United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-SECOND SESSION
*Official Records**

FIRST COMMITTEE
19th meeting
held on
Friday, 23 October 1987
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Chairman: M c . BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

later 1 Mr. GUTIERREZ (Costa Rica) (Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

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

Statements were made by:

Ms. Rahman (Bangladesh)
Mr. Al-Ketal (Iraq)
Mr. Maksimov (Byelorrussian Soviet Socialist Republic)
Mr. Murin (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire)
Mr. Badji (Senegal)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/42/PV.19
2 November 1987
ENGLISH

87-63111 8385V (E)

42p

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

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

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

Ms. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): It would be an act of reckless carelessness if man were to destroy himself through the excesses of his own genius. MY delegation's position on disarmament issues flows from that incontestable notion.

Some weeks ago, in the general debate in the First Committee, the Bangladesh Foreign Secretary said that deterrence is no substitute for disarmament and that trust, more than all else, deters conflict. He stressed the need for peace for the attainment of progress.

One would be hard put to detect a fallacy in such logic. Simple ideas can provide the material for response to the most complex situations. That is how we have formulated our opinion on some of the agenda items under consideration.

Our position on nuclear-free zones is unequivocal. We support the concept. We urge its implementation wherever the decision to do so has been taken. We would like to see fresh regions added, so that the globe is covered in due course with Such concentric circles.

With regard to agenda item 48, Bangladesh is of the view that total absence of nuclear weapons from Latin America would enhance mutual security and prevent the use Of such weapons against a Member State in that region. We would like to see an early ratification of Protocol I by all parties to which the Protocol is open.

Our position on agenda item 51 is similar: we firmly believe that the early implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/48 would assist in the creation Of an atmosphere conducive to the comprehensive Settlement of the Middle East problem. Pending the establishment of such a zone, Bangladesh would like to see

(Mr. Rahman, Bangladesh)

the States of the region declare that they would refrain, on a reciprocal basis, from activities that would tend to heighten suspicion in this regard. The deeply disturbing disclosures in the Sunday Times of London on 5 October 1986 were cause for uneasiness. We believe that Israeli acquisition of nuclear capability would most seriously destabilize the fragile peace in that region, with most horrific consequences. Israel is known to have test-fired Jericho Two, an intermediate-range ballistic missile capable of carrying a nuclear warhead. Its present range of 500 miles is likely to be increased to 870 miles soon.

We would naturally like to see our own region, South Asia, nuclear free. We have provided a written communication to the Secretary-General conveying our views on agenda item 52. Bangladesh is a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and will contribute in the best possible manner to the implementation of the resolution adopted by the Assembly in this regard last year. We believe that the security of the region would be strengthened against the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons if such a zone were established.

(Me. Rahman, Bangladesh)

Nationr have throughout history resorted to force of arms to advance perceived self-interest. Bangladerh is not in a position to do so, for our prohlems are too many; nor would we do so • ven if we ware able to, for our valuer and pr inciples would preclude us from doing so. As a natural corollary, we wish our area to he strife free - hence our total commitment to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Bangladesh will actively work towards it as a member of the Ad Hoc committee set up for the purpose.

My delegation welcomes the appointment of Zimbabwe to the Committee hy the President of the General Assembly on 6 May 1987. We believe that the inclusion of the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement - in whose leadership we have great faith - will add vigour to the deliberations.

The Conferonce must not he delayed any more. The Committee's recommendation in thir regard must be accepted without further ado. The views of the littoral States on the substantive issues may differ, but we are confident that talks at thr proposed Colombo Conference will narrow, rather than widen, the gulf. My Government has always conveyed its appreciation of the Sri Lankan offer to host a preparatory committee in Colombo next year. Agenda item 68, therefore, is much more than a regional concern.

Sadly, the genius of man to which I referred earlier has found ways and means not only to hlur the qualitative distinctions hetween conventional strategic weapons hut also to enhance the destructive capabilities of most varieties. Reason dictates that scientific and technological achievement6 must he used for peaceful purposes. The horrendous potentialities of weapons of radiological, particle-beam, infrasonic radiation and electromagnetic typen are well known. Our discussions under agenda item 60 will he desiqned to prohibit them. Bangladesh will support all measures that would help prevent their development. Likewise, on agenda

(Ms. Rahman, Bangladesh)

item 62, we urge the early conclusion of the chemical-weapons-ban convention whose prospects have already aroused some optimism.

I am happy to be able to say that the Disarmament Commission, on whoee Bureau We sat, has been able to do some useful work during its 1987 substantive session, focusing its attention on such issues as the role of t.he United Nations in this area, conventional disarmament, verification and naval disarmament. These are crucial nubjecta and increased understanding in these spheres would assist the achievement of this Committee's broad goals.

My delegal)n shares the enthusiasm recently generated in the improved globa) disarmament climate. This has received further impetus following the Soviet-American meeting in Moscow yesterday. We must work to make this hope pervade for ever, or suffer the pains of the maiden Antigone in Sophocles' tragedy as she walked slowly towards the inevitable tomb where she was to be buried alive.

Every age is confronted with a major challenge. Disarmament is ours. We must succeed. Given the political will and some rationality, we shall. Women and men of our generation bear this responsibility to those yet unborn.

If somewhere today a sleeping beauty should fall asleep for 100 years, she should on awakening find that the world not only exists but also thrives.

Mr. AL-KETAL (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic) : It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of Iraq on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. We are completely confident that ycu will successfully yuide its business. I am also pleased to congratulate the other officers of thr Committee. I assure you of my delegation's full willingness to co-operate So as to achieve the desired results.

If confidence-building is required to facilitate efforts to curb the arms race and ultimately to roach general and complete disarmament, and if measures have

(Mr. Al-ketal, Iraq)

been or will be taken to build and enhance confidence in this world, it should be recalled that reinforcement of the principles of international law and full respect for them in international relations are major requirements in the building and enhancement of confidence.

Nothing fuels and accelerates all aspects of the arms race among States more than lack of security. If aggression, violation of the sovereignty of States, interference in their internal affairs and acquisition of their territories by force replace respect for the principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the jurisdiction or the Security Council in the settlement of international conflicts, then talk about diearmament will be far removed from reality when a situation demands that States exercise their legitimate right to self-defence to protect their security and independence. Building confidence by reinforcing respect for the rule of law in international relations imposes specific obligations in relations among States end imposes respect for international law on those who have rejected or circumvented it. The principles of international law form an indivisible whole that is not amenable to a piece-meal approach and selective application. Therefore, thooe who directly or indirectly encourage a selective approach to the provisions of international law and the Charter are conspiring against them both. They are driving international relations into a state of lawlessness and anarchy. And they are disrupting international confidence, which previous speakers have addressed, together with its relationship to diearmament.

Selective application of the provisions of international law is untenable, and separation of the international bodies Concerned with disarmament and the maintenance of international peace is detrimental to the unity of the United Nations system. Therefore, in order to achieve Concrete results, the link between

(Mr. Al-ketel, Iraq)

the business of those bodies, including this Committee and the Conference on Disarmament, and the interaction among them must be maintained. That is essential and is, furthermore, a procedural necessity in keeping with the unity of the United Nations system.

(Mr. Al-Ketal, Iraq)

Moreover, these *bodies* should be accessible to the States that are willing to contribute and desirous of contributing positively to the negotiations on disarmament. It is not acceptable under any circumstances to turn them into exclusive clubs in which some States would voice their views and interests, rejecting the participation of others on some pretext, giving precedence to certain procedural rules over the substance and importance of the subjects under discussion.

Here it is relevant to quote once more what is contained in paragraph 28 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

"All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations. They have the right to participate on an equal footing in ... disarmament negotiations . ..". (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 28)

My delegation, calling once again for an end to the abuse of consensus in the Conference on Disarmament with a view to blurring the contributions of the countries that are willing and desirous, hopes that its call will be fully heeded both here and in the Conference on Disarmament. In this connection I wish to quote from the Final Document of the Eighth Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries as follows:

"The Heads of State or Government underlined the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. They stressed that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in disarmament negotiations, . ..". (A/41/697, p. 37, para. 57)

The Reykjavik meeting in 1986 between the President of the United States and General Secretary Gorbachev made it clear that there is no alternative to continuous dialogue in order to achieve détente in international relations. Recently Signs have emerged indicating that the two super-Powers have reached an

(Mr. Al-Ketal, Iraq)

agreement in principle to eliminate both medium-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles. Despite the fact that these missiles constitute but a small portion of the nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers, this agreement will, when finalized, constitute an important and encouraging step on the path towards disarmament and also in the field of confidence-building.

Nuclear disarmament measures cannot assume their true dimensions unless they cover all nuclear Powers and all forms of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the question of reaching a convention on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons is still the main task that should be given top priority.

It is not difficult to understand that it is meaningless to destroy an obsolete weapon while tests continue for the development of more sophisticated and more lethal weapons and while efforts are constantly made to extend the arms race from the Earth to outer space. The nuclear Powers must assume greater responsibility for banning nuclear weapons completely. They must take convincing steps on the path towards disarmament and halting the arms race. It is not reasonable, 17 years after the entry into force of the nuclear proliferation Treaty, to see nuclear parties to the Treaty still not observing its provisions, their excuses notwithstanding. This Treaty, intended to halt both horizontal and vertical nuclear proliferation, will of course encounter difficulties at its fourth review in 1990 if the situation remains as it is today and if the nuclear Powers remain unable to make positive and convincing strides to halt the arms race and achieve general and complete nuclear disarmament.

The faltering of the nuclear States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty in achieving genuine progress towards disarmament has encouraged other countries to develop nuclear weapons, with attendant grave threats to international peace and security . Here my delegation wishes to refer to the increasing military and

(Mr. Al-Ketal, Iraq)

nuclear capabilities of both Israel and South Africa and to reliable data on the possession by the Israeli entity of nuclear weapons and its development of medium-range missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads and delivering them to most targets in the Arab region and some parts of the Soviet Union. The dangers posed by these developments for peace and security in the region and in the world are disquieting. They require the taking of prompt and effective measures to prevent the outbreak of nuclear catastrophe there.

Israel has pursued an ambiguous nuclear policy, through which it hopes to terrorize and blackmail the Arab States and to maintain its domination over the occupied territories. It is a policy that has also been characterized by a desire to keep Israel the sole nuclear Power in the area, able to impose its hegemony there. Therefore Israel's actions have been aimed at destroying and sabotaging any Arab effort that it perceives as threatening its policy. Accordingly, the destruction of scientific and technical efforts in the Arab world, as well as of nuclear installations in Arab countries, is part and parcel of Israel's nuclear policy. It is in the framework of this policy that we can view the criminal attack of 1981 against the Iraqi research reactor devoted to peaceful purposes under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). We can also view in the light of this policy the continuous Israeli threat reflected in the destruction of any nuclear installation when Israel deems such action fit.

Iraq has consistently supported the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It has called upon all States in the area to renounce the possession of nuclear weapons and to place all their nuclear installations under the control of IAEA. Iraq, which is a party to the non-proliferation Treaty, finds in these measures the only practical way to avert nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

(Mr. Al-Ketal, Iraq)

Armed attacks against nuclear installations have numerous consequences and should be looked at from various aspects; this Committee is not concerned with all of them. However, the radiological consequences of destroying a nuclear installation, are similar to those created by radiological weapons and are worthy of discussion here, because banning the production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons is not complete unless certain necessary measures are taken to prohibit armed attacks on nuclear installations. We realize that concluding an international binding convention prohibiting armed attacks against nuclear installations would require certain technical studies in addition to defining the technical and political frameworks for such a convention. Therefore we believe that IAEA is the competent body, both technically and scientifically, to provide the required studies on the radiological effects of such attacks.

(Mr. Al-Ketal, Iraq)

It is also concerned with othrr facets of the issue, being the organization concerned with ● noouragAng and widening tho scope of the peacetul uses or nuclear ● nergy . We call hero on IAEA to co-operate positively with the Conference on Disarmament in accelerating the negotiations in order to conclude the required convention as ● oon as possible.

Next ● ummor will witness the holding of tne third special session on disarmament. We hope that, before it takes place , positive and tangible results will be achieved between the two super-Powers that will be conducive to confidence-building and to the creation of a positive atmosphere for productive a..d constructive action, going beyond the usual procedure of those moetings, merely delivering ● tatomrntr and adopting resolutions that remain unimplemented.

Disarmament negotiations should, as a matter of priority, deal with the most lethal wrapona, which pose a grave threat to life on this planet. Foremost amongst there are nuclear weapone. There should be a comprehensive ban on their product ion, stockpiling and use, and a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and of research related to the development of such weapons.

The fact that this forthcoming special session is close at hand will place an added responsibility on the Conference on Disarmament and on all the other bodies concerned to redouble their efforts to achieve positive results. This also makes it incumbent upon all States to mrke serious efforts to encourage the two super-Powers, as well as the other nuclear Powers. to agree on effective measures to enhance international peace and security and ensure respect for the principles of international law, on their indivisible character in international relations, and on effective measures to dismantle and destroy strategic weapons, and also to prevent the development of newer weapons of destruction or the location of new spheres in outer apace for another stage of the arms race.

Mr. MAKSIMOV (3yelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Prevention of an arms race in outer space Continues to be a matter of especial concern to the international community. We can see evidence of this in the fact that for a number of years now the General Assembly has adopted a resolution on this item, which has been adopted by all Members of the United Nations, with only one abstention. Since the question was discussed at the forty-first session of the General Assembly, developments in this area have gone in various directions. On the one hand, the matter has caused concern while on the other hand, the developments have laid down a solid basis for effectively keeping the arms race out of outer space.

Threatening elements can be seen in the steady work being done on the well-known Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) of the United States and in the intention to shift towards plans for implementing it at an early date - that is to say, for practical purposes, deploying the relevant weapons even at the beginning of the 1990s.

To justify these programmes, the legitimacy of which is denied by the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missiles Systems (ARM Treaty), the so-called broad interpretation of this Treaty is being invoked. Let us note by the way that such an interpretation is greeted with grave doubt, even in the United States itself.

Without going into detail regarding the essence of the problem, we wish to point out that the very attempt to shift to a new interpretation of a bilateral treaty and to do so unilaterally, especially when one partner to the Treaty, in this case the Soviet Union, has unambiguously maintained the need for strict observance of the conditions of that treaty: such an attempt, we feel, is wrong.

Our delegation is not going to concentrate in this statement on an analysis of SDI and its negative consequences for military and strategic stability, for

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorrussian SSR)

international security and for the prospects for disarmament. That has been done in part years. New studies and new analyses, including some done by leading American specialists and their orqanizationr, for example, the American Physics Society, confirm the negative view of SDI which we have expressed and which is well known. The conclusions of those analyses apply equally, and perhaps to an even greater measure, to the accelerated deployment of SDI.

Advocates of the building of outer-apace weapons, in trying to convince world public opinion about the rightness of so doing, uae concepts such as effective space defence and limited attack. But all of these arguments, if we really look deeply into them, do not deal with the essence of the matter. If its essence is to defend against nuclear weapons, then, is it not true that destroying nuclear weapons is the best and moet reliable way, end, in the final analysis, the simplest 4nd most economical way to etrenythen security? Preventing war is what should be talked about. That is the essence of the new situation in the world. Tno main means for deeence is, in the final analysis, mutual disarmament.

This brief description of the situation would be incomplete if we did not point out that the Soviet Union, which is a space Power, is fundamentally Opposed to an arms race in outer space, and has been taking tne relevant practical position on this. In particular, a few years ago, the Soviet Union unilaterally began a moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite systems in outer space as long as other States followed the example set for them. The "star peace/star wars" dilemma is one Of those rare situations in which the truth is unambiguous. Putt ing weapons into outer space, leads irreversibly to a growth in mutual mistrust and unpredictability and will accelerate the arms race and make peace even more

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorrussian SSR)

fragile. Over and above the purely military considerations on this subject, the calculations of the advocates of SDI clearly have another strategic co[illegible]:, an economic one. One of its [illegible] aaential elements is to dray the other aide inco an arma race, to limit its potential in the area ot economic tra..sformation, all in the name of and for the benefit of the working man.

(Mr. Makoimov, Byelorussian SSR)

Turning now to the effort to prevent an arms race in outer space, we would recall that there have been many serious initiatives in this field. Strict compliance with the anti-ballistic missile Treaty régime is very important if we are to keep outer space Peaceful and tree as a place tor broad co-operation in research and development in the interest of all mankind. It is the job of all mankind to keep that Treaty alive and viable; first or all, if there were t.o be an unbridled arms race in outer apace, peaceful international co-operation in space would simply die. Secondly, destroying tne Treaty would destroy the basin for substantial reductions in strategic offensive weapons.

But all peoples are interested in such reduction8, as we have seen from the statements made in the qeneral debate in the plenary Central Assembly and in the First Committee. Rapid and substantial progress is therefore necessary, in all existing forums, both bilateral negotiating forums and tho Conference on Disarmament.

There is more than a solid basis for such progress. There is general readiness - with a single exception - to adopt meaningful measures to prevent en arms race in outer space, but beyond that there already exists a whole set of serious proposals, both comprehensive und partial. It is abeolutely certain that on the basis of those proposals it would be possible to achieve clearly visible goals.

These are some of the areas covered by recent proposals: strict obeervancr and strengthening ot the anti-ballistic missile Treaty régime, including specific time-frames and a plan of action extending beyond those time-frames; achieving an agreement on prohibiting anti-satelli systems and space-to-Earth weapon systems; using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind;

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

establishing a world space organization; inspecting objects to be launched into outer space; and establishing an international monitoring system to keep outer space peaceful.

Any verification problems that arise in implementing future agreements could be resolved through the existence of an international apace inspectorate. The United Nations has a major role to play in the establishment of such a body. Such an inspectorate could ensure the permanent presence of groups of inspectors at all facilities used for launching apace objects. Moreover, all States involved in space activities would be on an absolutely equal footing. The permanent presence of inspectors would guarantee the reliability of monitoring. It is in the nature of space technology that verification is relatively simple and effective. Provision would be made also for the right to demand on-site inspections when it is suspected that there has been a launch from an undisclosed site,

Members will recall that the Soviet Union has stated its readiness, if a complete ban on space strike weapons is adopted, to extend inspections to its own storage, industrial, laboratory, testing and other facilities. That means the Soviet Union is ready for genuine, mutual openness, not in mere words, but in deeds. That is what we must do to establish trust.

The USSR recently informed the First Committee of its new specific proposals to the United States regarding strict observance of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty. These include possible agreement on a list of devices prohibited from being launched into outer space irrespective of their purpose if their technical characteristics exceed agreed parameters.

Even the most Critical scrutiny will show that the basis of these and earlier proposals is a desire to strengthen not the narrow security of a single State but comprehensive security, and an intention not to harm anyone's defensive position.

(Mr. Maksimov, Byelorussian SSR)

All participants in existing forums dealing with problems related to the prevention of an arms race in outer space must take a constructive approach, dictated by a concern for international security. Living, as we do, in a commonwealth of nations, we cannot ignore our commonality of interests, especially those whose importance is, quite literally, vital.

Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): Our Committee's debate unquestionably testifies to the constantly growing interest of States Members of the United Nations and the international community at large in achieving a radical change in the area of disarmament. New, positive elements have appeared in our dialogue, relating both to the form and content of the items under discussion and to disarmament as a whole. The general acknowledgement that nuclear war is inadmissible and support for the concept of a nuclear-free and non-violent world have come to form a platform for uniting diaarmamant efforts.

In place of doctrinea of nuclear terror we are seeing increasing attention to a new integrated concept of security, encompassing international life in all its aspects and guaranteeing the security of all States on an equal basis, regardless of their military potential. Disarmament is becoming the very core of attempts to achieve concrete yuaranteee of a secure world.

Even such traditional and seemingly unchangeable concepts as the balance of forces are beginning gradually to be transformed into more contemporary, more democratic: approaches based primarily on a balance of interests. We are seeing the emergence of such concepts as military sufficiency and defensive strategy.

The degree of openness in approaching such questions as monitoring the observance of arms-reduction and disarmament agreements has increased to the point where the whole question of verification has become a stimulus to the disarmament progress instead of a brake on it.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

This year has also witnessed significantly increased understandiny of the need for mutual balance in bilateral and multilateral efforts to solve disarmament problems. Au a result ot thr Soviet-United States negotiations, we now see a platform for nuclear disarmament. Tnis is a source of optimism and inspiration for the entire international community, including the United Nations. In response to the unequivocal demand of our times, in the area of efforts at disarmament we are seeing the gradual emergence and strengthening of a new term: internationalization.

All of this testifies to the realism and effectiveness of the new political thinking in international relations, and creates conditions for making the necessary progress In thu military and political spheres.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

In this connection, the United Nations faces some ● oriouu tasks. Thor. is the possibility of stimulating negotiations on diearmament at a qualitatively higher level. In our view, internationalizing disarmament efforts primarily means encouraging the participation of all States on a universal and democratic basis in the practice1 consideration and solution of all aspects of disarmament problems. Of course, a necessary condition for the establishment of such a favourable situation is the full utilization of the machinery and tire potential of the United Nations as a universal forum characterized by the total interdependence of Staten and their involvement in shaping peace processes and in all areas of international relations.*

But even the United Nations itself could not play a central role or bear primary responsibility for disarmament if it did not have the active and direct participation of all Member States. We wish to support the valuable ideas expressed at this session regardiny the responsibility of the Security Council in the area of disarmament under the Charter. The convening of a special series of meetings of the Security Council at the Foreign Minister level to consider goals and tasks in the area of nuclear disarmament would be a major step in that direction.

We also feel that the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in disarmament would be facilitated by introducing the practice of more frequently convening spucial sessions of the United Nation5 General Assembly devoted to individual essential matters in the field of disarmament. Within the united Nations, we could also establish the machinery proposed by the Soviet Union to carry out broad international monitoring of the implementation of agreements to

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

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

reduce tension, limit weapons and bring about disarmament and to monitor the military situation in regions of conflict - all of which would involve agreement on forms and methods of monitoring and the collection and processing of relevant information.

In this context, we feel that the proposal of Finland to establish a databank for this purpose is an interesting one.

The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held this year at the United Nations has been a focus of international attention. In our view, the proceedings and results of that Conference fully confirmed an organic, mutual linkage between those two pressing issues of our day. At the same time, it showed that these fundamental and significant problems could be solved once comprehensive international security was assured. We feel that the Conference has become a forum for substantive dialogue on the essence of the problems under consideration, dialogue guided by a desire to work jointly and adopt non-confrontational approaches.

The foregoing would constitute a framework for finding practical Solutions to disarmament questions and would form an excellent basis for the development of such processes universally.

That was the subject of a joint memorandum on disarmament for development and of other proposals made at the Conference by the socialist countries. We should like to say again that all the participants in the Conference contributed towards realization of that idea.

We should also like to observe point out that there was much co-operation in the drafting and unanimous adoption of the Final Document of the Conference. The timeliness of the Conference's results regarding the linkage between disarmament and development is evident: having emphasized the mutual interdependence of States

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

and the mutuality of interests in these key areas, those reeulte will promote the ability to overcome confrontation in international relations. Thus a clear answer is given to the well-known argument that disarmament, even under conditiona in which military and political criteria of equal security were observed, would result in economic profits for certain States, and for them alone. We believe that at this time the efforts of the United Nations should be directed at developing and implementing the results of the Conference, particularly its Programme of Action.

In this regard, the followin ate still on the agenda: matters relating to the reduction of military budgets under conditions of comparability, the conversion of production capacity from military to peaceful purposes, and the draftiny of relevant national plans of conversion for the eetabliehment of effective international machinery for the transfer of resources to development assistance for the developing countries

In our opinion those questions should be resolved during an agreed periodic review of the results of the conference by the General Assembly. A decisive step in that direction should be taken next year, at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We continue to favour implementation ot the proposal that disarmament and development questions be considered by the security Council at the higheet level.

An important component of the international disarmament machinery is the United Nations Disarmament Commission, whose work-load is increasing as the items on its agenda become more specific anu uryent. 'Phe Disarmament Commission could become a key instrument in tne internationalization of negotiations on Such complicated matte 3 as the whole package of questions related to nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

At the session the socialist countries presented a programme document on negotiations on the problem of nuclear disarmament in which they expressed the view that the process of nuclear disarmament could be carried out within as short a period as 10 years, beginning with a radical 50 per cent reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States in the first five years of that period. Of course, we assume that once nuclear weapons are eliminated it will be necessary to establish firm guarantees against the acquisition by any State of military superiority in outer space.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

The proposals of the socialist countries are intended to solve a broad spectrum of nuclear-disarmament problems, including those relating to the strict and effective international monitoring of such processes.

We are guided by the fact that nuclear disarmament is a cause supported by all countries, and we are prepared to continue our efforts to seek common ground for the solution of specific questions. Brazil's proposal to establish zones of peace in various regions of the world was a constructive contribution.

Progress in the work of the Disarmament Commission, particularly the agreement reached on the programme framework for negotiations for nuclear disarmament, would be a stimulus for the Geneva Conference on Disarmament as well. It is necessary to use all the Disarmament Commission's potential to ensure that in the future there will be tangible activity regarding the establishment of a broad international dialogue on nuclear disarmament. A minimum standard for such dialogue should, at the very least, be the recognition of the complete validity of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Along with the need to start the process of eliminating nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the question of reducing conventional weapons and armed forces is becoming more and more urgent. It would be very dangerous to ignore the fact that so-called conventional weapons, owing to the rapid improvements made in them, their strike power and their destabilizing effect on the international situation, are quickly becoming quite similar to weapons of mass destruction. It must also be borne in mind that their production and the maintenance of armed forces absorbs four fifths of the world's military expenditures.

We therefore believe that problems of this type could also be appropriately considered on a world-wide scale, while fully taking into account the specific

(Mr. Hutin, Czechoslovakia)

situation of individual regions. A natural common criterion for this should be the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces to a level of reasonable sufficiency - a level sufficient for defensive needs exclusively. Our belief is that situations with regard to ensuring security in various regions should be considered not in isolation but primarily within the framework of strengthening comprehensive international security. In making their well-known proposals for a substantial reduction in armed forces and weapons in Europe and for holding consultations to compare military doctrines, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty fully believe that there is an indivisible unity between European and world security.

An important role in the efforts to achieve progress in the area Of conventional weapons is to be played by the United Nations, more specifically by the Disarmament Commission. We wish to express our satisfaction with the basically constructive atmosphere in the dialogue on these matters which was begun in the Commission this year. We feel that the work of the Commission should he completed with the adoption of constructive recommendations which could substantially promote success in negotiations on conventional weapons.

A new, important and highly timely agenda item of the Disarmament Commission this year was the comprehensive consideration of the question of monitoring, including methods and principles for carrying it out, as well as the role to be played by the United Nations and its Member States in that area. Czechoslovakia devotes special attention to these questions, and we note with satisfaction the Progress made during those discussions. We are convinced that a real opportunity exists to prepare a comprehensive document, as early as next year, that will reflect the high degree of agreement on all fundamental problems of monitoring.

(Mr. Murin, Czechoslovakia)

We aupport the development of independent international research on those problems, which could promote a new, tangible shift in specific eolutione to problems of monitoring during the diaarmament process a5 a whole. In OUK view, there should also be serious discussion of the Soviet Union's proposal for monitoring to make sure that military ases in the territories of third States are not used for activities which are prohibited under existing ayreementa.

Moreover, we favour active involvement of the United Nation8 in the process Of monitoring the implementation of existing agreements on arms limitation and dinarmament on the basis of agreed procedures and objective criteria. We regard this as a first step towards the establishment of an international monitoring machinery.

There must also be a substantial increase in the work of the Disarmament Commission on such important and disquieting problems an naval armaments and disarmament and the nuclear potential of South Africa.

We believe that at the present time there are also rather strong new forces that could enable the Commission to conclude its work successfully on the drafting of agreed principles which would guide the future activities of States in the area of freezing and reducing military budyete.

The activities of. the Disarmament Commission are also linked to the consideration of a whole group of questions relating to the role of the United Nations in tho area of disarmament. In the dialogue being conducted along those lines, one Can discern many practical ways for enhancing the role of the Organization and its effectiveness in the development of a real and integrated disarmament proceae. We should approach those problems not just from the point of view of improving the organization of work and procedures but from a broad political point Of View, bearing In mind the desire of a constantly growing number

(Mr. Mucin, Czechoslovakia)

of States to make their own constructive contribution to a substantive solution of diearmament problems. On the basis ot the proposals already made and of the results of discussions in the Disarmament Commission, we believe that thin set of problems 'oo could be considered at the third special session Of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Czechoslovakia approaches all these problems in the spirit of the principles of equitable, constructive and non-confrontational international co-operation, which in an indispensable requisite for progress and a necessary condition for success in the international community's aspirations to find a solution for the burning probleme of disarmament. An open appeal for such co-operation is represented by the draft resolution on international co-operation for disarmament which we shall present to the Committee at a later dstr.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on Ambassador Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Chairman of the First Committee, who will speak in his capacity as representative of Zaire.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): While speaking in my capacity as representative of my country, I cannot but express my gratitude to all the members of the First Committee for their co-operation and the good wishes expressed to me since I have been Chairman of the Committee. The various marks of kindness towards me confirm the excellent relations that exist between their countries and mine.

The work of the First Committee at this forty-secona session of the General Assembly is taking place in an atmoepherc in which our thoughts are directed towards the goal of convenlny in 1988 the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to dinarmament. I wish therefore go give a list of the contributions made by Member States in implementing the provisions of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Asaombly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, held from 23 May to 30 June 1978; the activities and the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva; the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in New York from 7 June to 10 July 1982; thn Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe; the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development; and, last but not least, the bilateral negotiations between the two super-Powers currently under way in Moscow. All these contributions must be examined with a view to using them as new elements in the drafting of the programme of action of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Therefore, it would be desirable for the First Committee to keep in mind the successful completion of the work of the third special session devoted to

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

disarmament, in view of the progress made in various forums, which should be carried forward to the process of adoption at that session.

As far as the Conference on Disarmament is concerned, it adopted on 28 August 1987 the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, in conformity with decision 41/421 of 4 December 1986.

As certain delegations were not in a position to adopt final positions on that draft comprehensive programme of diearmament and there remained areas of disagreement on various aspects of the programme, the Preparotocy Committee for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has therefore recommended inclusion in the agenda for that session of an item untitled "Consideration and adoption of the comprehensive programme of disarmament". That provision will enable the Conference on Disarmament to ra-establish that Ad Hoc Committee early in its 1988 session so as to resolve outstanding issuer and to conclude negotiations on the programme in time for it to be submitted at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The purposes of that comprehensive programme of disarmament are well known to all. One is to eliminate the risks of war, particularly nuclear war, the prevention of which continues to be the most pressing and urgent task of our time. Arother is to maintain and strengthen the momentum provided by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and to undertake and accelerate the process of true disarmament on an agreed basis at the international level.

The progressive reduction and final elimination of armaments and armed forces are part and parcel of that comprehensive programme of disarmament, which has as its basic purpose the strengthening of international peace and security and of the

(Mr. Baybeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

security of States individually. Naturally, certain formulas or certain expressions in that comprehensive programme may not be agreed to by certain delegations, but it is clear that there is a will to contribute to the safeguarding of the sovereignty and independence of all States.

Therefore an effort should be made by those delegations to overcome their difficulties and to find acceptable language so that the programme, of which the introduction, objectives, principles and priorities, as well as the measures and phases of implementation, have been defined clearly, may be adopted by the Conference on Disarmament at its session in the spring of 1988 in order to enable the General Assembly at its third special session to consider it and possibly adopt it. This would mean a success in the area of disarmament and mark the beginning of implementation of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. On the other hand, once again there is a danyer that this coming session may join the second special session in failure.

My delegation wishes to address to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee who have the task of finalizing the drafting of the programme its moat sincere encouragement and its beet wishes for thu successful completion of their work.

The negotiations on the preparation of a multilateral convention on the complete complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction seemed to have real success several years ago, but now that we are approaching tho third special session devoted to diearmament my delegation wonders, whether the Ad Hoc Committee headed by Ambassador Ekeus of Sweden, in resuming its work early in 1988, will be in a position to submit that draft convention to the General Assembly at its special session.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Last year my delegation congratulated Ambassador Cromartie of the United Kingdom, then Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, on his efficiency in preparing the convention on chemical weapons. Having worked with him in Geneva and in New York, I must express my delegation's condolences to his family and to the Government of the United Kingdom.

Despite intensive consultations conducted by the Chairman of that Committee, several questions on jurisdiction and control, assistance and the definition Of production on an industrial. scale remain to be resolved. Furthermore, in its conclusions the report of the Conference on Disarmament indicates that appendix 1, while reflecting the present stage of negotiations on a convention on chemical weapons, does not bind delegations. This is proof that the progress apparently made in the area of chemical weapons is ephemeral because it is merely an academic exercise or speculation but States are not bound by it.

My delegation hopes that all members of the Conference on Disarmament - and my country is among them - will display political will and adhere to the various drafts submitted in that field.

Are the general provisions on the scope of that Convention frightening States because they must commit themselves not to use chemical weapons and not in any way to help and encourage other States to undertake activities prohibited under the draft convention or to acquire, produce or stockpile such weapons? This reticence on the part of certain States explains the complexity of the question of chemical. weapons, the installation of which may at times make it difficult to distinguish between civilian and military objectives.

The co-operation that seems to exist in that field, through visits authorizing States having production facilities for chemical weapons, such as those at Shikhany in the Soviet Union and the forthcoming one in the United States, shows that there

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

art possibilities for interaction that could promote negotiations on the elimination or reduction of such weapons and on the implementation ot agreements on verification.

In any case my deleqation believes that the Ad Hoc Committee should endeavour to speed up the process of adoption of that text SO that it may be submitted to the Generaly Assembly at its third special session devnted to disarmament.

That third special session will also take up the proposals considered at the second special session, which were not supporteu by all delegations.

The constructive attitude of the States that took part in the Stockholm Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is worthy of mention as an e f fort. towards disarmament and the strengthening of confidence and security in Europe.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

The concept of non-recourse to the threat or use of force which the participating States assumed as an obligation guarantees the territorial integrity and political independence of each of the States. This is an important step towards the application of the principle of peaceful coexistence among all European States with a view to promoting trust, co-operation and international understanding. The conclusions of the Stockholm Conference will certainly be taken up at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

For its part, the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development recognized, in its Final Document, that the current arms race takes up an extremely important share of the world's human, financial, natural and technological resources. It is a heavy burden on the economy of all countries and an obstacle to trade and to international financial and technological exchanges. The world's military expenditures are in striking contrast with the economic and social underdevelopment and with the poverty of two thirds of mankind. It is therefore in the common interest to ensure security at lower levels of armaments and to find the means to reduce the corresponding expenditures.

In this regard, my delegation has noted with special attention the indications given by Ambassador Butler of Australia according to which the amount of aid given by developed countries to developing countries, assessed at approximately $30 billion, is lower than the amount of weapons exported from developed countries to developing countries, which is assessed at approximately $34 billion; and that between 1975 and 1985 the equivalent of 40 per cent of the foreign debt of developing countries came from their arms imports.

This picture should bring an awareness in developing as well as in developed countries of the urgency of the action programme proposed by that Conference and

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

of the need to adopt appropriate measures to reduce the level and volume of military expenditures, as an approach to disarmament, so as to devote additional resources to the financing of economic and social development, in particular in developing countries. This action programme should also be strictly applied by the nuclear-weapons States and should be considered at the third special session of the General Assembly for appropriate action.

With respect to the negotiations which took place in Washington from 15 to 17 September 1987 between the two Foreign Ministers of the super-Powers and which are continuing at present in Moscow, my delegation would hope that all the other nuclear Powers would envisage unilaterally or collectively measures aimed at reducing their strategic weapons in subsequent proportions.

Whether it be the prohibition the nuclear tests, the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. the prevention of the arms race in space or the prevention of nuclear war, including all related questions, all nuclear Powers should feel concerned over the negotiations or consultations which are taking place on these questions, so that the balance of terror may no longer exist and the efforts of some may not be discouraged by the obstinacy of others. If that does not occur, then all the old notions of deterrence and persuasion will resurface and confront the nostalgia of military and technological superiority. One of my predecessors, Ambassador de Souza of Brazil, Chairman of the First Committee at the thirty-ninth session, stated in 1985 that the international environment was at its lowest point and that the concerns expressed by certain delegations on the increase in the number of resolutions in a given year were due to the absence of progress in the field of disarmament and the paralysis in bilateral and multilateral disarmament negotiations, and he added: "If and when

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

concrete negotiations are engaged in at the appropriate forums, the number of resolutions in this Committee will most probably decrease.' (A/C.1/39/PV.62, p. 81)

The lesson learned from that remark by my delegation is that the number Of resolutions will be reduced at this session precisely because of this new approach in the East-West dialogue and the negotiations taking place between the two Super-Powers, without forgetting, of course, to stress the forthcoming tnird special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. My delegation is Pleased with the positive response we have received from Moscow and we encourage the two Ministers to arrange the summit talks in December 1987.

As the representative of an African State, I cannot fail to mention the concern of the Heads of State of Africa to have that continent declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone and therefore to condemn the minority régime of South Africa for its nuclear tests.

For the success of the preparatory work of the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, my delegation recognizes the dynamism and competence of the Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Akashi, the Secretaries of the Conference on Disarmament and the First Committee, Mr. Komatina and Mr. Shorab Kheradi, and we wish them every success in their activities. The role of the United Nations will therefore be reviewed and strengthened in the programme Of action of the third special session on disarmament thanks to their contribution, which we know will be a positive one.

At the appropriate time, my delegation will express its views on the methods of rationalizing the work of our Committee.

Mr. BADJI (Senegal) (interpretation from French): Sir, I should like you to be kind enough to share with the Chairman of our Committee my expression Of pride and solidarity as we see him guide the work of this important Committee. The

(Mr. Sadji, Senegal)

harmony and the fraternal and friendly relations that exist between his country, Zaire, and Senegal prompt my delegation to express these feelings. The effectiveness and competence he ha8 demonstrated in his lofty post and the lively support of the other members of the Bureau are guarantees of the success of our deliberations.

If there is one road on which the United Nations has been resolutely engaged in order to contribute to achieving a world of peace, it is undoubtedly the road of effective disarmament and, consequently, the road of real security. In this regard, many initiative8 have been undertaken within multilateral and bilateral bodies in order to identify all the aspects of the phenomenon of the arms race and to achieve the agreement of all in a common effort to bring about general and complete disarmament under international control.

However, the result of all these efforts is, to say the least, disappointing. The generous statements on all sides have not always been followed by positive action. Positive action can only rest on the political will of all the States Of the international community.

Disarmament is a long-term project. Accomplishing it requires a keen awareness, at the individual and collective level of peoples and States, of the risks of backsliding, which weigh heavily upon humanity, and at the same time there must be an awareness of a firm determination to end the dangers involved.

Today, however, we must recognize that after several decades of proposals, negotiations and in too few cases partial progress, the resu3 s at the end of the 1980s, a decade which was proclaimed to be the Second Disarmament Decade, are broadly negative in comparison with the goals laid down to the extent that no significant result has yet been achieved in the area of disarmament.

(Mr. Badji, Senegal]

Far from being a subjective evaluation, this is a proven fact, supported by statistics and by a great number of specialized studies that early on brought out the flagrant disproportion between the unimaginable sums devoted to armaments and the basic need8 of mankind, on the one hand, and the vast stockpiles of weapons accumulated by States and their actual security needs, on the other.

It is a fact that we cannot deny, much less ignore. The world in which we live is in a state of over-armament, and that over-armament must be limited and prohibited if we want to avoid a disastrous tragedy for mankind and its planet.

That is why this Committee, a body intended to discuss and establish guidelines for disarmament and international security, should be used not to continue to deplore failure or to lapse into resignation but rather to persevere along the road prescribed by the Charter and already being travelled - particularly in 1978 and 1982, when the first and second sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were held.

Indeed, it is a question of pursuing, with determination and in an atmosphere of mutual confidence, a joing search for ways and means of achieving real progress, a search in which priority would be given to halting the uncontrolled growth of excessive weaponry, a search that would lead to the taking, at long last, of the first step towards true global and regional disarmament, in nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons.

In this regard we have taken heart from the improvement, albeit tentative, in East-West relations, upon which the status of international relations essentially depends. Long characterized by mistrust and suspicion, East-West relations, rather than merely being improved or normalized, should, as we see it, be irreversibly bound Up in a noble vision of the higher interests of humanity and the common destiny of all peoples.

(Mr. Badji, Senegal)

We interpret the agreement in principle recently reached by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the elimination of medium- and shortmr-range missiles from Europe and the good intentions demonstrated by both countries in the area of strategic weapons, chemical weapons and nuclear testing as harbingers of a new dynamic that should lead to an era of peace. Because it is imbued with justice and tolerance, and because it establishes equal dignity for all nations and peoples, peace is the option the international community must choose. If the option of war is chosen, selfishness, prejudice and intolerance win out over all other considerations.

It is to be hoped that the current meetings and those planned for the near future between Soviet and American leaders will be used quickly to go beyond the present stage of good intentions and will set them resolutely upon the road towards concluding bilateral agreements on the priority areas of disarmament, among which nuclear disarmament should have first place.

We can never over-emphasize the danger for mankind posed by the nuclear-arms race. Too often, priorities have been defined and a programme of action drawn up essentially to prevent a nuclear war and to halt the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons.

If almost nothing has been done so far, it is because the political will to achieve concrete results has been lacking. The generosity of the appeals contained in numerous resolutions adopted here every year on this question has been met with the strengthening and improving of destructive power, particularly by those who under the Charter have a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Alas, we small countries have no recourse other than to claim our rights, which derive from the universal aspiration to peace and which compel us to act to

(Mr. Badji, Senegal)

prevent the common destiny of mankind being left to t&e mercy of the vagaries of the relationships between that minority of States with the power to decide whether or not to destroy the world. That is why my country unhesitatingly joined in public initiatives to launch the World Disarmament Campaign. Thanks to the participation of all, it may well renew the enthusiasm and collective efforts Of peoples everywhere to overcome the obstacles and hesitancy that prevent them from embarking more resolutely upon negotiations on nuclear disarmament=

While that stage has not yet been reached, our efforts must be devoted to strengthening and expanding the nuclear non-proliferation régime. The overwhelming majority of our countries which, by signing the Treaty on the Won-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), formally renounced a sovereign right, have every reason to demand that the nuclear Powers, for their part, commit themselves to providing trustworthy guarantees that such weapons will not be used against the small countries.

It is high time an appropriate legal instrument was adopted clearly setting forth clear and unequivocal guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, Those States, because of the generosity they have shown, have a right to be freed from the fear of being an easy target for aggression or the threat Of aggression by the nuclear Powers.

In this regard the States of the African continent are particularly concerned because there can be no doubt as to the acquisition of the secret of atomic weapons by the racist régime of Pretoria, which has thus trampled upon the 1964 Declaration by the African Heads of State and Government *on* the denuclearisation of the African Continent. Instead of continuing to express doubt in this connection, as they did at the last session of the Disarmament Commission, the sceptics must finally agree to join in the efforts of the international community to avert this menace. The

(Mr. Badji, Senegal)

nuclear Powers have a decisive rule to play. The African States and all peace-loving peoples expect those Powers, through precise and restrictive commitments, to guarantee respect for the status of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa by refraining from any collaboration with South Africa in the nuclear field. In the hands of the proponents of apartheid, nuclear weapons pose an incalculable risk that the world cannot and must not accept.

(Mr. Badji, Senegal)

We are well aware of the irreparable consequences that would result from the use of nuclear weapons; none the less, that should not lead us to give secondary status to the question of conventional weapons. Their massive use in numerous armed conflicts - of which the developing world has almost been the exclusive theatre in recent years - has had devastating effects in terms of the loss of human lives and of material and ecological destruction, not to mention the huge financial. resources diverted from other areas to acquire those weapons.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament clearly defined the approach to be adopted in the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces. The responsibility of the States which possess the largest arsenals has been clearly established with regard to the opening up and pursuit of negotiations in this field and the to conditions which should, of course, guarantee to all an equal right to security. We are happy to note the continuing efforts carried on for some years now in certain regions, especially in Europe, and by certain countries such as the People's Republic of China. We hope that those efforts will extend to all regions of the world and inspire the multilateral negotiations on this question which have already begun.

As the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament approaches - the convening of which we envision for next year - the bitter memory of the deep divergences which we saw and observed helplessly during the second special session in 1982 must remain clear in our mind so that we may avoid a repetition of the same errors and avoid being once more the protagonists in the same dialogue of the deaf. To that end, future sessions of the Preparatory Committee should be used to open the way for broad consensus on the document that will be adopted as the outcome of the special session. In our view, the final document, the result of expanded and deep thought, should lay down the oasis for

(Mr. Badji, Senegal)

common aation, given the faat that mankind now faces the challanye of an age which has seen the appearance of third-ganeration nuclear weapons.

We are living through thr last days of the1980s, which has bean proclaimed the Second Diracmament Decade. Senegal, guided by ite leadere, decided at the outset, as it did moreover at the start of the First Disarmament Decade, to live these years in its own way, rooted in its own cultural heritage and guided oy its hietory meiked by friendship, tolerance and harmony. That means that from thw very beginning we were convinced that the Second Dinarmament Decade would have no meaning if our attitude ● imply remained one of statements. Therefore, what we needed to do war to change our habits of thinking and of behaviour by making peace the constant criterion and reference point for our daily actions.

Like any event, thir decade, which for the second consecutive time we have devoted to promoting disarmament, is coming to an end and it will end. So that it doer not remain merely a passing episode, it is necessary that the efforts undertaken to restore peace and build a safe and just world should be lasting and permanent ● ndeavoure.

The meeting roae at 4.55 p.m.