



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 10th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

later: Mr. NASHASHIBI (Vice-President) (Jordan)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Alzamora Traverso (Peru)  
Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia)  
Mr. Butler (Australia)  
Mr. Gyi (Burma)  
Mr. Zahid (Morocco)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC-2302, United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

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

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS:

Mr. ALZAMORA TRAVERSO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Peru wishes, first of all, to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Committee. We are convinced that, with our long-standing participation in multilateral diplomacy and invaluable experience in the field of disarmament, you will contribute significantly to the success of our work. My delegation is prepared to co-operate closely with you and thus contribute to the fruitful outcome of the Committee's work.

In the past 12 months a series of events creating a situation of positive change in the international arena has taken place; however, it has also been characterized by the continuance of structural problems combined with other factors which maintain the general insecurity of developing countries that has been a constant feature of the world situation during these past years.

Today more than ever, international peace and security are interrelated with issues connected with disarmament, development, respect for the fundamental principles of international law, and the policies practised by States, in particular the great Powers, in their international relations.

This is a complex reality which cannot recognize privileged geographical areas in any effort to achieve peace and promote disarmament; neither can it recognize privileged areas for the concentration of localized conflicts and the implementation of policies of force and power. The process of gaining space in favour of peace and restoring a climate of renewed détente must be general and must be observed in both developed and developing areas of the world, because the security of some cannot be reflected in the insecurity of the others.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

This view of the overall aspects of the processes relating to international peace and security was clearly expressed in the last annual report of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), which identified four factors directly threatening the maintenance of peace and security in the world. Those factors are: the nuclear arms race, and in general, questions relating to military and strategic matters confronting the great Powers; the continuance of armed confrontation between Iran and Iraq, that is to say, a localized conflict in the developing world; the human and political tragedy still besetting the South African people as a result of the refusal of the Pretoria régime to put an end to the inhuman practice of apartheid and the unlawful occupation of Namibia; and, finally, the problem of the external debt which appears - and I quote from the report -

"as a time bomb which can engender enormous insecurity of unforeseeable political and social consequences".

These facts show that the concept of security and the perception of peace as a permanent factor in international relations can in no way be confined to matters of a military and strategic nature among the great Powers. Security is a pluralistic concept that must encompass military aspects, not only of the great Powers, but of all countries. Above all, however, it should relate to the political, juridical, social and economic aspects that are at the root of the very stability and fragility of the international system. For the developing world it is clear that, over and above the possibility of a nuclear holocaust, which hangs over the whole of mankind like the sword of Damocles, factors militating against their security are essentially of a political and economic nature. Undoubtedly, the maintenance of the policies of the use or threat of the use of force, interference, coercion, areas of influence and the maintenance of economic and financial policies that run counter to the independence and the already deteriorating quality of life of

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

millions of human beings is, in the last analysis, the real danger besetting the security of the developing world.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the SIPRI report itself should have established that at present there are 36 hotbeds of conflict in the world, involving close to 6 million human beings in 41 countries and that of these 97.2 per cent are to be found in the developing world. It would be fallacious to derive from these figures that there is any fanatical desire for conflict. Quite the contrary, the only wishes shared by the peoples of the developing world are to exercise freely their economic and social systems and to develop their own security apart from the hegemonistic interests of the great Powers. That is why, behind every conflict in the developing world, we always find either some form of foreign interference or some form of indirect intervention or coercion or the remnants of economic and social situations which have their roots in the unjust international economic order and whose solution depends not only on the developing world but, first and foremost, on the awareness and readiness of the great Powers to accept and negotiate change.

In this context the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held recently was a step forward and at the same time a new source of frustration: a step forward because at long last it unanimously recognized the existence of a relationship between disarmament and development and the need to overcome limited blocs and hegemonistic concepts of security; and an element of frustration because, given the lack of political will, we have been unable to do anything else inasmuch as there was not even a readiness to renew commitments that had been obtained in the past in the United Nations in respect of disarmament and development.

Nevertheless we believe that, encouraged by the embryonic process of dialogue and hope which has been opened up in the field of nuclear disarmament, we must

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

continue to work in this essential sphere of disarmament with an appropriate synthesis of imagination and political will so as to devise ways and means of achieving practical results.

The Government of Peru regards the agreement in principle adopted by the Soviet Union and the United States of America for the elimination of all shorter- and medium-range missiles to be of outstanding importance. This agreement, which represents the clearing of ground for greater agreements and which may make a reality of the universal aspiration for nuclear disarmament, is of particular importance, not so much because of its quantitative scope, which represents only 5 per cent of existing nuclear arsenals, as because of its political value. It means that when there is a will to build peace, all obstacles and difficulties, including those relating to verification, can be overcome.

In order for this to become a reality it is, first and foremost, necessary for the agreement in principle to be formalized and to culminate as the first experience in the history of the elimination of a particular range of nuclear weapons. Secondly, it should be complemented by drastic reductions in the strategic nuclear arsenals and other types of nuclear weapons, as well as by the halting of the arms race in outer space, leaving that area as a symbol of peaceful co-operation for the benefit of all mankind.

It would be ironical in the nuclear era if the first real efforts to initiate the elimination of nuclear weapons were to be followed by a transfer of the nuclear scenario to outer space - which would merely mean escalating the irrational logic of the holocaust, thus further perverting the use of science and technology.

That is why the Soviet Union and the United States should likewise complement their agreements with specific decisions to that end and after that the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament can and should co-operate to produce an agreement that will free mankind from an obvious danger.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

My Government, on the other hand, is concerned at the fact that the five nuclear Powers should have continued to carry out nuclear tests in 1967. This situation has not gone unnoticed. Nuclear tests are proliferating despite the condemnation of the vast majority of States, despite the criticism and mobilization of peoples and despite the recommendations of the General Assembly. The cessation of nuclear-weapons tests is not a long-term objective. It is a prior and urgent condition for the achievement of progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. The international community cannot accept that nuclear arsenals should continue to be perfected or improved. It calls for the final, definitive cessation of nuclear tests preceded by a general moratorium as a sign of good will on the part of the nuclear Powers.

In this context the renewal of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament to continue consultations aimed at bringing the positions of Member States closer and the consideration of the convening of a conference for the revision of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, signed in Moscow in 1963, are two actions that can be carried out as soon as possible without overlooking the importance of negotiations at the bilateral level.

(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

The Peruvian people, like the peoples of the other coastal countries of the South Pacific, are especially affected by the repeated nuclear explosions in the area. To strengthen the demand that no further nuclear tests be held in the South Pacific and to contribute to halting its gradual militarization, it is urgently necessary, my Government believes, to declare the Pacific to be a zone of peace, thus establishing the anti-nuclear option in the region and preserving it from great-Power rivalry. This is an initiative aimed at establishing more areas of peace, co-operation and peaceful co-existence. The declaration of the South Pacific as a zone of peace would thus complement the denuclearization efforts made in the context of the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga.

The natural priority given to nuclear disarmament should not impeded renewed efforts at conventional disarmament. By its very nature, conventional disarmament is linked to specific regional or sub-regional situations, manifested in a growing arms race and the consequent creation of precarious balances or suspicions and escalations generated by military thinking that takes no account of the aspirations of the civilian population and minimizes the resources that could be devoted to development.

There is no example in history of a nation's having achieved permanent and positive benefits for its own security on the basis of a large-scale accumulation of weapons, as is recognized explicitly in the study on conventional disarmament prepared by the United Nations.

The Government of Peru is firmly committed to a policy based on the conviction that peace cannot be achieved by promoting the potential for conflict. Peace is a multifaceted process, and cannot be equated with the simplistic idea of a simple absence of war. Peace is connected with the social and economic well-being of people, with the concept and application of policies aimed at co-operation and

(Mr. Alsamora, Peru)

integration rather than domination or subjugation. That is why we believe that the problems of collective security should take pride of place in the regional disarmament and arms limitation process.

The United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America, which opened in Lima two weeks ago, on Peru's initiative, is intended to promote that essential process in our region. It is a process that my Government has tried to foster and give the maximum impetus to, with a drastic reduction of military expenditures and the promotion of measures to enhance confidence, which will enable us to make progress in limiting military budgets, using for economic and social development the resources thus released.

My country is therefore disappointed by the backward steps taken in the Conference on Disarmament with respect to the comprehensive programme of disarmament. In the light of that, Peru again reaffirms its conviction that disarmament must be carried out in all areas and at all levels, under effective international control, allowing for the harmonization of all efforts to that end. The comprehensive programme of disarmament thus acquires special significance, since it encapsulates and co-ordinates the efforts being made in these vast and complex areas. We again reiterate the central role played by the United Nations in the disarmament process, for whose realization the comprehensive programme of disarmament provides a substantive framework. The General Assembly should strengthen the work of the Ad Hoc Committee considering the question, by giving it the broadest possible powers.

The Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral body for disarmament negotiations, has achieved important progress on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. It is therefore imperative to produce binding international instruments to eliminate the existing arsenals of chemical weapons and forevermore prevent their production and use. We are aware of the



(Mr. Alzamora, Peru)

difficulties still created by the problem of verification, which is why my country is playing an active part in the Geneva negotiations on the matter. Peru believes that the chemical weapons convention under negotiation should clearly provide for the complete and general prohibition of the production, stockpiling and use of such weapons, without any distinction between States. Similarly, the convention should ban any form of co-operation that would enable a third party to produce those weapons of mass destruction. As for the verification system, it should be aimed at guaranteeing the destruction of existing chemical weapons and preventing their development and production. The verification system should be implemented by an ad hoc international body, to be set up under the Convention for that purpose as well as to carry out regular inspection activities and report infringements.

We are beginning to see encouraging signs with regard to peace. In this connection, we shall support any initiative to establish a comprehensive security system, taking into account the interests of all States, without any kind of distinction, embodying the concept of collective economic security and protecting the developing countries against policies based on the self-interest of others and on force.

The establishment of such a system should result in the elimination of bloc policies and allow for the creation of a more democratic and just world, which will at long last offer our countries a guarantee of peace, development, security and justice.

Mr. PEJIC (Yugoslavia): I wish first, Sir, to congratulate you, distinguished representative of friendly, non-aligned Zaire, on assuming the responsible duties of Chairman of this Committee. I am confident that under your able guidance the Committee will complete its work successfully. On behalf of my delegation, I assure you of my country's complete support.

(Mr. Pejić, Yugoslavia)

Our congratulations also go to the other officers of the committee. I wish also to express my satisfaction at seeing on the podium two Under-Secretaries-General, Mr. Akashi and Mr. Safronchuk, and, of course, my compatriot and friend and colleague of long-standing, Ambassador Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament.

At this session of the General Assembly we are in a position to consider disarmament issues in different, more auspicious circumstances than those that prevailed for many years. It seems that we are leaving behind a period characterized by the confrontation and intransigence of the super-Powers, the consequence of which was the escalation of the arms race, with an ever growing danger to the survival of mankind. The developments that we have witnessed in the recent past open up new and brighter prospects in the field of disarmament, with welcome repercussions elsewhere in international relations.

What I have in mind is first and foremost the agreement in principle between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the elimination of medium- and short-range nuclear missiles. In addition, there is evident progress in the negotiations on chemical weapons; positive results have also been achieved at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament; and the follow-up meeting, in Vienna, of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is nearing, we hope, a successful end. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which considered the problem of disarmament from a particular angle and adopted a meaningful document, made its own contribution along the same lines.

(Mr. Pejić, Yugoslavia)

The agreement in principle between the Soviet Union and the United States to eliminate medium- and short-range nuclear missiles is of exceptional importance. Admittedly, this agreement is modest in scope since it involves only a small percentage of the nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers, yet the readiness on the part of those Powers to take such a step raises the hope that it will be possible for them to begin a broader process of negotiations and agreement-making that would have a positive effect on the overall development of international relations.

The agreement on the elimination of medium- and short-range nuclear missiles will, if carried out, represent the beginning of a genuine process of disarmament and be of historic significance. It will be yet further proof that dialogue is the only means and agreements the only instrument for resolving key international problems. May I recall that this has been the position of the non-aligned countries since their first Summit Conference in Belgrade in 1961 and that they have always been steadfast in their insistence on the need to reduce the huge existing arsenals of nuclear and other weapons.

This position is also contained in the appeal addressed to the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States by the eighth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Harare, Zimbabwe.

We understand that this agreement is merely a first step. If it is to become a turning-point, the super-Powers should continue and speed up their negotiations with a view to eliminating other nuclear arms as well, within the shortest possible period of time. For, indeed, many other things do not brook delay when the security of the world is at stake.

This means that the next phase of negotiations should be aimed at drastically reducing the strategic nuclear arsenals on which the super-Powers have already reached agreement in principle. At the same time, it is necessary to take

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

resolute action to bring about a comprehensive nuclear test ban and prevent the extension of the arms race into outer space.

These processes must surely and inevitably come to include other nuclear Powers as well, since it will not be possible to achieve the goals we all strive towards without their participation.

The General Assembly of the United Nations should at this year's session adopt a resolution on the bilateral negotiations of nuclear Powers on nuclear disarmament, which would render support to the process just begun and clearly and unequivocally demand that it be continued and extended to include all types of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

The primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament rests with those who possess a monopoly on destructive power. However, if that process is to succeed and the goal of general and complete disarmament towards which we all strive is to be achieved, it is necessary that all States participate. That is their right as well as their obligation. Bilateral negotiations do not exclude multilateral negotiations - they complement each other and should therefore evolve side by side.

The Conference on Disarmament, as our single multilateral negotiating body, is in our opinion gaining in importance in the present circumstances. We consider it inadmissible, in the prevailing climate, to leave the Conference on Disarmament on the sidelines. Many of us have often voiced concern that the Conference has not yet begun genuine negotiations on the priority issues on its agenda. We cannot accept that some of its members, by their selective approach to the issues to be considered by the Conference, might deny it the possibility of fulfilling its mandate, thus in effect delaying the process of resolving the most important questions before us.

The nuclear-test ban is today one of the most pressing tasks of both bilateral and multilateral negotiations. It is difficult to accept the fact that there have

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

been no negotiations on this issue for a great many years now. At this time, when prospects for reaching agreement in the field of disarmament are opening up, the nuclear-test ban must be in the forefront of activities by the international community.

We welcome the readiness of the super-Powers to start talking about this issue, too. At the same time, the Conference on Disarmament should without delay begin its own negotiations on a nuclear-test ban, a good framework for such negotiations being the proposal by eight members of the Group of 21 in the Conference. The conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban would have an exceptionally positive effect on the prevention of the qualitative development of nuclear arms, cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament in general. This would also be the best proof of the readiness of the super-Power to speed up and intensify the process they have initiated.

The prevention of the arms race in outer space is also of exceptional importance for the future of mankind. The militarization of outer space would set off a new cycle in the arms race - particularly of a qualitative arms race - with unforeseeable consequences. The stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the creation of new systems have not brought about greater security for those who possess them. The best proof of this is the process now under way. Outer space, as the common heritage of mankind, must remain free and be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. It is also necessary that the Conference on Disarmament begin genuine negotiations on this issue.

We are pleased to note that the Conference on Disarmament has made important progress in negotiations on the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons. We are in favour of having the Conference expend additional effort to reach agreement on the remaining issues and submit a comprehensive draft convention on chemical

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

weapons. This would for ever free the world of the possession - and thereby the possible use - of the most lethal weapons of mass destruction.

Yugoslavia naturally attaches the greatest importance to the development of relations in Europe. Together with other neutral and non-aligned countries, it is actively participating in the present phase of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) in an effort to make its own contribution to positive developments in Europe since this is where its strategic orientation directs it, as do its vital and security interests.

The concluding document of the Vienna follow-up meeting, which is entering its final phase, should contain provisions on the continuation of the Conference on Disarmament in Europe, with its components of confidence-building and disarmament. We are of the opinion that the Conference should resume its work next year in accordance with the mandate from Madrid, supplemented in Vienna. As to constraining measures, the Conference should provide for further steps with a view to lessening the risk of military confrontation, covering inter alia independent air and naval military activities.

The importance of conventional disarmament should never be lost sight of, despite its being overshadowed by nuclear disarmament. The race in conventional weapons is taking place at an accelerating pace, especially between the countries that possess the largest military arsenals. A particular cause for concern today is those conventional weapons whose development is based on the most recent advances in science and technology and whose effects are often hardly different from those of nuclear weapons. The production of such weapons should be halted by resolute international action. The General Assembly should devote the necessary attention to this aspect of the arms race, in view of the danger with which it is fraught.

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

In the context of Europe, negotiations on conventional disarmament should be conducted within the CSEM process in order to enable all its member States to guard their own security interests.

Security in Europe is inseparably linked with security in the Mediterranean. This was emphasized by the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at their recent Ministerial Meeting at Brioni, Yugoslavia. They also came out strongly in support of achieving gradual stabilization of the situation in the Mediterranean through the intensification and promotion of co-operation among all the countries of the region - that is, in support of overcoming and resolving the pressing problems that beset the area and create tension therein. In this context, efforts being made in Europe to reduce and eliminate nuclear arms should encompass the entire region of the Mediterranean since, owing to an increased concentration of military power belonging to the super-Powers and the pressure that is being brought to bear on some non-aligned countries, the Mediterranean has become one of the most serious crisis spots in the world.

(Mr. Pejić, Yugoslavia)

The recently concluded International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development has for the first time pointed out at the international level the multifaceted interrelationship between those two crucial problems of the present-day world. It showed that the world cannot bear the consequences of the arms race and, at the same, achieve rapid social and economic development. Although the Conference fell short of fulfilling some of our expectations, the Final Document and the Action programme determine a broad enough framework for, inter alia, a future exploration of the possibilities for redirecting a part of the vast resources being spent on arms towards creating general development opportunities, particularly in the developing countries. The question of the relationship between disarmament and development must remain an important item on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly.

Yugoslavia continues, as in the past, to attach great importance to the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. This is a unique body within the United Nations system, one in which every country participates on a footing of equality and fully contributes to the process of disarmament. The Commission has been active this year as well. In some areas certain progress has been achieved. We consider it important that the Commission accorded due attention to the naval arms race and made a considerable contribution to the recognition of the dangers and consequences of the arms race in that area.

Today, when negotiations on disarmament are gaining new momentum and when the contours of the resolution of crucial international problems are taking shape, each and every proposal relating to the strengthening of international peace and security, and particularly to the role of the United Nations in that process, is worthy of our attention. Yugoslavia, along with other non-aligned countries, has always emphasized that the United Nations plays an irreplaceable role as the world



(Mr. Pejić, Yugoslavia)

forum not only for the consideration, but also for the resolution, of crucial international problems on which peace, security and development depend.

In the light of recent developments the forthcoming third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament is of very special importance. As we see it, it has a number of important tasks. First, it should give political encouragement to the process of negotiations now under way; secondly, it should assess the developments in that area in the period between the two special sessions; thirdly, it should ascertain the possibilities for the promotion and functioning of the system and for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; fourthly, it should consider the implementation of the Programme of Action adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development; and, fifthly, it should adopt a concrete programme of action in the field of disarmament for the next period.

Such tasks call for solid, qualitative and thorough preparations. Unfortunately, such preparations have not yet begun. Yet, without them, the success of the session, for which we all hope, will not be possible. The holding of the third special session devoted to disarmament must not become a goal in itself. Over all it must represent another step forward in the elaboration of the strategy of the international community in the field of disarmament. This should be borne in mind when we decide at this session on the most convenient time for holding the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In conclusion I should like to point out that the atmosphere in which we opened this session has encouraged us to believe that we are entering a period in which new prospects are being opened for the strengthening of multilateral co-operation, which alone can ensure lasting and genuine solutions to the numerous

(Mr. Pejic, Yugoslavia)

problems that plague this world. To carry on the process of nuclear disarmament within that noble undertaking is of paramount importance. Further progress in this field would go a long way towards allaying the mistrust accrued over a great many years and creating political and economic conditions for building up a more stable and secure world.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee, on your election to your posts in the First Committee.

The annual sessions of the Committee are always important, because they deal with arms control and disarmament. But we meet this year in extraordinary circumstances, some shaped by current events and other requiring us to look searchingly into the future. Our major task will be to seize this moment shaped by special circumstances and to encourage a process of real and substantive change. What will be required, if we are to succeed, is a new spirit and fact of co-operation, the co-operation to which we are all called through our common support of the Charter of the United Nations and our belief in the community of nations which it has established.

The current events to which I refer, and which are dramatically reshaping our present circumstances, include the following:

First, there are the major developments in arms-control and disarmament negotiations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, the two most militarily significant States. Most notable is the decision of the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate, on a global scale, two categories of nuclear weapons. Apart from its significance as the first true nuclear-disarmament agreement, an intermediate-range nuclear forces treaty should set a precedent for future arms-control and disarmament negotiations. In particular, we look forward

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

to rapid progress in the efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve a treaty on the reduction, by 50 per cent, of their strategic arsenals.

Secondly, we see the beginnings of a new era of openness and transparency in the Soviet Union with regard both to military forces and the political concerns that have previously given birth to great suspicion and sometimes real tension.

Thirdly, there is the recognition by the world community that the two great problems of our age - disarmament and development - have a relationship which, if handled correctly, can relieve both the burden of arms and of poverty that crush so many people.

Fourthly, there has been real progress in the Conference on Disarmament on negotiations for a comprehensive convention banning chemical weapons for all time.

Fifthly, we see the beginnings of a resurgence of interest in the United Nations itself as an institution through which major political problems can be solved and through which we can truly promote the Charter's goal of better standards of life in larger freedom.

These developments mean that we are turning a corner. They mean that we are beginning to emerge from a period in which the search for arms control and disarmament was derailed and in which we seemed to have lost sight of the lofty but vital goals on which the United Nations is based and which are essential to the maintenance of peace and security in our world community. But we have only just turned the corner. The road ahead remains long and, in some parts, rocky.

A future event through which we can manifest our collective commitment to good progress on the road ahead will be the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to be held next year. The third special session is a key future challenge, but it is a part of our turning-point today, because what we do at this session of the First Committee will, to a considerable extent, set up for success, or failure, that third special session.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

For the last 10 years, we have used the Final Document of the first special session as the basis for our work. The Final Document, adopted by consensus, was an achievement of truly historic proportions. As the world moved on, following the drawing up of the Charter of the United Nations, it became clear that the Charter, essentially a pre-atomic age and pre-decolonization document, needed supplementing. The Charter could not take full account of the changes that the leap of independence and self-determination would bring or of the fact that, in the last quarter of the twentieth century, we would find ourselves living in history's most heavily armed age.

The Final Document of the first special session provided that supplement to the Charter. It identified the realities of this age, not only in terms of arms control and disarmament, but in terms of the wider political, economic and social goals to which the world community was already, but needed to be further, committed. That Document remains and should remain an essential part of our basic international compact. Like any similar document, it was a product of its time and when one considers its time, it was inspired by the issues and circumstances which it addressed have moved on, as do all human events.

What we will need next year, at the third special session, is both a review of the Final Document to ensure that the goals it enshrines can be achieved in contemporary circumstances, and a new statement - one, we hope, of compelling force.

Simply stated, we will need to shape a new agenda. We need the agenda of tomorrow, not of yesterday, and we can and should begin working on that agenda through the actions we take in the First Committee at this session.

The rubric under which we have worked since the Final Document includes the universal belief that we need to negotiate a treaty that will bring about an end to all nuclear testing. Last year this Committee adopted and recommended to the

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

General Assembly four draft resolutions with the objective of putting an end to nuclear testing. That there were four draft resolutions clearly showed that there were differences of approach to this vital subject, but last year's differences had narrowed and the pattern of voting on the four draft resolutions demonstrated that a final, a real, convergence could emerge.

Since last year, important progress in bilateral work between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on the issue of nuclear testing has added further to that convergence. The Australian Government welcomes the United States/Soviet agreement to commence full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing as part of a process leading to the ultimate cessation of nuclear testing. Further signs of narrowing differences in multilateral consideration of the nuclear testing issue were evident at the Conference on Disarmament held at Geneva.

Can we not therefore this year reconcile the different approaches to the issue of putting an end to nuclear testing and find a way to guide us collectively towards the negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty?

Had the Conference on Disarmament been able to resume practical work in a committee on a nuclear-test ban, we would have made a major leap forward in arms control and disarmament and we would have given a powerful demonstration of international co-operation and of the effectiveness of multilateral negotiations on arms control and disarmament measures. What we resolve on the nuclear testing issue at this session of the General Assembly, in the First Committee, could provide that leap forward.

While nuclear arms control and disarmament have rightly absorbed predominant attention, it has become increasingly clear that the issue of the spread and manufacture of conventional arms and trade in them should also receive rivetted

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

attention. At present, some \$1,000 billion is spent each year on arms, over 80 per cent of which is in the field of conventional arms.

It is not just the fact that some 6 per cent of global gross national product goes to expenditure on arms that demands our attention. The true cost of the arms race is far greater than this figure would suggest: it is the tragic cost of what could have been achieved instead with the scarce capital and human resources currently dedicated to higher levels of armament by developed and developing countries alike.

There are also such bitter anomalies as the fact that aid from developed to developing countries is running at some \$30 billion, while exports of arms from developed to developing countries is running at some \$34 billion. There is the bitter anomaly that developing countries are spending on arms imports virtually the same amount as they receive in development assistance, and this when debt, especially on the part of developing countries, is one of the world's great problems. Between 1975 and 1985 the equivalent of 40 per cent of all debt incurred by developing countries was spent on arms imports.

There is a vicious circle encompassing aid, debt and expenditure on arms. That circle must be broken. The simple reality is that expenditure on arms does not create jobs but instead, together with the allocation of resources for the manufacture of arms, entails major costs, especially for developing countries. This is a sterile aspect of the present state of the global economy, but while it is sterile, it is not passive. Any investigation of major economic aggregates, whether balance of payments, balance of trade, debt or interest rates, shows that while the amount of global gross domestic product that goes to arms is a "mere" 6 per cent, a wider effect of the allocation of these resources to the military

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

sector or to expenditure on military goods will cause significant and damaging distortions in the pattern of the economic life of all of us.

I mentioned earlier the two great challenges of our age: disarmament and development. Since this age has become the most heavily armed in history, disarmament has become one of those challenges and because we live in the post-colonial age, development is another great challenge. Positive action in response to both of those challenges is required, and as it succeeds it will hasten the possibility of mutually reinforced progress in both areas.

Our agenda in the First Committee, in the multilateral system generally - the agenda to be considered at the third special session - must include concerted action to eliminate from our economic life and from our international relations the vicious circle of aid, debt and expenditure on arms and at the same time action to improve the social, economic and military security of all people.

We need universally accepted international standards of responsible behaviour with regard to arms transfers. We need a new determination to achieve significant results in conventional disarmament. We need these changes in order to secure the two great goals: a decent standard of living for all, and life within a framework of peace.

Looking further into the future, we need to establish the agenda that we will need as we move out of the age of nuclear weapons, out of the nuclear weapon culture, into the twenty-first century.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Nuclear-weapon systems have become a hideously blunt instrument. The leaders of the two States possessing the overwhelming number of nuclear weapons have stated that a nuclear war must never be fought, and they have committed themselves to the objective of nuclear disarmament leading to the ultimate elimination of those weapons.

These are immensely significant developments, and they deserve the full support of all of us. So we should start to prepare for the post-nuclear-weapon age and for a post-nuclear-weapon culture more sophisticated and less blunt than the one the nuclear-weapon age has represented. It will be an age of high technology. Thus, it is crucial that we begin now to ensure that the new frontier of technology, outer space, does not simply come to replace what we are seeking to remove in bringing to an end the nuclear-weapon age.

The multilateral system can and must make a real contribution to that end. We in that system must insist that the arms race we have seen on earth never be extended to outer space. This is another area, like the area of nuclear testing, where we should be able to act with one voice, with one common objective.

The remaining years of this century - and perhaps beginning next year with the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - should be the years in which we work on the basis of an agenda that will enable us to chart a new course towards the end of the age of chemical and nuclear weapons, to address more sharply, more clearly than we have ever done before, the issues of conventional weapons and to ensure with certainty that the new non-nuclear-weapon culture, the new age of high technology, is peaceful and turned towards the truly significant problems of human development in their widest and fullest sense.

This is not a small agenda nor is it an easy one. Its objectives are amongst the most vital and lofty objectives we face, and like any such objectives they must



(Mr. Butler, Australia)

be faced by ordinary humans, and often in very mundane ways. There is a strong connection between our ability to achieve our objectives, even lofty objectives, and the practical effect of our methods of work on our reaching or following through to our goals.

Our methods of work in this Committee have become rigid and have begun to retard our ability to fulfil our responsibilities, to pursue our goals. The efforts that have been made towards reforming our methods of work have not yet borne much fruit. We must invigorate that search for more efficient ways of doing our business, of conducting our negotiations.

I suggest that the solution does not lie in fiddling with our timetable or poring over rules of procedure. The only real difference between a meeting of one week and a meeting of ten is revealed by the answer to the question, Which meeting got the results? The one that got the results was the meeting that worked best, whatever its length.

What is required for us to get the results we need is a measure of self-denial. It is to seek co-operation, and that necessarily means compromise - for some, as I said, self-denial. It is to resist the temptation to score narrow political points, and that requires vision and tolerance, exercised for the greater good.

We work in an environment shaped by traditions of respect for national sovereignty and the freedom of all delegations to express their views and to pursue their interests. But the purpose of our institution goes far beyond providing an opportunity for the ritual exercise of established traditions or merely egocentric expression. Our responsibility is to forge international co-operation on arms control and disarmament, because such co-operation is not merely desirable: it is essential to our collective survival.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

We are at a turning-point today. Today we have an opportunity to reshape our agenda, to reshape our world. That opportunity should be seized.

Mr. Uyi (Burma): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is pleased to see you presiding over the work of this Committee. Having had the opportunity of knowing you as your country's representative in Geneva, I am confident that your diplomatic abilities will enhance the prospects for a favourable outcome of this Committee's work.

I wish also to take this opportunity to extend my delegation's congratulations to the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akashi, and to express our confidence in him.

The United Nations was founded on principles of regulating relations and co-operation between States on the basis of the Charter system. Fundamental to those principles is the imperative need of nations to settle their differences through the prohibition of the threat or use of force, which can be seen in the progressive development of international law in the course of recent history.

The Charter was conceived in an age when nuclear weapons were not yet in existence. Although the age of nuclear weapons was not anticipated, it was an irony of fate that the threat posed by nuclear weapons was the first issue that came under consideration by the General Assembly. In its resolution 1 (I), the first to be adopted, the General Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission "for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and ... other ... weapons [of] mass destruction". (resolution 1 (I), para. 5 (c))

Throughout these years the nuclear-arms race on the one hand and disarmament negotiations on the other have been incompatible processes that have been taking place side by side. Efforts to reverse the arms race have not been possible. The world today is oversaturated with nuclear weapons, the bulk of which are in the arsenals of the two major nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

The foremost issue of international concern, therefore, is the prevention of a war in which nuclear weapons would be used. That is a common danger that all nations face; no individual security policy can protect States from that threat. In the past it was possible for wars to destroy an entire village or town, or perhaps even a country. Now nuclear weapons threaten all mankind, for it has been said that in its dynamics nuclear war respects no sanctuary.

Efforts to halt and reverse the arms race have been the concern not only of the nuclear-weapon States but of the entire international community. Although a universal consensus has arisen on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the momentum of the arms race has made that objective an ever more distant goal.

The year 1985 saw renewed efforts at the bilateral level, when the two foremost nuclear Powers reached an agreement to conduct a set of negotiations aimed at preventing an arms race in space and at terminating the arms race on earth.\*

---

\*Mr. Nashashibi (Jordan), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

My delegation was encouraged by those developments and at the time we expressed our hopes for a favourable outcome to those negotiations. The recent announcement that the Soviet Union and the United States of America had reached agreement in principle on the elimination of an entire category of nuclear weapons can be considered a landmark in the history of disarmament negotiations. The two countries which possess the largest nuclear arsenals would be fulfilling the special responsibilities which they bear in accordance with paragraph 48 of the Final Document, because such an agreement would constitute the first measure not only to reduce but also to eliminate an entire category of nuclear weapons.

Reversing the nuclear-arms race in one important class of weapons can be considered a major breakthrough. Disarmament agreements are not negotiated in a vacuum; much of their success depends on the atmosphere in which negotiations are conducted and the political will and spirit of accommodation prevailing among States.

The approach to security through co-operative efforts that reduce the level of threat to both sides also enhances security at the international level. The road ahead is to find ways and means to maintain the gains that have been made and to create the momentum for further nuclear-disarmament prospects which, in turn, could be conducive to conventional disarmament measures, particularly in the region where the balance of security is conceived as the maintenance of both nuclear and conventional armaments.

The agenda for bilateral negotiations on armaments encompasses a wide range of issues that are also of multilateral importance, and the acceleration of the bilateral process should also have positive effects at the multilateral level. It must be realized that the issues being dealt with concern the vital interests of all States, and for that reason the international community should play a positive role through multilateral efforts.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

The role of the United Nations as a central disarmament forum should be enhanced and the work of the Conference on Disarmament as the only multilateral negotiating forum need to be revitalized by strengthening its negotiating character. The present developments should provide the opportunity to re-establish the positive interaction between bilateral and multilateral efforts.

In the past, disarmament efforts at the bilateral and multilateral levels were mutually supportive and resulted in a number of agreements which now constitute an infrastructure on which further disarmament measures need to be built. Trust and confidence are needed for the maintenance of those agreements; of these, particular mention should be made of the anti-ballistic-missile Treaty in view of its significance for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The General Assembly and its subsidiary organs, the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission, provide deliberating forums where all Members can participate and international opinion can be heard. Proposals and views submitted and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly are essential elements of the disarmament process. During the course of the general debate a considerable number of delegations expressed their views on the possibilities of revitalizing the deliberative machinery of the General Assembly, particularly this Committee.

In the process of improving the efficiency of the United Nations as a whole, ample opportunities also exist for the Committee to improve its procedures and practices without impairing its essential character as the most important deliberative forum for disarmament. Although consensus is desirable, in some cases the diversities of views and complexities of problems will not always make that possible.

The resolutions adopted by the General Assembly include those entrusting specific responsibilities to the Conference on Disarmament and constitute the

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

guidelines for work of the Conference in the 10 areas that have been defined in accordance with the relevant provisions of the documents of the first and second special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

It is in the area of chemical weapons that progress has been registered and that there are further positive developments for reaching agreement on the complete prohibition of those weapons. The negotiations on chemical weapons are essential for the formulation of a treaty susceptible to universal adherence, for the practical realities are that such weapons are within reach of nearly all countries of the world. However, the situation with regard to other areas of work in the Conference on Disarmament is different from what is being achieved with regard to chemical weapons.

Priority concerns of the international community are on nuclear-disarmament issues, and much time and effort have been devoted by the Conference on Disarmament to the agenda items relating to a nuclear-test ban, the cessation of the nuclear-arms race, and the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.

Despite the efforts being made from the time of its inception nearly 10 years ago, the body which is responsible for conducting disarmament negotiations has not been able to begin its substantive work on those issues. My delegation ventures to hope that the more favourable climate that has emerged as a result of the bilateral process will open up prospects for effective performance by the Conference on Disarmament in carrying out its mandate.

A comprehensive test ban has been the concern of the international community for more than a quarter of a century. No other disarmament issue has been the focus of international attention as much as this issue, and throughout this period it has been the subject of negotiations at the multilateral, trilateral and bilateral levels. In the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General

(Mr. Uyi, Burma)

Assembly at this session it is stated that the Group of 21 has reaffirmed, both collectively and in individual statements made in the Conference, the utmost importance that they continued to attach to the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a significant contribution to the aim of ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons as well as of preventing their proliferation.

The present situation in which negotiations on a test ban are kept pending is contrary to the wishes of the international community. A comprehensive test ban would constitute an indispensable element in the process of nuclear disarmament and there is now an imperative need for the Conference on Disarmament to begin the negotiation process. While a step-by-step approach is being considered in the context of the bilateral talks, multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear tests are also urgently needed so as to realize the ultimate objective of stopping all nuclear tests.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

The provisions of the outer space Treaty of 1967 define its universal character, for it is stated therein that activities in outer space shall be in accordance with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, in the interest of maintaining international peace and order and of promoting international co-operation and understanding. While it is recognized that bilateral negotiations are necessary for prevention of the arms race in outer space in accordance with the special responsibilities of the major space Powers, there is, indeed, also a parallel need to intensify efforts at the multilateral level to further the objectives of international law.

In the collective search for a more stable and just international order, the maintenance of international peace and security and the creation of conditions favourable to economic and social progress are issues in which disarmament and development and their relationship to each other increasingly reflect the interdependence of nations and the interrelationship of global problems.

The Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held recently has defined the broad principles and the objectives to be pursued in these two areas of international co-operation in their interrelationship.

The outcome of the Conference can be seen also from the broad perspectives of international co-operation on issues of common concern, the complexities of which have indeed made it difficult to find solutions. However, the spirit of accommodation and co-operation which prevailed during the Conference made it possible to adopt the Final Document. This, indeed, reflects a common desire on the part of nations to find solutions to global problems through collective efforts which forbode well for multilateral co-operation under the United Nations system.



Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) (interpretation from French): First of all, may I say how happy we are to have the representative of a fraternal African country presiding over the work of our Committee. While congratulating him, we should like also to assure him of the full co-operation of the Moroccan delegation to ensure the success of our work. We should like also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee, as well as Mr. Akashi in his new post.

The international situation is still characterized by the persistence of numerous conflicts and tensions and by serious economic and social difficulties, especially in developing countries. In view of this worrisome situation, which threatens international peace and security, initiatives were taken and negotiations carried out, as noted by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization for 1987, in which he states that these negotiations and initiatives are a portent of promising changes.

Indeed, this year the resumption of dialogue between East and West promises an improvement in the international climate which could contribute to a settlement of conflicts still unresolved and create favourable conditions for the strengthening of co-operation in all fields.

The agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States of America on 18 September 1987 for the conclusion of a treaty relating to medium-range nuclear missiles is undoubtedly an historic step forward in the field of disarmament and arms reduction. It is promising, and we should like to encourage the two great Powers to go ahead and thus free mankind from the nuclear threat.

We are convinced that this agreement of principle as well as the forthcoming meeting between the Heads of State of the two great Powers will help to improve East-West relations, an indispensable condition for any serious progress in regard to disarmament. Continued efforts to achieve the goal of a 50 per cent reduction

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

of strategic weapons, which has already been announced, will strengthen this trust and we hope that this aim will be achieved in the near future.

We are happy also about the agreement entered into between the two super-Powers on procedures for the continuation of negotiations on the total ban of nuclear tests. We hope that the process thus initiated will apply to all categories of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, so as to achieve the objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which alone can ensure greater international peace and security.

We are also convinced that success in this process will improve security in the Mediterranean area, in which the Kingdom of Morocco is a coastal country. It is of particular interest to us. As the Foreign Minister of Morocco said,

"... the security of the Mediterranean cannot be considered separately ... the problems it raises require comprehensive treatment by all coastal States."

(A/42/PV.21, p. 27)

We have always maintained that bilateral and multilateral efforts should be complementary and not mutually exclusive. Indeed, bilateral negotiations are of crucial importance and should be encouraged in view of the special responsibility of the two States that have the greatest number of nuclear arsenals. At the same time, multilateral negotiations should be vigorously pursued at the Conference on Disarmament in accordance with paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Indeed, if the two super-Powers have a special responsibility in ending the arms race and in nuclear disarmament, all States - nuclear or non-nuclear, large or small - must contribute towards attainment of the goal of elimination of nuclear weapons because of the threat those weapons pose for the security of all States and for the survival of mankind as a whole.

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

But it is sad to have to note that this year again the Conference on Disarmament was unable to launch negotiations on the question of cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament to which our Organisation accords high priority, as can be seen from various General Assembly resolutions, including its resolution 41/86 F in which it expressed the view that efforts should be intensified with a view to initiating, as a matter of the highest priority, multilateral negotiations in accordance with paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

The Moroccan delegation is convinced that a total ban on nuclear tests would contribute enormously towards stopping the nuclear-arms race and preventing the proliferation of these weapons. The techniques available are better able to assure the adequate verification necessary for a total ban of nuclear tests. Complete prohibition, under effective international control, can only contribute towards reducing the nuclear-arms race, not only by preventing the improvement of nuclear arsenals, but also by avoiding the introduction of new weapons.

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

The continuation of nuclear testing could diminish or even nullify the effects of possible reductions in armaments, as the Secretary-General stated in his report this year on the work of the Organisation, where he said:

"Continuation and even intensification of testing, in so far as it is directed at developing new weapons or perfecting those now deployed, will tend to mitigate the value of eliminating one present type of missile and perpetuate a competition that has been a major cause of distrust." (A/42/1, p. 9)

The Secretary-General therefore concludes in his report that it is necessary to reach early agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty.

In that regard, we consider that the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America should be encouraged, because of the special responsibility of those two Powers in this field, but the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body, should tackle the root of the question of banning nuclear tests in a special committee, with an appropriate mandate.

The Moroccan delegation regrets that this year once again the Conference on Disarmament has not been able to reach agreement on the terms of a mandate for a special committee on this question of vital importance for the whole of mankind. However, we do not despair; we appeal for more flexibility and understanding in order to enable the Conference to start substantive work as soon as possible on this matter, which the United Nations considers to be one of high priority.

The risk of nuclear war and the certain annihilation of the world that would result cannot be eliminated while nuclear arms exist. Aware of this threat and of its seriousness, the international community has never ceased to demand insistently the adoption of urgent measures to do away with the risk of nuclear war. Preventing nuclear war certainly concerns all States, because of the threat to not only their security, but their very existence. But the States possessing nuclear

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

weapons have a special responsibility for the adoption of adequate measures to prevent nuclear war. In this connection, we consider that the conviction expressed by the Soviet Union and the United States in their joint declaration of 21 November 1985 that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought could lead to concrete results in the new spirit now shown in the negotiations between the two super-Powers.

However, we regret that in the Conference on Disarmament there has been no progress on this matter, which has been on its agenda for several years, despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly that negotiations should start, as a matter of high priority, within a special committee that the conference should set up for the purpose. We reaffirm and support the appeal of the General Assembly, and hope that the new spirit in the bilateral negotiations will extend to the multilateral negotiations, making it possible to end the current blockage in the Conference.

Outer space, the common heritage of mankind, must continue to be used solely for peaceful purposes, in the interests of all mankind, especially for the promotion of the socio-economic development of the developing countries.

The international community should spare no effort to promote constructive co-operation in the exploration and exploitation of outer space. In that connection, we welcome the efforts made by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and by its Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and its Legal Sub-Committee. We hope that the spirit of compromise that led to the Committee's adoption of principles on remote sensing, endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 41/65, will be maintained during its future work, thus enabling it to establish an adequate legal framework to strengthen international co-operation in space activities.

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

The international community should also take the necessary measures to prevent the militarization of outer space. The extension of the arms race to outer space would only exacerbate the current state of insecurity, as the General Assembly said very well in its resolution 41/53.

As the Secretary-General said in his report on the work of the Organization, the preservation of certain regions from the deployment of nuclear weapons has greatly benefited the entire world. We also agree with him about the need, in this era of progress in space technology, for the international community to ensure respect for the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. Moreover, the existing legal system should be strengthened in order to make it possible for space technology and space activities to develop in an atmosphere of co-operation, not of confrontation. Therefore, the multilateral and bilateral efforts should complement one another.

We are also happy that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space has been re-established at the Conference on Disarmament and that all Member States have expressed the desire to spare no effort to succeed in their substantive work on this matter.

We also support the bilateral efforts between the two super-Powers in this field, and hope that they will lead to effective agreements very soon.

The first International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held at Headquarters from 24 August to 11 September 1987, did not measure up to the aspirations and expectations of the majority of countries, particularly the developing countries, which had placed high hopes in the Conference with regard to freeing resources for economic and social development through disarmament measures. However, the Conference was a concrete manifestation of the international community's interest in the question of the relationship

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

between disarmament and development, and it gave an opportunity to reaffirm formally, in a Final Document certain principles and commitments, as well as plans for future action. Thus, paragraph 9 of the Final Document reaffirms the existence of a multidimensional relationship between disarmament and development, and paragraph 10 says that that relationship in part derives from the fact that the continuing arms race and development compete for the same finite resources. The Final Document concludes unequivocally that disarmament, apart from promoting international peace, security and co-operation, can contribute to socio-economic development by releasing additional financial resources. The international community also reaffirmed its desire to give concrete expression to its belief in the relationship between disarmament and development by taking specific measures, and confirmed its commitment to allocate a portion of the resources released through disarmament to purposes of socio-economic development, with a view to bridging the economic gap between developed and developing countries.

Thus the Final Document, despite shortcomings and lacunae, provides a framework for future action by the international community through the General Assembly, including action at its forthcoming special session devoted to disarmament.

The matters to be considered within that framework should include formal proposals by various groups, including the establishment of machinery for the transfer of resources released through disarmament for socio-economic development.

The accumulation and sophistication of conventional weapons are also matters of concern to the Moroccan delegation. The international community must spare no effort to reduce and limit conventional weapons, particularly in regions where there is a big concentration of them. Reducing such weapons would certainly contribute to easing tensions and facilitate a peaceful settlement of various

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

regional conflicts. Every effort to that end, both bilateral and multilateral, should be made and encouraged.

The earliest possible conclusion of an international convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons, and their destruction, is one of the most urgent measures of disarmament, according to paragraph 75 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

The Moroccan delegation believes that the conclusion of such a convention would make a big contribution to promoting general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and it is happy with the efforts made by the Conference on Disarmament and its Ad Hoc Committee on the matter to negotiate a draft convention. The work has reached an advanced stage, and we hope that it will be crowned with success with the least possible delay. Our delegation plays an active part in the work in Geneva, and it will spare no effort to contribute to its success.



(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

Together with bilateral and multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament, the international community should encourage and support the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, which are considered in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly as important disarmament measures. Paragraph 60 states that:

"The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure." (resolution H-10/2, para.60)

The delegation of Morocco, which supports efforts to establish such zones in various parts of the world, expresses its deep concern at the persistence of obstacles preventing the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa and the Middle East. Despite numerous appeals by the General Assembly in favour of the creation of such zones, South Africa and Israel continue to strengthen their nuclear capacity, thus preventing the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and increasingly threatening peace and security in those two regions.

The convening of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament comes at a propitious moment in view of the encouraging prospects for disarmament negotiations between the two super-Powers. We hope that this resumption of dialogue will contribute to the success of the work of this special session and make it possible to advance the cause of disarmament. We consider that the next special session should reaffirm the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and examine ways and means of speeding up its implementation.

This special session should also make it possible, in the light of efforts made since 1978, to seek ways of ensuring greater effectiveness for multilateral machinery dealing with matters of disarmament and strengthening the role of the Organization in this field.

(Mr. Zahid, Morocco)

In this connection, we support the Secretary-General when he states, in his report on the work of the Organization, that

"The forthcoming third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament can, with thorough preparation, provide a valuable opportunity to consider how the Organization's potential in this regard can be realized. Indeed, the session will permit a timely review of the entire work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, an area of vital importance where rationalization and innovation could permit the resources of Member States to be effectively focused on the most productive activities." (A/42/1, p.9)

Moreover, any strengthening of the role of the United Nations can only help it fully to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by the Charter as concerns the promotion of international peace and security and the preservation of future generations from the scourge of war.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.