



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 5th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Razi (India)  
Mr. Gotsev (Bulgaria)  
Mr. Djoudi (Algeria)  
Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/41/PV.5  
17 October 1986  
ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. RAZI (India): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to extend to you the warm felicitations of my delegation on your assumption of the office of Chairman of the First Committee. On behalf of my delegation, I offer you our full and sincere co-operation in securing a fruitful outcome for the deliberations of this Committee.

Over the past decade, and especially since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, there has been a continuing escalation in the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. There are today over 60,000 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of nuclear-weapon States. New and more deadly engines of death and destruction, with unprecedented precision, have been deployed. Annual global military expenditures are now close to \$US 1 trillion. Expenditure on the modernization of existing nuclear arsenals is rising proportionately faster than military expenditure in general. India and the other non-aligned countries attach great importance to the proclaimed objectives of the bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union: to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate the arms race on Earth, and ultimately to eliminate nuclear arms everywhere.

It was in that context that we had looked forward with hope and great expectation to the meeting between President Reagan of the United States and General-Secretary Gorbachev of the Soviet Union, held at Reykjavik last weekend. We are deeply disappointed that the two leaders were unable to come to an agreement. Our disappointment is all the greater since we note that the two had in fact been very close to an understanding on far-reaching arms control measures. We

(Mr. Razi, India)

urge the two sides to continue their efforts, especially at Geneva, to narrow their differences. The issues involved are too important not to be addressed, too vital to brook any delay.

It is universally acknowledged that the greatest peril facing the world is the threat to the survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons. The General Assembly, at its first special session devoted to disarmament, resolved by consensus and without a single reservation that the removal of the danger of nuclear arms was the most acute and urgent task of the present day. In subsequent years, the General Assembly has continued to discharge its responsibility by adopting resolutions by overwhelming majorities on the most pressing areas related to nuclear disarmament, such as the prevention of nuclear war, the non-use of nuclear weapons, a nuclear-weapons freeze and a comprehensive test ban.

Despite the very clear mandate given by the General Assembly to the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament, the Conference has year after year been denied the possibility of commencing meaningful negotiations on any of those crucial issues. On multilateral nuclear disarmament - an item on its agenda that has for over two decades been given the highest priority by the General Assembly - the work of the Conference has been confined to unstructured and purposeless discussion, owing to the unwillingness of a few delegations to pursue multilateral disarmament negotiations in that area. That unfortunate state of affairs in respect of nuclear disarmament and the cessation of the nuclear arms race was reflected also in the 1986 session of the Disarmament Commission, where no meaningful progress was noted and where previously agreed formulations were placed within square brackets for the first time.

(Mr. Razi, India)

Bilateral negotiations are no doubt important because the two major nuclear-weapon Powers have greater stockpiles of nuclear weapons than the other nuclear-weapon Powers. But those negotiations have to be supplemented by multilateral ones. The imperatives of the nuclear age underscore the shared fate of humanity. Disarmament and the ending of the nuclear arms race are important not only for the security of the two super-Powers alone, or even for the security of the other nuclear-weapon States, but for that of mankind as a whole.

(Mr. Razi, India)

Every nation therefore has an equal stake in ensuring the preservation of the planet that we all share. The fate of our civilization cannot rest in the hands of two States or five States. The non-nuclear-weapon States have the same right to determine their own destiny.

In this context the six-nation initiative of the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania stressed, in the Delhi Declaration of 28 January 1985, that the agenda of disarmament negotiations was a matter of concern for all nations and all peoples. They declared that two specific steps required special attention: the prevention of the extension of the arms race into space and the signing of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. More recently, when they met again at Ixtapa, Mexico, in August of this year, on the anniversary of the Hiroshima devastation, the six leaders stated that in the past decade, when the nuclear-weapon States have had almost sole responsibility for controlling the nuclear arms race, that race has continued and become more intense. They were therefore determined that countries that possessed no nuclear arsenals should be actively involved in all aspects of disarmament. They stressed that the protection of this planet was a matter of concern for all the people who live on it. They could not accept that a few countries alone should decide the fate of the whole world.

In October 1985 and February 1986, and again in April 1986, they appealed to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev for a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons, and offered their services in the monitoring of such a moratorium. In the latest message, they declared their conviction that a moratorium on nuclear testing was the most effective first step in halting the nuclear arms race and establishing a climate of confidence. Those appeals have, been conveyed, inter alia, through an exchange of correspondence at the highest level in the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The problem of adequate

(Mr. Razi, India)

verification arrangements was raised. At Ixtapa the leaders of the six nations offered a concrete programme of verification. We welcome the fact that the Soviet Union has responded by extending its unilateral moratorium until January of next year.

The Final Declaration adopted at the eighth summit Meeting of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement held at Harare underlined the fact that the survival of mankind had been held hostage to the perceived security interests of nuclear-weapon States. The leaders of the non-aligned countries emphasized the extreme urgency of adopting immediate measures for the prevention of nuclear war and for nuclear disarmament in order to attain the objective of security for all.

The eighth summit Meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement stressed the urgency of halting the development of anti-satellite weapons, dismantling existing systems, prohibiting the introduction of new weapons systems into outer space and ensuring that existing treaties safeguarding the peaceful uses of outer space, as well as the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, are fully honoured and extended, as necessary, in the light of recent technological advances. The summit Declaration also contained an invitation to the Conference on Disarmament to explore ways and means of bringing military satellites under international control.

The present stalemate in disarmament must be addressed through a bold and innovative approach. The dangerous trend of a qualitative nuclear competition leading towards an acceleration of the arms race must be arrested and reversed. A comprehensive nuclear test-ban is imperative. This could form the basis of actual disarmament, that is, the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. It may be recalled that, in April 1954, in the immediate aftermath of the testing of a nuclear device, Jawaharlal Nehru spearheaded an initiative in the United Nations

(Mr. Razi, India)

for a nuclear test-ban. He asked for a standstill agreement in respect of testing, even if stopping nuclear-weapon production was not immediately possible.

The alleged absence of adequate means of verification can no longer be used as an excuse for putting off a comprehensive test-ban. Adequate verification is now available through a network of global seismological observation facilities coupled with the existing capacity for global surveillance by satellites using remote-sensing instruments of increasing refinement. This Committee and the General Assembly have repeatedly mandated the Conference on Disarmament to embark upon multilateral negotiations for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban, the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. The report of the Conference on Disarmament on its 1986 session provides a sorry account of the reasons for its failure to set up a negotiating group on a nuclear test-ban, or, indeed, on any of the other critical issues related to nuclear weapons, during the course of its work. The view that negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty should wait until issues relating to verification have been completely resolved is unjustified. The modalities of a verification system are dependent upon the objectives, scope and nature of the corresponding commitment. A verification system can therefore be considered in the context of actual negotiations. We would once again call upon those nuclear-weapon States that oppose negotiations to review their position in deference to the almost universal demand for commencing such negotiations.

One of the central objectives of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the Six-Nation Initiative, and a major concern of the United Nations, has been the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We have been told that the ultimate objective of a space defence shield is to reduce the risk of nuclear war by rendering nuclear weapons ineffective. Every new evolution in weaponry to reduce

(Mr. Razi, India)

the risks from existing nuclear forces has, paradoxically, led in the past two decades to a progressive development of their offensive capability. The possibility of the destruction before launch of intercontinental ballistic missiles led to the creation of substantially larger forces than required.

Independent re-entry vehicles were justified as a means to overcome the defensive anti-ballistic-missile systems expected to be built by the adversary. Nations prepare for war on the basis of a worst-case scenario. A space-based defence system may also lead to the development of an offensive system that is much more powerful, thus making the outbreak of nuclear war more likely. Outer space should not become the cosmic dimension of a terrestrial battleground. In any case, any perceived improvement in the security of the two super-Powers will not add to the security of other nations of the world, which will continue to remain at the mercy of nuclear-weapon States. We must not let outer space become another arena of the arms race.

The research and development of weapon systems in outer space will put great strain on the already fragile security system. It will trigger a gigantic qualitative leap in the arms race and will lead to the squandering of material resources on such a scale that the world's financial and economic crisis will be further accentuated. The Committee should focus its attention on certain specific measures upon which the Conference on Disarmament could concentrate its efforts in an effort to prevent an arms race in outer space.



(Mr. Razi, India)

The common perception of President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev that "a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought" (A/40/1070, p. 3) should be translated into concrete disarmament measures. There is a fundamental incongruence between that perception and the concept of nuclear deterrence, which is the corner-stone of the strategic doctrine on the basis of which the arms race goes on.

The United States and the Soviet Union should, together with other nuclear-weapon States, agree to sign a binding international instrument forswearing the use of nuclear weapons pending the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

Nuclear deterrence to be credible in the last resort must threaten nuclear war. It is based on a balance of terror. As Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has put it:

"A balance of terror implies eventually accepting total annihilation of the enemy, total destruction of oneself, and most likely the extinction of all life on planet Earth."

The use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons would be a crime against humanity and a violation of the United Nations Charter. The two super-Powers and other nuclear-weapon States are now conscious of the dilemma of their steadily increasing military and nuclear arsenals and their decreasing national security. This problem has no scientific or regulatory solution. Arms control negotiations within the framework of controlling numbers and achieving strategic parity and not addressing directly the principal threat posed by the very existence of nuclear weapons are of limited utility. John Kenneth Galbraith, the eminent American economist, in an interesting essay on military power written a couple of years ago, made the following interesting analogy:

"Two boys are in a closed garage with several inches of gasoline on the floor. One has six large matches, the other has seven smaller ones. They debate as to who is strategically superior."

(Mr. Razi, India)

No meaningful disarmament measures have been taken. The Non-Proliferation Treaty has been suggested as a disarmament measure. However, all it has done is legitimize the possession of nuclear weapons among nuclear-weapon States. It has not impeded the nuclear-weapon States in their pursuit of quantitative, qualitative and geographic proliferation of nuclear weapons. The continued production of nuclear weapons with unprecedented power and precision and their deployment in almost all parts of the world has proceeded hand in hand with a significant increase in the total number of nuclear warheads available to the nuclear-weapon States. The total number of warheads of the combined strategic nuclear missiles and bomber forces alone of the United States and the Soviet Union between 1968, when the Treaty was signed, and 1985 increased more than four-fold, from 5,350 to over 22,000.

Consistent with India's abhorrence of all weapons of mass destruction, we must draw attention to the new dangers posed by chemical and biological agents in case they are used for weapons purposes. Their potential lethality has increased enormously as a result of recent scientific and technological advances. Chemical weapons continue to be maintained in battle readiness by some major Powers, which must therefore bear special responsibility for the earliest possible conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The fulfilment of such a commitment - about which we have been reminded by the recently concluded Second Review Conference of the parties to the biological weapons Convention, in Geneva - will mark an important step forward on the road to disarmament. That Review Conference ended with a significant final declaration which reaffirmed the validity of the Convention and strengthened its provisions relating to verification and international co-operation for the peaceful uses of genetic engineering and biotechnology.

(Mr. Razi, India)

Sometimes efforts are made to divert the attention of the Committee from the priority areas of nuclear disarmament by focusing on the expenditure being incurred by the developing countries on conventional weapons. The scale of expenditure by the nuclear-weapon States and their allies on the one hand and by developing countries on the other cannot be compared. In any case, developing countries also have to spend on their national security as they live in a highly militarized world dominated by military alliances. They must have, in this environment, a modicum of conventional preparedness.

What is more pertinent is the limitation and reduction of the military activities and competition among the nuclear-weapon States and their allies. The accelerating arms race has managed to spread the theatres of tension beyond the boundaries of the great Powers and the military blocs and adversely affected the security of non-aligned and other countries.

It is a matter of regret that the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development was not convened in Paris in July 1986. The increasing military expenditure of the major military Powers has had an adverse impact on their own economies and, through the global interdependence of the world economy, on other countries as well. The concentration of resources and research and development efforts in the military sector have reduced productivity, thereby retarding the overall growth of the economies concerned. There is a need to make a fundamental political assessment of the dimensions of the relationship between disarmament and development. It is my delegation's hope that during the current session of the General Assembly a decision on the dates and venue of the Conference will be taken in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its resumed fortieth session to convene it in 1987.

(Mr. Razi, India)

The present impasse and slow movement on the entire range of disarmament issues is no doubt a reflection on the statesmanship and wisdom of our times. The impasse can successfully be broken by mobilizing the support and encouragement of an informed public, which could eventually change the very logic which led to pursuit of the arms race. In his address in New Delhi in January 1985 President Alfonsin called upon the nations of the world and upon all the men and women that inhabit it to demand the restitution of our right to life. He stated then that if our voices are united our claim will change the very logic that has prevailed in the arms race and led us to the present situation.

We must persevere in our work. The paths to disarmament are difficult, but pursue them we must. To paraphrase Jawaharlal Nehru, that alone will make possible survival and fulfilment.

Mr. GOTSEV (Bulgaria): The general debate in the General Assembly, which concluded a few days ago, drew a disturbing picture of international relations. It can be said firmly that the vast majority of Member States were unanimous on the main conclusion that genuine security can be ensured only through arms reduction and by lowering the level of military confrontation. Flouting that conclusion would inevitably result in the precipitation of an unfettered arms race and nuclear chaos, which would ineluctably bring ruin to human civilization and life on Earth.

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

World developments have reached such a crucial point that particularly responsible decisions are needed, and inaction and delay could have dire consequences for mankind. Peoples are entitled to expect from heads of State, particularly of States possessing nuclear weapons, a demonstration of the wisdom, farsightedness and political courage required by the realities of our nuclear age.

This is precisely what peoples had expected from the summit meeting in Reykjavik between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Sergeiyevich Gorbachev, and President Reagan. We welcomed this continuation of the extremely important dialogue between the two leading nuclear-weapon States. Together with the vast majority of States and the entire international community, the People's Republic of Bulgaria had hoped that the meeting could have become a serious and fruitful step along the long - but still the only right - road towards co-operation in building a safe world. We learned with satisfaction that a very detailed and useful discussion had taken place at the summit meeting, which had come close to reaching agreement on major measures to reduce nuclear weapons in all areas. However, it is now clear that a truly historic opportunity to move towards the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons was missed. The reasons for that should be very obvious to any unbiased person. The refusal to think and act in accordance with the realities of the nuclear age and to observe the common understanding already reached that it is impossible to end the arms race on Earth without preventing its extension into outer space and without sacrificing the vital interests of mankind on the altar of military-technological superiority, is the obvious reason for the lack of concrete results in Reykjavik.

We would like to declare frankly that the insistence on keeping outer space open to the arms race on the part of one of the parties to the summit meeting deepens the sense of insecurity with regard to the future of our world. That stand

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

confronts mankind with the risk of a new, extremely dangerous round of the arms race, with unpredictable consequences for peace and security. That is why we would like to think and hope that this is not the last word on the part of the United States Administration. We sincerely hope that dialogue will continue and that the experience gained at Reykjavik will not be lost. We hope that the United States will reconsider its position, thus making it possible to pave the way for a great reduction in, and the eventual elimination of, all nuclear arms in order to preserve human civilization and all life on Earth.

In view of the events of Reykjavik, the Bulgarian delegation would like to reiterate its view that, in the present-day world, all should begin to think in new terms in order to guide the political decisions of Governments. Together with the other socialist countries, we are convinced that, in order to achieve a safe world, it will be necessary to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security, the principles of which should be applicable to the military, political, economic and humanitarian fields.

It is our profound conviction that this system must be based on direct guarantees that war will be averted and that weapons will not be unleashed. The most reliable way of bringing that about is to eliminate armaments and to achieve disarmament as a sound material barrier to war.

In order to resolve this vital and universal problem it is necessary, first and foremost, for each and every one to recognize the stark realities of our nuclear age that bind together the lives of all countries and peoples, namely, that the world is interdependent and that peace is indivisible, whereas the ongoing arms race, the exacerbation of tensions and the danger of war threaten us all with destruction. The explicit inference to be drawn from those realities is that we must proceed forthwith to genuine disarmament, which would ensure the security of all States, separately as well as collectively. Attaining the goals of disarmament

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

is a global task requiring the concrete efforts of all States and nations. In performing it, all international forums should be used and the effectiveness of the arms-reduction and limitation talks should be greatly strengthened.

The logic of objective social development in the space and nuclear age imposes the need for a new mode of political thinking and for the adoption of a new, realistic approach to the problem of safeguarding national interests and security, as well as to international affairs in general.

First, it is necessary to break decisively with past concepts of war and the role of armaments, the use of force or threat of the use of force as a means of resolving international, political, economic, ideological and other contradictions, including the conflicts between the two opposing systems of socialism and capitalism. It is also necessary firmly to establish the principle of peaceful coexistence in international affairs, which should be accepted by all as a basic norm of inter-State relations. Regrettably, some recent statements have once again demonstrated adherence to the bankrupt approach to negotiations from "a position of strength".

In fact, today nobody would deny that war has become an absurdity. The Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva also reaffirmed that a nuclear war must never be fought, nor can it be won. Today, however, the recognition of that fact alone is not enough. It must find direct expression in the national policy and practice of States and should be translated into concrete actions to facilitate the reduction and elimination of major arms programmes and the gradual diversion of the resources thus released to peaceful economic and social development.

Our space and missile age has destroyed past concepts of security. Now, security must be mutual and, in world-wide terms, comprehensive. Given the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction in colossal numbers, security cannot and

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

must not be based on military force or on the threat of its use. This means that neither nuclear war nor the preparation for it in the form of the arms race can be won, nor can it gain political advantages for anyone. The continuation of the arms race, and even more, its transfer to outer space, would only accelerate the already frantic pace of amassing and modernizing nuclear weapons. No State, however powerful it may be, should harbour the illusion that it can defend itself through military-technical means and the development of large-scale defences alone, whether on land or in outer space.



(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

Moreover, the further improvement of military-technical means, and especially their deployment in outer space, could bring us to the point where security is no longer under the control of the politicians, who could become the prisoners of technology and of military-technocratic logic. The possibility of weaponry getting out of human control and of a nuclear catastrophe being precipitated by an accidental error or by a defect in electronic or other equipment is a tangible risk, not a purely fictional one. Is there any need to prove that such a contingency could have disastrous consequences for mankind?

That is why we have maintained that it is essential above all to lower the level of military confrontation and to ensure equal security at the lowest possible level of the strategic balance, from which nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction should be excluded altogether. Military arsenals should be curtailed to the limits of a reasonable sufficiency for defence.

Taking into consideration the paramount importance of this problem and the necessity of its direct and radical settlement, the Soviet Union enunciated on 15 January last a historic programme for comprehensive security through disarmament. The highlight of that programme is the gradual elimination of nuclear arms throughout the world, coupled with an effective prohibition of strike space weapons. This is a constructive, realistic programme, which opens the prospects of mankind's use of nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes by the end of the century. It takes into account present-day realities, the views of other States, including nuclear-weapon States, and the special responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States for achieving the objectives of nuclear disarmament. The implementation of this programme would not imperil the security interests of any State, as it envisages that the reduction of nuclear arms should be carried out in such a manner as to maintain approximate equality of forces at every stage. In

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

essence, the programme is fully in accord with agreements reached at the summit meeting in Geneva and is aimed at accelerating bilateral negotiations on the range of issues relating to nuclear and space weapons. On the basis of the programme, significant, equitable and fully verifiable accords can be reached. The missed opportunities at Reykjavik have only reinforced that conviction on our part.

That bold and resolute step on the part of the Soviet Union is an example of the right way to think and act at the present momentous stage of human history.

The Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare, and the six countries of the Delhi Declaration have made valuable recommendations and proposals in this field of security and disarmament. We fully support these.

Together with the overwhelming majority of other Member States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has called for keeping outer space peaceful and free of strike weapons. Outer space should be transformed into a sphere of all-round co-operation in the exploration and use of space for the benefit of all peoples. Ample opportunity for such co-operation has been provided by the "star peace" proposal of the Soviet Union aimed at implementing global peaceful research programmes, including the establishment of an international organization in this field, for the benefit of all mankind. Strike space weapons should not be created, and the prohibition of such weapons should be ensured by strengthening the régime of the 1972 anti-ballistic missile Treaty and by complying strictly with its provisions.

Of particular concern is the refusal of the United States to halt nuclear-weapon tests and to join the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions maintained for more than a year now by the Soviet Union. It is no accident that the majority of experts in this field view the attitude of States towards banning nuclear testing as a litmus test of their positions on the issues

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

of nuclear disarmament and lessening the danger of nuclear war. All excuses concerning the difficulty of verification, alleged Soviet superiority and other spurious pretexts are completely irrelevant, and can no longer convince anyone. It is no secret that nuclear-weapon tests are conducted with the aim of developing new strike weapons, particularly one of the basic components of the "star wars" initiative, the nuclear-powered X-ray laser, to fight and win a nuclear war. We cannot but agree with United States Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts, who wrote in a letter to The New York Times that

"... it is ironic that the Strategic Defence Initiative programme, whose goal is to make nuclear weapons 'obsolete', has become the main reason for continuing nuclear testing, especially since the President has described it on at least 17 occasions as consisting solely of research into 'non-nuclear' defences". (The New York Times, 5 October 1986, p. E20)

Today, the entire international community, with the notable exception of certain circles in one State, is confident that halting nuclear-weapon tests is the first, and natural, step towards curbing the nuclear arms race. The way to achieve that objective is a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions by the Soviet Union and the United States and the immediate initiation of talks on the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests under strict control.

While there is still time for the United States to join in the moratorium, time is none the less running out. Not only future relations between the two great Powers but the prospects for the international situation as a whole depend largely on whether the moratorium becomes mutual in the few months remaining before the end of this year or whether it becomes the last Soviet decision of the kind. We are hopeful that the question of ending and banning nuclear-weapon tests will find a

(Mr. Gotsev, Bulgaria)

practical solution as soon as possible, as a signal of the readiness of all countries to put an end to the arms race on Earth and to avoid an arms race in outer space.

Now more than ever it is necessary for all States and political leaders to show realism, a sense of responsibility, and political will in joining, before it is too late, collective efforts to ensure the survival of all mankind and a future free of war and violence. As before, the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to contribute to the best of its ability to the efforts to that end.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): It gives me great pleasure to express to you, Sir, my delegation's pleasure at seeing you presiding over our work. We are convinced that your competence, your personal qualifications and your perfect knowledge of disarmament problems will be of great benefit to our Committee and help us to conclude our work successfully.

If an observation of the evolution of the international situation often consists, in essence, in analysing the development of relations between the two super-Powers, the past year has been particularly significant in that respect. After a continuous process of deterioration in relations between the two countries, the Geneva meeting between the leaders of the two super-Powers in November of last year raised hopes that it would usher in an era of confidence and dialogue that could promote the better international relations everyone so much desires.

Throughout the year, however, there was an obvious difficulty in maintaining the renewed dialogue when it came to fulfilling its promises. As the recent Reykjavik meeting has demonstrated, the two countries are still unable to move their relations for any length of time out of the turbulent area in which they seem so often and so inevitably to fall.

The rest of the world, and particularly the countries of the third world, are concerned as are the two principal nuclear Powers by what is at stake in their negotiations - namely, the survival of mankind under the nuclear threat - remains on the look-out for the slightest sign of increased mutual confidence and eager to see the beginning of some process of negotiation on nuclear and space weapons that would truly lead to the realization of the goal set forth in the Geneva Joint Statement of 21 November 1985, namely,

"to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth" (A/40/1070, p. 3).

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Owing to their huge nuclear capability, and given their respective or combined abilities to influence international relations, the two super-Powers have a special responsibility to pursue and achieve the objective of nuclear disarmament and to promote lasting international peace and security.

By its very nature, however, the nuclear threat is the more intense owing to its indiscriminate power to sow mass death and destruction: every nation and the entire human race are equally threatened with total extinction. Thus, each nation has an equal right to be involved in the quest for true and effective nuclear disarmament. As the United Nations Secretary-General stated in his statement during the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly:

"I feel the question may justifiably be put to the leading nuclear Powers: by what right do they decide the fate of all humanity?" (A/39/PV.97, p. 119-120) His statement retains all its validity, its timeliness and its authority today, and in particular his remark that:

"The international community will no longer be reassured by the mere appearance of progress," (A/39/PV.97, p. 122)

and that "Every person on this earth has a stake in disarmament."

In that connection, the United Nations represents a unique and irreplaceable framework for joint action and co-ordination, for negotiations as well as for implementation and follow-up action.

Furthermore, the need for all States to participate in disarmament within the United Nations framework does not arise solely out of political considerations. It is also a basic condition for the effective implementation of disarmament measures precisely to the extent that such implementation will require broad and close co-operation among various countries from different regions of the world. Thus, there can be no question that some meaningful results, however modest, were indeed achieved this year at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Measures and Disarmament in Europe on the question of verification, which has for so long been a seemingly insurmountable obstacle to the implementation of confidence-building measures or to the achievement of any disarmament agreements. Such results are encouraging for the achievement of such agreements, but there can also be no doubt that in the future more sophisticated verification procedures will be established that will involve a greater number of States. The past year has also brought out the need for the broad co-operation required for any plan designed to deal with the prevention, control and containment of possible accidents caused by the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Similarly, there can be no question that the verification of any total ban on nuclear-weapon testing, which has also been held up as the basic obstacle to an agreement, may now become sufficiently effective - for example by the creation of seismic observation posts in selected parts of the world and by co-operation on a an ever-larger scale.

In spite of its comparable make-up, and notwithstanding its more broadly representative character, the Conference on Disarmament has made markedly less progress since its reactivation in 1979 than did the Conference on Disarmament in Europe on the eve of this session. Although some of the results it achieved are encouraging, and although negotiations between the United States and the USSR are often spoken of as promising, the United Nations must nevertheless regain its central role in the field of disarmament, starting with the conclusion of agreements on priority items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. As the unique world negotiating body, it must be enabled fully to play its role in this field, and the dialogue between the two super-Powers must stimulate its efforts and not treat it as a mere bystander.

In this connection, intensified efforts should be made to reach an agreement on the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests as a first step towards nuclear

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

disarmament. Indeed, we must once again express regret that for the third consecutive year the same attitudes prevail that have prevented the Conference from setting up an ad hoc committee on this question.

We must also hope that owing to the apparent will to negotiate, which will have real meaning only if there is a real will for negotiations to succeed, progress will be quickly made with regard to the other priority items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, such as those dealing with chemical weapons and the prevention of the extension of the arms race to outer space. From this viewpoint, Algeria is pleased with the real progress made in the field of chemical weapons, and we also hope that negotiations on drafting a convention on their prohibition can soon be concluded.

However, for any favourable atmosphere to have a stimulating influence at all levels of disarmament negotiations, there is also a need for restraint in international relations, respect for prior agreements and a refusal to weaken existing disarmament agreements, no matter how feeble they may appear to be.

The nuclear-arms race is obviously a question that demands priority attention. However, the efforts that have been devoted to the subject for nearly two decades are still marked by a two-speed approach. On the one hand, there is the vertical nuclear-arms race, which continues to accelerate, although from time to time some controls have been introduced, and, on the other, there is the question of prevention of the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, a question to which real and concerted effort is being devoted, but frequently to the detriment of equitable international co-operation for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, although even on that level the approach, to put it mildly, varies widely in scope.



(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Thus it is surprising to hear some claim that South Africa has a right to benefit from international co-operation in the nuclear field while such co-operation is withheld from developing countries as a whole - as though South Africa could even remotely be considered a State like any other, as though the policy of aggression it has raised to the level of a principle of neighbourliness, has not automatically enabled its régime to achieve a decisive military advantage that it can use against its neighbours.

It is precisely the disagreement on the nature of the Pretoria régime and whether it possesses nuclear weapons that again this year prevented the Disarmament Commission from approving a series of recommendations on South Africa's nuclear capability. Indeed, some countries prevented a consensus that at one time appeared imminent on facts that the international community and the most serious studies had definitely established: namely that South Africa is governed by a minority racist régime, which is condemned to disappear in the near future, and that the established possession of nuclear weapons by that régime is inadmissible and intolerable in every respect. To maintain the opposite is once again to run the risk, as the present situation makes glaringly obvious, of being proved wrong by events at the very moment when all are demanding the breaking of these last links, which are the fundamental reasons for the persistent survival of the racist Pretoria régime.

In the Middle East the situation is comparable to that prevailing in southern Africa. An expansionist régime has acquired nuclear weapons and is attempting to prevent the Arab countries from even obtaining mastery over the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. As in the case of South Africa, doubts have been cast on Tel Aviv's possession of nuclear weapons. But here again the most authoritative information confirms that nuclear weapons have been introduced into the region. To

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

mention only the most recent information, according to the Sunday edition of The New York Times of 5 October last, the Zionist régime has for 20 years been manufacturing nuclear weapons, which now number between 100 and 200. It already has the neutron bomb and has embarked on the production of thermonuclear bombs. That information also confirms the figures contained in a report of the United States University of Georgetown dated December 1984. They confirm what we have known at least since Moyshe Dayan's declaration of June 1981 after the Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi reactor in Tammuz that "Israel has the ability to produce nuclear weapons".

Moreover, Zionist leaders have always affirmed that it is a good thing for them that the Arab countries believe Tel Aviv has nuclear weapons. Thus we can see how the Zionist régime adds a new dimension to the rhetoric of deterrence. We are already familiar with the sophistry according to which world peace is preserved by the balance of terror. But in the Middle East the situation for more than 20 years has been a unilateral threat of an imbalance of terror.

Like the countries of southern Africa, therefore, the Arab countries of the Middle East are denied fulfilment of their aspiration to make their region a denuclearized zone.

It is a fact that the process of negotiating on disarmament suffered stagnation and even took a step backwards directly after the adoption of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That was why, on the eve of the third such session, my delegation was among those that welcomed the convening of an International Conference on the relationship between the two major challenges of our time: disarmament and development. That Conference, which should have been held in July 1986, was in principle deferred until 1987. When this happened, my delegation did not fail to emphasize its deep disappointment.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Since the beginning of this session of the General Assembly, moreover, the fear of this Conference being struck by what might be called the Indian Ocean syndrome have grown, for further postponements are clearly envisaged, which in the final analysis would almost certainly mean that the Conference was doomed.

Algeria remains convinced that the possibility of yet another postponement cannot be raised without mentioning also the difficulty of knowing whether some countries really want the Conference to be held and thus singling out those who are responsible for these postponements. To require a consensus on matters of substance even before the Conference is held, thus making the holding of the Conference subject to the will of certain delegations, would mean that the Conference had fallen victim to the already well-known rule of consensus, which is but a means to bring the views of the vast majority into line with those of a tiny minority.

In this respect, my delegation fully agrees with the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference, according to whom, unless it is held, as finally agreed, in 1987, there is no point in continuing an exercise in which both the credibility of the participants and the arguments in favour of the usefulness of holding the Conference in such conditions have been exhausted.

The Preparatory Committee, with the help of the Secretariat, did good work. The group of eminent persons adopted by consensus a document that is undeniably relevant and would at the appropriate time provide a basis for the Conference. A single session of the Preparatory Committee of two weeks at the most should be quite enough, if the general political will is there to ensure conditions favourable to the success of the Conference.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

For several decades our world has faced one overriding reality: the balance of terror. But the most tenacious of myths have often had the most unexpected end. Indeed, having long been told that world peace exists because of that on the whole healthy balance, one suddenly discovers that the situation is one not of genuine security but of an arms race in outer space, which is not so healthy. Thus we have a new sophism in place of the illusion of peace guaranteed by the threat of assured mutual destruction: mutual security assured by the famous outer-space shield.

Although this new concept seems attractive such a project, once again, can only make us fear the worst; Star Wars threatens to transform our planet into star dust.

With regard to technological progress, it is often said that the world has grown smaller. I have in mind the almost ubiquitous supersonic aircraft, because of which people are increasingly inclined to travel and become citizens of the world. I am thinking also of the world-wide immediate distribution of news made possible by telecommunications. It is said, although rather less often, that what more than anything else makes the world one, rather than united, is the constant threat of mass, anonymous death in the twilight of the human race. A more optimistic vision of a world in which all live in increasing solidarity and interdependence cannot therefore be imagined unless the threat of a nuclear holocaust is removed once and for all. Perseverance in the quest for peace and progress for all nations is the only adventure capable of making both man and civilization greater.

Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the chairmanship of this important Committee. I wish you every success.

I should also like to congratulate the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur on their election.

The general disarmament strategy the outlines of which are contained in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, was well received by the peoples of the world, which yearn for peace and security. The work of the Assembly at that special session revived the hopes of the people that an end could ultimately be put to the arms race and to the troubles that afflict the world because of it.

It is regrettable that most of the provisions of the Final Document remain unimplemented and that therefore the nuclear arms race has continued, with its attendant qualitative and quantitative developments as regards stockpiles of nuclear weapons. There have been advances in conventional weapons also and they have actually been used in local conflicts that still jeopardize the peace of the entire world.

Similarly, the second special session on disarmament, held in 1982, was not very successful. There was no agreement on any of the proposals put forward at that session with the exception of two marginal items - the World Disarmament Campaign and the programme of fellowships on disarmament - both having to do with information and the information media rather than operational aspects of disarmament.

There is a glimmer of hope because of the efforts of the two organs established at the 1978 special session - the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. The first has conducted in-depth studies, and

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

it provides interesting concrete recommendations; the second is the only multilateral negotiating organ available to the international community for negotiations on disarmament issues.

We associate ourselves with other delegations in expressing the hope that the efforts of those two organs will yield positive results as regards a problem on which the world can no longer afford to postpone action or to delay decisive measures that will lead to its resolution in such a way as to meet the interests of all countries and safeguard the destinies of future generations.

As my country reflects on its location on the world map, and inasmuch as it belongs to the Arab Group, it cannot but point to the grave danger to the whole world posed by Israel's nuclear armaments. Despite prevarications and attempts at denial, specialized quarters whose neutrality and objectivity are beyond doubt testify that Israel has so far produced 200 nuclear bombs of varying sizes, each having tremendous destructive force and making possible nuclear blackmail. This is the situation in an area in which only Israel possesses nuclear weapons and it refuses to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to allow its nuclear installations to be subjected to international supervision - unlike its neighbours, which are parties to the Treaty and accept international control of the peaceful installations that some of them may have.

In view of the recent revelation that Israel is the sixth nuclear Power of the world, the United Nations has a special responsibility to concentrate its efforts and mobilize the international community as a whole to declare the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The General Assembly has been seized of this issue ever since its twenty-ninth session - for 12 years. At the last session the Assembly urged all the parties concerned seriously to consider taking practical steps to turn the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It once more invited the

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

States of the area that had not done so to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to allow their nuclear installations to come under international control. My country's response, and those of the other Arab countries to the Secretary-General were unambiguously positive as regards the requests made by the General Assembly, while the Israeli response was based on its insistence on not acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and on not allowing its nuclear installations to be subjected to international control. It said it had reservations and used other kinds of prevarication and deceit, which are reflected in the Israeli response (A/40/383). Comparing those two positions, one is inevitably led to a conclusion that need not be stated.

However, continuation of the nuclear collaboration between Israel and the racist South African régime still gives my country and all the countries of the Middle East and Africa cause for concern. That a collaboration gives rise to far-reaching dangers that will extend to other areas and threaten the entire world with the worst of catastrophes.

The racist Pretoria régime has refused to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to accept the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a fact that is referred to by the last conference of the States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in paragraph 20 of its final statement, under the title "Article 4".

The issue of the link between disarmament and development has been a focus of concern for the international community at least since 1950, when the General Assembly adopted its resolution 380 (V), in which it expressed the determination of every nation to reduce to a minimum the diversion for armaments of its human and economic resources and to strive towards the development of such resources for the general welfare, with due regard to the needs of the

(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

under-developed areas of the world. At that session India put forward a proposal for the establishment of a peace fund under the supervision of the United Nations to be devoted to purposes of development in developing regions, a fund that would be replenished by savings from cuts in armaments and from other sources. Since 1950 the General Assembly has been seized of the issue year in and year out, one way or another. The proposals of various countries have followed one another in this respect, but there has been no general agreement, and none of the proposals has been implemented.



(Mr. Al-Kawari, Qatar)

The astronomical figures of global budgets for weapons are a clear indication of the grave damage inflicted on development by the arms race and the allocation of a massive portion of the world's limited resources to unproductive military purposes. The countries of the world, particularly the developing countries, urgently need all their limited resources to foster the prosperity of their peoples and improve their standard of living through social and economic development.

We need only note that world expenditure on weapons research and development - not on manufacture - has reached more than \$30 billion. Half a million scientists, engineers and technicians are exerting their efforts in that work. This expenditure on armaments, in terms of human and material resources, exceeds total expenditure in the fields of energy, public health and food.

Bloated military spending is not limited to the super-Powers or the industrialized countries. The military budgets of developing countries are far greater, proportionately, than those of industrial States. This is a great tragedy given the fact that the peoples of developing countries continue to suffer from poverty, disease and poor living conditions. These resources could be used to improve the extremely grave situation, whose unpredictable consequences could be catastrophic.

Like other delegations, my delegation welcomes the attention given by all the Members of the United Nations to the relationship between disarmament and development, as reflected in General Assembly resolution 40/155. That resolution reiterated the call for the convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, the first of its kind under United Nations auspices. The resolution was sponsored by industrial countries, developing countries, and members of various political blocs, which demonstrates the international unanimity on the importance of this subject. The fact that the

(Mr. Al-Kasari, Qatar)

resolution was adopted without a vote, reflected the agreement among Member States on the significance of the Conference at a time when the entire world is in the midst of an acute financial crisis, with great implications for development activities, especially in developing countries.

We commend the efforts of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference for its serious, precise studies and detailed reports, which will facilitate the functioning of the Conference. We hope that the Conference will be convened in 1987 and that it will find solutions to the problems of development and their relationship to increased military expenditures, enabling the world community to strike a compromise between national security needs and development needs, particularly those of developing countries. This augurs well for a new epoch in which a higher standard of living and greater prosperity would be promoted for all the peoples of this interdependent world, which has suffered so long because military expenditures have taken precedence over basic human factors relating to the prosperity of mankind.

An acceptable balance must be found between military and developmental expenditures, particularly in the third world, the countries of which look forward to sharing in prosperity and progress and to a proper standard of living for all mankind.

The CHAIRMAN: The following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for tomorrow morning's meeting of the Committee: Czechoslovakia, Iraq, New Zealand and Hungary.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.