likely to reassure those who are convinced that general agreement is the surest way to express in a lasting way joint commitment and collective will.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Although the First Committee has decided to pursue its consideration of the question of making its work more efficient, we cannot help but note that the search for consensus is a moral obligation only in so far as it reflects a serious concern to find a just balance among different points of view and a token of commitment to act in keeping with the collective will. It is in that sense that thorough-going consultations and mutual accommodations are called for. An excessive search for consensus can lead to immobility and inaction, thus damaging democratic rule and even joint effort.

In that context my delegation will strive to reduce the number of draft resolutions in order to continue to enlarge the basic agreement that exists among members of the Committee and to promote whenever possible a unanimity of views on the problems with which it is dealing.

Mr. IN SOPHEAP (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea and on my own behalf it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. Your wisdom and your wide experience are the surest guarantees of the success of our work. My delegation is particularly happy to see the First Committee select the remarkably talented representative of a great country, Zaire, with which Kampuchea has long-standing ties of friendship. We should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee and to assure you of our whole-hearted co-operation.

Notwithstanding an agreement in principle and certain encouraging signs, the international situation is still tense. After more than 40 years of disarmament negotiations since the end of the Second World War the international community is still awaiting the conclusion of a treaty on the true and balanced reduction of nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, the conventional arms race and programmes to modernize both nuclear and conventional weapons continue apace, and local and

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic Kampuchea)

regional conflicts are on the increase. Lastly, the economic crisis rampant in third world countries is constantly deteriorating and adversely affecting their security and stability.

While the possibility of a nuclear war hangs over us all like a sword of Damocles, there are several others as well those of conventional weapons, of chemical weapons, of subversion, of annexationism and of poverty, that hang over the heads of the developing countries in particular. When those swords fall, as has happened in Kampuchea and Afghanistan, hotbeds of war are united, jeopardizing peace, security and stability in whole regions and in the world. In this connection we would pay a tribute to the third-world countries that have played and continue to play a vital role in disarmament and in the defence of international peace and security thanks to their reasonable and practical ideas and initiatives and, above all, to the many different kinds of struggle they have waged, individually or collectively, in defence of their own existence, independence and security and, at the same time, of the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

Kampuchea, like all weak countries in the world, quite naturally has a special interest in the cause of effective disarmament and the establishment of a world that is safe for all. We hope that disarmament will be accompanied by effective measures that would make impossible any act of aggression or military intervention, use of force, blackmail, interference in internal affairs on the part of any Power, regional or global, against any State, particularly the poorer States, in any part of the world - Europe, Asia or elsewhere. Unfortunately, we have so far seen the arms reductions and troop reductions cannot be agreed upon by hegemonists without damaging their policies and ideologies. In the current geopolitical context, fraught with conflicts, tensions and mistrust, true disarmament is still a far-off goal. Treaties and agreements arrived at with great difficulties have been

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic Kampuchea)

violated with impunity. As an example, the invasion of Afghanistan tolled the knell of the ratification of SALT II - which does not, by the way, seem overly to bother the invader who, in pursuit of its global strategy, would never have forgone conquest for a disarmament agreement. Similarly, all the decisions of international bodies, and those of the United Nations and its Charter in particular, when they are not consonant with its interests, are simply disregarded or scorned by hegemonism, which cannot conceive of the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, or any other conference as anything but its spokesmen or as instruments for its domination. Those groups have also been the targets of attempts to pervert their original purpose, to empty them of their original meaning and use them for its own profit. After all, the multiplication of resolutions, conferences and new organizations all flow from this same lack of determination to respect those that already exist.

On the other hand, supposing it is possible to freeze the arms race for a time, it can still start up again very rapidly, for its industrial technological, economic and political infrastructure will remain intact. We have seen, for example, the speed and pace with which the Soviet nuclear tests were resumed after the end of the moratorium was announced.

Initiatives and measures have been taken for nuclear disarmament and progress has been achieved in some areas, and we welcome that. However, they cannot afford us a larger measure of security or contribute to an increase in the standard of living of peoples unless hegemonism and power politics are simultaneously combatted.

It should be stressed that the war of aggression in Kampuchea was not launched by a nuclear Power. Indeed, the aggressor is very poor. However, it has had a clear policy of regional expansion for half a century, aimed at establishing, through the annexation of Kampuchea and Laos, a so-called Indochinese Federation.



(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic Kampuchea)

That policy has disastrous consequences for regional as well as international peace and security, for disarmament and for development.

First, it had been the cause of the war in Kampuchea and of the serious tension that affects the whole of South-East Asia.

Secondly, it has caused the aggressor to arm itself unduly: with a population of 60 million, it possesses the world's third largest army, with 1,200,000 men under arms in regular units, 1,500,000 militiamen and paramilitary forces - in other words, one person out of 23 is on a war footing - and stockpiles of arms that are constantly growing and being modernized. In Kampuchea alone its occupying forces are today estimated to number 140,000 men, more than whole national armies of a number of countries, including developed countries, much larger than Kampuchea. In Kampuchea, which has a population of 7 million, there is one uniformed soldier for every 50 inhabitants. However, if we add so-called "advisers" and 700,000 settlers, who are in fact peasant soldiers, there is one invader for every 7 Kampucheans.

Thirdly, this policy of regional expansion is opening the way for the super-Power that is expansionist on a global scale to intensify the militarization of the region. That super-Power has already obtained in exchange for its support of the occupation of Kampuchea the military bases at Cam Ranh and Danang, the first warm-water ports it so ardently covets to consolidate its position and advantage in the region and to extend its tentacles into the South China Sea, the South Pacific, the Strait of Malacca and the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic Kampuchea)

I will spare members statistics given in many specialized publications testifying to the increased presence of troops, naval units, air force units, control and surveillance stations and other installations and facilities. Furthermore, the Vladivostok speech last July was in no way reassuring when it made clear the growing interest of this global expansionist in the Asian and Pacific region and its intention to strengthen its superiority there and deploy its political and economic umbrella. All this explains why that super-Power, which possesses some very important leverage without which the aggressor against my country would not be able to continue its occupation, refuses to help to solve the Kampuchean problem by political means and is instead striving to ensure that the international community accepts this occupation as a fait accompli.

Finally, this regional expansionist is not only ruinous to our country and people, but also to its own country and people. The sufferings, misfortunes and devastation caused to my country and people are well known, but it is worth stressing the disastrous situation of our aggressors themselves who are struggling against increasing, inextricable difficulties in all areas - political, military, social and economic. Unless they put an end to their war of aggression and occupation against Kampuchea they will never be able, no matter what reforms they undertake, to find solutions to these insuperable difficulties.

If hegemonism has not claimed any other victims in South-East Asia and if the grave situation in the region is not even worse it is because of the combined efforts of the members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the solidarity of countries throughout the world that cherish peace and justice, and the sacrificial struggle of the Kampuchean people, who have not only brought the occupation troops to a standstill on the battlefield and prevented acceptance of the fait accompli of this occupation, but caused insuperable and insoluble difficulties for the aggressors themselves.

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic Kampuchea)

The adoption by the General Assembly last Wednesday of resolution 42/3, on the situation in Kampuchea - the ninth consecutive year that it has adopted such a resolution - with a majority of 117, or three quarters of the States Members of the United Nations, is a strong, new appeal by the international community to our aggressors to put an end to their occupation of Kampuchea, thus making possible the easing of tension in South-East Asia and a start on the process of disarmament in the region and, at the same time, that of development and co-operation. It is the aggressors' refusal to accept this reality that blocks any progress towards a political solution and the elimination of the threat to peace, security and stability in Asia, and maintains the climate of distrust, which is not at all propitious for disarmament.

We also know that the problem of Kampuchea is one of the major obstacles to the restoration of normal relations between the influential Powers permanent members of the Security Council. If it is so difficult for this world super-Power, the protector of Viet Nam and its arms supplier, to permit Kampuchea and its people to enjoy independence and their legitimate rights, it is hard to believe in the sincerity of that super-Power's constant rhetoric about peace and disarmament, unless the disarmament it advocates is aimed solely at strengthening its own advantage in its global expansionist strategy and avoiding rivalry in areas where it is sure to be the loser.

Having suffered from several wars in succession - and in particular the present war of extermination, which has been waged for almost nine years by our great neighbour from the East - Democratic Kampuchea believes that peace is the most precious commodity of all and desires whole-heartedly that the countries which enjoy peace may continue to enjoy it. It has supported and will continue to support all initiatives and measures likely to contribute in any way to the safeguarding of international peace and security and the reduction of the risk of

(Mr. In Sopheap, Democratic Kampuchea)

war; the prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; a drastic reduction in conventional weapons and troops, with appropriate verification; the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, and so on. Disarmament must be considered in all its aspects. The struggle for this noble cause must be continued with perseverance and in all possible ways.

The trouble and conflict constantly provoked throughout the world, the malaise in international relations and procrastination in negotiations reflect the reality that disarmament, the easing of international tension, respect for the right to self-determination and national independence, the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the strengthening of international peace and security are intimately interlinked. Success or failure in one area has positive or negative effects in other areas. The concerted struggle against hegemonism and policies of force is an essential component of the maintenance of international peace and security and the bringing about of effective disarmament and a safer world.

Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of the Cuban delegation, on your assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee for the current session of the General Assembly. We are aware of your experience in disarmament matters, including your work at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, and we are certain that under your leadership the work of the Committee this year will be most promising.

I also wish to congratulate your predecessor in that post, Ambassador Zachmann of the German Democratic Republic, on the distinguished role that he played last year as in guiding our work. I also wish to greet the other officers of the Committee and the Secretariat personnel. I promise you and all of them my delegation's co-operation in the tasks that lie ahead.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

The work of the First Committee is beginning this year in an atmosphere of hope. After a long period of frustration in the field of disarmament, in which bilateral negotiations bore no fruit and multilateral nuclear negotiations were stalemated, on 18 September last we learned of the agreement in principle between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. We also learned of the new possibilities that were opening up for embarking on negotiations aimed at banning nuclear tests. This is, to say the least, encouraging.

We also wish to recall that since the signing of the SALT II agreement in 1979, bilateral negotiations have not been producing practical results. Now, however, and contrary to what has been achieved in the past, we are on the threshold of the signing of a new treaty which will eliminate once and for all a whole generation of nuclear weapons - medium- and shorter-range missiles - from the face of the earth. This is not a mere reduction; it is the complete elimination of a type of nuclear weapon for the first time in the history of disarmament negotiations, and this deserves to be welcomed.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

However, it is our hope that the signing of that agreement before the end of this year will be only a first step towards the elimination of all nuclear weapons before the end of this century. What we are witnessing today is the result of the consistent application of the spirit of Reykjavik and, in keeping with that spirit, we must hope for, and even demand, a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons by mid-1988. We must work on the basis of that momentum and it is the duty of all of us to contribute to maintaining dialogue and understanding.\*

In this context it is also the duty of the international community to demand respect for what has been achieved thus far, since it constitutes the basis for future agreements. I am thinking of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty which, among other things, prohibits tests of this type of weapons system in space. Strict implementation of that Treaty and straightforward observance of all its provisions would strengthen confidence and facilitate unimpeded work toward general and complete disarmament.

Let us also recall that a commitment already exists between the Soviet Union and the United States to conclude effective agreements intended to prevent the arms race in space and to halt it on earth for the ultimate purpose of achieving the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons. This commitment of both countries to the principle that a nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought leads us to conclude that it is important, not to say essential, for the dialogue we are witnessing today to be institutionalized and maintained in the future so as to lead to tangible results.

Let us recall that what is at stake in the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race, is the vital interests of all the peoples of the world.

---

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

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

We also welcome the possibilities opening up for the consideration of nuclear weapons tests. Although it was not usefully followed up, the unilateral moratorium that was maintained by the Soviet Union for 18 months did play an important role towards the prohibition of tests, and perhaps we shall soon see its results. The possibility of starting negotiations on this item even before 1 December 1987 reminds us that for a long time all that has been needed to prohibit nuclear weapons tests in all environments and for all time is real political will on the part of all States.

The questions of verification and technicalities that in the past seemed to prevent a nuclear test ban are no longer a problem. Now what is required is for no one to consider a test ban a long-term objective but rather an essential element in ending the nuclear arms race.

Another encouraging sign that is of direct relevance to the work of the First Committee this year is the highly useful Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

Here again, despite any opinion to the contrary, the international community has recognized the existence of a close relationship between disarmament and development and has reaffirmed that disarmament is fundamental to the aspirations of peoples to development.

As is stated in the Final Document, adopted by consensus a few weeks ago, true and lasting peace and security in today's interdependent world requires rapid progress in the field of disarmament as well as in that of development. There is a grim contrast between the trillion dollars the world spends annually on weapons and the 850 million illiterates, the 1.5 billion who have no access to medical facilities, the 780 million undernourished and the one billion who are inadequately housed, who are mentioned in the Final Document.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

There is, furthermore, a recognized relationship between the trillion dollars the world spends every year on weapons and the foreign debt which has hit developing countries. It is increasingly obvious that the resources needed to pay that debt can be found in those military expenditures.

It is no accident that - also by consensus - the Final Document states that: "The present world economic situation should also be seen in the context of the arms race. For certain countries the high deficits caused by military expenditures as well as the cumulative effect of the subsequent rise in the interest rates have the effect of diverting substantial flows of capital away from development activities. In this sense, the whole world is affected by the arms race." (A/CONF.130/39, p. 18)

The flexibility and readiness to co-operate displayed by all the participants at the Conference prove that multilateralism is offering us new possibilities and augur well for the future work of the international community in the fields of disarmament and development. It is therefore necessary for the General Assembly at this session to express its views on the results attained at the Conference and to establish guidelines for a broad consideration of that question at the forthcoming third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. With reference to that special session, since it will be held in 1988, that will allow us to make use of the new prospects opening up in that field. Naturally, the basis for the work of that Conference will be found, as has been stated repeatedly by virtually all delegations in different forums, in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament of 1978. The purposes, priorities and principles established therein should be reaffirmed next year.



(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

Our urgent task and the challenge we must continue to face is that of preventing the outbreak of nuclear war, ending the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, banning nuclear-weapons tests in all environments and for all time, prohibiting the production of all types of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, and preventing the arms race from extending to outer space.

The third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which is to take place next year, will offer an appropriate forum in which to consider the implementation of the 1978 Final Document, the direction taken by disarmament negotiations and how we should act in the future to guarantee implementation of the programme of action we adopted in 1978 and solemnly reaffirmed in 1982.

(Mr. Oramas Oliva, Cuba)

In future statements my delegation will speak more at length on the specific items before the Committee. Allow me, in conclusion - because I believe that this moment is ripe for dialogue and achieving the objectives of disarmament, development and peace - to recall the following words of President Fidel Castro before the General Assembly in 1979, which remain fully valid today:

"The clashing of weapons, the threatening language and the overbearing behaviour in the international arena must cease. Enough of the illusion that the problems of the world can be solved by nuclear weapons. Bombs may kill the hungry, the sick and the ignorant; but bombs cannot kill hunger, disease, and ignorance. Nor can bombs kill the righteous rebellion of the peoples. And in the holocaust, the rich, the ones who have the most to lose in this world, will also die.

"Let us say farewell to arms, and let us in a civilized manner dedicate ourselves to the most pressing problems of our times. This is the responsibility, this is the most sacred duty of the statesmen of all the world. Moreover, this is the basic premise for human survival." (A/34/PV.31, pp. 62 and 63)

The time is ripe for action. Let us make good use of it. The international community and world public opinion are calling for it.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghanistan): Allow me at the outset to extend the felicitations of my delegation to the Chairman of the First Committee on his assumption of this high office. On behalf of my delegation, I pledge to him our full and sincere co-operation in securing a successful outcome for the Committee's deliberations. I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

The discussions of disarmament matters in the Committee have brought into focus the vital issue of concern to all mankind, that is, the issue relating to the

(Mr. Nengrahy, Afghanistan)

very survival of human civilization the core of which is the threat of nuclear annihilation.

It is a reality that mankind has been drawn into the vicious circle of the arms race. Sparks of discord and flames of war flare up again and again in various parts of the world. Those flames, if not checked in time, may one day incinerate our planet. If this threat to mankind is to be overcome, war must be divested of its material substance, that is, weapons, and the road to general and complete disarmament must be pursued vigorously.

The agreement in principle between the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union and the United States Secretary of State at their meeting in Washington to eliminate Soviet and American medium-range and shorter-range missiles is of significant political importance. The agreement also proves the fact that the comprehensive programme of nuclear disarmament by the year 2000, submitted by the Soviet Union, is valid and feasible. It should be translated into treaty provisions to pave the way towards the elimination of all types of nuclear weapons. We welcome this positive development and hope that it will be pursued with intensified efforts to achieve our common objective, namely, the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world.

The fact that there can be no winner in a nuclear war has been acknowledged even by those who once spoke of "limited nuclear war". However, merely understanding that truth is not an active step towards removing the threat of nuclear destruction now looming large over the world. Concrete measures must be adopted immediately to stop the world from falling into the abyss - which could happen not only by evil intent but also by a mere technical error.

The destructive consequences of the use of nuclear weapons are many and diverse. The facts now available to science show that a nuclear conflict will be truly catastrophic for humanity and all living things. Numerous studies made in

(Mr. Nengrrhary, Afghanistan)

various countries and under United Nations auspices are convincing evidence that the use of even a relatively small portion of the nuclear-weapon stockpile will instantly kill hundreds of millions of persons, destroy immense material and cultural values, do colossal damage to the productive forces, and result in many more being doomed to a slow death from hunger and disease.

What has become very clear is the fact that none of the other global problems can be solved without first solving the problem of war and peace, without disarmament and peaceful co-operation. Some authors of military doctrines disguise this point as much as they can by placing emphasis on one and then on another global problem and either mention in passing or even ignore the threat of a nuclear holocaust. In our opinion, the solution of the problem of war and peace requires a restructuring of the system of inter-State relations and reorientation of scientific research towards peaceful aims.

Annual global military expenditures are now close to \$1 trillion. Expenditure on the modernization of existing nuclear arsenals is increasing faster than military expenditure in general. Taking due account of that situation, Afghanistan and other non-aligned countries attach great importance to the continuation of constructive and sincere negotiations to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate it on Earth.

My country is of the opinion that every State has an equal stake in ensuring the preservation of the planet on which we all live and establishing lasting peace. The fate of our civilization cannot rest in the hands of those who have constructed their policies on deadly doctrines of nuclear deterrent and protracted nuclear war. As a non-aligned country, Afghanistan believes that non-nuclear-weapon States have the right to determine their own destiny vis-à-vis the nuclear threat.

(Mr. Nengrahar, Afghanistan)

Now that there is an approximate strategic military balance between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), any attempt to undermine that would result in increased threat to international peace and security. Yet the present United States Administration continues to whirl the flywheels of the arms race and to prepare for Star Wars. If the spread of weapons to outer space is not prevented, it might result in a new, escalated round of the arms race and greatly increase the danger of a nuclear war.

On the matter of destroying all nuclear weapons, so far no radical solution has been achieved; it should be made absolutely clear to the world public that the choice is either to preserve and consolidate the anti-ballistic missile Treaty and thus render impossible a nuclear war or to agree to the militarization of space. However, if we want our planet and its inhabitants to survive, there is only one path to take - that leading to a nuclear-weapon-free world.

In this regard, the Delhi Six - the leaders of States of Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa - for the first time in history are working from common positions to avert the danger of nuclear annihilation, and that is considered an important initiative. Afghanistan hails this effort of the six leaders and considers it a sign of universal public aspiration. These undertakings have provided new evidence that our contradictory world is becoming ever more integral, that security is increasingly becoming a political concern rather than a military one, and that prevention of war must be an objective rule of behaviour for all countries.

A comprehensive nuclear test ban would make it possible to resolve one of the most complicated tasks in the field of nuclear disarmament - the task of preventing the qualitative upgrading of nuclear arms, the development of new types and

(Mr. Nengrahar, Afghanistan)

varieties of weapon systems, and the modernization of nuclear arsenals. In this regard, we welcome the agreement by the Soviet Union and the United States to start stage-by-stage negotiations on the cessation of nuclear tests.

(Mr. Nengrahar, Afghanistan)

We commend the practical step in that direction taken by the Soviet Union, which for 18 months abided by its unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing. Unfortunately, there was no similar response from the United States. The fact is that the attitude of States to the task of prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests is a touchstone by which their real intentions as regards nuclear disarmament can be verified.

My country was a founding member of the Non-Aligned Movement and has always supported its efforts to promote peace and disarmament. In the Final Declaration adopted at its Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government, held in Harare, the Movement emphasized the extreme urgency of adopting immediate measures for the prevention of nuclear war and for nuclear disarmament. It also stressed the urgency of halting the development of anti-satellite weapons, dismantling existing systems and prohibiting the introduction of new weapons into outer space.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is of the opinion that the present stalemate, or slow pace of progress, in disarmament must be addressed through a bold, constructive and practical approach. We consider that nuclear disarmament measures require strict verification procedures, including on-site inspection, and that the process should be real, all-embracing and convincing. Verification procedures should result in full confidence and demonstrate that agreements are being faithfully discharged.

In line with Afghanistan's rejection of nuclear weapons and all other types of weapons of mass destruction, we consider that a new danger is posed by chemical and biological agents, when used for weapons purposes. Their lethal potential has reached new dimensions as a result of recent scientific and technological advances. That state of affairs makes it all the more imperative that we conclude a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. That would be an important step forward on the road to disarmament.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

The Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is of the opinion that life on our planet is supreme. Mutual trust and understanding should replace fear and suspicion. Spending for militaristic purposes should be diverted to social progress and development. We must find ways and means to achieve comprehensive international security. The fear of the threat or use of nuclear weapons should be removed.

All the efforts of the Members of the United Nations should be translated into concrete measures leading to the accomplishment of that very important role.

The struggle for peace and international security constitutes the soul of our foreign policy in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. We acknowledge the fact that the road to disarmament is difficult, but it is not impassable. Our united action can solve this very important problem that threatens human civilization, thus creating peaceful conditions for economic and social development.

Comrade Najib, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, has said the following in this regard:

"Implementation of our creative plans can be effectively achieved only if lasting peace and security prevail in our region and throughout the world."

Mr. TERREFE TADESSE (Ethiopia): First of all, I should like to express the satisfaction of my delegation that Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya is presiding over the work of the First Committee. My congratulations go also to the other Committee officers, the two Under-Secretaries-General here present and the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament.

My delegation also requests the delegation of the United Kingdom kindly to transmit our sincere condolences to the family of the late Ambassador Cromartie.

The United Nations Charter, formulated as it was at the conclusion of a devastating war, reflected the strong hope and desire of the international



(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

community to prevent the recurrence of global war. Since then, technology has produced numerous new types of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, which now threaten the very survival of mankind and human civilization. It is therefore timely and appropriate to cite the basic principle embodied in the Charter governing relations between States and members of the same society. The Preamble and Article 2 of the Charter contain these words:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind ...

"And for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security ..."

and

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

Ethiopia is one of the original signatories to the Charter. It is a mosaic of nationalities, cultures and beliefs, its people have for centuries been known to be hospitable and patriotic, jealous of their freedom and independence and always united against external aggression and intervention. In the past 13 years the people of Ethiopia, having liberated themselves from a feudal and exploitative socio-economic system, have assumed State power, embodied in a Constitution, the preamble to which reads in part:

"We the working people of Ethiopia, based on a centuries-old glorious history, are engaged in a great revolutionary struggle to extricate ourselves from our current state of backwardness and transform Ethiopia into a socialist society with a high level of development, where justice, equality and social

(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

prosperity prevail ... this constitution which is the supreme law of the land and the basis for establishing and administering the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia and in which our sovereignty is expressed; the unity of our country and the equality of nationalities based on our right to self-determination is ensured; basic freedoms and rights are guaranteed and duties respected; we are enabled to make our due contribution to world peace, justice and democracy and social progress."

The People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia firmly believes in co-operation for mutual benefit among all peoples of the world, the strengthening good-neighbourly relations, respect for the principles of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and in general the principle of non-alignment. Ethiopia is a party to many international treaties: the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water - the so-called partial test-ban Treaty - of 1963; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, of 1968; the outer space Treaty, of 1966; the sea-bed Treaty, of 1970; the biological weapons Convention, of 1971; and other international conventions.

Ethiopia, like the overwhelming majority of States, has a vital interest in disarmament measures, because we believe that the arms race lies at the root of increasing tension and insecurity in international relations. As far back as 1959 Ethiopia proposed a United Nations declaration of principle condemning and outlawing the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. We have repeatedly expressed our concern at the testing, production and deployment of all types of weapons of mass destruction. We have vigorously urged States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to abide by the commitments laid down in the partial test-ban and Non-Proliferation Treaties.

(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

We have before us in the First Committee the report of the Conference on Disarmament, in which it is noted that a consensus was not reached even on a mandate for an ad hoc committee to carry out multilateral negotiations on a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear test explosions.

(Mr. Terrefe Tadejse, Ethiopia)

It is to be recalled that a ban on nuclear-test explosions by all States for all time was considered a matter of highest priority in General Assembly resolution 41/46 A. Ethiopia voted in support of that important resolution, and, as President of the Conference on Disarmament during the month of July 1987, we had the opportunity to draw to the attention of the Conference that its most crucial task remained the conducting of negotiations to ban weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons. Many recalled the grim consequences that would ensue if such weapons continued to exist and if the nuclear-weapon States continued to drift towards nuclear confrontation. For the past 30 years the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests has been the subject of more than 50 General Assembly resolutions. The non-aligned countries have reminded the nuclear-weapon States that renewed escalation of the nuclear-arms race, as well as reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, which is based on the threat of the use of nuclear weapons, heighten the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war. In resolution 41/92 the General Assembly has reminded us that the road to equal security for all States in all spheres of international relations lies in strengthening the collective security system embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

Nearly 10 years ago the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament affirmed that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is therefore essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race. The nuclear-arms race, far from contributing to the strengthening of the security of all States, weakened it and thwarted efforts towards the relaxation of international tensions.

In the Conference on Disarmament negotiations were to be undertaken on all substantive items on the agenda. The modality of establishing ad hoc working groups with clear mandates should continue, even though the provision of experts

(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

poses constraints for countries with small delegations. Members of the Group of 21 attached the utmost importance to the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on the complete prohibition of testing of all types of nuclear weapons in all environments by all States, thus ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons, as well as preventing nuclear proliferation. Regrettably, the establishment of ad hoc committees on items concerned with nuclear-weapon testing and the cessation of the nuclear-arms race were not supported by a group of Western countries.

On the other hand, it is gratifying to note the overall support and active participation received by the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons has resulted in a draft text of a convention. The Ethiopian delegation would like to stress the necessity of the earliest possible conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction. It would be imperative for the States concerned not to complicate the negotiations further by imposing untenable conditions or by producing other new types of chemical weapons.

Sixteen years ago the Indian Ocean region was declared by the United Nations as a zone of peace, and every year the General Assembly has adopted resolutions urging the speedy implementation of the Declaration. However, efforts to realize that objective have continuously been frustrated. The failure since 1983 to hold the Indian Ocean Conference at Colombo is a case in point. Ethiopia, as a hinterland State of that Ocean, urges that that Conference take place as provided by the decision of the General Assembly.

My delegation also cannot but express grave concern at the deterioration of peace and stability in the adjoining Gulf region. The current security environment of the region is characterized by the presence of an unprecedented number of naval forces, which is contributing to the mounting tensions. The situation has now

(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

become explosive to the point of posing a grave threat to international peace and security. Ethiopia views those developments with great concern.

Twenty-five years ago African Heads of State and Government issued a Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. The General Assembly reaffirmed that call and urged all States to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-free zone. At its tenth special session the General Assembly decided that the Security Council should take steps to prevent the frustration of that objective. It is clear that the nuclear programme of the racist régime of South Africa constitutes a very grave danger to international peace and security and a continuous menace to the security of African States. It also increases the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Disarmament Commission, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat, in consultation with the Organization of African Unity, were involved in studies and reports on South Africa's nuclear capability. General Assembly resolution 41/55 called upon all States, corporations, institutions and individuals to desist from further collaboration with the racist régime that may enable it to frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. Three Western nuclear-weapon States opposed that resolution. It is equally regrettable that the Disarmament Commission has this year once again failed to reach a consensus on this important item on its agenda. Nevertheless, the report of the Commission reaffirms that South Africa's policy of apartheid, an institutionalized form of racial discrimination, remains condemned by the international community and by the Security Council as a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind.

Ethiopia, a country striving to combat underdevelopment, views with particular interest the results of the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development. We welcome the fact that, despite initial

(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

difficulties, the Conference was able to adopt the Final Document by consensus. We reaffirm the view that genuine and lasting security in this interdependent world demands rapid progress in both disarmament and development. In the words of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, "the time has therefore come to seek security in disarmament."

We are encouraged by the sequence of events designed to improve the international political climate, and we welcome the resumption of the Geneva arms talks, as well as the summit meetings between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan, first at Geneva and later, in 1986, at Reykjavik. The double-zero option put forward by the Soviet Union to eliminate medium- and shorter-range nuclear weapons is truly a breakthrough in Soviet-American bilateral negotiations. The upcoming agreement between the United States and the USSR will also reinforce multilateral disarmament negotiations, since it envisages in the future the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests by all States, together with an effective verification system. We also welcome the submission of a draft treaty to the bilateral forum to reduce strategic weapons by 50 per cent and a draft agreement to strengthen the terms of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty.

Those developments, although they hold great promise, are not in themselves adequate to remove the constant fear of nuclear annihilation under which we live. All nations are concerned about their national security interests, and the national security interests of those that are close to them. But the security of the world as a whole can best be assured not by a balance of terror but by global commitment to uphold peace and stability.\*

---

\* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Terrefe Tadesse, Ethiopia)

The mere accumulation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction has proved utterly inadequate to guarantee peace and the genuine security of States. Therefore, it is necessary to assess the progress made in the field of disarmament and to design a further strategy to ensure international peace and security.

Since that is the purpose of the special session of the General Assembly to be held next year, one cannot underestimate the value of world public opinion in creating a climate favourable to progress in the field of disarmament. Resolution 41/60 A, on the World Disarmament Campaign, calls upon Governments of all States to recognize and respect the mass peace movements as an important factor in disarmament. United Nations Centres for Peace, Disarmament and Development, in co-operation with the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, can play a vital role in making available material, particularly on nuclear disarmament, provided they are given the necessary support.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): In the light of ongoing consultations with a number of members of the Committee, and bearing in mind that it is my intention to report to the Committee on those consultations today, I propose now to suspend the meeting.



The meeting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 6 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): As I indicated at our 6th meeting, consultations have been under way on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Romania (A/C.1/42/L.1). After the consultations held last Friday morning I was not in a position to inform the Committee of their result, owing to new developments: another draft resolution was put forward by the United Kingdom, sponsored also by a number of other delegations. Moreover, the group of non-aligned countries announced that it would be submitting yet another draft resolution on this subject. Since the two draft resolutions - the United Kingdom text and the text that was to be submitted by the non-aligned group - dealt with substantive agenda items, it was clear that consultations needed to be pursued solely on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Romania.

After intensive discussions over the past several days, we have reached virtual agreement on a draft decision proposed by the Chairman (A/C.1/42/L.3), which appeals to the two super-Powers to continue the negotiations begun at Washington and to conclude those negotiations in accordance with the agreement in principle reached by those Powers.

That draft decision came about thanks to the co-operation of many delegations during the consultations; I take this opportunity to thank them for their willing co-operation with the Chairman.

Before the Committee takes a decision on the draft decision, I should like to read out the text:

(The Chairman)

"The General Assembly, noting the joint statement released by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of the meeting of the Secretary of State and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, held at Washington, from 15 to 17 September 1987, urges the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of the United States of America to spare no effort in concluding, in accordance with the agreement in principle reached at that meeting, at the earliest possible date a treaty on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles to be signed at a summit meeting to be held in the fall of 1987 between President Reagan and General-Secretary Gorbachev, as it was agreed, and to make a similarly intensive effort to achieve a treaty on 50 per cent reductions in the strategic offensive arms within the framework of the Geneva nuclear and space talks." (A/C.1/42/L.3)

That one paragraph would express the views of the First Committee on the major negotiations now under way. This Committee cannot remain indifferent to this matter, for it is our task to discuss questions of disarmament on the agenda of the General Assembly.

I call now on delegations wishing to state their position on this draft decision.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for reporting to us on the consultations you have been holding with a number of delegations and on their results, as reflected in the document now before the Committee. I assure you that we have no objection to the spirit behind the draft decision or to your efforts to bring about consensus on the text before us.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

Nor do we have any insurmountable problems with the content of the draft decision. We do, however, have some technical and other difficulties we wish to explain before a decision is taken on the draft text.

First of all, we do not believe this document will have an impact on the course and results of the talks soon to be held at Moscow between the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and the Secretary of State of the United States.

As to our serious technical difficulties, first of all regarding the form of the document, the text has been placed before us as a draft decision, whereas it is in reality a draft resolution. An attempt has been made to make it look different, but its content and purpose are those of a draft resolution. It is our understanding that General Assembly decisions relate to the conduct of its own work and are normally addressed to Assembly organs, or to the Assembly itself concerning the transmittal of documents or agenda items for consideration by other organs. The present document contains an appeal to States Members, which means that in substance and form it is like a draft resolution.

We also have considerable difficulty with the substance of the document. In this draft decision the Assembly would take note of a document that is not an official document of the United Nations: the General Assembly would note the joint statement issued by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. To my knowledge, the Assembly has not been informed of the contents of that statement, nor has any other United Nations body.

Another difficulty is that the document refers to the possible date for a summit meeting, while neither of the States that will participate has agreed even to hold such a meeting. In that connection, I would cite the 15 October edition of The New York Times, which reported that the United States Secretary of State had indicated that no date had been set and that there was no certainty that the meeting would take place.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

Moreover, we doubt that it is appropriate or necessary to adopt such a draft decision at this time. The coming Moscow meeting between the United States Secretary of State and the Soviet Union's Minister for Foreign Affairs is a single event in a process that is still evolving. We truly do not see the need for the General Assembly to make the appeal proposed in this text with respect to a meeting that will itself lead to no final result.

Finally, we have a procedural difficulty with the proposed text. Rule 120 of the Assembly's rules of procedure states that as a general rule no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of a Committee unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.

Having said that, my delegation will not stand in the way of a consensus on this draft decision, but I wish to make it clear that the delegation of Venezuela will not participate in that consensus.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I have taken note of the comments of the representative of Venezuela and of the fact that his delegation will not be participating in a consensus on the draft decision.

The Committee will now take a decision on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/42/L.3. May I take it that the First Committee adopts that draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call now on delegations wishing to make statements after the adoption of the draft decision.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the draft decision just adopted by the First Committee. I wish to draw attention to the fact that in this text we speak of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. In almost all official languages those are not technical expressions; we have therefore consulted with other interested delegations and can state that my delegation and other interested delegations interpret the words "intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles" to mean missiles with a range of between 500 and 5,500 kilometres.

Mr. TANASIE (Romania): The Romanian delegation would like to express its satisfaction at the consensus achieved by the First Committee on a draft decision by which the General Assembly would appeal to the Soviet Union and the United States to spare no effort in concluding as soon as possible this year a treaty on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The draft decision is a product of our common endeavours and contributions. We appreciated and co-operated in the intensive consultations conducted by the Chairman with almost all delegations. I thank you, Sir, for the fruitful results of your activities, and congratulate you on them.

The cause to which we are dedicating our energy and political will is of particular importance. The General Assembly could not miss this historic opportunity to fulfil its important role in the field of disarmament and to encourage the first major step on the way towards eliminating nuclear weapons.

I consider that the main objective of the draft resolution introduced at our 4th meeting by my delegation was achieved through the adoption of this draft decision. I am grateful to all members for their understanding and support.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I should like to thank delegations, especially those that lent me such valuable support during all the consultations and discussions in which they participated on the draft decision just adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.