



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 12th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. Roche (Canada)

CONTENTS

- GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)
- STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: Before we hear the **first speaker** for this morning, I want to **wish** all my **colleagues** a happy United Nations Day. Today, **24 October, is the anniversary of this great** institution of which all of **us** here **are members**.

Mr. MLLOJA (Albania) : The problems relating to the militarisation Of outer space, rightfully, are drawing the **increasing** attention of international opinion. The prevention of that **process has already become** a permanent agenda item for deliberation by this Committee and other international forums. The fact of the matter is that **this concern** is neither new nor previously unknown. But against the background of the escalation of the **process** and the fact that our planet is truly being threatened with destruction from a new direction, the concern of peace-loving peoples and countries is increasing.

It is a well known fact that the **1980s** have been marked by a renewed dynamic in the **militarization of outer space**. It has become an intensive part of the **global arms race**. We are witnessing the initiation of various **space** projects, which are being developed in the framework of long-term programmes. In the light of the evolution of this **process**, it is evident that the current situation has been brought about by Soviet-United States competition to exploit space and the relevant **technology** in order to achieve military **superiority**. The **process is** taking the same course as that established in the **spheres of** nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons.

We share the legitimate aspiration of the majority of the international community: that **outer space, as** the common heritage of mankind, should be used **exclusively** for peaceful purposes in order to promote development, well-being and peace in the world. That is the just and rational course to which peoples have

(Mr. Mlloja, Albania)

always aspired. **However**, one cannot fail to notice that outer space is used only minimally for peaceful purposes, while in **its** military **aspects** it is being turned increasingly into a potential threat to the **very** existence **of** our planet Earth. It is a fact that military activities in that environment, along with the **introduction** of **advanced** military **systems**, have continued to increase. Available data **show** that 70 per cent of space activities are military in **nature**. **Moreover**, many civilian projects are exploited for **military** purposes. **Today** the distinction between military and civilian activities is tending to become less clear cut, and many projects introduced **as** civilian can indeed **be** used for military purposes.

When **speaking** about the role of the international community in the prevention **of** an **arms** race in outer space, it must be admitted that **efforts** have never **been** lacking, the efforts of this Committee included. Since the earliest days, when the very first steps were taken to explore **outer space**, world opinion has expressed the **wish** that this new frontier opened up by science should be used for peaceful purposes. Likewise, it has shown natural concern **that** **new** scientific developments should **not be** used to turn outer space - **as** land, sea and air have been turned - into another area for the deployment **of weapons of mass** destruction.

Regrettably, the worst has happened. The military aspect has prevailed, and **priority** has been given to using outer space as an arms platform, to gain military **superiority**. **Now**, a critical stage has been reached, when the military presence and technology have become real elements in **outer space** and when new military **strategies** in progress pose the potential danger of escalation. In that **context**, the **militarization** of **space** is a **concrete** expression of the imperialist strategy and policy of turning the security of **one country** - as it **is** being turned - into insecurity **for** others, and that this security can be **used as** a threat to others. In the light **of** the ongoing military process and especially the so-called Star Wars programmes, it is those ambitions **by** which the super-powers abide.

(Mr. Mlloja, -Albania)

Indeed, the question of the **outer-space arms race** already occupies a prominent **place** in the current Soviet-United States dialogue, and it **has become a central topic in their negotiations**. That very fact **is** a clear indication of the bitter reality and **shows how far** they have gone with their **programmes** to turn outer space into a new **arena for their rivalry**. Their dialogue on **this subject follows the same pattern as that** in other **fields of armaments**, and **is** being conducted in accordance with their **political and military interests**.

(Mr. Mlloja, Albania)

The Albanian delegation considers the military **use of outer space to be part and parcel of the global arms race**, and a **basic** orientation of the efforts **of the** Super-Powers towards gaining an advantage in the achievement of their goal⁸ **for** world domination and hegemony. Reiterating **our** position with **regard to** the dangers **that** the extension of **such an arms race** poses for mankind, we join the majority of **the** international **community**, in demanding its prevention. This demand is addressed **first** and foremost to the United States and the **Soviet Union**, which **are the main** ~~poaaeaa~~ **poaaeaa** ~~o~~ **o** ~~ra~~ **ra** of space weaponry and which **are** preparing new and **dangerous programmes**. We maintain that only through identifying the real **causes** and goals of **such a** process - and those responsible for the existing situation - **can the** peoples' aspiration **to use outer space** for peaceful purposes and as **the common** heritage of mankind **be** realized.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela): As you pointed **out**, **Mr.** Chairman, we are now celebrating United **Nations** Day. Before **beginning** its **statement**, my delegation would like to pay a tribute to **the Organization**, particularly for its efforts **on** behalf of peace in recent **months**. This tribute goes especially, of **course**, to the **Secretary-General**, Mr. Javier Perez de **Cuellar**, and to all the officials of **our** Organisation, without whose assistance it **would** not have been possible for the United **Nations** to achieve such success.

As all previous speakers have said, the work of the **First** Committee is going **on** this year at a time when there is a particularly propitious international climate. Clearly, winds of **change** are blowing throughout the world that suggest we are **about** to enter a new era of international relations. This wind of **change is not only causing a** fundamental **change** in the sphere of **international** relations, but is also promoting favourable developments within States. The solution of certain regional conflicts that **have been** disturbing the geostrategic **situation in** various

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

par **ta of** the world for **many years**, and the prospects that other areas **of** tension and of confrontation **may be** resolved and come to a fruitful conclusion, are all palpable evidence that we are witnessing **an** important change.

Furthermore, the tolerant response **being** given to the various expressions of the fulfilment of the desires on the part of various peoples for democracy in **recent months are** also tangible signs that humanity is **now** on **the** threshold of **an** era of international stability and reason unprecedented in **recent** history.

The distrust which prevailed between the leaders of the two super-Powers has **been** eased as a result of the direct personal contacts that have occurred over the last three years. The profound differences that marked their approaches to reciprocal relations and to the international situation in general - which **at** one time reached a dangerous level of verbal confrontation - have given way to the atmosphere of constructive co-operation that is now evident in the **relations** between these **coun** tr ies. The effects of the change extend to the general sphere of **East-west** relations and are beneficial to humanity in that , they are contributing **to** the easing of the pressure and tension that **characterize** the conflicts in various parts **of** the world.

Within the framework **of** disarmament, this constructive co-operation has already produced concrete results, which we all welcome. As has been universally recognised, the entry into force of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles represents the first step on the path towards real disarmament.

On 28 August last, we **had** occasion to witness the destruction of three SS-20 missiles within the framework of the implementation of the Washington Treaty. The demonstration, carried out in Kapustin Yar before more than 150 international

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

observers, has strengthened our conviction that disarmament - even nuclear disarmament - is not Utopian. What is needed for its implementation is true political will.

We welcome the fact that negotiations on the reduction of strategic armaments have shown important progress, and that the United States and the Soviet Union have reached agreements on certain essential elements of the Treaty which will bring about a 50 per cent reduction of the offensive and strategic weapons of these countries. We are sure these negotiations will continue to develop favourably, and that very soon we shall witness a second historic step in the efforts to free the world from nuclear terror.

Within the same context, something else of great significance is the series of experiments on the detection of underground nuclear explosions carried out jointly by the Soviet Union and the United States. Here again, there has been a change in the attitudes prevailing in the relations between the two countries, which has led them to permit the presence of the other side's observers in strategically sensitive zones of their respective territories.

In our view, the experiments being carried out within the framework of the joint detection tests being carried by the United States and the Soviet Union have served to demonstrate the validity of an assertion that has been repeated for some time now in international forums, namely, that with the technical resources available today it is possible to detect and identify any nuclear test of any significant size for military purposes. Therefore, it should be possible immediately to conclude a treaty that would impose a global bar on nuclear tests.

The winds of change which we are observing in the international arena have not yet begun to make themselves fully felt in the multilateral efforts towards disarmament, and this accounts for the failure of the third special session of the

(Mr. Taylharda t , Veneeuela)

General Assembly devoted to disarmament held recently. **We** are aware that **many** **countr** lee consider that it **was** not a **failure**. They insist on finding positive elements resulting from that meeting. **We** prefer to be **realistic** and to call **things** **by** their **proper** names.

It has **been** said that the third special session devoted to disarmament was **not** a failure **because** it made it possible to have a broad convergence of views on many important questions and there **was** some cryetallization of conseneuo.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

It is also arid **that there** waa a **quasi-consensus** with regard to the **questions** con8 Ida red . For **us**, consensus is **something** absolute) **there** is either **consensus** or **there** is not. We cannot talk about a partial oonaenaue. **As** we have **said** **repeatedly**, that is **particularly** true of **disarmament**, where a **decision** or **measure** that does **not** enjoy the support of all the countries **concerned** has little Or no value.

In our **view**, the only **positive** outcome of the third special session **is that** the **Final Document** of the first special **session** has **remained intact**. Not only **has** **its** validity as our fundamental guide on **international** action for disarmament not **been diminished**, but, rather, it **has been** consolidated, in spite of the **efforts to** **weaken** it. We can also state that **as a** result of the failure **of** the third special session **there has** been a strengthening of the international **community's confidence** in the **Conference** on Disarmament as the sole multilateral **negotiating** forum on disarmament.

For **us**, the cause of the failure of the third special session should **be sought** in two diametrically oppcaed **approaches** that are to **be** observed in **multilateral** disarmament **efforts**.

On the one hand, there **is** the **universalist** approach **adopted** by **most** countries, baaed on the premise that **disarmament** is a **matter** of universal concern in **which** the **organized** international **community** should play a decisive role **through the adoption**, by means **of** the **multilateral** organs it has set up, of specific, effective **measures** **to** halt and reverse the **arms race**. That **approach has** as its point of departure recognition of the central obligation of the United Nations, without detracting from the importance **Of** other **more** limited **forums** or disregarding the essential role played **by** bilateral negotiations between the **two** super-Powers. That approach **was** faithfully reflected in **paragraph 5** of the **Final Document** **of** the first special **session**, which **says**:

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

"The Members of **the** United Nations are fully aware of the **conviction** of their peoples **that** the question of general and complete **disarmament is** of utmost importance and that peace, security and **economic** and **social** development are indivisible, and they **have** therefore **recognized** that the corresponding obligations and responsibilities are universal." (resolution S-10/2, para. 5)

In **accordance** with that approach - here I **borrow** a sentence from the Secretary-General's annual report this **year** -

"Disarmament is **not the** exclusive responsibility of **the two most** powerful **States, but a** joint undertaking of all States". (A/43/1, p. 13)

The other approach is the marginalist approach, the attitude **of** those very few, countries which, although they recognised that **disarmament** is a matter of general interest, do not concede **that** the United **Nations** should play a significant role in efforts to halt **the arms race**. Those who adopt that approach believe **that** the work of the United **Nations** and its competent bodies should **be** limited to marginal tasks, reserving **negotiation** on fundamental issues **for the more** restricted forums. That approach rejects **even** the possibility of the United Nations playing any role in verification. It is hoped, however, **that** the international **community will always be ready** to associate itself with the initiatives and agreements reached in bilateral negotiations or in **the more** restricted forums.

The contrast between those two approaches to the role of multilateral disarmament **efforts was** evident **throughout the** special session. While it was possible during the negotiations to establish **consensus** language with **regard to some of the 1 terms** contemplated in the draft final document, **that was only at the expense** of the position of those who championed **the** universalist approach. That there **was** no agreement on **the whole draft final document was because too many concessions** had already **been made to the** marginalist school. To have gone further

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

would have meant restricting to inadmissibly low levels the function of the organised international community in the disarmament field.

Those of us who champion the universalist approach are aware that the super-Powers possess the principal nuclear arsenals and the most advanced space and military technology. We also recognise that their security concerns and interests raise delicate problems requiring particular attention. Precisely for that reason, we not only recognize that they have a special responsibility in all disarmament matters but demand that they shoulder that responsibility. That is the reason for our insistence that there is close link and complementarity between efforts made at the various levels and various forums on disarmament, whether bilateral, regional-multilateral or universal-multilateral.

No one claims that the multilateral approaches should impose any concrete disarmament measure on the super-Powers, but it is legitimate to insist that they should recognise that the organised international community has a role to play in negotiating these measures, particularly when they have international effects and scope.

One of the lessons we must learn from the failure of the third special session is, therefore, that it is imperative to lay down clearly the relationship that should exist between the various bodies where disarmament problems are aired and make clear the role of each in order to ensure the achievement of our common goal.

In our view, that relationship should be developed within the framework of permanent interaction; although each forum must follow the path that best suits it in the search for its objectives there should at the same time be close reciprocal co-operation making it possible for them to support and complement each other in order to facilitate the achievement of concrete results in the shortest possible time. The best illustration that such a relationship is possible is offered by the

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, now being carried out at both the bilateral and multilateral levels. The latter have benefited considerably from the former. Some delicate problems likely to affect the security of the two super-Powers have been ventilated in bilateral negotiations and then found satisfactory solutions in multilateral negotiations, with the result that this year the work of the Conference on Disarmament on a draft chemical weapons convention has been marked by further progress.

I now turn to a brief review of the situation regarding the main items discussed at multilateral disarmament forums - particularly in the Conference on Disarmament. The fact that I am not referring to all the items on the global disarmament agenda should not be interpreted as a lack of interest on our part in those subjects.

For Venezuela, and the vast majority of the countries represented here, nuclear disarmament continues to be the objective of highest priority and all our efforts are directed to that end. Although the danger of nuclear war has considerably diminished since the two leaders of the super-Powers enunciated the principle that a nuclear war could not be won and therefore should never be fought, the risk that humanity will be annihilated by a nuclear holocaust will remain as long as the nuclear weapon continues to exist anywhere in the world.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

The Powers **that** possess these weapons **continue** to best primary **responsibility** with regard to nuclear disarmament, **But the** rest of the international **community** - all the other **countries** in the world - has a vital interest in **contributing** to the **achievement** of positive results in the negotiations **on disarmament, because** what is **a t stake here** is our own survival **and** the future of **mank** ind .

There is a profound contradiction implicit in military doctrines that **are founded** on the possession of nuclear **weapons**. **It is** claimed that the possession Of these weapons is indispensable **as** a means of guaranteeing the **security** of the countries that possess **them**. **But** possession of nuclear **weapons**, far from **strengthening** the **security** of the **countries** that possess them, heightens the **insecurity** of all mankind , is constantly **exposing everyone** to the risk of a nuclear holocaust. **At bottom**, the reason for the possession of **nuclear** weapons is **to prevent** their use, **but to achieve** that, **there** is the **constant threat** that **they** will **be used**, even though **that** would mean self-destruction, the annihilation of life on our planet.

It is the firm hope of Venezuela that the Conference on Disarmament, on **which** all **States** that possess nuclear weapons are represented as well **as** a representative **group** of countries from all parts **of** the world, will **begin to play** its proper role in this field **by** negotiating nuclear-disarmament **measures** that will help to **reduce** the threat **of** a nuclear war and will reverse **the nuclear-arms** race.

Intimately related to efforts to **achieve** nuclear disarmament is the **imperative** need to **work** for a broad treaty on the total **prohibition** of nuclear tests. Such a measure, as we all know, would constitute the **most effective** means of halting nuclear **proliferation**, **horizontal** and vertical, and would **be the best way** of preventing the redeployment of **nuclear weapons** which have **been** eliminated **as** a result of **disarmament agreements**, whether concluded **or** about to **be** concluded.

(Mr. Taylharda t, Venezuela)

Venezuela **rejects** the idea that the prohibition of nuclear **tests** is **conceivable** Only as a **long-term objective**, as **something that can be achieved only after** agreement has **been reached** on large-scale **reductions** in existing nuclear **arsenals**. We **welcome** the fact that bilateral negotiations **between** the United States **and the Soviet Union** on the limitation of nuclear tests are **progressing** satisfactorily. What does **concern** us, **however**, is the fact **that** the purpose of these negotiations is only to limit nuclear tests and to create **conditions for the entry into force** of the Treaty On Underground **Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes** and the treaty limiting the yield of such tests. In my **country's view**, the prohibition of nuclear tests should **be total**, in the sense that an end should be put to all tests **of** any yield, in any environment, and for all time,

In keeping with this position, Venezuela, together with Indonesia, **Mexico**, **Peru**, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia, **took the initiative** of putting **forward a proposal for** transforming the partial nuclear **test ban** Treaty into a comprehensive one. This initiative is not, **as** some have **claimed**, a sign **of** frustration in the face of the stagnation in which this question finds itself in the Conference on Disarmament. The purpose **of** the six **countries** is simply to 'close the gap **that was** deliberately left **by the** authors of the **Moscow Treaty of** 1963, when they agreed to **put** an end to testing in the atmosphere, in **outer space** and under water, but reserved the right to continue underground nuclear tests.

Nor is the amendment of the Moscow Treaty designed, as has been claimed, to raise **any obstacles** to the work of the Conference on Disarmament in this area. Quite the **contrary**; its purpose is to **promote** the early resumption of **multilateral** negotiations on a **comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty**. The proposed **amendment is** simply an expression **of** a commitment **on** the part of the international community -

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

a commitment **that** is largely unsatisfied - **and** recognition of the urgency and high priority **that** this question should enjoy.

There is serious and quite legitimate concern on the **part of** the international **community** at the prospect that outer **space** may be allowed to **become** the theatre for continuation **of the arms race** that we are **now witnessing** on Earth. This **concern** is all the **more** serious **because** the **progress** in space **science** and technology is bringing closer the time when man will **be** capable of developing and producing space weapons. It is for **that** reason that the vast majority **of** countries are so insistent that the **few** countries that possess this capacity should **renounce** the possibility **of** deploying weapons in space.

The international **community**, in different instruments, has expressed its unequivocal determination **to** preserve outer space from the military rivalry prevailing on Earth. It has stated its objective as being **to reserve** this **environment** exclusively **for** peaceful uses. Venezuela fully shares these aspirations. Therefore **my** country attaches particular **importance** to the **work of** the Conference on Disarmament **as** it relates to the prevention of an **arms race** in outer space. The interest **of** Venezuela in this **matter** has been demonstrated **by** its active participation in the examination of the item. In 1988 I had the honour **of** being Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee **of** the Conference on Disarmament **that** dealt with **it**.

It is interesting to note **that** the treatment of this item has recently **been characterized by the** fact that the debate has **been between** two dominant **trends**. On **one** hand, the **vast** majority of **countries** want to see specific **measures** adopted to prevent the spread **of the arms race to outer space**. On the **other** hand, the item is particularly delicate and sensitive **for some** countries, and this leads them to **assume** an extremely cautious **position**. In so doing they prevent the Conference

(Mr. Taylhardat, Vsnesuela)

from playing a **significant** role in this **field**, subordinating **multilateral action** to the **development of** efforts that are being **conducted** at the **bilateral level**.

However, as the relevant **chapter of the report of the Conference on Disarmament indicates**, the subject has **received increasing** attention **this year**. This is a reflection of the **heightening** priority being **given to it** on the **global disarmament** agenda, **As the report of the Conference on Disarmament indicates** there has been a qualitative **change** this year in the **consideration of the** item, attention being focused on the many proposals, put forward by a **number of delegations**, relating to **concrete measures** to prevent the arms **race** from spreading to **space**. It can be said that the **activities of the Conference** have **now** taken a turn **towards** the **achievement of concrete objectives**. This should lead to an **intensification** of its work. We **can claim** also that, with the possible exception of one **country**, **States members of the Conference** have **recognized** that the legal **régime governing space** is not adequate to **prevent arms** from being **deployed** there.

(Mr. Taylors, Venezuela)

The space Treaty provides for a partial prohibition on the deployment of **weapons** in **space** restricted to nuclear weapons and weapons of mass **destruction**. The **Treaty** contains **no** provisions prohibiting the stationing of other **types** of **weapons** in **space**, not to mention new **weapons** based on new **technologies** that are now the object of very intensive research and development in order that **they may become** elements of a planned strategic **defence system**. By their very **nature** space **weapons** **know** no frontiers or limits of **any** kind and they therefore **pose a threat to all** mankind, since no **country** is **safe** from the **effects of a** possible military confrontation in **space**.

Chemical weapons are the most cowardly and abominable **arms** ever conceived by the human mind. The terrible **havoc** wreaked by the use of such weapons during the **First World War** brought the international community to agree upon the **1925 Geneva Protocol** that has, for over half a **century**, **served** to prevent renewed use of **such** weapons. Venezuela feels bound to express its deep concern **at the fact that there** has **now been a recurrence** of the use of chemical weapons in an armed conflict. Venezuela supports all countries that have energetically and firmly demanded total conformity with the obligations set forth in the **1925 Geneva Protocol**.

The **most** effective way to halt the resurgence of chemical **weapons** and their **possible** proliferation is the prompt conclusion of **an** international comprehensive instrument prohibiting the **development**, production, possession and **use** of chemical weapons and providing for the destruction of existing arsenals **and of the** facilities **for their production**.

We are pleased to note that the work of the Conference on Disarmament on a draft convention designed to contain **such a** comprehensive prohibition has continued to **be** positive. This year the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament have resulted in further **substantive** progress. However, we should **recognize** that those negotiations are not progressing at the pace required **by** the urgent need to

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

produce **such** an instrument. **Important** and **delicate** issues are still **outstanding**, but, given the necessary **political** will, none of them should **pose** an **insuperable** obstacle. We believe that one obstacle, **which** arises out **of** the notion of **"security stakes"**, has been **eliminated** following the **announcement** by the President of France in his address to the General Assembly that his country was prepared to **renounce** all **facilities for producing chemical** weapons with the entry into force of a future **convention**. That **statement** is obviously **of the utmost** importance. **At the same** time, however, it does raise the question of what **France's** policy would **be** with regard **to chemical** weapons prior to the entry into force of **such** a convention.

Venezuela views as very important **the** initiatives **taken by the** Presidents **of** the United States and France to **convene an** international conference devoted to **the** prohibition of **the use of chemical** weapons. We have conveyed to **our** authorities the invitation extended by the representative **of** France in **the** Conference on **Disarmament**, Ambassador Pierre Morel, to all **States** parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol to participate in such an international conference, to **be** held at **Paris** **from 7 to 11 January 1989**.

We **have** taken note of the fact **that** that meeting has **been** conceived **as a** political act designed to strengthen compliance with the Geneva Protocol and **not as** an attempt to introduce any juridical modifications to **that** document. We also note that **the** conference would in no way impede or hinder the work **of** the Conference on Disarmament in producing a comprehensive convention and that its purpose is, **rather, to** give **those** negotiations the final political impetus they need to resolve outstanding difficulties and complete work as soon **as** possible on the drafting of the final text of the new instrument.

As it has been presented to us, the proposed conference would have as its final objective that **of** solemnly reaffirming the unreserved adhesion of all States parties to **the** obligations entered into under the Protocol and would also serve **as**

(Mr. Taylhada t, Venezuela)

a means of interesting all Governments that have not so far done so in becoming parties to it. In our view, if there is a real wish to strengthen the Geneva Protocol and compliance with its provisions, the **Paris** conference should lead to the withdrawal of the reservations so many States formulated when becoming parties to it. As **is** well known, the Geneva Protocol, which was conceived **as an international** treaty designed to prohibit the use of chemical weapons, has become a treaty on **the** non-first-use of **such** weapons owing to the effect of the **many** reservations that have been entered in its regard.

The withdrawal of reservations to the Geneva Protocol would have the **dual** effect of strengthening that instrument, and allowing it to play the role for which it was originally conceived, and of eliminating the concern many of us **have that the so-called** rights that have been unilaterally claimed in regard to the Protocol, may be invoked with respect to the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons **contained in a future** convention.

Another **measure** that could **emerge from** the Paris conference and that would also have the dual effect of strengthening the **Geneva** Protocol and giving impetus **to** the negotiations **of** the Conference on Disarmament would consist in the immediate imposition of a universal moratorium on the production of chemical weapons of any kind pending the entry into force of a new convention that would contain an obligation to destroy arsenals **and** production facilities. The moratorium would help to establish a limit **on** the stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their horizontal and vertical proliferation.

As we all **know**, a considerable portion of the resources used to produce armaments is devoted to the qualitative improvement of existing **weapons** and to the design and development of new weapons and systems. Ever-more deadly and effective weapons are daily being manufactured and more sophisticated weapons being planned,

(Mr. Taylhardat, Veneauela)

and, gradually, the **distinction** between conventional weapons and **weapons** of mass destruction **is becoming more** and more difficult to make.

It has been estimated that some 25 per cent of over-all military expenditures is devoted to research and development for **weapons** production. Although it is true **that** it is impossible to halt **progress** or to **create** obstacles to **the** advance of **science** and **technol**ogy, it **is** becoming increasingly clear that there is an **urgent** need to begin to comply with the provisions of paragraph 39 of the Final **Document** of the first special **session** of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which stresses the need for negotiations on the limitation and **cessation** of the qualitative improvement of armaments, especially **weapons of mass** destruction, and **for** seeing **that** scientific and technological achievements are used solely for **peaceful** purposes.

Many delegations have referred to that question at the third special session **devoted** to disarmament and **at** this session of the First Committee, and we **can state** that there is a broad consensus for the inclusion of an item on the qualitative **arms** race in the international disarmament agenda. Interesting proposals have **been** made in this connection, including one **by** India **at** the third special session that could serve as a basis **for** entering into the substantive consideration of this **new** aspect of the disarmament problem. Perhaps, again to facilitate the understanding of the scope and dimension of the problem, the United Nations **might** prepare a special study containing an evaluation of the technological, political and legal implications of the problem, as well **as** an analysis of its implications from the standpoint of security and its ramifications for economics and trade. Such **a study** could serve as a basis for determining how international treatment of this important question might proceed.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

In recent days we have heard it stated forcefully that disarmament is serious business, ~~that~~ it must be approached with realism, and that comprehensive approaches based on all-or-nothing demands will not contribute to problem solving.

I do not believe any ~~Government~~ thinks ~~disarmament~~ is not serious business. Nor do I believe that when a country advocates a ~~comprehensive~~ approach it is aiming at an all-or-nothing solution or that it is disregarding the delicate and complex implications of ~~the~~ negotiation of any disarmament measure.

But the facts cannot be viewed solely from the viewpoint dictated by the security perceptions of the great military Powers. Realism means not ~~forgetting~~ that billions of human beings with their own serious security concerns live on this planet. The notion of security harboured by the great majority of countries is based on a broad, multidimensional concept. A country's security should embrace, apart from the military aspects, ~~requirements~~ relating to the economic, social and ~~environmental~~ stability a ~~population~~ needs to live in ~~harmony with~~ its neighbours.

The ~~encouraging~~ picture prevailing on the international political scene is in profound contrast with the ~~gloomy~~ economic situation that is harming the developing countries. At a time ~~when~~ the arms race ~~continues to~~ swallow incredible quantities of the world's limited human, financial and technological resources for what some countries view as their own military security needs, a great part of mankind is ~~struggling~~ for survival amidst threats to ~~social~~ and ~~economic security~~ and political stability posed by underdevelopment, poverty and the intolerable ~~sacrifices~~ imposed by the ~~crushing~~ burden of ~~external~~ debt.

In this *connection* I would recall the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, ~~which states~~ that

(Mr. Taylhardat; Venezuela)

"The world can either **continue to pursue the arms race** with **characteristic** vigour or **move consciously and with deliberate speed** towards a more **stable and balanced social and economic development** within a more **sustainable international economic and political order** ; it cannot do both ."

(A/CONF.130/39, section II, para. 4)

In that **connection** I wish to **conclude** by quoting a **passage from the address** by the President of my **country**, Mr. **Jaime Lusinchi**, to the General **Assembly at its present session**:

● "Security' is usually defined in **terms of custody, preservation and promotion** of a **country's basic** interests. For **Venezuela, together with what is inherent in our national being , its security also means** democracy. . . . It means the freedom of **its citizens** to dissent, under the rule of **law, to be able to prosper and satisfy** their **material** and spiritual needs. Nevertheless, in a contemporary world **such as ours, our security and the security of our countries** are threatened from outside. **So it is high time to make this charge, and there is no more appropriate forum in which to do so than this, at this rostrum open to all the peoples of the world.**

"Today the **legitimacy of our fundamental rights** as nations and **peoples . . . is** being challenged. There is no other way to explain the lack of definitive solutions **to problems** such as the problem of external debt , which **drains our countries' economies** and deprives them of the right to a **stable future.**" (A/43/PV.5, p. 3)

That **is** the **harsh reality** faced by mankind.

Mr. AL-ADGALY (Oman) (interpretation from **Arabic**): In compliance with rule 110 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, about the enforcement of which the Chairman is enthusiastic, I shall plunge directly into the substantive part of my statement.

At the outset, I wish to reiterate the wish of Oman that through participation in the work of this Committee, and through the adoption of resolutions and recommendations reflecting the genuine desires of many delegations, many issues and items of great importance to the international community will be resolved by consensus.

This Year, the General Assembly is taking place at a momentous time of hope for positive change and tranquility. The United States of America and the Soviet Union have agreed on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles in Europe. The political significance of that agreement lies in the acknowledgement by the two nuclear Powers that the theory of nuclear deterrence is no longer enough to ensure peace and tranquility, irrespective of capacity for military destruction, and that dialogue, negotiations and respect for the interests of others are the foundation for common international security.

We are optimistic about the progress made in the relationship between the two super-Powers as regards reductions in strategic nuclear weapons and as regards a serious start to efforts to curb the arms race and halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons along with the elimination, as a first step, of two types of destructive weapons. We welcome this initiative. We look forward to the two super-Powers entering soon into negotiations on other disarmament and arms-limitation measures, for the sake of the well-being of mankind. This detente and dialogue between the two super-Powers has yielded concrete positive results in easing tensions. This in turn makes for a more stable and tranquil world, and augurs well for a broadened dialogue and agreement on an increasing number of international issues.

(Mr. Al-Zadgaly, Oman)

In that connection, I wish to address several issues that Oman considers of great importance to the international community.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament painted a grim, if realistic, picture. It is still realistic, in that it expresses the feelings prevalent among the States of the world;

"Mankind is confronted with a choice: we must halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or face annihilation". (resolution S-10/2, para. 18)

In paragraph 45 of the Final Document, the General Assembly placed nuclear weapons at the head of the list of priorities for disarmament negotiations.

Since my country has always pursued a peaceful foreign policy with respect to all regional and international issues, believing in the triumph of peace based on justice and love among all nations and peoples, we had looked forward to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We saw much in the meetings at that session that was consonant with the basic principles of Oman's policy.

(Mr. Al-Zadgaly, Oman)

It was also of prime importance not to allow the international climate which has been generated by the recent initiatives to be dissipated. It behoved us to give further momentum to the process, so that the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should live up to expectations. It is our belief that such momentum would lead to the strengthening of links between multilateral and bilateral efforts to halt and reverse the arms race. If there is any slackening of United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament, this must be due to the lack of political will in implementing the resolutions and programmes formulated in this regard. In the formulation of such programmes, national interests took precedence over the international. Hence, the special session should have been seen as an opportunity to promote and co-ordinate United Nations multilateral efforts, so as to be consonant with the bilateral efforts.

Last week one of the delegations attributed the failure of the last special session to the lack of agreement on two paragraphs on the Middle East and South Africa.

Regrettably, this could not be farther from the truth, firstly because the number of issues on which agreement was reached defies counting and, secondly, because the real reason is that mutual trust was not strong enough to lead the concerned parties to a convergence of points of view. These points of view comprise the different ideologies via-b-via regional initiatives on nuclear disarmament, naval armament, the link between disarmament and development and the peaceful use of outer space.

The issue of disarmament is not the sole concern of any one State or group of States. It is a world issue that concerns all peoples, because no one would escape the nuclear catastrophe that would wipe man and civilization from the face of the earth. Hence, collective work is necessary if we are to prevent such a catastrophe.

(Mr. Al-Zadqaly, Oman)

Such a collective endeavour will be possible only if each and every State shoulder its responsibilities and makes the necessary sacrifices to pave the way towards a new concerted world effort to formulate a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The report of the Secretary-General on the study of the effects of nuclear war on the planet, prepared by a number of experts and contained in document A/43/351, leads us seriously to consider the effects of certain regional conflicts on the rest of the world. The report urges the conclusion of a treaty that bans all nuclear testing underground, in outer space, and in the seas and oceans. The work of the ad hoc committee of the Conference on Disarmament on the multilateral negotiation of a treaty prohibiting all nuclear tests and explosions should be facilitated.

In this context, we welcome the proposal of France and the United States - repeatedly advocated by the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to convene an international conference to prevent the spread, production, stockpiling and use of chemical, toxic and bacteriological weapons, so long as this will lead to the promotion of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which is rightly considered a multilateral agreement which limits chemical weapons, and so long as the Conference does not single out certain parties for blame for tendentious political reasons.

Perhaps the real challenge to the international community lies in launching the preparatory work for the fourth review conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The fact that the Sultanate of Oman has not acceded to this Treaty at present does not prevent it from opposing the futile and dangerous nuclear arms race. We have to take concrete measures in order to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both vertically and horizontally.

(Mr. Al-Zadgaly, Oman)

We hope that the review conference will remove the suspicion **that** the Treaty will impose an international fait accompli **that** would **perpetuate** the situation of both the States **that possess** nuclear weapons **and those** that **renounce or do not possess** them. We, like all other Arab and Islamic countries, **reject the idea of** the proliferation of nuclear weapons and wish to **warn** against such weapons falling **into** the hands of **States that have hostile** intentions and **which** may use them to intimidate countries which do not **possess** them. Such a **situation** will only lead to **increased suspicions and instability and exacerbate** regional and international **tension** while **legitimizing an arms race** and the channelling of natural and **economic resources** to military defence.

We, like other peace-loving **States** of the **world**, **feel** the increasing need to **create a** nuclear-weapon-free **zone** in the Middle **East**. However, while we **support** making the Middle **East** an area of **peace, free** of nuclear **weapons**, we wish to draw the attention **of** the international community to the fact that Israel's **increasing** nuclear capability and its refusal to place its nuclear installations under the control **of** the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) pose a real threat to the security of the Middle **East** and impede **the** creation of **a** nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The Sultanate, being aware of the **destruction** and instability **such a posture** may bring to the region, calls for **increased efforts by the United Nations**. The international community **is** called upon today seriously to **consider** the creation **of** a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Mediterranean and the Middle **East**, taking into consideration the **circumstances** and the **nature of** the region. **This** will constitute **a great boost** to international peace and security.

Since its **accession** to the ad hoc **committee** on the preparation **of the United Nations Conference concerning** the implementation **of** the General **Assembly** declaration on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, Oman **has** spared no

(Mr. Al-Zadqaly, Oman)

effort to promote the preparatory work of that Committee. we hope that the **First** Committee will adopt the report of the Preparatory Committee and take the **necessary** action to promote the **Committee's** work, with a view to holding the Indian Ocean conference before the end of 1990, as scheduled.

We also welcome the declaration issued by the States of southern Asia concerning their desire not to acquire nuclear weapons. We hope that this declaration will lead to a legal, mandatory agreement .

The Sultanate supports all proposals calling for the curbing of the practices of certain transnationalals which dump their nuclear, toxic and radioactive wastes in the territories of developing countries, especially in Africa, the Middle East, and the southern Pacific. The countries of these regions should not be saddled with such wastes which Others produce. This is a matter of paramount importance and should be regarded with the gravity it deserves. It involves certain unethical practices that pose serious threats to people and the environment in which they live. It is also vitally important to contain the process of spreading and burying such toxic wastes in any environment. Certain mandatory, legally compelling and comprehensive agreements should be concluded in this respect .

The concept of collective security leads us to consider outer space as a common heritage of humanity. It should be used for peaceful purposes. It is thus imperative for the international community to make an appeal to the States that have the scientific, technological and economic know-how to ensure that the reasonable, legal restrictions on outer space are not violated and that outer space be used only for purposes that serve peace and humanity. We follow with concern the attempts to extend the arms race to outer space and develop new weapons systems that contravene the concepts of international security and the view that outer space is a common heritage, and use outer space for military and espionage purposes.

(Mr. Al-Zadqaly, Oman)

The news that Israel has launched a satellite to spy on the military and defence **activities** of the Arab and **African countries** is cause for great concern to **us**. It **is** a new act of **aggression** which undermines security and **stability** in the Middle **East** and the Mediterranean. It **also** impels the countries of the region into a new arms **race spiral**, this time in outer **space**.

The **issue** of naval armaments **is** a thorny and complex one which **deserves special** attention. In **this respect**, the Sultanate finds **it necessary** to take confidence-building **measures** to enhance security and reduce the dangers of **incidents** and confrontation on the **seas, especially** between ships armed with nuclear **weapons**. It **is** also important that such international efforts should complement those made on the bilateral level, and that **negotiations on such efforts** should take place within **the** framework of the Conference on Disarmament. The matter **considered** should include **security** guarantees **for** non-military **activities** On the **seas** and **safeguards for** the **coastal** States and the ships of neutral **countries** caught up in conflicts.

It would be **remiss of me** when dealing with disarmament not to refer to conventional disarmament. Since the end of the Second World War the world **has witnessed** 36 military conflicts in **which** conventional weapons have been used. **More** than 5 million people have died in **those** conflicts. In addition, tremendous **amounts of** money have been spent on the acquisition of **such weapons**. Special priority should be given to **this** aspect of disarmament. All countries **should adhere** to the principles of the Charter and refrain from the threat or the use of force and from interference in the internal **affairs** of any other State. That will **add the necessary** ingredient of security which **is the prerequisite** of any **serious** disarmament effort. We also call for the implementation of all the General Assembly **resolutions** that have been adopted on **the** matter year after year.

(Mr. Al-Zadqaly, Oman)

We also welcome the efforts to reduce conventional **weapons** in Europe, within the framework **of** the Stockholm Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Here I wish to **refer** to the **Secretary-General's** report on the economic **and social consequences of the arms** race and military expenditure⁸ (A/43/368).

We have two **options**: either **to** go on arming **ourselves**, or to **turn swiftly** and with determination to balanced and **steady** economic and social **development** in the context of a **more stable** political and economic **system**. The inter **national** community has demonstrated its belief in the validity **of** the latter option by stressing the link between disarmament and development and adopting by **consensus** the Final **Document** of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which made it clear that disarmament and development were the most urgent **challenges** facing the world today.

More than \$35 billion **is** spent on military **research** and development annually, while many **peoples** of the world face the problem⁸ of hunger, drought and **desertification**. There is an urgent need to encourage the reduction of military budget **to**. International peace and **security** will be **ensured if States** in all regions of the world take concrete **steps** to reduce military arsenal⁸ to the minimum reasonable requirement⁸ of defence and **security**.

In **conclusion, because** we believe that the **effectiveness** of the United Nations **role** in disarmament **should be** enhanced, we find it is high time to re-evaluate the **activities** of the **specialized agencies** of the United Nations concerned with **this area**, foremost **among** which, of **course**, is the **Conference on Disarmament** in Geneva. We maintain that the **Conference** has achieved a great deal in the area **of** disarmament. We have the opportunity to **consolidate its** work in order to achieve **better results**. The implementation of the 1983 **resolution** to widen the **Conference's membership** may augur well for its work. **Also the evaluation and**

(Mr. Al-Zadgaly, Oman)

rationalization of the work of the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission would have the same beneficial effect.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): My delegation is greatly encouraged by the widely shared sense of confidence and optimism about the present state of international relations as we begin our deliberations at this session. It is our hope that the prevailing positive political climate, largely generated by the improved relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union arising out of the super-Power summits and the signing of the Treaty between the United States Of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF Treaty), will serve us well in our present deliberations. It is also our hope that the happy conjuncture of favourable international trends and the renewed interest and confidence in the United Nations and its enhanced prestige will yield positive results at the end of the current session.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that a similar mood of optimism prevailed during the deliberations of the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament (SSOD 111) earlier this year, but, much to our dismay, we were unable to utilize the propitious climate to bring the deliberations of SSOD III to a fruitful conclusion. We failed to reach a consensus on a final document. While my delegation shares the positive assessment of many delegations of the usefulness of SSOD III, we must be candid enough to recognize the success that it was not.

At this forty-third session of the General Assembly we are again meeting in a climate of continued relaxation in the international political arena, almost unprecedented in the history of the post-world-war period. Here we are once again given the rare opportunity of making good what we lost earlier this year.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

In a nuclear age the threat of annihilation hangs over all nations, **big** and small. **For** this reason many nations, big and small, have expressed their concerns, fears and **hopes** in the Assembly. To this universal clamour **for** a safer and **more** stable world - free **from the** threats of nuclear holocaust **or other** forms of mass annihilation - Malaysia adds its voice. We voice the legitimate concerns of small countries that possess no nuclear weapons to act **as** so-called deterrents or anti-nuclear shields for protection. **Our** only arsenal is our plea for rationality and reason. With others, and **in unison**, we all may yet **be** heard.

Herein lies the continued relevance and importance of the United Nations, particularly to the smaller nations of the world, for the forum it provides for the expression of their views and expectations. Herein also lies the continued relevance and importance of the multilateral **disarmament** process, for inasmuch as we commend the two super-Powers for the recent breakthroughs in their bilateral negotiations, the very nature of the nuclear **threat** demands the continued involvement and active participation of all members of the international community. **For**, simply put, the nuclear **predicament** of *the* **super-Powers** is no longer a private or bilateral matter between them, but is a **common** problem affecting all humanity. As the fates of small nations hang in the balance in **much the same** way as those of the great Powers, they have every right to be seized of **the** problem and to **contribute** to its solution in appropriate ways.

My government, like others, is gratified to hear the joint declaration **of the** two super-Powers that

"A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought". (A/43/58, p. 3)

If so, would it be too much to hope that **such** wars should never be contemplated? The logic of the joint pronouncement **demands** the complete eradication of **such** weapons, and the sooner this is done the safer will our planet **be**. Their continued presence - in their thousands - in the arsenals of the nuclear **Powers** does not

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

guarantee the continued safety of mankind, as we are persuaded to believe, but threatens its very survival **as** a species.

While we **recognize** the **difficulties** and **even risks of** a quick reduction of such **weapons**, Malaysia would strongly appeal to the **nuclear Powers** to heed the cry for **a** safer and more **secure** world, based **not on the doctrine** of **nuclear** deterrence, which brings only a **precarious** peace, at best, but on **one of** dialogue and co-operation between nations. **Any move by the super-Powers** in that direction, however **tentative**, would go a long way in generating increased confidence and **security around** the globe, so essential in the resolution of regional **conflicts**, as recent **events** have **shown**.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

In our common efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons, my Government attaches great importance to the cessation of all nuclear tests and strongly supports and encourages multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We believe that the key to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race lies in the banning of all such tests and would therefore urge that the matter be given the highest priority at the Conference on Disarmament in the coming years. Among the proposals that have been advanced in this regard, my Government finds itself in sympathy with the call for amending and updating the partial-test-ban Treaty (PTBT).

As we grapple with the problem of a nuclear-test ban in the long term, we should also address ourselves to the more immediate question of the reduction and eventual elimination of existing nuclear weapons. We commend the United States and the Soviet Union for their historic first step in eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles from their arsenals, and would strongly urge and encourage them to press ahead with their bilateral negotiations to effect a 50-per-cent reduction of their strategic nuclear arsenals in the near future, taking advantage of the momentum and positive political climate generated by the signing of the INF Treaty.

Of equal importance is the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space - that last frontier of mankind, where for peaceful purposes we should preserve as humanity's common heritage. Malaysia gives strong encouragement to the deliberations in the Conference on Disarmament on this question and would strongly endorse the initiation of serious negotiations that would lead to the concluding of an international agreement on the banning of weapons in outer space.

My Government follows closely the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the question of chemical weapons, and is encouraged by the progress made within the last year. We abhor the use of such weapons and would therefore urge the Conference on Disarmament to accelerate its consideration of the

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

subject so as to make possible the early conclusion of a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention. As a parallel and complementary measure, we would also support the proposal for an international conference to reaffirm the validity Of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

Another subject on the international disarmament agenda to which Malaysia attaches great importance relates to the question of verification measures and compliance with international agreements. In this regard we believe that the United Nations has a central role to play and, therefore, would like to express Our support for the Six-Nation initiative towards the setting up of a multilateral verification system within the Organization, even if this can only be realised in the long term.

We also attach importance to strict compliance, by all parties concerned, with the Non-Proliferation Treaty in our efforts to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and, in preparation for the next Non-Proliferation-Treaty review conference in 1990, we support the proposal for a new, comprehensive study of nuclear weapons by the United Nations, as this would facilitate the success of that conference.

Malaysia follows with keen interest developments towards the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and looks forward to the early convening Of the projected Colombo conference for the implementation of the United Nations declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We follow with similar interest the developments pertaining to the promotion of a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic, as well as the proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, particularly in Africa and the Middle East. In this regard Malaysia strongly condemns the efforts of South Africa to introduce nuclear weapons to Africa, as well as Israel's nuclear activities and capabilities in one of the world's most unstable and volatile areas.

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

Malaysia's keen interest in the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world stems from its own commitment and efforts, in partnership with the other members of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia, encompassing the entire South-East Asian region, of which a nuclear-weapon-free zone will be an integral component. It is the view of my Government that the realisation of such a zone in South-East Asia would be a concrete contribution to regional peace and stability and would complement and reinforce the already fruitful economic co-operation between the ASEAN countries. Such a zone, once realized, will not be directed at any power external to the region but aimed at providing a structure of peace, security and co-operation and of harmonious relationships between countries within the region, as well as with those outside. Such a framework would constitute a concrete disarmament- and confidence-building measure in a strategic area of the globe.

In our preoccupation with the most awesome threat to our survival, namely the nuclear threat, we should not lose sight of the real and ever-present threat of conventional weapons. My Government shares the sense of alarm felt by the international community at the massive accumulation of these conventional weapons by many countries, in response to their security needs, and calls on all members of this Organization to contribute in every possible way towards the lessening of this threat.

Malaysia is equally concerned at the growing threat and destabilizing potential of the naval arms race in many regions of the world, including our own region of South-East Asia. We would like, once again, to draw the attention of the First Committee and of the General Assembly to this equally important issue on the disarmament agenda, and we call on all countries to play their appropriate roles

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

And to contribute to auring this growing threat at sea, without prejudice to the legitimate national interests of all the countries concerned.

Malaysia is cognizant of the danger A And r l eke of the dumping of nuclear And toxic industrial wastes to human life and to the ecosystem. We are appalled at the news of the dumping of toxic industrial wastes in Africa. The dumping of these highly hazardous waetee represents the negative aide of scientific And teohnologial progress, which must be kept under A strict régime of international safeguards And control. Towards this end, Malaysia joins in the call for international efforts towards the establishment of A oanpreheneive international instrument to prevent the tr ansfer of these nuclear And toxic industrial wastes to developing ooun tries.

As A developing country with total commitment to, And preoccupation with, the business of na tionrl development, Malaysia is fully oonvinoed of the undeniable linkage between disarmament And development, based on the eimple equation thst more money for armaments means less maney for goods And services. Malaysia is encouraged by the growing recognition of the close relationship between these two important aspects of national security - in the broadest sense of the term - And would urge the implementa tion of the programme of action contained in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament And Development.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my delegation's strong eupport for your efforts to make speedy progreee in the work of this Committee, which, hopefully, will yield more coneeneue-building resolutions than were possible in the past. My delegation is of the view that, after repea ting ourselves year after year for so long, the time has come for us to effect some forward movement in the pursuit of our common goals, in the larger interests of humanity to which we are all committed. The stakes are high and the challenqee formidable, but if at

(Mr. Razali, Malaysia)

this crucial juncture we are all inspired by the Age-old vision of peace on earth, as we all must be, no obstacles will be too big for us to overcome. To this end I pledge my delegation's fullest co-operation in the work of this Committee.

Mrs. TOURE (Mali) (interpretation from French): I should like to express the great satisfaction of my delegation at the skill and effectiveness with which you, Mr. Chairman, have been guiding our work. The delegation of Mali would like also to express its gratitude to the two Vice-Chairmen, the Rapporteur and the members of the Secretariat. It would be remiss of me not to thank, too, your outstanding predecessor, Mr. Nzengeya of Zaire, who continues to make a positive contribution to our work.

Most of those who have spoken in this debate have expressed appreciation of the feeling of hope that prevails at the present time in international relations.

(Mr A. Touré, Mali)

Indeed, the glimmer of hope that had Appeared on the horizon following Geneva has brightened with the signature on 8 December 1987 At Washington of the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics And the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range And Shorter-Range Missiles. My delegation also welcomes the Agreement in principle on A 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons.

Moreover, the last session of the Conference on Disarmament And the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament allowed for An exchange of views on the best approach, within the framework of the United Nations system, likely to lead to general And complete disarmament Under effective international control,

Notwithstanding that welcome progress, however, the First Committee At111 has before it questions on security And disarmament, questions that continue to pose a serious threat to international peace And security. In other words, the hopes that have been aroused throughout the world risk being disappointed by the negative attitudes of some or by lack of political will on the part of others. Peace is truly An indivisible whole, And all possible situations must be taken into account.

The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament gave rise to considerable hopes. It provided A good opportunity for working on And Adopting A disarmament program within a multilateral framework. That step was a logical one within the framework of the objectives of the United Nations Charter, namely, the safeguarding And maintenance of international peace And security. My delegation notes with great disappointment the lack of consensus regarding questions dealing with southern Africa and the Middle East.

(Mrs. Touré, Mali)

In adopting its 1964 declaration on the denuclearization of Africa the Organization of African Unity (OAU) rounded the alarm with regard to the danger posed to the African continent by the presence of nuclear weapons. Twenty-five years after the adoption of that important declaration, we are yearly witnessing the growth of South Africa's nuclear capability. The possession of nuclear weapons by A régime that has institutionalized racial discrimination and is making aggression against its neighbours a permanent element of its foreign policy is A serious danger for Africa And a threat to international peace And security. This is the appropriate forum for launching an urgent appeal to the international community to react rapidly to that danger.

Israel's nuclear capability poses A serious threat to all the States of the region. The quest for peace in that part of the globe requires the convening of an international conference on peace in the Middle East with the participation of all parties involved, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

My delegation would like, however, to point out that despite the lack of consensus in the adoption of a final document, the third special session devoted to disarmament did, as is clear from the Secretary-General's report, make possible agreement on A certain number of points. The report states:

"Disarmament is not the exclusive responsibility of the two most powerful States, but a joint undertaking of all States)

"While nuclear disarmament must continue to be the primary concern, conventional disarmament has acquired a new importance And urgency;

"The qualitative aspect of the arm race needs to be Addressed along with its quantitative aspect;

(Mrs. Touré, Mali)

"National security needs to be viewed in the **broader context** of **global issues** and **inter national concerns**;

"The goals of disarmament And arms limitation need to be **pursued** in conjunction with efforts to resolve conflicts, build confidence and **promote economic** and **social development**;

"The existing machinery for disarmament can And should be **utilized** better."

(A/43/1, p. 13)

The **role of** the **United Nations** in **the search for** And maintenance of international peace And security is **becoming** ever more **important**. That **trend must** be continued in the interest of the international **community**. The **Awarding of** the Nobel Peace Prize to the United Nations **peace-keeping** forces has a **particular** significance in this **regard**. That **award** should serve as a stimulus to our **efforts** to **seek** international **peace** and security.

The philosophy of deterrence is **certainly** understandable, but the boundary between national security and the threat of world catastrophe should **also** be **observed**. The survival of **mankind** will **be at stake** so long as the nuclear-arms **race continues**. By transcending passions we can together build **a world of hope for** future generations. All other nuclear Powers should follow the example set **by the two super-Powers** and **embark upon the** process of nuclear disarmament.

In his report on the work of the Organisation **for** 1988 the Secretary-General notes that there is **a** need to conclude **a** convention on the prohibition **of** the **development**, production, stockpiling, **acquisition**, transfer And **use of chemicals** weapons And their destruction. My **delegation** encourages the **Conference on Disarmament** in **its** efforts to produce **such** a convention and **hopes** that the General Assembly will adopt such a **document** in the near future.

(Mr S. Touré, Mali)

My delegation would like to share another concern with the Committee, namely, the danger to Africa of the dumping of nuclear and industrial wastes.. Everyone is well aware that such practices are likely to violate the geophysical And ecological make-up of the environment, not to mention their negative effects on man. My delegation would like to welcome the decision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) , which, At its thirty-second session, condemned all dumping of nuclear wastes. The international community should take up this question As A matter of urgency, for, in addition to their illegal and immoral aspects, such practices violate the national security of African States And both regional and international peace and security .

My delegation has always supported the idea that the strengthening of solidarity in the field of disarmament would serve the cause of international peace and security and that the resources freed through the reduction of expenditures on armaments would contribute to the growth And stability of the world economy, in particular the economies of the developing countries.

That fundamental idea, which is at the heart of the disarmament-development relationship, is still relevant, And in that connection I should like to recall the statement made a few weeks ago by the President of the Republic of Mali and Acting President Of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), General Moussa Traoré, in his address to the General Assembly , He said :

"Hence, only by translating our sense of common destiny into action will we be able to resolve the paradox of spending 81,000 billion each year in the production of lethal weapons, while only a fraction of that sum would make our planet a land of prosperity for millions of people who today suffer from illness, hunger, thirst and ignorance." (A/43/PV.16, p. 12)

(Mrs. Touré, Mali)

My delegation hopes that the Disarmament Commission, which is working on the question of the reduction of military budgets, will reach consensus on the use of the reporting system for military expenditures of States, and on principles governing the future action of States to freeze and reduce military expenditures.

With respect to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, my delegation believes it important that existing agreements be scrupulously respected, and that there be an in-depth study of the role the United Nations can play in verifying those disarmament and arms-control agreements. My delegation believes also that since space is the common heritage of mankind its exploration and use should be carried out solely for peaceful purposes. We call on major space States to contribute to achieving that goal.

Once the United Nations Charter was signed, mankind had the right to believe that the nightmare of the scourge of war had vanished forever. That dream is far from coming true, given the items still on the agenda of this Committee. But there is still room for hope, because mankind is growing increasingly aware of the threat nuclear conflict poses to our planet. That awareness should make all States scrupulously respect the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) (interpretation from French) : The chairmanship of the First Committee requires outstanding professional experience, including wide knowledge of disarmament issues, and acknowledged personal qualities such as readiness and openness to the concerns of others and therefore to dialogue. Since those qualities, Sir, are among those which have won you the admiration and respect of your colleagues, it was only natural that you should have been elected to guide our work this year. The delegation of Algeria welcomes your election and assures you of its complete readiness to co-operate with you.

(Mr. Djoudi , Algeria)

In the year since the last session of the General Assembly the trend towards dialogue and negotiation in super-Power relations has been intensified. In fact, in 1988 negotiations bore their first fruit, including the ratification and initial implementation of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Nuclear Forces,

That alone is a historic event; it cannot be too heavily stressed that it is the first-ever agreement on actual nuclear disarmament dealing with an entire category of nuclear weapons. Moreover, the strategic-arms reduction talks (START) are continuing) and it is hoped the two States parties to the talks will soon reach an Agreement on the agreed goal Of a 50 per cent reduction Of the strategic nuclear arsenals. The parties should be encouraged in this task by the entire international community, which is eager to make a constructive contribution to the inauguration and pursuit of an authentic process of nuclear disarmament: the only alternative for world peace and security - indeed, for survival.

That dialogue appears to have its own irresistible dynamic in many respects, opening many possibilities for the two major Powers, even in areas until now closed to discussion irrespective of the state of their relations)' these often involve areas of the world where the general lines of regional peace have been drawn even though permanent tension and bloody confrontation had earlier prevailed.

The United Nations itself - unjustly called into question and deprived of the means to fulfil its mission - has drawn new vigour from this state of affairs, reaffirming, perhaps as never before, that it is irreplaceable as a framework for the resolution of the most bitter conflicts and for achieving solutions most in keeping with the rights of states and of peoples.

(Mr. Djoudi, Alger is)

Those results can only be welcomed when we consider the spreading circle of dialogue that can give rise to a wave of peace flowing over all aspects of international relations. But however satisfactory 1968 may have been for certain spheres of disarmament and for the settlement of regional conflicts, we wonder whether even a summary balance sheet can be drawn up reflecting only those positive aspects, however important they may be - and they certainly are important. We think we must also face the reality of the immense task facing all States, first and foremost the most heavily armed among them. That reality brings some thoughts to the mind of the Algerian delegation.

The years of cold war that followed the Second World War, and the decade of confrontation that began on the eve of the 1980s left a lasting mark on international relations, more of a mark than transient dialogue and passing détente. The first lesson of political realism is to see the world as it is. Yet for the non-aligned countries - whose Movement was founded during the dangerous rise of the cold war - their difficulty in affirming independence and assuring development has showed them that the world remains divided by a double gap; East-West and North-South. Since they became an autonomous force for initiative and action in a framework of solidarity - since the establishment of the Movement - the non-aligned countries have chosen in-depth dialogue, expanded co-operation and the establishment of appropriate forums as the sole ways and means to transcend this global Calvary and to ensure universal collective security and development.

Now that dialogue is taking place where it ought to have begun - between the two super-Powers, and on the need to halt the arm race threatening the survival of mankind - Algeria, as a member of a responsible Movement, acknowledges the regenerative potential of multilateral co-operation, so long as it lives up

(Mr. Djoudi, Alger 12)

to its promise through the spread of its positive aspects to all spheres of international relations and through the participation of all States with a shared interest in giving international relations the needed stability and harmonious development. The multifaceted threat of disaster remains present and acute, and requires concerted, well-organized multilateral action to avert it. The challenges are numerous and varied in the military, political, economic, ecological, energy, financial and other spheres.

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

Therefore, while the renewal of negotiations in the area of disarmament is a reason for optimism, we should also remember the urgency of eliminating all the other threats from which the arms race cannot be isolated. The disarmament process must be carried out in a framework that guarantees that it will be irreversibly pursued while it continues to be associated with the settlement of other problems that are growing worse because there is no attempt to resolve them.

We hope that the dialogue under way will rapidly create this inevitable logic, which will lead States, first and foremost those that are the most heavily armed, to this point of no return, at which the negotiation of significant disarmament agreements will become an irreversible process aimed at ensuring ever increasing common security through ever lower levels of weapons. This will bring the world significantly closer to the day when it will be freed once and for all of the threat of a nuclear holocaust, because of the total disappearance of nuclear weapons, and will attain the goal of general and complete disarmament.

We must adhere consistently to a strict interpretation of agreements concluded. The process of nuclear disarmament in particular must be resolutely pursued and nothing should be undertaken that might jeopardize the strengthening of that process. We must insist that it was no accident that it was an agreement on nuclear disarmament, the first of its kind, that crowned the meetings of the two super-Powers at the negotiation table. Nor was it a coincidence that the agreement was accompanied by other such measures, as the establishment of centres for the reduction of the nuclear threat. It is, indeed, the nuclear weapon that threatens our planet with total, irreversible destruction, and it is the danger of its voluntary or accidental use that makes each period of confrontation more dangerous. No other weapon, no matter what its terrifying capacity for mass destruction, can be compared to it, even if its prohibition is urgently necessary, therefore measures must be envisaged, in the form of a binding commitment

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

undertaken by the nuclear-weapon States, prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance. Is not the agreement that a nuclear war can never be won and must never be fought already the political formulation of a commitment that must be legally enshrined within the framework of a binding international instrument?

No one can deny that the comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban is the decisive measure, the critical threshold that will allow the disarmament process to become effective and make challenges and steps backward impossible. Any approach that does not have this short-term objective will run the risk of having no real effect on the arms race, because halting the arms race would no longer be the real objective. There is reason for apprehension that the so-called step-by-step approach might take us further from that objective, which must remain the total prohibition, not the gradual reduction of thresholds. The stages of that approach are so vague and the final objective so uncertain that it is legitimate to doubt that it can be seriously envisaged. This is all the more true in that we note with concern that the conclusion of an agreement on the reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals might make the continuance of nuclear tests even more necessary to ensure the reliability of the remaining nuclear arsenal. That would be a distortion of the effect of interaction expected of nuclear disarmament agreements, since instead of stimulating the process of nuclear disarmament the negotiations under way would thus give rise to a new series of nuclear tests.

The delegation of Algeria at first voted with reservations in favour of the draft resolution on the notification of nuclear tests, wondering whether such an initiative would not, in the final analysis, legitimize those tests. But following the publication of the notification of some tests carried out by certain nuclear-weapon Powers, we have been struck by the magnitude of another fact. If all tests were made public and listed in a single document, their number, frequency and power would undoubtedly contribute to communicating to the world public the

(Mr. Djoudi, Algeria)

reality of that totally **destructive power** which nuclear **explosions** would **unleash** if they **took place** beyond the **comforting bounds** of **so-called tests**.

It **is** high time for the resumption of **effective** negotiations with an **objective** whose urgency has been talked about for **three decades now**. The Conference on **Disarmament** is the **perfect** forum for the negotiation of a treaty on the **complete** prohibition of nuclear **tests**, within the framework of an **ad hoc** committee entrusted with a **mandate to negotiate** not to explore such **specific aspects** of such a treaty as the field of application or **verification**. Moreover, **verification** can no longer **serve as a** **serious** pretext for opposition when it **is** now clear that **seismic** observation **installations** can **detect** even explosions **carried out** at the **lowest** threshold. Three nuclear **Powers** have committed **themselves** to **achieving** the conclusion of such a treaty within the **framework of** more than one international agreement. Their **specific responsibility** in working out the **timetable** - work that is already **under way** - **must** be **emphasized**.

If the will of nuclear-weapon **States**, in particular that of the two **most** important ones, **is necessary** to **put** an end to the **arms race**, it **is** those two also that **must** prevent an arms race in outer **space**. The **common** heritage of mankind, outer **space** **must** be **used solely for peaceful purposes**. If outer space **is** to be the new frontier of mankind for exploitation, it **is important** that that frontier be **demilitarized**.

In recent **years** the Conference on Disarmament has **considered this** question in **sufficient** depth to be able to begin at its next session a **specific study** of **proposed measures** aimed at preventing an **arms race** in outer space. In this context, numerous **suggestions** have been made which **represent** a **basis** of **sufficient** agreement to allow **us** to commit **ourselves** to that path.

It **is** right that the negotiation of a convention on the prohibition of the **development**, production and stockpiling of chemical **weapons** and on their

(Mr. Djoudi, Alger la)

destruction is given extremely high priority. That question enjoys rare unanimity, and indeed is the only one on which progress is made year after year within the framework of negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament. It is our realistic hope to see a convention adopted before the end of this decade.

The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament ended in failure. Such a gloomy statement is necessary not in order to repeat vain recriminations but to affirm some of the healthy lessons to be learned, lessons that are extremely informative regarding the nature, scope and magnitude of developments under way and, above all, what remains to be done in order to deal with changes that have yet to prove their ability to safeguard the security interests of all States.

It is necessary to reaffirm the imperative need for the rehabilitation of the role of the United Nations in the disarmament sphere. We cannot on the one hand celebrate the role of the Organization in various processes connected with the settlement of existing conflicts, and on the other work to make that role marginal in the negotiation of agreements vital to the entire international community, while both disarmament and the settlement of conflicts are part and parcel of the United Nations mission of maintaining international peace and security.

(Mr. Djoudi, Alger is)

On the other hand, the **discussion** of the **impact** of technological developments on the **arms race** will demonstrate the limits **of any disarmament measure that is not accompanied** by the greatest restraint in research and development on new **technologies for military purposes**, **Lack of control** over that would **considerably** reduce the importance and credibility **of** results obtained in the field of disarmament.

We might have doubts about the statement that **technology** is neutral when the **dominant** approach in matters **of co-operation** with developing **countries** in the nuclear, **chemical or** missiles sphere is that of non-proliferation **conceived** as an obstacle to the transfer of technology **for** civilian purposes.

We welcome the fact that it is increasingly **recognized** that disarmament is not an end in itself, but **is** linked, **for example**, to the problem **of** human rights. But what about the rights of peoples? **Can the** right to self-determination **of peoples** be invoked only when it is convenient **for** manipulation in the **framework** of East-West **conflicts**? The same **holds true** for the problem of **arms transfers**, a question which **can be raised** validly only if we take into account **all** the elements involved in regional **conflicts** and which can be **dealt** with by the States **concerned** only in the framework **of** settling existing crises.

Whilst it is repeatedly said **that** the most Powerful **States** arm themselves **because of** mutual distrust, and not vice versa, which means that it is not the **arms race** that creates the distrust, **would we not** logically add **that it is not the arms race that** provokes regional conflicts, but **that the existence** of those **conflicts makes** certain States **acquire** arms to defend themselves? **That is particularly true** of southern **Africa** and the Middle East, where the permanent aggression of Israel and South Africa **make the other** countries of the two **regions seek** military means to **resist that** permanent **desire** for **aggression** and regional domination. In those **two** situations we **clearly** cannot **speak** of the problem **of** the transfer **of arms without**

(Mr. Djoudi, Alger is)

raising the problem of the nuclear weapons of Israel and South Africa, which, moreover, thanks to the military technology assistance they receive, have acquired an incomparable potential at the regional level to produce and deploy a large range of weapons.

The pursuit of dialogue and continued concerted action, such as is taking place today within the Committee, give an excellent opportunity to express legitimate concerns and openness to the security interests of the greatest number of countries. By their constructive contribution, the non-aligned countries have always worked for the exercise of the collective will to promote multilateral action to deal with the numerous challenges facing the international community. Faithful to its original message and that mission, their Movement recently called in Nicosia for increased dialogue and a search for common approaches. We hope that we can put behind us the missed opportunity and be able to agree on joint approaches. My delegation is firmly resolved to make its contribution to that goal.

Mr. AZAMBUJA (Brazil): Allow me, Sir, to begin by congratulating you on your election. Your very well-known qualities of wisdom, common sense and flexibility are additional guarantees that our work is bound to be successful.

The year 1980 has already earned its place in the history of post-war international relations. It began just after the signature in Washington in December 1987 of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - INF Treaty - the first nuclear disarmament agreement ever. It saw the ratification of the INF Treaty at the Moscow Summit in June and the continuation of the Geneva nuclear and space talks between the two Super-Powers, from which springs the hope of another treaty leading to a 50 per cent reduction in

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

their strategy of offensive arms, The improvement in the dialogue between the two super-Powers was also undeniably a relevant factor in the accomplishments of the United Nations with regard to some regional conflicts, seemingly insoluble Until only a few months ago.

These most welcome developments and prospects, however, have not yet been accompanied by similar progress in multilateral disarmament negotiations Or even deliberations. The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was unable to produce a consensus concluding document. The Disarmament Commission at its 1988 substantive session reached consensus on its agenda items relating to verification, confidence-building measures and naval disarmament, but at the expense of continuing sluggishness on the item dedicated to nuclear disarmament, which deserves the highest priority.

The Conference on Disarmament again faced an awkward stalemate in relation to its nuclear items - not by sheer coincidence the first three on its agenda - a non-negotiating mandate in the Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space, and still too many obstacles and postponements on the road to a universal and non-discriminatory ban on chemical weapons development, production and stockpiling.

If an atmosphere of mutual recrimination was known to be adverse to progress in disarmament negotiations at the multilateral level, it has come as a surprise that the better climate between the two super-Powers has not brought visible results in advancing multilateral negotiations. Some seem to have taken the isolated example of the INF Treaty as final proof that bilateralism is a panacea, and that multilateralism is either a minor disturbance hindering the dialogue going on between the bloc leaders, a mechanism adequate in very narrowly defined areas, such as chemical weapons, or useful merely as a deliberative arena mainly to treat collateral measures - the so-called horizontal themes - such as verification or confidence-building measures, warming over concepts that arose in specific

(Mr. Asanbuja, Brazil)

geographical contexts and that are presented to the rest of the world as universally applicable, ready-made formulas.

Nevertheless, we refuse to accept that we are entering an era of renewed bilateralism or selective multilateralism. We prefer to think that the process of change now going on in the bilateral relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and affecting the international climate as a whole will gradually produce further results and will at last reinforce true multilateralism, including disarmament negotiations.

As President José Barney stated when he addressed the General Assembly at the third special session last June,

"The task of salvation belongs to all of us, with no exclusions. The weakening of multilateralism damages the cause of peace. Disarmament, however powerful the demands of the super-Powers, cannot be a discussion between the two. • (A/S-15/PV.10, p. 6)

Bilateralism can be nothing more than a process of accommodation of interests, of give and take, so that at the end each party keeps roughly what the other will also keep. Its goal is an acceptable balance of forces, not the gradual extinction of form itself.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

Multilateralism **works as** a law-making process, where the collective **will** of the whole finally includes the interests of all, big or small, and the new rules **apply to everyone**, without **discrimination**.

Some 19 years ago, an eminent **Brazilian** diplomat and statesman, Ambassador **João Augusto de Araújo** Castro, addressing the First Committee, **said**, with his customary foresight:

"The prevalent trend **among** the **major Powers** **is** to demand that all medium-sized and **small** nations repose unlimited confidence in their supposedly **common** Purposes, while each of those self-eame **major** Powers will not deposit any confidence at all in the purposes and intentions of the other major Powers, car in the small Powers either". (A/C.1/SR.1692, para. 80)

It would **be** difficult to change a word in that text, even if we tried to update it and apply it to **current** reality.

Coming back to the events of this **fertile** year, I would like to stress **that**, while the ratification of the Treaty between the United States **of America** and the **Union** of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the **INF** Treaty - deserves praise from the international community, the fact is that the **arms** race has not been halted, let alone **reversed**. New **nuclear weapons** are still being constructed **and** **tested**, and, **first** and foremost, the logic **that** pervades the **nuclear arms race** - the logic of **deterrence** - continues to reign unassailable. This doctrine is at the **origin** of the continuing escalation of the quantitative **and** qualitative development of nuclear **armaments**. **Some** States continue to think and speak **about** nuclear weaponry, in **its** frightening historical novelty **and** **specificity**, **as if it were just another** means of **warfare**. In the report **of** the Conference on **Disarmament** we **can** read that some delegations **consider** that

(Mr. Asambuja, Brazil)

"States had acquired nuclear weapons for the same reason that made them decide to acquire conventional ones - to enhance security." (A/43/27, para. 61)

In another part of the above-mentioned report we read that some hold that deterrence is "a fact of life" - of death, we should say - and that it made a significant contribution to East-West stability. If all this is true, it would be reasonable to ask for the world-wide distribution of nuclear weapons, for we would then, first, enhance the security of each and every State; secondly, we would, without doubt, stabilise every bilateral or regional conflict, for we cannot accept or support the premise that some States are more reasonable than others. The sophistry of the "normalization" and "stabilization" theories about nuclear arms is clearly shown by its reductio ad absurdum.

In brief, simply to add or subtract nuclear weapons to or from nuclear weapons, in a gloomy exercise of accounting, is to indulge in an arithmetic of infinities - so far-reaching are the effects of their eventual use - absolutely incommensurate with the effects of any of its predecessors. Nuclear weapons do not allow for quantitative logics of balance or equilibrium - one weapon is already one weapon too many.

This state of affairs was obviously reflected in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. For the items "Nuclear-test ban", "Cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament" and "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters" - all of them matters of the highest priority for the international community - the Conference on Disarmament could not agree on the establishment of the respective subsidiary bodies. The general negotiating mandate of the Conference was thus once more ignored, and the rule of consensus used to prevent the establishment of crucial machinery.

The Brazilian delegation, along with the other members of the Group of 21, continued to work for the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-weapon

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

Met-ban treaty, irreplaceable as a means of ending the qualitative improvement Of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of such weapons, and of preventing their vertical proliferation. Together with other members of the Group of 21, and under the assumption that the proposal contained in document CD/520/Rev.2 remained valid, Brazil supported a compromise draft mandate through which the Conference on Disarmament would decide

“to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on item 1 of its agenda with the objective of carrying out the multilateral negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty’.

This proposal was considered generally acceptable by all groups, except one, which prevented the expected consensus. Thus the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating body, was barred from beginning work on this most relevant matter, recognizably the first logical step in any process for the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

Those who opposed the mandate of the Group of 21 maintained that the stage-by-stage approach of nuclear testing offered the best chance for early progress, through the ongoing bilateral talks between the two super-Power@. We, for our part, think that the existing bilateral thresholds do not preclude the modernization of nuclear weapons and their qualitative development,

The same scenarios, roughly, occurred again on items 2 and 3 of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. The Group of 21 proposed draft mandates, but it was not possible to reach consensus, except in the case of one group of States. As regards the prevention of nuclear war, we heard, with not a little surprise, that this question could not be isolated from the problem of preventing war in general. This misleading fallacy seeks to equate the risk of extinguishing life on earth and annihilating human civilisation with the results - terrible as they may be - of any conventional conflict.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

On outer **space**, the Ad Hoc Committee established by the Conference on Disarmament, under the able and energetic chairmanship of **Ambassador Adolfo** Taylhardat of Venezuela, advanced and developed further the examination and identification **of** various **issues** relevant to the **p'vention of an arme race** in outer **space**. There **was** general recognition that the legal **régime applicable** to outer **space did** not guarantee the prevention of an **arms** race in that environment. **Specif** ically, it **was** clear that the existing legal ins **trumenta** left open the possibility of the introduction of **weapons** in space, other than nuclear weapons or **other weapons of mass** destruction, and, consequently, were not **sufficient** to prevent the **spread** of the arms **race** in that **medium**. There is **an urgent need** to consolidate, reinforce and develop **that régime** and to enhance **its** effectiveness, with **a** view to preventing science and technology from once more out-pacing disarmament efforts. The concrete actions required **are** hindered by the non-negotiating mandate some parties **still** favour, in contrast with paragraph **80** of the Final Document **of** the first special session, which **specif ically** asked that

“further **measures** should be taken and **appropriate** international negotiations held **in accordance with the spirit of** the { 1967 Treaty on Pr **inci** plea Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use **of** Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial **Bodies**”. (S-10/2)

We hope the Ad Hoc Committee will be re-established **next year** with a negotiating mandate. Here, **as** elsewhere, we believe that **multilateralism is** not a hindrance to bilateral negotiations, but that, **on** the contrary, multilateral **and** bilateral processes **can** and **ehould reinforce each other**.

I will **not** address today the subject of chemical weapons - one that we **can say, for sure**, has been at the forefront of international attention, and one that we at the **Conference on Disarmament have treated** with the utmost **attention** - **for I will speak on this specific** matter on another **occasion** in the near future.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

It is an undeniable fact that disarmament and development are two of the main roads to a better world. More than that, they should not be seen as parallel and separate ways. The arms race absorbs an important proportion of the human, financial, natural and technological resources - scarce resources - of the world. It weighs heavily in the economies of all countries, developed and developing, and disturbs the international flow of trade, capital and technological knowledge.

.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

What the world spends in the military sector is in tragic contrast to the misery and poverty that affects more than two thirds of mankind. This should be a warning for the international community and a stimulus to immediate action to disarm and use the resources so freed to help in the urgent tasks of development.

The Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held here in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, stated that the global arms race and development compete for the same finite resources at both the national and the international level. Developing countries, for their part, are doubly affected by the expenditure they incur themselves and by the disturbing effect of military expenditures on the world economy. It would be rather cynical, however, to equate the national and international levels, since the effects of the spending pattern of the two super-Powers and of the major military Powers have a much wider repercussion upon everyone than the military expenditures even of all the developing countries taken together.

Development will diminish non-military threats to security and so enhance the possibilities of a faster pace in disarmament. Disarmament will free scarce resources and so increase those available for development. It is as simple as that, but its sheer simplicity makes some doubtful. I still hope to see an evolution in their position.

The year 1988 is coming to an end. It will be remembered for the ratification of the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - INF Treaty - and for the general improvement in the international climate, obvious in the treatment of several regional crises. It will also be remembered by most of us in this room as the year of the third special session of

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a gathering that began wrapped in the most extraordinary atmosphere of hope - based on the same welcome facts and trends on the bilateral and regional levels as I have mentioned - only to end in a Climate of such half-hearted rationalizations as, "It was an occasion for high-level participation", or again, "a forum for discussing new trends", or "a brainstorm." We all know it was not meant to be only that. It was not meant to be an academic meeting - and I duly appreciate academic meetings. The third special session devoted to disarmament was primarily a meeting of statesmen and diplomats, people whose words are relevant not only because of the ideas and information they carry but because they engage and commit the States they represent. In that capacity our June meeting fell short of our reasonable expectations, and we should be ready to acknowledge that. It was a warning that there is a growing distance between improvement in the dialogue between the two super-Powers and the broader conversations among all of us. International society is much more complex and diverse now than it was some years ago. Bilateralism cannot guide us all in a field such as disarmament, which relates to the security of each of our nations, large or small. If multilateralism is under a moratorium because it no longer responds to the signals of the more powerful States, bilateralism by itself will not be able to impose a legitimate world order democratically arrived at and accepted by all parties concerned.

I should like to conclude by again quoting President Sarnay's words as he defined some principles we cherish in the field of disarmament. He stated:

"First, no State should demand from any other disarmament measures that it itself is not prepared to take, and no one should require of another that

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

which he himself will not ~~do~~; secondly, concerns regarding the security of one State **are just as** valid, just **as important and** just **as relevant as** those of **any other State - that** is the principle of equality," (A/S-15/PV.10, p. 15)

If **our** multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament **are** built upon foundations like these, ~~we~~ will be designing **a** future international society **capable of justice and peace and**, for **that** reason alone, assured of permanence.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: *Before adjourning* this **morning's** meeting, I should like to draw the attention of delegations to an **issue** on which the First Committee should, in **my** view, pronounce itself not later than 4 November 1988.

On 12 October **the** President **of** the General Assembly, in a letter addressed to **me**, transmitted the text **of a** communique from the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, ~~which~~ has been distributed in document **A/C.1/43/4**. It concerns the request to the Main Committees, including the First Committee, to communicate their views **to** the Fifth Committee on the relevant chapters of the provisions to the medium-term plan for the period 1984 to 1989, which is now extended to 1991 and on the Secretary-General's note **containing** the draft introduction to the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997.

This matter **has** been brought to the attention of the officers of the Committee at their meeting. At this stage I would like to **request** members of the Committee to give consideration to this matter so that the Committee may be in a position to submit **its** views on the subject in an appropriate manner and within the time-frame that I stipulated earlier.

The meeting rose at 12.49 p.m.