

# CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV. 451  
24 March 1988

ENGLISH

---

## FINAL RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Thursday, 24 March 1988, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Paul Joachim von Stülpnagel (Federal Republic of Germany)

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 451st plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference continues today its consideration of agenda item 4, entitled "Chemical weapons". However, in conformity with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

As announced at our last plenary meeting, the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, Dr. Ola Dahlman of Sweden, will introduce the progress report of the Ad hoc Group contained in document CD/818 once we reach the end of the regular list of speakers. Members wishing to comment on that report will have an opportunity to speak immediately after its presentation.

As I also informed you at our last plenary meeting, I have been requested by the Group of 21 to put before the Conference for decision a draft mandate for an Ad hoc Committee on item 2 of the agenda, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament", which has been circulated today as document CD/819. Once we have listened to those members speaking today, I shall suspend the plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting of the Conference to establish whether there is agreement on the draft mandate. Immediately afterwards, we shall resume the plenary meeting to take up document CD/819.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Morocco, Nigeria and India as well as the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. I now give the floor to the first speaker on my list, the representative of Morocco, Ambassador Benhima.

Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): Mr. President, it is a particularly pleasant task for me to extend to you my warmest congratulations and those of my delegation as you take over the presidency of our Conference, where you represent the Federal Republic of Germany, with which the Kingdom of Morocco has close relations of trust, friendship and fruitful co-operation. For several years you made a personal contribution to the consolidation of these relations when you occupied an important post within your Embassy in Rabat, where the outstanding qualities which you are displaying in this forum were greatly appreciated.

I would also like to express my delegation's gratitude to your predecessor, Ambassador Harald Rose of the German Democratic Republic, who presided over the work of our Conference last month with his customary competence and efficiency.

Lastly, I am happy to perform a pleasant duty in welcoming our new colleagues, Ambassadors Solesby from the United Kingdom, Elaraby from Egypt, Azikiwe from Nigeria, Marchand from Canada, De Azambuja from Brazil and Sujka from Poland. We wish them every success in their functions, and I can assure them that they will enjoy full co-operation from my delegation.

(Mr. Benhima, Morocco)

Never since its creation has the Conference held one of its sessions in such a promising international climate. The two big Powers' recent summit in Washington, the agreement on the elimination of short-range and intermediate-range missiles, the prospect of a treaty on the reduction of strategic arsenals, continuing negotiations in Geneva on space weapons and the forthcoming meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, scheduled to be held in Moscow at the beginning of the summer, are important stages in the process of progressive re-establishment of confidence, which in the past was so sadly lacking in relations between the two super-Powers. This budding détente, which we hope will gain in momentum, gives us real grounds for satisfaction and high hopes.

It is hardly necessary to stress that the INF Treaty is an event of considerable historical scope, as the first international instrument since the beginning of the nuclear era which is aimed at destroying a whole range of weapons of mass destruction. Its historic significance also lies in the fact that the Treaty marks a passage from the stage of arms limitation to the stage of stopping the arms race. While in quantitative terms this agreement is limited, since it covers only 5% of the world's nuclear arsenal, it opens up a new era for the world, the reversal of the nuclear arms race, and marks the beginning of the freeing of our planet from the nuclear threat, thus enshrining the primacy of man's wisdom over the murderous madness of weaponry.

It took almost 10 years for the two major nuclear Powers to try to take up the challenge of security through disarmament, a challenge facing the international community which it described in the following terms in its warning contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: "Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament, or face annihilation".

With the INF agreement, and despite its bilateral nature, the healthy path of survival has been chosen. And pending conventional disarmament, the United States and the Soviet Union have thus fulfilled their obligations deriving from their special responsibility in safeguarding and maintaining international peace and security.

It is with real satisfaction that we note that the process which Moscow and Washington have embarked upon since the historic Geneva declaration in 1985 has put a brake on the nuclear arms race and demolished the psychological barrier of distrust which has too often been used to justify the build-up of large arsenals.

Nevertheless let us beware - let us not be carried away by euphoria. Let us not forget that the international community has been calling for the continuation of negotiations, and hopes that they will be crowned by the achievement of the goal for which it is mobilizing - that of general, complete and internationally verifiable disarmament. However important it may be, the Washington Treaty cannot be seen in isolation; in our view it is only a stage in a long process.

(Mr. Benhima, Morocco)

The future agreement on the reduction of strategic arsenals also carries enhanced hopes with it. Since the beginning of our session authoritative sources have expressed the wish that the present momentum will be maintained and carry along other Powers.

In this context my delegation welcomes the repeated commitment made by China, whose representative stated on 23 February that "as a nuclear Power, China will not evade its responsibilities for achieving the complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons".

In a situation which has never been so promising for disarmament, a relevant and legitimate question comes to mind: what can or must be done by our Conference to contribute to strengthening the new trend which seems to be gaining the upper hand?

My delegation agrees with the view that mankind is at a decisive turning-point in its history, because since the last world war conditions have never been so favourable for laying the foundations of a world rid of the nuclear threat. Hence the Conference owes it to itself not to miss this crucial rendezvous with history, by carrying out the mandate entrusted to it unanimously by the international community in 1978. There is no need to recall the nature of this mandate, but we cannot pass over in silence the Conference's lack of success in its negotiating mission. It is not that it has not undertaken or attempted anything, but rather that until 1985 the deterioration in international relations had a negative impact on its work. Now with the impetus generated by the resumption of the East-West dialogue, the Conference must show that it is able to take advantage of this new international climate and draw on the positive contributions it makes.

It is time for our Conference to abandon its reserve by finding within itself the impetus needed to give new momentum to its work. The new factors on the international scene must be fully exploited by all the members of this body to allow it to carry out its mission alongside other negotiating bodies.

We have always unanimously stated that all bodies dealing with disarmament negotiations, whether bilateral or multilateral, form an interlinked and coherent whole. This assertion must be made a reality through the way in which we deal with the matters on the agenda of the Conference.

The pretext which has often been put forward to justify the lack of movement in the Conference on several subjects has been the lack of political will on various sides. In our view this political will, which has allowed a major breakthrough in the bilateral negotiations, should soon show itself in our own sphere of action. Such an input is necessary, not to say imperative for the future of this Conference.

In this context, our thoughts cannot but turn to the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which will be held in a few weeks' time in New York. The session will provide an occasion, inter alia, to take stock of what the Conference on Disarmament has done. In that regard my delegation feels that the forthcoming special session should not make this stock-taking a priority. The session should look to the future and not the past. Its primary task should be to give new blood to this

(Mr. Benhima, Morocco)

negotiating machinery. It should also give the necessary political stimulus to speeding up the disarmament process, in particular by strengthening the framework for multilateral negotiations to make sure that the latter can complement the bilateral negotiations.

If there is one item on the Conference's agenda whose importance and priority enjoy unanimous support, not only on the part of the members of the Conference but also from the international community, it is undoubtedly the subject of the nuclear test ban. This is a matter which has been the subject of a considerable number of General Assembly resolutions over nearly three decades now, and it is often the core of plenary statements in this Conference. This sustained interest which has never been modified by time, expresses the absolute importance attached to the question of a nuclear test-ban treaty.

Yet we have no choice but to note that the level of priority and urgency which this item enjoys is contradicted by the true state of affairs.

We know that, if the elaboration of a treaty on this question is still being awaited, it is because of the disagreements regarding the mandate to be given to the ad hoc committee which will deal with it. Equally, no one any longer denies the political essence of these disagreements. However, as much as we understand the political nature of these disagreements, we remain puzzled at the fact that they have persisted for five years.

This inaction into which our Conference has fallen is a source of grave concern, for many reasons.

The lack of any negotiation on this item runs counter to the universally proclaimed desire for a nuclear test-ban treaty. Moreover, in the long term this may lead the Conference to a stage of hibernation - at a time when the same problem has been under discussion at the bilateral level since last September.

This log-jam is also harmful for our Conference, because of the interaction between the three items on the agenda which relate to nuclear disarmament. It is obvious that item 2, relating to cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament, and item 3, relating to prevention of nuclear war, are suffering from the negative effects which derive from the lack of movement on the first item.

We would have liked to see a change in this situation on the eve of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Lifting the deadlock would, we feel, have been a positive response on the part of our Conference to the many continued appeals from the General Assembly to negotiate an agreement on this matter. However, the time remaining between now and the third special session does not leave much room for optimism.

Yet we remain confident that the Conference will shake itself out of its inaction, and we hope that the time available to us will be wisely used so that the efforts undertaken by all delegations lead to the identification of a common approach.

(Mr. Benhima, Morocco)

In this regard my delegation would like to stress that our disagreements on the terms of the mandate are not insurmountable. The convergence of views on INF between the two major Powers proves that in negotiations nothing is impossible, provided that political will exists. That is why quarrelling over mandates should not, we feel, prevent us from arriving at our common aim - the negotiation of a nuclear test-ban treaty. Resolution 42/26 A as well as resolution 42/27 contain the elements on which we can build a mandate and a wise combination of all the elements they propose would undoubtedly allow us to arrive at an agreement on a mandate.

The Ad hoc Committee on Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space has just recently been established. Although tardy, this step gives us real grounds for satisfaction given the very special interest we have in this subject. After three years of "study", "identification" and "general consideration" on the substance of questions relating to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, we had the right to expect this year to be a year of negotiation.

Such a development, which would have fitted logically in with resolution 42/33, has not been possible. It is thus easy to understand our disappointment at the fact that the adoption of the mandate and the President's statement have been delinked. Given this situation we have to be realistic, and we have to benefit from all elements which can help to achieve progress in the work of the Ad hoc Committee: the results of three years of work, the continuation of the bilateral negotiations in Geneva which cover space weapons, among other matters, and the presence at the head of the Committee of Ambassador Taylhardat, who last year made an outstanding contribution to the work of the Ad hoc Committee.

The work of the Ad hoc Committee entrusted with the task of negotiating a treaty banning chemical weapons has entered an extremely crucial stage. On the one hand, the negotiations reached a very advanced stage in 1987, thanks in particular to the inter-sessional consultations. On the other hand the international community is becoming more and more insistent in its demands that this convention should be finalized as soon as possible.

In this situation, marked also by the bilateral discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union on chemical weapons, our Conference must respond to the General Assembly's appeal to it in resolution 42/37 A. The third paragraph of that resolution urges the Conference, as a matter of high priority, to intensify, during its 1988 session, the negotiations on such a convention and to reinforce further its efforts by, inter alia, increasing the time during the year that it devotes to such negotiations, with a view to the elaboration of a convention at the earliest possible date.

The re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee at the very beginning of the session is in itself encouraging, as is the fact that it is led by Ambassador Sujka of Poland, who has already demonstrated his great experience in the Chair of the same Committee in 1982.

We take this opportunity to express our genuine pleasure at the fact that the new Chairman has been able to keep up the pace and maintain the impetus which his predecessor provided throughout the 1987 session. The results

(Mr. Benhima, Morocco)

obtained thanks to the praiseworthy efforts made by Ambassador Ekéus fortify us in particular since they now stimulate the work of the Ad hoc Committee under Ambassador Sujka, who is brilliantly supported by the co-ordinators of the three working groups.

There is no doubt that the task of these groups is difficult, but it is not impossible. Thus, we very much hope that all the members of the Conference will combine their efforts and make sure that the Committee succeeds in its work during this key year.

It would not be without value to recall here that the eyes of the international community are upon us. The international community expects concrete results as an adequate response to the concern expressed for the first time by the General Assembly in the resolution I referred to, at the delay in elaborating the convention. In this context we would very much like this treaty to crown the work of the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. However, as this date gets nearer the goal seems impossible to achieve because of the many pending matters which show no signs of being resolved in the immediate future.

The persisting disagreement on such topics as non-production of chemical weapons, the destruction of existing stocks, the destruction of chemical weapon production facilities, all the aspects of the verification régime, the institutional framework which will ensure that the convention is complied with, assistance, and economic and technological development must in no way sap our will or our vigour in completing the negotiations on the convention. Nor should these divergences slow down the pace of work reached during the last session.

This is why we feel that the rapid conclusion of this convention has become imperative. It is all the more necessary as the siren songs of ad hoc partial or regional solutions are becoming more and more pressing. Such solutions can in no way replace our Conference's noble objective which has been and remains the complete and effective prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of all chemical weapons, together with their destruction.

The principle of universality in disarmament has always governed all negotiations conducted within the Conference, in particular those on chemical weapons. Let us work together to ensure that it is not called into question at a time when the goal has never appeared so close since the joint Soviet-American statement of 10 December 1987, which "reaffirmed the need for intensified negotiations toward the conclusion of a truly global and verifiable convention".

Given such a commitment we have every hope that all the members of the Conference will redouble their efforts and overcome the problems in order to conclude this convention by the very latest in 1989. This hope is equalled by our confidence that all countries will be resolved to spare no effort to ensure that these negotiations are successfully concluded.

(Mr. Benhima, Morocco)

Our optimism may seem to outflank the realism we have always shown in our statements. However, this feeling of optimism derives from our profound conviction that the complex nature of the problems still pending, as well as the high commercial and military stakes which continue to obstruct the negotiations, can be considered by all of us to be not so much insurmountable obstacles as true reasons to persevere in seeking appropriate solutions and to step up the work of the Committee in order to make sure that the convention on chemical weapons becomes a reality in the very near future.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Morocco for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Azikiwe.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): Mr. President, my delegation is pleased to see you, the distinguished representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a country with which Nigeria maintains very cordial relations, presiding over the work of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of March. It is a fitting tribute to your country for its role in disarmament matters. Permit me also to express my delegation's gratitude to Ambassador Harald Rose, the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic, for the very skilful manner in which he guided the work of this Conference during the opening phase of this session.

May I take this opportunity to extend a warm welcome to the representatives of member States who, like myself, have recently been appointed by their Governments to lead their delegations to the Conference on Disarmament. As I am participating in the Conference for the first time, I sincerely look forward to working closely with them and other colleagues in the pursuit of the noble objectives of this Conference.

Before I continue, let me extend to the delegation of the United Kingdom the heartfelt condolences of the Nigerian delegation on the untimely death of Ambassador Ian Cromartie, whose valuable contribution to the work of this Conference as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in 1986 will always be remembered by us all.

Although Nigeria is not a nuclear-weapon State, and does not intend to pursue such an ambition, my delegation has a long tradition of participating in the Conference on Disarmament. We are here because we believe the issues under consideration are vitally important, as disarmament is not the concern of an exclusive club. The items on the agenda are of a global nature and concern all our futures. The current global situation is fraught with danger, but equally filled with opportunity. The main problem which will remain with us for a while is how to reconcile global security with preserving national interests. We must however strive to work out a system of security in which politics, not technology, is pre-eminent - a system in which peoples affirm their identity together with and not in opposition to others. Undoubtedly, security must be security for all, global and planetary.

Almost 10 years have elapsed since the Conference on Disarmament was designated as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community. Regrettably, the Conference has so far not achieved tangible progress on any of the first three items of nuclear disarmament which

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

have been accorded the highest priority on its agenda, despite the growing threat to the very survival of mankind with the unrestrained refinement and continuous accumulation of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States.

We would, however, be drawing a wrong conclusion if we blamed the lack of progress at the Conference on incompetence. This is certainly not the case, as it is largely due to the state of affairs in the relations between the super-Powers and their allies, which have assumed alternately the character of "cold war" and "cold peace". Indeed, this has continuously denied the Conference the much-needed political will which forms the basis of its work.

It is against this background that the Nigerian delegation welcomes the conclusion of the INF Treaty last December between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Although the Treaty is highly limited in its scope, the fact remains that it is the first treaty ever to actually eliminate an entire category of nuclear weapons. It therefore constitutes a milestone in international disarmament efforts. By signing the Treaty, both the Soviet Union and the United States have demonstrated their recognition of the advantages of seeking security through disarmament and co-operation, rather than through the discredited arms race and confrontation. The Nigerian delegation also welcomes the intensified efforts by the leaders of the two great countries to achieve a 50% reduction in their strategic nuclear weapons. It is the hope of my delegation that the favourable international climate brought about by these developments will offer room for overt optimism about the work of this Conference.

We should, however, like to state that the bilateral efforts of the two super-Powers would be largely unhelpful if the elimination or reduction of some categories of nuclear weapons were offset by increases in other categories. We also believe that if further obstacles are to be created to hamper progress in the multilateral negotiations, the achievements in the bilateral efforts would be substantially diminished. If the bilateral negotiations are not to be denied what should constitute a universal input into the solution of issues of global concern - an input which should provide a base for ensuring the universality of disarmament agreements and thus help to create confidence for adherence - then we must accept the fact that bilateral and multilateral efforts must complement and facilitate each other in order to be purposeful and effective.

My delegation is, however, aware of the increasing signs of preference among some delegations for a bilateral or even unilateral approach to issues which are of universal interest. The multifaceted problems of the world today are so complex that no single country, nor even a combination of a few countries, can presume to be able to dictate solutions. Notwithstanding the shortcomings of multilateralism, it has provided an indispensable forum for deliberations on global issues on the basis of the democratization of international relations. The downgrading of the system is bound to aggravate the international situation further by creating a vacuum.

The lack of urgency with which the question of a comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban has continued to be treated in this forum is clearly out of tune with the immense dangers which the ongoing search for more devastating

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

nuclear weapons poses to the continued survival of mankind. What is at stake is not the power or the prestige of the nuclear-weapon States. The issue in question is the continued survival of humanity and of civilization.

The nuclear weapons currently at the disposal of the nuclear-weapon States, especially the two super-Powers, are already sufficient to destroy all life on Earth several times over. The search for more devastating nuclear weapons must, therefore, be stopped if respect for human dignity is to be assured and the goal of general and complete disarmament - which remains one of the most profound aspirations of humanity - is to be attained.

The position of Nigeria on the question of the cessation of nuclear weapon testing is already well known to this Conference. We believe that a comprehensive nuclear test ban is the first and most urgent step towards a cessation of the nuclear arms race, and that, as underlined in paragraph 51 of the Final Document of SSOD-I, "it would make a significant contribution to the above aim of ending the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons and of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons". Nigeria is a party to the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty, and was the first among the 40 members of this Conference to renounce the nuclear option under the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. These two treaties also imposed concrete obligations on their depositary Governments, including the two super-Powers, to "seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time and to continue negotiations to this end".

Since the two treaties came into force nuclear weapon testing has continued unabated, resulting in the continued ominous refinement and modernization of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States, especially the super-Powers, against the profound aspirations of humanity.

Much as the Nigerian delegation welcomes the decision last year by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to enter into bilateral negotiations on nuclear testing, we find the step-by-step approach adopted by them to be unacceptable. This approach, by allowing testing at agreed and defined intervals of time and agreed yields, merely licenses nuclear testing and will not prevent the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. Above all, it would defer, indefinitely, the goal of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

The Nigerian delegation believes that the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban falls more appropriately within the competence of this Conference. We therefore urge the Conference to establish an Ad hoc Committee on the item as a matter of urgency, with an appropriate mandate to commence practical work. A bilateral approach to this item will only succeed in denying the international community a global solution. There should be no further delay on this item.

The Nigerian delegation is highly impressed by the progress made so far in the negotiations on the draft chemical weapons convention. In this regard,

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

I would like to extend our deep appreciation to Ambassador Rolf Ekéus of Sweden, who so ably chaired the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in 1987, during which time the Committee moved fast and made appreciable progress towards the conclusion of the draft convention.

As we are approaching the concluding stage of the negotiations on the draft chemical weapons convention, my delegation is of the opinion that those outstanding issues which are of central importance to the convention, and which could to a large extent influence the decision of several countries as to whether or not to join the convention, should now be taken up with all seriousness. I would like to draw attention here to the need to include in the convention measures that would effectively protect parties against chemical weapons intimidation or attack by non-parties. As we are all aware, chemical weapons are second only to nuclear weapons as the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction. Any decision to renounce chemical weapons could place parties at a serious permanent military disadvantage if non-parties felt free to intimidate or attack them without fear of retaliation.

It is for this reason that my delegation considers it most necessary for article X of the convention to incorporate an undertaking by parties to assist any party, in the exercise of its inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, when threatened or attacked with chemical weapons by a non-party, if requested. Such a provision would be consistent with the provision of article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which states that "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security ...".

Such a measure in the opinion of Nigeria would commend the convention for greater adherence since it would deter non-parties from attacking parties, thus removing any military advantage in staying outside the convention.

Nigeria attaches priority importance to the question of negative security assurances. The early re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on the item with a full negotiating mandate is commendable. Nigeria remains convinced that the most effective measure to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons is nuclear disarmament, but until this is achieved, it is imperative for the international community to develop effective measures to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

It is our hope that the Ad hoc Committee will succeed this year in its search for an appropriate formula to facilitate substantive work on the item. To this end, my delegation would like to recall that Nigeria submitted a proposal contained in document CD/768 last year in which non-nuclear-weapon States were classified into categories, based on their security situations, to enhance effective negotiations. Early this month, an alternative proposal aimed at resolving the stalemate was submitted by my delegation in the Ad hoc Committee for consideration. Nuclear-weapon States are urged to lay aside their various unilateral declarations in the negotiating process to allow the adoption of a convention on the basis of a common approach or formula. Should they consider it necessary, nuclear-weapon States could feel

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

free to make reservations reflecting their unilateral declarations while ratifying the Convention. Furthermore, my delegation would like to urge the nuclear-weapon States, especially the depositary Governments of the NPT, to show greater commitment on this item.

International interactions in outer space are gradually degenerating into a possible arms race. With increasing technological advancement in space science, outer space may soon become an arena for an arms race. Outer space should continue to be the common heritage of all mankind, and its uses should be restricted for peaceful purposes.

My delegation is pleased with the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on outer space. Although the mandate given to it is a non-negotiating one, we believe that the Ad hoc Committee could still carry out practical work that would facilitate the strengthening of the present legal system which governs outer space in order to effectively ensure the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

My delegation also welcomes the early re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons, and is pleased to note that it has settled down to substantive work. With respect to the issue of radiological weapons in the traditional sense, we believe that the fact that radiological weapons as such do not exist should encourage the Ad hoc Committee to negotiate a model convention on the prohibition of possible future means of warfare. As for the issue of prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities, my delegation believes that it would be necessary for countries to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards to be eligible for such immunity.

My delegation notes with great pleasure the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament under the chairmanship of one of our most competent colleagues in the field, the distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles. We hope the Ad hoc Committee will be able to meet the deadline set for it, to conclude the elaboration of the CPD for submission to SSOD-III.

Soon after the spring session, the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be held in New York. One of the major items on the agenda of the special session is the report of this Conference. Indeed, our work since SSOD-II will come under close scrutiny. We are all aware that the lack of political will constitutes the main obstacle hampering progress in this forum. Hence, we should all endeavour to ensure that practical steps are taken to advance the work of the Conference.

Similarly, my delegation attaches great importance to a successful outcome of SSOD-III, which should be realistic and forward looking. As a participant at the last Preparatory Committee meeting, my delegation notes with satisfaction the skilful manner in which the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan guided the work of the meeting, which was rather eventful. SSOD-III will no doubt provide us with a wonderful opportunity to restore the multilateral role of the United Nations on disarmament issues. We should, however, avoid bringing in new elements and peripheral matters that will delay the work of the session, merely to aggravate ideological differences or to

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

embarrass a particular group of delegations. It would also be helpful if we maintain a flexible approach, with the views of all delegations given proper attention. My delegation looks forward to promoting genuine and constructive co-operation with all other delegations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Nigeria for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I give the floor to the representative of India, Ambassador Teja, who will speak as Co-ordinator of the Group of 21 for agenda item 2.

Mr. TEJA (India): Mr. President, allow me first of all to reiterate my Minister of State's tribute to you personally, since you have assumed the presidency of the Conference for one of the two most crucial months before we adjourn for the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. I have no doubt whatsoever that with your personal knowledge and commitment to the work of disarmament, we can rely upon you to enhance the purposes for which we have been engaged for so many years since the last special session on disarmament, as well as the involvement of the Conference on Disarmament. I am also happy to note that the CD is being presided over by a representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, a country with which my own country has maintained ties of cordial co-operation and friendship for so many years. I should also like to take this opportunity to welcome our new colleagues, Ambassador Solesby of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Elaraby of Egypt, Ambassador Azikiwe of Nigeria, Ambassador de Marchand of Canada, Ambassador Azambuja of Brazil and Ambassador Sujka of Poland.

I shall now speak in my capacity as the Co-ordinator of item 2 for the Group of 21.

I have asked for the floor today to introduce the draft mandate of the Group of 21 on item 2 of the agenda - Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. The Group firmly believes that, as stated in the Final Document of SSOD-I, the nuclear arms race, far from contributing to strengthening the security of all States, on the contrary, weakens it, and increases the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war. Further, the nuclear arms race thwarts efforts towards relaxation of international tensions. The Group of 21 is convinced that cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament would improve the international climate and facilitate progress towards international peace and security.

All nations have a vital interest in negotiations on nuclear disarmament, because the existence of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of a few States and the qualitative and quantitative development of such weapons jeopardize the vital security interests of both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. We believe that multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament are long overdue. The progress achieved in bilateral negotiations is indeed a welcome development, but because of their rather restricted scope and the fewer number of parties involved, these cannot replace the multilateral search for concrete, universally applicable nuclear disarmament measures. The Conference on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, should play its role with regard to the urgent question of nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Teja, India)

The Group also welcomes the joint declaration issued in Stockholm on 21 January 1988 by the Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, already issued as document CD/807. It believes that, in accordance with its considered view already reflected in documents CD/64, CD/116, CD/180 and CD/526, the immediate object of the consideration of item 2 by the Conference should be the establishment of an ad hoc committee to elaborate on paragraph 50 of the Final Document and identify substantive issues for multilateral negotiations. Accordingly, the Group of 21 submits to the Conference on Disarmament the mandate contained in document CD/819.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Teja for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts, Dr. Ola Dahlman, who will introduce the report of the Group contained in document CD/818.

Mr. DAHLMAN (Sweden): I am pleased to present to you the results of the recent meeting of the Ad hoc Group and to introduce its progress report, contained in document CD/818, which is in front of you.

The meeting took place from 7 to 18 March 1988, and experts from 24 countries and a representative of the World Meteorological Organization attended the meeting. The Group very much appreciated the services provided to the Group by the secretariat.

The Group is now considering two big and interrelated tasks: to develop a conceptual design of a modern international data exchange system, and to plan the conduct of a large-scale experiment. As has earlier been reported to the Conference, the Group has agreed in principle on the design of a modern international system for the expeditious exchange of all available seismic information. The seismic data are to be obtained from a global network of highly sensitive seismological stations. Information should be fully utilized in the analysis to be conducted at specially established international data centres.

The Group's meeting was devoted to a technical assessment of the various components of the system. The discussions were based on technical material provided by the five study groups established earlier. This material, and our deliberations during this meeting, will provide the basis for a comprehensive draft report on the conceptual design of the system. This draft report will be prepared by the Group's Scientific Secretary, Dr. Frode Ringdahl from Norway, and will be considered at the Group's forthcoming summer meeting.

The material considered at our recent meeting was fairly technical, and is thus difficult to reflect in great detail in a progress report. The Ad hoc Group therefore decided to submit a fairly short progress report at this time, and to use all available time for technical discussions. The rather thin progress report in front of you therefore does not reflect a lack of progress but rather considerable progress in working out all the technical fine print needed for the conceptual design of a modern international data exchange system.

(Mr. Dahlman, Sweden)

I will briefly comment on some of the issues discussed.

Seismological stations are key elements in a global system. To achieve standard stations, including special array arrangements to improve signal detection and event location, the Ad hoc Group has earlier discussed the concept of a "CD station". At this meeting the Group decided to work out technical specifications for such a station, and discussed tentative designs.

To develop a prototype "CD station" and set up such standardized, modern and highly sensitive stations on a global scale is in my view most important for achieving a high-quality global network.

As to the national data centres, which are the national gateways into the international system, their functional requirements were thoroughly discussed. Modified sets of seismic parameters to be extracted and exchanged were presented and discussed, together with specific rules for the routine exchange of wave-form data.

Efficient data communication systems are further key elements of the international system. The dedicated high-speed communication links between the international data centres earlier agreed upon must be supplemented by high-quality communication links between the national and international data centres. Various technical options for computerized data transmission between centres available in various parts of the world were presented and discussed.

The possibility of using the World Meteorological Organization's Global Telecommunication System for data exchange has been discussed earlier, and a representative of the World Meteorological Organization reviewed recent discussions and decisions within the Organization on these matters.

International data centres are the cornerstones of the envisaged international system, where all data are collected and analysed and from which processed information is transmitted to all participants. To develop the methods and procedures needed to routinely analyse wave-form data from a global network of stations involves breaking new scientific and technical ground. At the institutions developing experimental international data centres, extensive work is under way to cope with these issues, and results so far available were presented and discussed.

A plan for the large-scale experiment was presented by the Co-ordinator, Mr. Peter Basham of Canada. This plan, which was in line with the earlier agreed stage-by-stage approach, was thoroughly discussed by the Group.

It is generally recognized that the design and testing of the system and its components must be an interrelated dynamic process. A conceptual design is the basis for the planning of experiments to test uncertain or crucial components, and results of the tests will influence the final design.

In the tentative time schedule discussed it is anticipated that what we call "warm-up" experiments to test critical components such as procedures at experimental international data centres and communication links will start as early as the autumn of this year.

(Mr. Dahlman, Sweden)

A large-scale test on a global scale similar to that conducted in 1984, but also involving what we call level II or wave-form data and thus volumes of data greater by orders of magnitude, needs careful preparation and is not likely to be conducted before 1990. A revised plan based on the Group's discussions will be worked out by the Co-ordinator and presented at our forthcoming meeting.

The Ad hoc Group suggests that, subject to approval by the Conference on Disarmament, its next session should be convened in Geneva from 25 July to 5 August 1988.

This concludes my presentation and my introduction of the Group's progress report.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group for his statement introducing the report on the twenty-fifth session of that Group. As I announced at the last plenary meeting, I shall put before the Conference for adoption the recommendation contained in paragraph 14 of the report at the plenary meeting on Thursday 31 March.

In connection with that document, I now give the floor to the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Lüdeking.

Mr. LUDEKING (Federal Republic of Germany): On behalf of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, I wish today to comment briefly on the work of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events.

First and foremost, I wish to express my delegation's appreciation for the able chairmanship of Dr. Dahlman and the many interesting and fruitful contributions made by the participating scientific experts.

As my delegation has not yet had time to study in depth the progress report contained in CD/818, I wish to underline only a few points which we consider to be of particular importance.

My delegation appreciates the steps taken by the Ad hoc Group with a view to elaborating the practical and technical basis for a global seismic monitoring system and carrying out a large-scale data exchange experiment. We continue to attach great importance to the contributions made by a growing number of co-operative national investigations into level II or wave-form data exchange; our seismic experts, Professor Harjes and Dr. Henger, have been working extensively with their colleagues from a number of countries in this area. The two experts have presented, as document GSE/Federal Republic of Germany/25, a "Proposal for a standard format for transmission of digital seismic wave-forms in binary form". That proposal, if adopted, could serve as the future international standard format for digital exchange of seismological data, and could not only result in lower costs for data transmission, but also considerably speed up data processing and data analysis by the international data centres that will collect national data in the future large-scale experiment.

(Mr. Lüdeking, Federal Republic of Germany)

National data centres would also profit from the proposed new format for transmission: this format could not only be used in the world-wide seismological data exchange, but in adopting it national data centres could also fulfil their obligations under a future global monitoring system without having to re-format the seismic wave-forms that have to be transmitted regularly or on request to the international data centres. In this context allow me to draw your attention to last year's demonstration of 5 and 6 March when our experts demonstrated the "open station concept" developed by them and their collaborators. It means that seismic data centres in the Federal Republic of Germany are designed for open access and remote data treatment via telecommunication links in order to freely share our scientific knowledge in this field with interested seismic scientists all over the world. If national data centres, in a step-by-step approach, could be either transformed or from the outset designed after this model, automatic storage of seismic data in wave-form, easy accessibility via international data communication links and interactive data processing could considerably simplify the system design for a global seismic monitoring network.

I wish to refer to a principle which my delegation considers to be of particular importance - that in preparing for the large-scale experiment, the Ad hoc Group should make use of all available technical options in order not to preclude their later integration into the work carried out on the definition of a future global monitoring system.

There does not exist, in our view, a mutually exclusive relationship between one task of the Group, namely to define parameters for the future monitoring system, and its second objective, i.e. to carry out, as soon as possible, a large-scale data exchange experiment including the exchange of level II data. On the contrary, we see each task as complementary to the other.

A too narrowly defined approach to the envisaged large-scale experiment would merely result in a repetition of the 1984 data exchange experiment, and thus foreclose valuable new experiences that could help shape a more realistic and state-of-the-art design for the future global seismic monitoring network. After all, what is the objective of the work carried out by the Ad hoc Group? I believe that there is consensus in this Conference that it should prepare in the best imaginable way for the day when a comprehensive nuclear test ban will enter into force and will have to be verified in the most comprehensive manner in order to be convincingly enforced.

Keeping certain promising technological options open does not necessarily mean excluding countries that at present do not have certain technologies from taking part in the large-scale experiment; rather, a solution can be envisaged which combines both bold new approaches and more traditional ones.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in his plenary statement on 22 July 1986 announced his Government's readiness to accede to the demands for a new large-scale experiment encompassing the exchange of level II or wave-form data. At that time, he was quite optimistic that this experiment could take place in 1988; but judging from the results achieved during the twenty-fifth session of the Group of Scientific Experts, this will hardly be possible. My delegation notes with regret and

(Mr. Lüdeking, Federal Republic of Germany)

disappointment that it does not seem to be likely that this commonly agreed goal will be translated into practical deeds soon. We hope that the Group as a whole will find itself in a position to move forward more speedily towards the envisaged large-scale experiment during the summer session it proposes to hold between 25 July and 5 August of this year. We ask the Conference to decide to allow the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to continue its valuable and indispensable work along the lines proposed in document CD/818.

The PRESIDENT: That concludes our list of speakers for today. Does any member wish to take the floor at this stage under rule 30, or to comment on the report just submitted by the Chairman of the Ad hoc Group? That does not seem to be the case.

I now intend to suspend this plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting of the Conference to consider the draft mandate for an ad hoc committee on agenda item 2 contained in document CD/819.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 451st plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

As requested by the representative of India, in his capacity as Co-ordinator of the Group of 21 for agenda item 2, I put before the Conference for decision document CD/819, submitted by that Group and entitled: "Draft mandate for an ad hoc committee on item 2 of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament - Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament".

Is there any objection to the draft mandate? I see the representative of Belgium.

Mr. NIEUWENHUYS (Belgium) (translated from French): In view of the importance of the subject-matter addressed under agenda item 2, the delegations of the Group of Western States have once more considered carefully the mandate proposed by the Group of 21 under this agenda item. These delegations have noted that our programme of work regularly provides for discussion of this agenda item in plenary sessions of the Conference. In addition, for the past two years the Conference has held informal plenary sessions devoted to item 2 in which the Western delegations have fully participated.

The Western Group also took into account the developments in all arms control forums, especially the ongoing bilateral negotiations on nuclear and space arms between the United States and the Soviet Union which have reached a successful outcome on INF and are continuing on strategic arms.

Consequently, although the Western delegations are prepared to participate in informal plenary meetings on the subject-matter of item 2, they have not been convinced that creation of a subsidiary body would contribute to the cause of nuclear disarmament, and they are therefore not in a position to join in a consensus with regard to the proposed mandate.

The PRESIDENT: In view of the statement just made, I am obliged to state that there is no consensus at present on the draft mandate contained in document CD/819. Does any other member wish to take the floor at this stage? I see the representative of China.

Mr. FAN (China) (translated from Chinese): On the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, item 2 - Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament - has all along been an important issue of priority. It is related directly to the elimination of the threat of nuclear war and the safeguarding of international peace and security. The Chinese delegation has all along attached importance to this agenda item, and has expounded its views and proposals in a statement as well as in working papers. The Chinese delegation is willing to co-operate with everyone and launch a common effort to seek practical ways and means to promote progress on discussion of this item.

The Group of 21 has always attached special importance to this item and tried to promote its discussion. This year the Group of 21 has again made positive efforts. The Chinese delegation would like to express its appreciation in this regard. With regard to document CD/819, we can go along with it in principle. We are in favour of the establishment of an ad hoc committee on this topic within the CD. At the same time, we are also willing to consider the adoption of other ways and means to enable the CD to play its due role on this matter.

The cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament are wide-ranging and complicated questions. We earnestly hope that through further serious consultation and discussion a common formula acceptable to all parties will be found which will enable the CD to make headway on this item of nuclear disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of China for his statement. Does any other speaker wish to take the floor? I recognize the representative of the German Democratic Republic.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): After the door has been opened towards nuclear disarmament with the conclusion of the INF Treaty by the Soviet Union and the United States, the Conference on Disarmament too should now live up to its responsibility in the nuclear field. Proceeding from the principle that bilateral and multilateral negotiations should complement and reinforce each other, the establishment of an ad hoc committee would be the most suitable approach for the active conduct of practical work by our Conference under item 2 of its agenda. It is for this reason that the Group of Socialist Countries was able to support the draft mandate for an ad hoc committee on agenda item 2 as contained in document CD/819, submitted by the Group of 21. Regretting that a consensus has not been reached, and having in mind the forthcoming SSOD-III, we favour continuation of the consultations with a view to finding an organizational framework acceptable to all groups and States which will allow substantive discussion on item 2 of our agenda.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the German Democratic Republic. Does any other member wish to take the floor? I recognize the Ambassador of India.

Mr. TEJA (India): Before speaking on item 2, I should like to add a word of welcome to Ambassador Nasserri of Iran, who has joined us recently; we look forward to closely working with him in this body.

The significance which the Group of 21 attaches to agenda item 2 is well known, and its views are already reflected in documents CD/64, CD/116, CD/180 and CD/526. In keeping with its consistent position, the Group of 21 presented the draft mandate contained in CD/819. It is a mandate that reflects the two crucial aspects of this issue - the urgency attached to it by the Group of 21, and the need to deal with it in the multilateral negotiating framework of the Conference on Disarmament. The Group regrets that, despite the preliminary work carried out on this subject during the last two years, it has still not been found possible to set up an ad hoc committee on this item.

In keeping with the discussions that took place on this subject last year, and as reflected in the report of the CD contained in document CD/787, the Group of 21 is convinced that the need for urgent multilateral action on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, leading to the adoption of concrete measures, has been amply demonstrated. In its opinion, multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament are overdue. It welcomes the progress achieved in the bilateral negotiations, but would like to reiterate that because of their restricted scope they can hardly be a substitute for a genuine multilateral search for universally applicable nuclear disarmament measures. It believes that all nations have an interest in negotiations on nuclear disarmament because the existence of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of a few States and the qualitative and quantitative development of such weapons affect the security of both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. It is an accepted fact that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat to the survival of mankind. It is essential, therefore, to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avoid the danger of nuclear war. As was stated in the Harare Declaration adopted at the Eighth Non-aligned Summit:

"Since annihilation needs to happen only once, removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe is not one issue among many, but the most acute and urgent task of the present day."

It is clear that global security cannot be based on doctrines of nuclear deterrence. On the contrary, the advent of nuclear weapons obliges us to undertake a re-examination of the basic relationship between armaments and security. The belief that security can be enhanced through possession of nuclear weapons must be challenged because accumulation of nuclear weaponry undermines the very security that it seeks to protect. In the nuclear age, the only valid doctrine is the achievement of collective security through nuclear disarmament. The INF Treaty, as the first disarmament agreement which eliminates an entire class of nuclear weaponry, is a further vindication of the view that the reduction of nuclear arsenals leads to an enhancement of global security, and can only be welcomed.

The Group of 21 is convinced that the doctrines of nuclear deterrence, far from being responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, lie at the root of the continuing escalation of the arms race and lead to greater insecurity and instability in international relations.

(Mr. Teja, India)

Moreover, such doctrines, which in the ultimate analysis are predicated upon the willingness to use nuclear weapons, cannot be the basis for preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war, a war which would affect participants and innocent bystanders alike. The Group of 21 cannot agree, politically and morally, and considers it unjustifiable, that the security of the whole world should be made to depend on the state of relations existing among nuclear-weapon States.

In the task of achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament, the nuclear-weapon States bear a special responsibility. In keeping with respect for the security concerns of the non-nuclear nations, and refraining from action leading to intensification of the nuclear arms race, the nuclear-weapon States must accept the obligation to take positive and practical steps towards the adoption and implementation of concrete measures towards nuclear disarmament.

The realization that nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought is a significant step forward, which must be translated into practical steps. Paragraph 50 of the Final Document indicates guidelines for the CD to provide an effective and complementary process in the multilateral framework. The Group of 21 remains firmly committed to the implementation of this paragraph, and the establishment of an ad hoc committee provides the best means to achieve this objective.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of India for his statement. Does any other member wish to take the floor?

I should like now to turn to another subject. The secretariat has circulated today, at my request, an informal paper containing a timetable for meetings of the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the coming week. In that connection, I should like to note that on Friday 1 April and Monday 4 April, the Palais des Nations will be closed and therefore no conference services will be provided. Accordingly, there will be no meetings of the Conference on those two days. As usual, the timetable has been prepared in consultation with the chairmen of the ad hoc committees. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I have no other business for today, and I now intend to adjourn the plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 29 March, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.