



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AOKI (Japan) (Vice-Chairman)

later: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Sister Keenan (Holy See)
Mr. Cissé (Mali)
Mr. Ribedi (Uganda)
Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic)
Mr. Thompson (Fiji)
Mr. Nashashibi (Jordan)
Mr. Alatas (Indonesia)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

*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 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Sister KEENAN (Holy See): The Holy See is grateful for the opportunity to address the First Committee and, i n so doing, would like first of all to offer congratulations to the Chairman and to the other officers of the Committee.

In addressing the First Committee this year, t h e Holy See would like to limit its statement to two principles that have immediate application to the field of disarmament, while not entering directly into political and technical aspects that are outside the competence of t h e Holy See. The two principles are, first, t h e responsibility of all States for disarmament and, secondly, dialogue and negotiation as indispensable means in the diarmament process.

Both of those points deliberately place disarmament within the broader context of peace. In this International Year of Peace it is important to recall that, while peace cannot be reduced to disarmament, gradual, balanced and verifiable disarmament measures are indispensable elements of a n enduring and true peace.

The first principle may he stated as follows: disarmament is the responsibility of all States and of all peoples. This responsibility, however, falls in the first place on those States that are the most heavily armed and, secondly, on those actually engaged in conflict or in situations of confrontation that could break out into open conflict.

The common responsibility of all peoples and States for disarmament derives ultimately from the oneness of the human race. Whatever the cultural, political or ideological differences that may divide them, all peoples have a common stake in the future of humanity and have not only a right but also a duty to contribute to t h e building of a peaceful world. T h e same holds true for States, which are by nature at the service of the common good of their people. This responsibility for

(Sister Keenan, Roly See)

peace has now **assumed proportions** that go **beyond** the **limits** of any particular State, in **view of** the **intricate and wide-ranging** ties that **bind States** together, including **treaties**, cultural and historical **links or dependencies** of the **most varied** kind.

This **fundamental and growing solidarity among States** has found **formal expression** in the **United Nations**, where States have **freely assumed a commitment** to take **collective meaasura for** the prevention and the removal of **threats** to peace. Certainly, one of the **graveest threats** to peace today **is the existenc of stocks** of armaments that go **beyond** the legitimate **needs of wlf-defence**, and whose **destructive power makes** their **use unthinkable**.

The **United Nation8** addressed this situation collectively **wher** it determined on a **programme of** action for disarmament in the **Final Document** of the **first special session Of** the **General Assembly devoted to disarmament** held in 1978. Paragraph 45 of that Document **spells out** priorities that have remained the subject **of** constant preoccupation **and** intense **negotiation**. It **is** indeed a sign of hope **at the end of** this **International Year of Peace** to **see** some **progress in certain of those priority areas**, in particular in **efforts to** reduce **nuclear arms** through **hilatoral talks** between the **United States and the Soviet Union**, and to ban **chemical weapons** totally through **negotiations** in the **Conference on Disarmament**.

The **responsibility** for the reduction of nuclear arms, an urgent **priority**, **falls** in the **first place on** the two **major nuclear Powers**. It is not **theirs alone**, however. As Pope John Paul II **said** in his 1985 address to the **diplomatic corps** accredited to the Holy See:

"This situation of bipolarization cannot condition the latitude for action and the **possibilities of initiative of** the other **countries;** rather, **this reepensihiity of** the two **Powers - like that of the permanent members of** the Security Council within the **United Nations - find6 its justification only** to the extent **that** it **allows** other nations to **as-rume** their **place, to undertake**

(Sister Keenan, Holy See)

their initiatives, to ~~exercise~~ their influence effectively under just conditiona *and* for the good *of* the world community..

Within this context, the two major nuclear-weapon States, from whom the world rightfully ~~expects~~ concrete reductions in nuclear ~~arms~~, exercise their ~~responsibility~~ fully when they take into account the legitimate ~~desires~~ and security needs of other States, as well as the influence ~~of~~ any bilateral decisions on ~~these~~ same States. Thus, bilateral negotiations find their legitimate and necessary ~~extension~~ in multilateral forums.

(Sister Keenan, Holy See)

The responsibility for the building of a peaceful world falls, in the second place, on countries at present engaged in war. Regional conflicts, in an increasingly interrelated world, risk becoming generalised. Even should they remain localised, the terrible loss of life and of property, as well as the disruption and potential destruction of the social fabric that such wars entail, make them increasingly unjustifiable as a means of settling disputes. The growing recognition of the futility of war is a sign of hope that at some future date war will no longer be the scourge that it remains today. Those at present engaged in armed conflict bear, therefore, a responsibility that they must exercise by seeking the way of dialogue, of negotiation.

When Pope John Paul II called for a general truce on 17 October, the day on which the heads of the great religions of the world will be praying for peace, he saw it precisely as opening this way to dialogue. In his appeal for the cessation of all conflict, he stated:

"May the 27 October truce be an incitement for parties in conflict to undertake or to pursue reflection on the motives that have led them to seek by the use of force, with its cortege of human miseries, what they could attain by sincere negotiations and recourse to the other means that law provides."

Still others also bear a doubtful responsibility in local conflicts: those who sell arms indiscriminately to the parties involved. Unfortunately, the number of States that are arms exporters has increased in recent years. Certainly no country can be denied the means to defend itself, but those who seek benefits from such arms sales cannot be said to be working for peace. On the contrary. Present initiatives to study this question within the United Nations may help to clarify the intricacies and consequences of arms sales and transfers of various types.

(Sister Keenan, Holy See)

Still other countries are in situations of confrontation that risk turning into armed conflict. Very often, those situations have deep historical roots with legitimate, if conflicting, interests on both sides. Again, is there any way other than that of dialogue and negotiations that seek agreement on the higher plane of the mutual good, the common interest and the honour of both parties concerned? The 1984 agreements between Argentina and Chile over the southern zone, which the Holy See was able to mediate, are an example of such a reference to a higher good which eliminated the danger of war between the two countries.

The second point that the Holy See would like to address relates precisely to the importance of dialogue and its characteristics. It may be stated as follows: dialogue and negotiation are the way to peace. Two of the fundamental principles of that dialogue are truth and reciprocity.

Political dialogue is demanding, and yet it may not be refused. There is no legitimate alternative except that of believing in the supremacy of force, that of accepting the inevitability of war. To agree to dialogue is not to abandon the righteousness or truth of a position held. It is not to yield to demands that may seem illegitimate. It is, rather, to agree to recognize that there is a common good that goes beyond particular interests and that, in many cases, accommodation of particular interests is possible in the light of this greater good.

The basic principle of political dialogue - indeed, of any dialogue - is truth. As applied to disarmament, this includes an adequate exchange of information and mutually agreeable and adequate means of verification, a word, moreover, semantically related to the word "truth". The 1986 International Year of Peace has seen progress in the acceptance, in principle, of adequate verification measures in certain current negotiations. This is due in no small part to the efforts of several States to develop procedures and methods of verification that

(Sister Keenan, Holy See)

are politically acceptable to the negotiating partners. The Holy See hopes that progress made in negotiations on verification measures of a chemical-weapon ban will lead to the rapid conclusion of a treaty that will completely eliminate the existence of those inhumane weapons. Continued reports of their use make the conclusion of such a treaty all the more urgent.

Truth in political dialogue is also allied to trust, to confidence. While confidence-building measures are not disarmament measures and must not replace them, such measures on a regional level can increase the level of trust in the region and therefore both lead to and accompany negotiations on specific disarmament measures. The Holy See is pleased with the successful conclusion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, as well as with the significant progress made in the Disarmament Commission on guidelines for confidence-building measures on a global and regional level.

A second principle of political dialogue is that of reciprocity in relations. Each State must defend the good of its own peoples and assure the full measure of their human rights and dignity. This is the very foundation of a State. Each State has a similar obligation to respect the legitimate rights and interests of other States. True political dialogue and subsequent negotiations must recognize this principle. As Pope John Paul II asked, again in his 1985 address to the diplomatic corps:

"How can one claim at the international level or in bilateral relations what one has refused to concede to others in conformity with their rights?"

In political dialogue concerning disarmament, it is difficult to see how one State can legitimately challenge another concerning armaments, when it is increasing its own arms beyond measure. Similarly, proposals made by a State have little

(Sister Keenan, Holy See)

credibility when the internal situation and actions of the State are not in accord with them. Strict respect for reciprocity in dialogue and negotiations is a necessary condition for concrete results in disarmament negotiations.

Since dialogue remains an ongoing necessity, it calls for and requires structures. At the same time, such structures give expression to the common responsibility of all States for disarmament. The United Nations has a central role to play in providing those structures. The Holy See, in concluding, renews its support of the United Nations and its work in the field of disarmament.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): I should like to express to you, Mr. Chairman, my delegation's great satisfaction at the skill, dynamism and effectiveness with which you are conducting our work. Every preceding speaker has noted that the privilege of chairing the political Committee at this forty-first session is one that you fully deserve, not only because of your personal qualities, but also because of the outstanding contribution made by your country, the German Democratic Republic, with which my own enjoys excellent relations.

My delegation would also like to congratulate the two Vice-Chairmen, the Rapporteur and members of the Secretariat. And, of course, I cannot fail to mention the remarkable qualities of your predecessor, Mr. Ali Alataa, who continues to contribute to the rationalization of our work.

(Mr. Cissé, Mali)

The Political Committee is now engaged in a general debate on the questions of security and disarmament on its agenda at a time when the international situation remains disquieting despite certain glimmers of hope.

In this International Year of Peace proclaimed by our Organization, the existence of the political will needed to reach specific solutions on crucial disarmament issues still remains doubtful.

The arms race continues to have a detrimental effect on the development of two-thirds of mankind, although the peoples of the world regardless of their political economic and social systems, share the same aspirations to security and, the right to survive, and to justice and well-being.

International tensions in many parts of the world still feed on unjust wars, interference in the internal affairs of States and typical acts of aggression against peoples whose only aspiration is to peace, independence and life.

Conflicts and opposing interests, particularly between the two ideological and military blocs that dominate our contemporary world, do not seem likely to favour the creation of those conditions so essential to the implementation of a system of collective security, and consequently of the tranquillity for all that each State needs for its development, especially the States of the third world.

These generally unfavourable trends in the international scene, dangerously reinforced by a complex world economic crisis, are giving rise to violence in many parts of the world, violence bringing in its train unresolved conflicts, as in southern Africa - where the apartheid régime is hard pressed, in the Middle East, in the Iran-Iraq war in Asia, in the Korean peninsula - where scarcely a day dawns peacefully, in Kampuchea, in Afghanistan and in Latin America - where the Contadora Group is, nevertheless, doing useful work.

(Mr. Cissé, Mali)

This sombre picture is necessarily reflected in the work and concerns of the bodies responsible for questions of disarmament and international security. This is clearly shown by a perusal of the reports of the Conference on Disarmament contained in document A/41/27, of the Disarmament Commission in document A/41/42, of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean in document A/41/29 and of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference in document A/41/28.

Such a perusal reveals a series of failures resulting from an absence, or insufficiency of political will. The Geneva summit held in November 1985 aroused legitimate hopes, but it failed to yield any positive results, because the two super-Powers, on which the fate of the contemporary world depends, are still in a state of confrontation.

The Tokyo summit seemed in some strange way to wipe out the effects of a bilateral rapprochement, although the Friendship Games organized in Moscow at the beginning of July 1986 showed that hopes of such a rapprochement were fully justified. Above all, the failure of the Reykjavik summit has demonstrated that the world continues to live under the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

At a time when the international situation is marked by violence and tension, my delegation would like to make an appeal. Let us decide together to commit ourselves resolutely to working to promote a creative and positive political will, to strengthen the United Nations as the principal centre for negotiations, and to increase international co-operation in all areas.

Faithful to the ideals of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), my country will continue as always to support all proposals directed to disarmament, the strengthening of world peace and the strengthening of individual and collective security of States both great and small.

(Mr. Cissé, Mali)

Mali will continue to support as always, all measures designed to strengthen mutual confidence, to create and consolidate denuclearised zones and to maintain peaceful coexistence and good neighbourliness.

My delegation believes that the main feature of today's world is the advent of the nuclear era, whose potentials to some degree nullify ideological conflicts, since they no longer have any real meaning, any human meaning, and from a historical standpoint involve a fundamental contradiction.

A new world is emerging before our eyes, on the threshold of the twenty-first century, which seems despite everything show the vanity of certain ideas: the vanity of the wars in mankind's history, the vanity of the wars of hegemonism fought yesterday and today, and the vanity inherent in suicidal visions of an impossible or fruitless victory.

Consequently my delegation would encourage all sincere moves to promote general and complete disarmament, and true peace, the peace of hearts and minds. We should like to welcome all such efforts, particularly the unilateral moratorium already renewed by the Soviet Union which, as we all know, has also already renounced the idea of a first nuclear strike.

My delegation would like to encourage the efforts of the United States - that great nation - have contributed, beyond suspicion, to the birth of a positive spirit, the spirit of Reykjavik, a flame which must all strive to keep alive.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation of the Republic of Mali, Mr. Modibo Keita, speaking on 8 October 1986 in the General Assembly, said:

"The establishment of a true atmosphere of peace in the world will be possible only when countries, in their day to day life, scrupulously abide by the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. We must convince ourselves that peace depends on the will to negotiate and to strengthen mutual trust and collective security, and not on confrontation and violence.

(Mr. Cissé, Mali)

Wall, for its part, reaffirms that it will, in its relations with other States, and in particular with its immediate neighbours, rigorously abide by negotiation and the principles of good-neighbourliness set forth by our Organization." (A/41/PV.28, p. 58)

My delegation, because of the facts of the matter, is bound to feel confident, for the dynamic process of peace is indivisible - even better, it is irreversible.

Mr. KXBEDI (Uganda): I wish to start by expressing our deepest shock and sorrow at the tragic death of a great son of Africa, President Samora Machel of Mozambique. President Machel was a dedicated and leading light in the fight for the total liberation of the southern region of Africa, a stand which made him the target of the racist forces that control South Africa. His passing is therefore a loss not only to Mozambique but also to the whole of Africa; however, his memory and inspiration will live for ever.

I would ask the representative of Mozambique to accept the heartfelt condolences of my President and delegation, and the Government and all the people of Uganda.

I extend to you, Sir, my congratulations and those of my delegation on your election as Chairman of this very important Committee. My delegation is confident that, with your wide-ranging diplomatic experience and renowned ability, you will conduct the Committee's deliberations with skill and impartiality. My congratulations go also to the other officers of the Committee, and I pledge to you my delegation's full co-operation.

Although 1986 has been declared by the United Nations the International Year of Peace, the turbulent situation obtaining everywhere in the world has been a constant cause of concern to us all, so much so that mankind has been driven to a state of despair and apprehension. In an endeavour to alter this ominous situation for the better all the nations, large and small, have untiringly worked for peace and security. Many ideas and proposals have been put forward, all aimed at reducing armaments and opposing war.

The desire to save mankind from the scourge of war and total annihilation by weapons of destruction has been fully reflected in the declaration of eminent personalities and statesmen, like those of the leaders of the five continents

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

during their meeting held in New Delhi and Ixtapa, Mexico. This ~~same~~ anxiety and concern for the fate and well-being of mankind was equally echoed in the political declaration of the Eighth Summit Meeting of the Non-Aligned Countries held last September in Harare, Zimbabwe. In all those forums the guiding principle and common message has been that the two super-Powers should be mindful of their responsibility to mankind and take concrete steps to achieve genuine disarmament.

The past year witnessed the holding of a summit meeting between the two super-Powers in Geneva; that was indeed a source of relief to all States. In their joint statement the two super-Powers declared that a nuclear war could not be won and must never be fought. They fully acknowledged their responsibility in checking the arms race and reducing nuclear armaments. In the bilateral negotiations on arms control and disarmament each side boldly put forward a number of proposals and plans, including the proposal for a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear stockpiles. That was without doubt a most welcome development.

The Geneva summit was followed by the successful conclusion of the recent Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures in Europe. My delegation, like others who have spoken before me, hopes that those achievements will help bring about a disarmament agreement which, in turn, will lead to the easing of tension in Europe. In addition, we believe that regional measures of that sort could have a global significance and should therefore be welcomed.

The anxiety and expectations of all nations were further heightened recently by the news that the two super-Powers would hold what was termed a preparatory meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland. The outcome of that meeting appeared to be a disappointment to everybody; however, both sides have stated that Reykjavik was not a complete failure after all. We understand that agreements of fairly major

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

significance were in prospect in Reykjavik and far and strategic and intermediate-range weapons were concerned, as well as other aspects of East-West relations. The one clear message discernible from those developments is that disarmament agreements are possible. On the basis of what came of Reykjavik the leaders of the two super-Powers should, despite the temporary setback, continue their tireless efforts aimed at creating a safer world for mankind.

While we believe that special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the nations with the largest military arsenals, we believe equally that arms control and disarmament must not be left exclusively in the hands of the most powerful States. Those issues are a concern of all States. It must therefore be the responsibility of all States, big and small, developed and developing, to address themselves to those issues and to enhance the process of effective, all-round disarmament.

It is the honest view of my delegation that the ever escalating nuclear-arms race poses a real threat to international peace and security and that the ultimate aim of nuclear disarmament should be the complete prohibition and total elimination of all nuclear weapons. As a first step towards achieving that goal, the two super-Powers should mutually agree to stop the testing, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons. At this juncture, we wish to acknowledge and commend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosion declared by one of the super-Powers and extended up to early 1987. Furthermore, we believe that in the event of the super-Powers agreeing to halt all nuclear-weapon tests, that should be followed by multilateral negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty to which all States should accede. The conclusion of such a treaty would be a milestone in the prevention of the further horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Kihedi, Uganda)

I wish now to address myself to the issue of conventional disarmament - a subject that is of equal concern to all of us. My delegation attaches great importance to the question of conventional disarmament and feels that it should be considered together with the question of nuclear disarmament, because the two issues are interrelated and influence each other.

To us in the developing world the sale and transfer of conventional weapons are a cause of great concern. Aside from being a drain on the scarce resources of our treasuries, conventional weapons inflame national and regional conflicts, and hence affect national and regional peace and security. The international community should therefore address itself with the same seriousness of purpose and concern to the question of conventional disarmament.

I wish also to address myself to another subject of equal importance to us in East Africa - the question of the Indian Ocean. The presence of great Powers in that Ocean and the tension that that generates are naturally a major concern to us as littoral and hinterland States. The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace in 1971 by General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) acts out the guiding principles on how the Indian Ocean could be insulated from great-Power rivalries. Uganda, a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean zone, supports the Declaration and strongly opposes foreign military pressure and build-up in the Indian Ocean. We call for the necessary arrangements to be set in motion for the convening of the Colombo Conference that will pave the way for the implementation of the Declaration.

Another unreeolved question that appears every year on the agenda of the General Assembly of our Organization since 1965 is the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. This issue is of paramount importance to the international community when viewed within the context of the maintenance of regional and international peace and security.

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

The racist minority régime in South Africa is a threat to the peace and security of that region. The minority régime's policy of apartheid and its constant incursions into the front-line States with the intention of destabilizing those States are further indications of the magnitude and seriousness of the situation in the region. Our concern is even further magnified by the fact that it has been established that the racist minority régime has attained nuclear capability. Coupled with this is the secret collaboration between that régime and Israel, which is equally known to have nuclear capability. Those two régimes, by virtue of their collaboration in the clear field, pose a threat to the security of the African continent.

The international community, while therefore continuing to condemn all nuclear collaboration between the racist minority apartheid régime of South Africa and any other State, should endeavour to bring about the expeditious implementation of General Assembly resolution 2033 (XX).

The subject of the relationship between disarmament and development has attracted a lot of interest on the part of representatives who have spoken before me. This is because the subject is of tremendous interest to all of us, and especially those of us in the developing world. At its tenth special session, the first devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly emphasized this in its Final Document, where it was stated that

"In a world of finite resources there is a close relationship between expenditure on armament and economic and social development". (resolution S-10/2, para. 16)

The same message has been echoed by the panel of eminent personalities on the relationship between disarmament and development. We therefore support the call for the convening in 1987 of the postponed United Nations International Conference

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The nations participating in the preparatory process for that Conference have already agreed that disarmament and development, which are distinct processes in themselves, should be pursued seriously, because they both strengthen peace and security and promote prosperity.

I wish to consider a little further the issue of disarmament and development, with special reference to the continent of Africa. My delegation agrees that the fruits of science and technology should be utilized to preserve life, educate people and eradicate disease and poverty from our midst. Africa appreciates the fact that the peaceful application of science and technology could tackle very swiftly some of its most pressing developmental problems. With the application of nuclear science, Africa could tomorrow be rid of mosquitoes, tse-tse flies and other scourges that today inflict untold suffering on its people and animals.

Uganda therefore advocates the establishment by Africa as a matter of urgency and high priority of a regional nuclear research centre to achieve the above objectives, with the assistance of the United Nations, its agencies, interested Member States of the Organization and the international community as a whole.

This position was also affirmed in the Lomé Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted at the Ministerial Regional Conference on Security, Disarmament and Development in Africa, held from 13 to 16 August 1985. That Declaration marked a concrete step towards recognition of this triangular relationship.

Like several other members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Uganda is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and therefore has a particular interest in article IV (2) of the Treaty, which states that

"Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so shall also co-operate in contributing alone or together with other States a international organization to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy

(Mr. Kibedi, Uganda)

for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world". (resolution 2373 (XXII), annex)

Before concluding, I should like to touch very briefly on two equally important subjects on our agenda: the subjects of chemical weapons and of an arms race in outer space.

Chemical weapons also pose a serious threat to mankind and we feel that the international community has not yet dealt with this issue sufficiently. Although the use of chemical weapons was outlawed in 1925 by the Geneva Protocol, those deadly weapons continue to be stockpiled in the arsenals of major military Powers. Moreover, there are disturbing reports to the effect that an increasing number of other States are developing them too.

While we support the efforts of the Secretary-General in upholding the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, we wish to reiterate that there is an urgent need to free the world from the scourge of chemical weapons and other agents. I therefore urge the international community to do all it can to arrive at the early conclusion of a comprehensive, effective and verifiable convention on chemical weapons.

Finally, my delegation urges that outer space continue to be the heritage of all, and that its use therefore remain restricted to peaceful uses and purposes aimed at benefiting the whole of mankind. That situation should not be compromised by the introduction into outer space of weapons of warfare and destruction.

Mr. AL-ATASSI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): I take this opportunity, Sir, to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. With your diplomatic qualifications and wide experience, you will surely guide our work to the desired conclusion. This is all

(Mr. Al-Atassi , Syrian
Arab Republic)

the more clear since you belong to a country, the German Democratic Republic, that is making a contribution to international peace and security. I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on the confidence in them shown by the Committee.

The world today remains deeply concerned, frustrated and even despairing, by the failure of the efforts to achieve genuine nuclear disarmament. We have all stressed the threat to the world posed by nuclear weapons and made proposals for serious efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. Yet, despite all our efforts, the already huge arsenals of nuclear weapons continue to grow and the nuclear-arms race is escalating, so that the predominant feeling among the world public is that the very survival of mankind is threatened and effective steps must be taken to improve the situation.

The challenges facing the world today are many. The nuclear threat is the greatest of those challenges, but there are others as well, and the international community must speedily find effective ways of dealing with them. These challenges include the development problems faced by the majority of the countries of the third world, the problems of the environment and its resources and the problems arising from interference in the internal affairs of States and from attempts by imperialist countries to achieve hegemony and domination. All these problems lead to tension and disrupt relations between States, and in addition there is the problem of the existence of the odious racist régimes in southern Africa and occupied Palestine .

(Mr. Al-Ataai, Syrian
Arab Republic)

Such régimes may further destabilize these regions and consequently may jeopardize regional and international security.

These questions and issues lead to misgivings and to a lack of confidence among States. They also lead to the exacerbation of tension, a sense of insecurity, the attendant increase in armaments, and entry into the spheres of the arms race. Achievement of disarmament is the duty of the whole international community because the dangers of the arms race affect the whole world. It is an international responsibility, not limited to certain countries. It is true that the nuclear Powers, especially the two super-Powers, bear a special responsibility in eliminating the spectre of a nuclear war as well as promoting international peace and security.

However, we maintain that there is no alternative to the unanimous responsibility of all States through the international Organization which nurtures all efforts aimed at curbing the arms race, especially the nuclear one. Proceeding from this premise our international community has to encourage the continuation of dialogue and meetings between the Soviet Union and the United States, to urge the two States to reach more nuclear agreements and to give a strong impetus to the bilateral negotiations.

The task of preventing a nuclear catastrophe is so important that it should not be left to the nuclear Powers alone. The fate of all mankind is now at stake. Therefore, it is necessary, in our view, that all the countries of the third world, especially the non-aligned, should play a leading role in these momentous issues. We wish to pay tribute to the resolutions of the 14th Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries held in Harare concerning the issues of disarmament and of averting a nuclear catastrophe.

Lack of confidence is a factor that still plays a great role in disarmament

(Mr. Al-Atassi , Syrian
Arab Republic)

and the arms race. Despite the progress achieved in confidence-building, verification and communication systems, we still have a long way to go. Here, we have to express our optimism regarding the positive results reached by the Stockholm Conference on Confidence Building and Security Measures. We believe that the success achieved in Stockholm will lead to a strengthening of the atmosphere of confidence. We maintain that confidence-building is only possible through dialogue because dialogue will ease tension and remove misunderstanding. Hence, my country had hoped that the meeting between the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and the American President, Mr. Reagan, at Reykjavik would pave the way towards solving many problems of the world, foremost among which is curbing and reversing the nuclear arms race as well as easing tension.

If the nuclear-arms race poses the greatest danger to mankind, it becomes all the more acute and the danger of a confrontation is intensified should such an arms race be extended to outer space. The Syrian Arab Republic, based on its belief that outer space is the common heritage of mankind, reaffirms that all the countries of the world have the common responsibility to take the necessary and effective measures to limit the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes. There should be an agreement concerning the non-militarization of outer space and a commitment not to spread any weapons to it. Therefore, the intention of certain States to militarize outer space, confirms their desire to continue escalating armaments in order to achieve greater domination, hegemony and superiority.

Syria hopes that the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva will make every possible effort in order to stop the extension of the arms race to outer space. One of the most important results of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is the creation of a multilateral negotiating body

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

to study the issues of disarmament and to achieve complete and comprehensive disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva is one of the most important achievements of that session. But what is regrettable is to see the Conference on Disarmament today paralysed, ineffective and inactive in achieving what the whole of mankind is aspiring to. The Conference on Disarmament has not been able to draft an international treaty that would commit the nuclear Powers not to use nuclear weapons. A ban on all nuclear tests is the first task of that Conference. However, it has not been able to contribute in this respect.

The nuclear-test ban has been unilaterally crystallized on the part of the Soviet Union. My country wishes to commend its position in this respect. In the meantime it appeals to the other party to follow suit in the interests of mankind as a whole.

Chemical weapons and the danger of its production on a large-scale has become one of the major preoccupations of the international community. Syria maintains that a comprehensive ban, prohibition and the need for complete elimination of such chemical weapons has become one of the most important issues which we all have to confront most seriously. We have to reach agreements concerning that. Hence, we urge the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to continue consideration of such issues with a view to reaching that goal.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is an important step on the path of general and complete disarmament. This would reinforce international peace and security. The Syrian Arab Republic supported the Declarations of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Indian Ocean, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East, proceeding from its belief that it is of paramount importance to create such nuclear-weapon-free zones. Regarding the Middle East, and despite the resolutions of the General Assembly confirming and reaffirming this fact, year in and year out, this zone in the present situation is not free from nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

Israel is the only party that possesses the nuclear weapon and it refuses to subject its installations to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Different pretexts on the part of Israel concerning the need to conduct direct negotiations among the States of the area, in a way similar to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, is a form of hypocrisy. The Treaty of Tlatelolco is an understanding among the States of Latin America, where there is no invader, no aggressor or occupier of the lands of others; while the situation in the Middle East is based on annexation, invasion and the occupation of the territories of others. Israel's approach is no different from the approach of the racist régime in South Africa which is armed to the hilt with nuclear weapons, like Israel. They co-operate in the nuclear field, in broad daylight, and with the co-operation of certain Western countries in such a way as to contravene the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian
Arab Republic)

The creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East leads to the nuclear armament of Israel, which is a source of concern and fear for the peoples of that region and for the whole international community. The several resolutions adopted by the General Assembly every year concerning Israeli nuclear armament reflect the concern of the international community regarding Israeli nuclear activities. So far Israel is refusing to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty or to subject its installations to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspection.

It is instructive to recall in this respect for the benefit of the members of the First Committee reports concerning Israeli nuclear activity in the American Press last year in connection with the smuggling of krytron devices from America to Israel and concerning the sale by a certain mineral company in Luxembourg of certain amounts of uranium to Israel, illegitimately and in such a way as to contravene international control measures.

I hardly need to recall today the recent report in The Sunday Times of London revealing the existence of the Israeli nuclear arsenal on the basis of what was stated by the Israeli nuclear expert, Mordecai Vannu, who worked for 10 years in an Israeli nuclear bomb factory. This stated that Israel at present has between 100 and 200 nuclear bombs, and that the nuclear bomb factory is underground, in the Negev desert, next to the Dimona reactor. Thus the nuclear threat to the Middle East as a result of the nuclear weapons possessed by Israel is an established fact.

I cannot discuss disarmament issues without dealing with the link between disarmament and development. The gigantic expenditure on military budgets has impeded economic and social development in all countries of the world. This excessive expenditure has occurred not only in the developed, nuclear States, which have repeatedly doubled their military budgets, but also in certain developing

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian
Arab Republic)

countries with very modest revenues. These small States, in order to preserve their independence and resources, allocate to armament very high percentagea of their national revenue, which should be devoted t raising the living standards of their peoples.

Here the close relationship between disarmament and development becomes crystal clear, and this matter has been analysed in valuable studies carried out by the United Nations. In this context, we believe that the General Assembly should reaffirm this year the necessity of holding the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987. The Preparatory Committee, in its three meetings during 1986, laid the foundations of the work of the Conference, the theme of which is the reduction of military expenditure and the use of the human and physical resources released thereby in the interest8 of development in the third world.

The Syrian Arab Republic maintains that international peace and security are jeopardized by the continuance of the policy of the arms race. Indeed, no one can deny that the arms race, especially in its nuclear aspect, constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security and jeopardizes the very survival of mankind. However, the threat to international peace and security has various sources: recourse to violence, the use of force or the threat of force, recourse to a policy of aggression and interference in the internal affairs of other States all jeopardize international peace and security.

The desire for domination and hegemony is one of the reasons for tension, and it too poses a threat to international peace and security. There are certain countries that pursue a policy of annexation and expansion, and do not respect the right of peoples to live in peace and to self-determination. The doctrine of

(Mr. Al-Atassi, Syrian Arab Republic)

such States constitutes a threat to international as well as regional peace and security. It is useful to recall damage done to the international situation by the conduct of certain countries because of the implications for international Peace and security. That conduct is made more serious by the fact that certain countries possess nuclear weapons; I refer to the régimes in Pretoria and occupied Palestine. The possession of those weapons may have certain serious implications for the régimes in question. My country will deal with this in detail when we discuss the item on the strengthening of international peace and security at a later stage of the work of our Committee.

My country, as a Mediterranean littoral State, will raise the question of removing the foreign naval fleets in the Mediterranean, since they endanger the security of the littoral States and their territorial integrity.

In conclusion, Sir, my delegation wishes to assure you of its full co-operation.

Mr. THOMPSON (Fiji): The world waited, literally with hated breath, for a successful outcome of the Iceland summit. so much was expected. The disappointment was deeply felt everywhere. Nevertheless, a new plateau was established and it is most gratifying to note that the two super-Powers are still actively searching for the common ground which eluded them in Reykjavik. We sincerely hope that decisive reductions in nuclear weaponry will soon result and that the disarmament process we have all long prayed for will begin in earnest.

Yet again we will join in the consensus on moving towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Our support for the principle of banning all nuclear tests in all environments for all time remains steadfast. As was so aptly stated by New Zealand's Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs in the General Assembly recently:

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

"No other single step would do so much to slow the remorseless advance of nuclear-weapon production and experimentation, or to establish confidence in the will of the nuclear Powers to eliminate nuclear weapons from the world's arsenals. It would be a truly universal arms control measure." (A/41/PV.13, 58)

We believe that all countries have a role to play in achieving a greater measure of international disarmament. Small States like some of us in the South Pacific can give tangible expression to the objectives of disarmament by constituting, as we have done, nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such modest contributions, in sufficient numbers, could encircle the world with interlocking zones free of nuclear weapons.

The South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty, commonly known as the Treaty of Rarotonga has now been signed by 10 countries and ratified by four. It is expected to come into force within the next two months. We are pleased to learn that most nuclear-weapon States are giving positive consideration to signing the Protocols.

We remain profoundly affronted by France's blatant insensitivity to the legitimate concern of South Pacific States concerning its continued nuclear testing on Mururoa Atoll. In his statement in this Committee on Friday, 17 October 1986, Ambassador Morel of France wrote of the South Pacific sentiments when he said:

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

"On each occasion we have been able to show that the criticism was based on no objective factor and was in fact a reflection of discrimination against us." (A/C.1/41/PV.10, p. 79)

He then patronizingly claimed:

"On the pretext of establishing a denuclearization régime - without any reason, given the absence of any threat of proliferation in the region - the Treaty would attempt to impose a régime discriminatory with regard to France." (A/C.1/41/PV.10, p. 79)

And he went on to make the astonishing assertion that, having stated France's disagreement in principle, that country's approach would be to exercise its rights "with the greatest openmindedness."

He topped this off by concluding that France would 'exercise our legitimate rights in the Pacific with . . . the fullest respect for the legitimate interests of our neighbour6 in the region. we hope that they will show the same respect and the same openmindedness."

(A/C.1/41/PV.10, p. 79)

To illustrate that these concerns are not confined to the countries of the South Pacific, the matter was considered at the most recent meeting of the 132-member African, Caribbean and Pacific States (ACP) - European Economic Community (REX) Joint Assembly at Vougliameni, Greece, from 22 to 26 September this year. The Joint Assembly consists of parliamentarians who represent the whole spectrum of political affiliation of its member States and can thus be considered jointly representative of electoral opinion in the European Community and the ACP States. That meeting adopted a resolution which, inter alia, recognized that France was the only State conducting nuclear tests in the Pacific and that nuclear-test accidents could not be precluded. The meeting remembered the tragic example of Chernobyl, that chilling reminder of the fallibility of pundits

(Mr. Thompson, Fiji)

presumptuous enough to give gratuitous assurances on the safety of nuclear material. In operative paragraph 4 of its resolution, the Joint Assembly

"Exhorts France furthermore to end its nuclear testing in the Pacific immediately and take effective measures to prevent further radioactive contamination as a result of previous tests".

Many other delegations in their statements in the general debate have expressed strong support for the South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty and the principles on which it is founded. France, therefore, is becoming increasingly isolated and conspicuous by its continuing defiance of regional and international opinion.

Mr. NASHASHIBI (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic) : It gives me great pleasure, on behalf of my delegation, to extend to you, Sir, our congratulations Upon your election as Chairman of the First Committee. I would also like to extend congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, and I wish you and your colleagues every success in your endeavours to further the Committee's work.

I would also like to express our thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Indonesia, Mr. Ali Alatas, for the diplomatic skill with which he guided the Committee's work at its last session.

The most serious danger facing the world today is the continued escalation in nuclear arms. The international community is endeavouring to study all the appropriate ways and means to achieve complete nuclear disarmament, aware as it is of the dangers inherent in the nuclear weapons being developed and manufactured by the nuclear-weapon States. The super-Powers, which have a gigantic potential for the production of such sophisticated weaponry, bear the greatest responsibility in this connection. Under the provisions of the United Nations Charter, the super-Powers are supposed to bear the primary responsibility for the maintenance of

(Mr. Naehaehibi, Jordan)

international peace and security. It may be that they have been prevented from carrying out that task because of the pervasive rivalry and competition between countries and their reliance on military force as a means of dealing with each other. That imbalance has led to the spiralling arms race and to the acquisition of armaments, particularly nuclear armaments, which have become ever more destructive and lethal.

Jordan, like all peace-loving countries, continues to pin great hopes to the summit meeting held at Reykjavik between the leaders of the United States Of America and the Soviet Union. Whatever the results, we still view that meeting as a positive step towards understanding and constructive dialogue for the benefit of mankind, one that augurs well for the hopes of all peoples for stability and social and economic development. We believe that it will help to lay the foundation for mutual trust between the two super-Power, as well as helping to further talks on issues related to nuclear disarmament and curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Jordan hopes that both parties will make use of all available opportunities to continue their dialogue, with a view to achieving progress in solving the outstanding problems between them.

Jordan views the United Nations as a body through which all disputes can be settled peacefully, in order to avoid exposing the world to more terrible rivalry and attempts to acquire and develop weapons of mass destruction. Some countries are obliged to allocate a large part of their resources to armaments instead of meeting the requirements of their social and economic development. Reports refer to the vast sums spent on weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, and those sums are increasing every year in a manner that causes anxiety and fear. All this is occurring at the expense of development in the developing countries. It was for those reasons that Jordan supported the convening of an International Conference

(Mr. Nashashibi, Jordan)

On the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that was scheduled to take place at Par is this year. We hope that At this session of the General Assembly appropriate arrangements can be made and guidelines laid down for meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the International Conference, so that it can be held in 1987. The International Conference should strive to reach Agreements on curbing the arms race and on the reallocation of the vast material resources thus realized to social And economic development, particularly in developing countries. such Agreements would also assist those countries to emerge from the financial crisis from which many of them are suffering.

The arms race, and particularly the nuclear-Arms race, has reached An unprecedented level. Mankind today is facing the threat of self-annihilation because of the stockpiling of the most destructive of all the weapons ever produced. To avert the outbreak of a nuclear war, we must halt and reverse the arms race. The States with the largest nuclear arsenals have a particular responsibility to embark on nuclear disarmament, curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons and work to avoid the use or threat of use of such weapons.

(Mr. Nashashibi, Jordan)

In this connection, I should like to refer to the note by the Secretary-General on Israeli nuclear armament, A/40/520, dated 9 August 1985. That note states that Member6 of the United Nations have over the years shown increasing concern regarding the danger of the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Middle East, particularly in view of reports that Israel has developed A nuclear weapon capability. This has also been affirmed in recent press reports, which have clearly revealed the secret of the Israeli nuclear arsenal, on the basis of information given by the Israeli technician Vanunu, who worked for 10 years in a nuclear bomb factory. His statement has been confirmed by A technical invest lga. group formed by British and American specialists.

It has been proved that Israel now has between 100 and 200 bombs and that the plant where nuclear weapons and bombs are made is located under the Negev desert, or adjacent to the Dimona reactor. It added that Israel has the capability to deliver those weapons to targets in neighbouring countries.

Israel has pursued A policy of camouflage in regard to its nuclear inettallatione. Since the end of the 1950s, Israel has acquired nuclear and technological material by illegal means. It was assisted in that undertaking by the racist régime of South Africa. I should like to refer to the fact that the General Assembly, at its thirty-ninth session, noted with concern the continued Israeli refusal to agree to not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons, despite the repeated appeals of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It has also rejected the proposal that it should place its nuclear installations under the IAEA eafeguarde.

The General Assembly has also condemned Israel for its continued refusal to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981). The General Assembly requested the Security Council to investigate Israeli nuclear activities and the collaboration of other parties, States and institutions in those activities.

(Mr. Nashashibi, Jordan)

The General Assembly has also reiterated its call to the IAEA to put an end to any scientific co-operation with Israel that might contribute to strengthening Israel's nuclear capabilities. It has also reaffirmed its condemnation of the Continuing co-operation between Israel and South Africa, which jeopardizes the security of the entire African continent.

The continuation of Israel's aggressive approach is confirmed not only by the occupation of Arab territories and the displacement of their population, but also by the aggression against economic installations, such as the aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was used for peaceful purposes, and was subject to the full safeguard of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Jordan has always supported the resolutions of the General Assembly which call for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The last resolution was A/40/82 dated 12 December 1985. That resolution refers to the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/40/442 and Add.1, urges all parties directly concerned to consider seriously taking the practical and urgent steps required to implement the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and, as a means of promoting this objective invite the countries concerned to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The resolution calls upon all countries of the region that have not done so to agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and to desist from developing or producing nuclear weapons or permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territories or territories under their control.

(Mr. Nashaahibi, Jordan)

Jordan supports the strict observance of the principles of the United Nations and the fulfilment **Of** the commitments **Set** out in the Final **Document** of the tenth special session of the General Assembly. As an essential **condition** for strengthening trust between States, that **document** calls in particular for a strict commitment to the principles contained in the Charter of the **United Nations**, **emphasizing** the principles that States shall refrain from the threat **or** use of **force** against the territorial **integrity** of any State or against its political independence, **and** from interference and intervention in the internal affairs of other States, and shall settle their **disputes** by peaceful means.

Disarmament cannot take place **as long as disputes** and **problems** disrupt the international situation. Measures should be **taken** to resolve these problems in **a** spirit of **equity** and justice, on the **basis** of achieving security for all. The two super-Powers bear a special responsibility in this respect. They must set a good example by agreeing to take **the** road to genuine disarmament by strengthening the role and effectiveness of the **United Nations**, by promoting respect for its **Charter**, and by deterring States that are pursuing aggressive **policies from** persisting in so doing, in order that a spirit of confidence and **tranquillity** may prevail in relations among States.

Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): It can **be** said the the **First Committee** is meeting this year in an atmosphere of heightened expectation. There have **been** concrete achievements at the Stockholm Conference on Security and **Confidence Building Measures** in Europe which, in spite of their modest scope, may open the **way** for the adoption **of** further **measures**.

Similarly, the review conference of the biological weapon⁸ Convention succeeded in adopting a final Declaration aimed at strengthening its **provisions**. **Important multilateral efforts** are under way in the Conference on Disarmament

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

concerning chemical weapons. And new proposals and initiatives have been submitted in Geneva and Vienna on intermediate-range nuclear forces and the progressive reduction of conventional forces in Europe.

But as was rightly pointed out earlier in the debate, expectations should not be confused with success. For even a cursory survey of the current International scene will impress upon us the distressing reality of how little actual progress we have made in real disarmament or arms reduction and how marginally we have moved beyond the mere regulation and control of the arms build-up.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

The ever upward spiralling arms race, especially in nuclear arms, has continued unabated and now threatens to cross the threshold into outer space as well. Enormous investments are being funnelled into the research and development of new generations of weapons and weapon systems, both nuclear and non-nuclear, thus steadily obscuring the distinction between offensive and defensive capabilities and between nuclear and conventional armaments, and new rationalizations of old doctrines are advanced to justify their development and eventual use. Despite the welter of statements, pleas, exhortations and resolutions churned out daily on various occasions and in a variety of forums, we are now, in terms of global arms outlay and expenditures, some 50,000 nuclear warheads and \$US 1 trillion further away from the goal of disarmament.

It is clear that if we continue to temporize over the arms race, ameliorating its manifestations rather than terminating it in substance, we run an increasing risk of equivocating ourselves into oblivion. That unilateral security can be achieved through armaments has proved to be a dangerous myth, and the only rational option for humanity lies in seeking common security through disarmament.

It was within this perspective that we looked expectantly towards the Reykjavik meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, hoping that a positive and concrete outcome, particularly in the field of disarmament, would lead to a welcome improvement in the international security climate as a whole. Like others, we are of course very disappointed that it did not turn out that way, especially after the negotiations apparently came remarkably close to a historical breakthrough on many critical aspects. We draw encouragement, however, from the attested willingness of both sides to follow through and build on what was achieved in Reykjavik in their ongoing talks at Geneva and in the multilateral forums.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

In retrospect, it was perhaps a bit unrealistic to expect the leaders of the two major Powers to be able to bridge the chasm of their differences in one weekend session of negotiations, albeit very intensive and far-reaching. We recognize that the process of nuclear disarmament will of necessity require a finely tuned blend of both vision and realism in approach as well as sustained and practical efforts based on specific proposals. That is why we have noted with interest the idea of working through a comprehensive programme of nuclear disarmament in a phased, time-bound framework recently put forward by the Soviet Union and reflected also in the proposals advanced by both sides in Iceland.

In this context, we continue to believe that the achievement of a comprehensive test ban must retain the highest priority. After more than three decades of debates and discussions, it is evident that it would constitute a crucial measure in arresting and reversing the nuclear-arms race, preventing qualitative refinement and stemming horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. Yet, despite its imperative urgency and existing treaty obligations, a test ban has continued to elude us. Progress has long been stymied primarily on the question of verification, although national and international means of detecting violations already exist to ensure a high degree of compliance. Clearly, what has been lacking is not adequate technical safeguards but the marshalling of the necessary political will and determination for the early conclusion of a treaty banning nuclear tests.

My delegation and others have in the past emphasized that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty, there should be an immediate bilateral moratorium on all tests, to be followed by a multilateral one. In this regard, my delegation would like to express its support for the offer made by the six Heads of State or Government in the Mexico Declaration of last August. It is

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

indeed a timely and realistic approach to resolving the question of verification. The modalities envisaged in the proposal would make a constructive contribution in enhancing confidence and dispelling doubts concerning compliance. A positive response by the nuclear Powers would constitute a tangible expression of their professions of co-operation with the non-nuclear States on issues concerning disarmament.

The extension of the arms race into outer space portends incalculable consequences for disarmament. There can be no doubt that plans to develop a strategic defence capability and an enlarged scope for anti-matellite weapons would introduce further destabilizing elements into the strategic environment. We know from past experience that every new development and innovation in weapons technology, whether defensive or offensive, has inexorably led to an acceleration of the arms race. In the context of outer space that would amount to a quantum leap in vertical proliferation and usher in an entirely new dimension in the arms race. Such developments would also undermine existing agreements on arms limitation, especially the anti-ballistic missile Treaty. Furthermore, the astronomical costs involved in developing a space-based defence system taken together with those incurred to counter such a move would inevitably result in heightened strategic competition and greater mutual vulnerability and would further deepen the global economic crisis. It is imperative, therefore, to stop the further militarization of outer space and ensure that that environment is used exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all mankind.

For my Government, there is an additional reason for concern over this issue deriving from Indonesia's geographic location and configuration. Since we are a country consisting of more than 13,000 islands girding the equator across some 3,000 miles, the unhindered functioning of our space-based communication satellites

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

is essential to our domestic telecommunications system. The negative implications for peaceful satellite communications of the extension of the arms race into outer space cannot but be disquieting to my delegation. Compounding those dire prospects is the question concerning the use of the geostationary orbit for military purposes. Unless urgent action is taken, including the strengthening of the current legal régime and the banning of anti-satellite weapons, there is little doubt that the last frontier of human endeavour will soon be turned into a new battleground.

Indonesia remains convinced that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements recently arrived at among the States of the region concerned would constitute an important disarmament measure. Two years ago the member States of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) took a decision to work towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia and thus remove the region from the purview of strategic competition. Accordingly, efforts have been undertaken to determine the zone's scope and meaning, as well as its modalities and principles. The working Group's efforts have now progressed to the point where a draft treaty can be prepared for consideration by the Ministers at, it is hoped, their next annual meeting.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

ASEAN has been encouraged in its efforts in this regard by the success recently achieved by the South Pacific Forum in its adoption of the Rarotonga Treaty establishing a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. My Government wholeheartedly welcomed that initiative and will continue to extend its support to Forum members in realizing their aspirations. Ultimately, a denuclearized zone in South-East Asia, taken together with the zones encompassed by the Treaties of Rarotonga and Tlatelolco and the Antarctic Treaty, would mean that a vast contiguous zone would be free from the menace posed by nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, we cannot but express our deep concern at the inordinate delay in the convening of the international Conference on the Indian Ocean. That state of affairs has resulted in a steady deterioration of the political and security climate in the region, underscoring the urgency of the early convening of the Conference. We reiterate our call for its early convening as the only viable forum at this time to seek the harmonization of divergent views and interests. Its successful outcome will depend on a firm and resolute commitment by, first and foremost, the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users and the littoral and hinterland States.

In this context also, members are of course aware of the report submitted by a group of experts on the naval arms race. At this juncture I wish merely to point again to the recommendations contained in that report concerning two basic objectives: the achievement through negotiation of effective measures of nuclear disarmament at sea, and an improvement in national and international arrangements to ensure the rational and equitable use of marine resources. We are heartened by the number of substantive findings and recommendations put forward during the meetings of the Disarmament Commission last May, thus emphasizing the interest and concern of the international community with regard to this issue. The resultant

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

working paper, in our view, constitutes a sound basis for further elaboration of and agreement on a significant reduction in conventional and nuclear naval arms and armed forces. My delegation may wish to return to this question at a later date and discuss it in greater detail.

Turning now to non-nuclear issues, my delegation is pleased to note the progress made this year in the field of chemical weapons, in addition to that achieved in the past, which essentially relates to definitions, the elimination of arsenals, the implementation of national measures and non-use of these weapons. Divergences continue to exist on certain key questions; none the less, on various aspects of the consultative committee and the executive council as well as on procedures for requesting clarifications, a substantial measure of agreement has been reached. It is particularly gratifying to my delegation that the working group of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament was able to negotiate a set of draft provisions, including provisions on the difficult issue of on-site verification by challenge. Given the fact that it is now over 60 years since the adoption of the Geneva Protocol, the coming into force of a convention on chemical weapons would constitute a historic milestone and a major achievement by the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation believes that, with the necessary political will and flexibility, the Conference on Disarmament will not fail to seize this opportunity to achieve success on this major issue on its agenda.

Ever since the accident at Chernobyl there has been heightened concern not only about ensuring the safe operation of nuclear facilities but also about the disastrous consequences that would follow upon the release of ionizing radiation in the event of an attack on such facilities. Indeed, any State with peaceful nuclear installations is vulnerable to such attacks or the threat of such attacks. These compelling reasons underscore the need to include the question of the prohibition

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

of attacks in a convention on radiological weapons. At the same time, the convention should not in any way stifle or circumscribe access by end activities of States in developing the necessary technology and establishing peaceful nuclear facilities.

The inherent relationship between disarmament and development can be perceived only when placed in the larger context of their impact on security, to which both are intimately linked. We all know that disarmament and development are parallel and distinct processes. Yet there is a strong case for approaching those twin goals in an integrated manner. The task is to identify the pre-conditions and policies that would make it possible and feasible to ensure that resources released by disarmament could and, indeed, would be utilized to promote development. It was in the light of these considerations that my delegation was looking forward to the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was to have been held this year in Paris. We regret its postponement and therefore welcome the General Assembly's decision to convene the Conference next year in order to harmonize the actions of States through a programme of action that can best serve the collective aspirations of mankind to genuine disarmament and equitable economic development.

The cavalier treatment to which the Conference on Disarmament has been consistently subjected, especially nuclear issues, is another disturbing expression of the erosion of multilateralism. The situation has deteriorated to the point where the Conference has been prevented from even establishing subsidiary bodies on any of the priority items on its agenda. These problems in the multilateral approach can be directly attributed to the refusal by some major Powers to rise above their political rivalry and competition in pursuit of unilateral advantage. Nuclear issues cannot be regarded as falling within their

(Mr. Alatae, Indonesia)

exclusive domain. Bilateral and multilateral disarmament and security efforts must be viewed as mutually reinforcing if effective agreement⁸ with universal adherence are to be achieved.

We cannot accept a situation in which the vast majority of States are reduced to mere spectators and excluded from assuming their rightful role on issues so profoundly affecting their very survival. They can and should be allowed to play a role in devising and implementing a comprehensive programme leading to general and complete disarmament.

As a deliberative body with universal participation, the First Committee has an important role to play and specific contributions to make to the multilateral disarmament process. By serving as a forum for elaborating and clarifying a number of issues of pre-eminent concern to the international community, it has facilitated the formulation of concrete proposals and recommendations for consideration and action by other forums.

(Mr. Alatas, Indonesia)

My delegation shares the view held by many in this Committee that our work should continue to be directed towards substantive consensus. The fact that there are no easy solutions to disarmament problems should not lead to defeatism or cynicism. In this context it may be timely to recall that in two years' time the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is to take place. That session will provide a historic opportunity to further our common cause of enhancing the role of the United Nations in disarmament efforts. Its success will be wholly dependent on the dedication of Member States and their persistence in working to realize common objectives, a goal to which my delegation pledges its continued co-operation and unflinching support.

The CHAIRMAN: A number of delegations have requested to make statements in exercise of the right of reply. I remind members that, with respect to rights of reply, the Committee will follow the procedure to which I referred at an earlier meeting.

Mr. ZIPPORI (Israel) : Several delegations have seen fit to repeat their concern about the alleged nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa. This baseless allegation has been continuously rejected by Israel in this Committee and in other forums. The facts have been sustained by a recent United Nations document, A/CONF.137/CRP.2 of 15 May 1986, prepared by a group composed of experts from Nigeria, Sweden, the USSR, Venezuela and France. They were appointed by the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs and the United Nations Centre for Disarmament in consultation with the Organization of African Unity. That document was presented at the World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa, held at UNESCO headquarters in Paris from 16 to 20 June 1986.

(Mr. Zippori, Israel)

The 14-page document, entitled "South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability", is perhaps the most comprehensive report ever issued by the United Nations, and discusses every aspect of this topic. With one minor and irrelevant exception, Israel is not even mentioned in the entire document. Why? Because this United Nations report recognizes that all the allegations accusing Israel of collaborating with South Africa in the nuclear field are nonsense.

Repeating a lie over and over again does not make it true. However, the lies against Israel attempt to distract the attention of the world from the well-documented trade in oil between most Arab oil-producing States of the Gulf, Iran and South Africa. My delegation has distributed in the Fourth committee documented evidence of the almost \$8 billion in oil sold to South Africa by these Arab States and Iran in a period of five years. Every year, oil to the value of almost \$2 billion was sold by Arab countries to South Africa, and there is little doubt that the trade continues.

Those two "peace-loving" States, Iran and Iraq, have both recently entered into strategic barter arrangements with South Africa, the net value of which totals nearly 42 billion. According to a January 1986 report by the Egyptian Middle East News Agency, Iran has agreed to sell \$750 million in crude oil to South Africa in exchange for heavy-calibre Howitzers of the same value. The Iranian agreement was probably signed some time late last year.

Also late in 1985, Iran's arch-enemy, Iraq, entered into a similar oil-for-weapons deal with South Africa, valued at \$1 billion. The Iraqi deal was first reported by the British monthly Euro-Money Trade Finance Report in February 1986 and in the May 1986 newsletter of the Dutch Shipping Research Bureau. The bulk of the Iraqi deal, according to British financial sources, involves 70-millimetre Howitzer shells produced by the South African arms industry.

(Mr. Zipor Israel)

While the bullets are being supplied to Iraq, the oil in the barter deal is not from Iraqi wells; the oil is from Saudi Arabia, which has been supplying oil to Iraq in support of its war effort. British sources note that the Iraqi-South African arrangement is already well under way, and that shipments in European super-tankers probably started late in 1985 or early this year.

So, in dealing with assistance to South Africa and conducting military deals with it, let us look in the direction of those countries, and not be fooled by their attempts to divert the attention of this Committee in the wrong direction.

Mr. de La BAUME (France) (interpretation from French) : I should like to reply to statements made earlier by the representative of Fiji, concerning French nuclear tests. First, I should like to stress that personal remarks of the kind we heard are not acceptable and in no way improve the quality of the debate.

Secondly, I would emphasize that no one can tell us how to behave. We will not listen to such attempts from anyone, especially where our security is concerned. Agreement on the sensitive question of nuclear testing is a well known fact, it is clear every day that not everyone agrees on this matter - far from it. We have noted the divergence of views and are thus seeking every opportunity to explain our position and to engage in discussion calmly, honestly, and without polemics. Last February, in that spirit, we received a delegation from the countries which signed the Treaty of Rarotonga, among them Fiji. I can say only that the talks on that occasion were very useful and that we are prepared to continue them.

On the other hand I cannot but regret the polemic tone adopted by the delegation of Fiji. Political disagreements are a fact that can form the basis for dialogue. It is important to avoid personal quarrels in this context.

Mr. MASHHADI-GHAHVEHCHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : It is well known to everyone that following the victory of the Islamic revolution in Iran we severed all our relations with the two racist régimes, those of South Africa and of Israel. We severed all diplomatic relations with them, and cut off oil supplies to those two racist régimes. Even now those two régimes are indebted to us for past shipments of oil during the former régime in Iran; they have not paid their debt.

There is thus no point in making these unsubstantiated and unfounded accusations against Iran with a view to obscuring the strategic relations that exist between South Africa and Israel in all fields, including the nuclear field.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We have just concluded the first phase of our work, the general debate on all disarmament items. Beginning tomorrow, 24 October, the First Committee will proceed to the next phase of its work, namely, statements on specific disarmament agenda items and continuation of the general debate, as necessary. Accordingly the period from 24 October to 4 November will be devoted mainly to statements on specific items, without, however, precluding the right of any delegation to make statements of a general character during that same period, particularly if it did not have the opportunity to do so during the first phase of the Committee's work.

It would be highly appreciated if delegations wishing to speak during the second phase of the Committee's work would inscribe their names on the list of speakers as early as possible. A large number of delegations have already conveyed to the Secretariat their intention to speak during the next phase of our work. I would urge other delegations wishing to make statements in the Committee during that period to inscribe their names on the list of speakers at as early a date as is convenient but, if at all possible, by next Monday or Tuesday. I am making that suggestion merely with a view to ensuring that the Committee may be in a position to organize its work with the greatest possible degree of efficiency. In this context, early notification by delegations would enable the Committee to proceed in a rational and systematic fashion, thereby helping with consolidation of meetings, as necessary, and also avoiding the need for extensions of meetings as well as night or week-end meetings.

I would also like to draw the attention of members to the fact that we are drawing closer to Thursday, 30 October, which is the deadline for submission of draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items. I would therefore request delegations to submit their draft resolutions as soon as possible in order to

(The Chairman)

enable the Committee to keep on schedule with respect to its programme of work and timetable. I thank you all very much for your co-operation.

Before adjourning, I should like to inform the Committee that the representatives of the following delegations have inscribed their names on the list of ● □□□&□□■ for tomorrow morning's meeting: Panama, Czechoslovakia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mongolia, Nicaragua and Nepal.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.