

**United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

*Official Records**



**FIRST COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Thursday, 29 October 1987
at 10 a.m.
New York**

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25 th MEETING

Chairman: M r . BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire)

CONTENTS

**STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE
GENERAL DEBATE, AS NECESSARY (continued)**

Statements were made by:

Mr. Kostov (Bulgaria)
Mr. Nonglary (Afghanistan)
Mr. Fahmy (Egypt)
Mr. Jaeger (Denmark)
Mr. von Stuelpnagel (Federal Republic of Germany)
Mr. Lawson-Betum (Togo)

* Changes in subject, correction, corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within the week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC-156, 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.

**Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/42/PV.25
4 November 1987
ENGLISH**

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 (continued)

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

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French) : I call on the representative of Bulgaria, who as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.45 on the report of that body,

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria), Chairman of the Disarmament Commission: In my capacity as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission for the current year, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission (A/C.1/42/L.45), sponsored by members of its Bureau and delegations of various regional groups, namely, Austria, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Denmark, Jordan, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Uruguay and Venezuela.

As in previous years, this draft resolution contains a number of basic elements concerning the role and mandate of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body in the field of disarmament. Certainly, it is not necessary for me to explain those paragraphs that have been repeated for years. However, there are a few changes in paragraphs of its operative part, in comparison with previous resolutions, which reflect the situation at the 1987 substantive session and relate to the future work of the Disarmament Commission.

First, in order to reflect the progress achieved on certain agenda items during its 1987 substantive session, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution states that the General Assembly

"notes that the Disarmament Commission has yet to conclude its consideration of some items on its agenda, but notes also with appreciation the progress achieved on some of these".

(Mr. Kostov, Chairman, Disarmament Commission)

Representatives may recall that in 1999 the Commission made considerable progress on the subject of verification in all its aspects, the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, conventional disarmament, and naval armaments and disarmament, as pointed out in my statement at the 7th meeting of the First Committee on 15 October, at which I introduced the report of the Disarmament Commission. Although the Commission was unable to conclude the work on those items this year, I am sure that considerable achievements will be made at its next session, in 1988.

Secondly, in the light of the fact that the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be held in 1998, as in the case of the second special session in 1962, the General Assembly would, as stated in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, request the Commission to submit a substantive special report to the third special session containing specific recommendations on its agenda items and a regular report to the General Assembly at its forty-third session next year. In this regard, the Disarmament Commission will need an additional short session to consider its annual report some time in the fall of 1966.

Thirdly, as representatives are aware, at the 1997 session the meeting services for the Commission were considerably curtailed and this resulted in some difficulties for the Commission's subsidiary bodies. Consequently, a concrete recommendation has been made, with the support of all members of the Commission, to correct that situation. In operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested

"... to ensure full provision, to the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, of interpretation and translation facilities in the official languages, and to

(Igor Kostov, Chairman, Disarmament Commission)

assign, as a matter of priority, all the necessary resources and services to this end".

With that brief explanation of some new elements introduced in the preent draft, I recommend that, as in previous years, the draft resolution be adopted by the First Committee without a vote.

Mr. NENGRAHARY (Afghansietan) : I should like briefly to address agenda item 67, **"Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace"**.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan attaches great importance to the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Without any doubt, this matter is of crucial importance not only for the security of Asia but for the world as a whole. Afghanistan, as an Asian country, is following with great concern the latest developments on the Asian continent. It should be made clear that the major source of tension in the region lies in the policies of those who spare no efforts to crush by various means the aspiration of Asian nations to independence and socio-economic development of their own choice. Such activities pose a serious threat to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and peaceful development of the States of the region.

The militaristic activities of the United States in the Indian Ocean, and particularly its military bases on the island of Diego Garcia, as well as its building of facilities for its rapid deployment force, constitute a flagrant violation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and thus seriously endanger the security of Asian countries.

It is obvious that the continuous military pressure of the imperialist Powers in the Indian Ocean area is growing at an alarming rate. The expansion and upgrading of existing bases, on the one hand, and the search for new ones and the establishment of new military command structures by the United States and its allies, on the other, are of great concern to the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the non-aligned countries and other peace-loving countries of the world. The existing situation requires the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean as a first step towards the creation of a zone of peace in that region. We believe that such a step would greatly enhance military and political stability in the region.

(Mr. Mengrahary . Afghanistan)

In that regard, Afghanistan **welcomes the readiness** of the **Soviet Union to start negotiations** with the United **States** and **other** extra-regional States **possessing warships** stationed permanently in the Indian Ocean, **aimed at reducing** the **size** and **activities** of naval **forces**, and **its readiness** to conduct **negotiations** with the United **States** and the **Asian countries** concerned on confidence-building **measures** in the military field relating to **Asia** and the adjacent waters of the Indian and **Pacific Oceans**.

The eighth **Conference of Heads of State or Government** of Non-Aligned **Countries**, held at **Harare** last year, reaffirmed **the determination** of non-aligned **States to continue their efforts** to achieve the goals and **objective** of the **Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace**, as considered at the July 1979 meeting of littoral and hinterland **States of the Indian Ocean** and at **subsequent meetings of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee** on the Indian **Ocean**.

While joining in the affirmation **by** the non-aligned **countries at their eighth summit** Conference, we **express** our full support for the **Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace**, adopted **by** the General **Assembly in resolution 2832 (XXVI)** of 16 December 1971, and **urge its** early implementation.

We regret that the convening of the conference on the Indian Ocean **has been** inordinately delayed **because of the obstructionist** attitude adopted **by certain** States. In the view of my delegation, **necessary steps should be taken to ensure that the conference is held** at the earliest **possible** date.

In that **connection**, we call for full and active participation in the conference **by** all **parties** concerned, **particularly** the permanent **members** of the **Security Council** and the **major maritime users**, as well as co-operation **by those States with the** littoral and hinterland States, which **is** essential for the **success** of the conference.

(Mr. Nengrahary, Afghanistan)

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will **spare no effort** to achieve that goal.

Mr. FAHMY (Egypt): It has been overwhelmingly acknowledged that there **exists a pressing** need for **concrete** action by the world **community** to prevent the further **exacerbation** of the **arms** race and in particular to prevent an **arms** race in outer **space**, a **danger which** has become predominant in recent **years**. An **arms** race in outer space would deal a devastating blow to international efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control and would introduce **new** divisive elements, **greatly** complicating already difficult **efforts** to control the **arms race**.

The members of the Non-Aligned Movement have over the **years** been in the forefront of those calling for outer space to be preserved solely for peaceful **purposes**, firmly believing that outer space **is** the common heritage **of** mankind. Their position **has** been presented on **numerous** occasions and in great detail in many different forums, among the **most** recent the non-aligned **summit** Conference at **Harare**, which called upon the Conference on Disarmament to begin **negotiating** an agreement or agreements, **as** appropriate, to prevent an **arms** race in **outer** space.

In spite of the exhortations and efforts of the Non-Aligned Movement and many other like-minded States, the dangers of an **arms** race in outer **space** undoubtedly remain with **us**, and there are even **indications** that they may have increased and become more acute. At the same time, one cannot ignore that a few **positive trends** **seem** to be developing in the relations between the two most powerful nuclear-weapon States, which are at the **same** time the States most advanced in **space** technologies, **particularly those relating to military applications**.

(Mr. Faïmy, Egypt)

Of **positive significance as well as** that the resolution adopted **by the General Assembly** on the **issue** of the prevention of **an arms race in outer space** has been **receiving** greater **support** over the **years**. We hope that both **those trends** will enhance the ability of this Committee to achieve **progress** in this field. **We** are duty-bound to **seize** the opportunities before **us** to abate whatever potential **there is for an arms race in outer space**.

On behalf of the 22 sponsors of draft **resolution A/C.1/42/L.43**, I **should like to introduce** that draft resolution to **the Committee**. It **is** based to a great **extent** **On resolution 41/53** of **December** last year. Variations on that **resolution** are limited and restricted to **areas** where we **believe** there is general agreement, or where **this** can **evolve**. I shall limit **my comments** today to those variations.

The **reference** in draft resolution L.43 to the inadequacy of the legal **régime applicable** to outer space **and the need to consolidate that régime** comes from the **consensus** conclusions in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the prevention of **an arms race in outer space**, established **by the** Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. **The** appeal made to States to affirm that they have not **based weapons in space** on a permanent **basis is seen** as a confidence-building **measure** and has **been** suggested in a **similar** manner in **connection** with negotiations on other **types** of weapons, **particularly** chemical weapons.

(Mr. Fahmy, Egypt)

The call directed to the **Conference on Disarmament to endeavour** to identify **concrete measures aimed at the effective** prevention of an **arms race in outer space** attempts to give **direction to the Ad Hoc** Committee's work. This emanates from paragraph **80** of the Final Document of the **first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and from a statement** made by the President Of the Conference on Disarmament when the **ad hoc working group was established; so** this, again, should not be **controversial**. The paragraph referring to the **study by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), which has now been completed,** simply takes into **account the present status** of the **study and therefore** simply reflects progress **concerning the** related paragraph **of last year's** resolution. Lastly, all **States** are called **upon to convey their views to the Secretary-General on the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space**. **Again,** that addition should not **prove controversial** and should provide food for thought **as** we approach the **third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament**.

Of course, the draft **resolution is consistent with the position of the Non-Aligned Movement and other like-minded States** which have traditionally sponsored a draft resolution **on this issue**. It is, however, important to **recognize that the sponsors** of the draft **resolution** would have preferred a **much stronger and more ambitious** text, one which **clearly** reflected **their positions** and aspirations. The **sponsors,** however, felt that for the sake of **strengthening and encouraging an even greater degree of support for this item, they would present a compromise** draft resolution. It is their **belief that the draft resolution as presented** reflects the concerns of a large number of **delegations** from different groups. It is in that spirit that we had hoped for a **single** draft resolution on which to build consensus. **Although** there are **other draft resolutions** before the Committee, the **sponsors** are ready to consider all **constructive comments and suggestions**.

(Mr. Fahmy, Egypt)

We should **like** to reaffirm that the draft resolution, as **presented**, al **eady** **reflects** a great deal of flexibility on the part of the sponsors and should be viewed as a compromise text, over **80** per cent of which **has been** endorsed by this Committee before, an achievement which we **believe must** be safeguarded **and** further developed.

I am confident that thid draft resolution will be **accorded** appropriate consideration by all delegations. This initiative, with which my delegation has been associated for a number of **years** al **ng** with the delegation of Sri Lanka, has been **prisent**ed with a view to achieving a consensus resolution which would enhance international efforts aimed at keeping outer space free from an arms race. We call upon all delegations to consider the **proposal** with **that** in mind **and** from that perspective. We are hopeful that with sincere endeavours by us **all, we can** continue to achieve **progress** this year.

Mr. JÄGER (Denmark): I wish, on **behalf** of the 12 member States of the European Community, to address agenda item 61, **concerning** chemical and **bacteriological** (biological) weapons.

The Twelve are committed to the goal of reaching an early conclusion of an effective **convention** to outlaw chemical **weapons** for all time. We see the total elimination of these particularly repugnant weapons as one of the top priorities in the field of disarmament.

The multilateral neqotiatione **on a** chemical-weapons convention, which is one **of** the most urgent **questions** on the **agenda** of the Conference **or** Disarmament, have seen significant progress since the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee was agreed upon in 1984. Intensive negotiations have taken place during this **year's** session **of** the Conference on **D.sarmament**, and the rolling text of **a** draft convention **has been** further elaborated.

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

The Twelve welcome the **progress** made in the **Conference** on Disarmament this year with regard to the vital **element** of incorporating a **stringent verification régime** in a convention. Solutions to sensitive political and complicated technical **issues** are still outstanding.

Members of the Twelve have contributed substantially to **the negotiations** on a multilateral **convention**. **We hope that further** constructive steps will **make it possible** to **move closer to** early **agreement on a comprehensive**, world-wide and effectively verifiable treaty embracing **the** total destruction of existing stockpiles of chemical **weapons** within an agreed time-frame.

The Twelve welcome the various ongoing **discussions**, including the **talks** between **the** United **States** and the Soviet Union on **issues** related to the prohibition of chemical weapons, including the question of verification. **These discussions** have made a positive **contribution** to the negotiating process in **the** Conference on Disarmament.

The urgent need for an effective global **ban** on chemical **weapons** **has been** clearly demonstrated by reports of **the renewed** use of chemical weapons in **the** conflict between Iran and **Iraq**. The Twelve are **deeply** concerned at the unanimous **conclusions** reached **by the experts sent to the region by the** Secretary-General, to which reference **was** made in the statement **issued by the** President of the Security Council **on 14 May 1987**.

These **make it clear that the provisions** of the 1925 Geneva Protocol have **been repeatedly** violated **despite pressing appeals** from **the security** Council and **the** Secretary-General. The Twelve, as stated **by** their Foreign **Ministers** in their declaration of 25 May, strongly condemn these flagrant **breaches**. The Twelve **maintain that** it is **the** responsibility of **the** world community **as a whole** to **ensure that the** Protocol is respected, and they urgently appeal for an immediate end to the **use** of chemical **weapons** in the conflict involving **those** two countries.

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

While actively pursuing the objective of a global and effective convention, and in an effort to reduce chemical-weapons production and prevent further proliferation of chemical weapons in so far as possible, member States of the European Community have, together with other countries, imposed export controls on certain compounds that could be misused for the production of chemical weapons. National chemical industries have also been alerted to the possibility of inadvertent assistance in the manufacture of chemical weapons.

The Twelve welcome the outcome of the Biological-Weapons Convention Review Conference Experts' meeting held earlier this year at Geneva. It worked out a series of realistic confidence-building measures to help strengthen the Convention. They are practical and useful measures which deserve the fullest support.

Several draft resolution texts have been submitted concerning the agenda item I am addressing. It is the hope of the Twelve that it will prove possible to obtain consensus on this very important subject.

I wish also to make some comments on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community on agenda item 62 (i), entitled "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament".

The Twelve have continuously supported endeavours aimed at strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter. We welcomed the inclusion of this question in the agenda of the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session, at the initiative of a group of African countries led by Cameroon. We support the draft resolution by Cameroon, which has been sponsored also by some members of the Twelve.

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

The 12 member States of the European Community have submitted their detailed views on this important subject in a document of the Conference on Disarmament (A/CN.10/69/Add.1). In our view, serious efforts should have continued, with the aim of organizing work within the United Nations in the field of disarmament in a more efficient way.

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

The General Assembly and, in particular, the First Committee are central forums for the consideration of disarmament problems. In the First Committee all Members of the United Nations can participate in deliberations on disarmament issues and the contributions of a great number of States with differing geographical, economic and security backgrounds give the work of the Committee a truly global character. It is, however, important that we look for solutions that will create a work situation for the First Committee in which it can optimally perform its duty in helping the international community to achieve progress in the field of disarmament.

As was pointed out in the statement made on 13 October in the general debate by Denmark on behalf of the Twelve, the repetition of resolutions over the years has led to a proliferation of resolutions, which has increased the workload of this Committee to a point approaching its limit, where serious and careful consideration of the many proposals may no longer be possible. The continuation of this situation would undermine the credibility of the Committee, we should all make serious efforts to expand the areas of meaningful consensus, as this would increase the influence of the Committee. The Twelve will continue to make active contributions to this end.

This subject was considered by the Disarmament Commission at its 1987 session, and constructive proposals for a more effective organization of the work of the Committee were discussed, but no agreement was reached. In this connection, we should like to refer to the constructive proposals made by a member of the Twelve at that session, which are contained in a Disarmament Commission working paper A/CN.10/99. We call attention also to the work of the Group of 19 on the efficiency of the Organization and their recommendations in document A/41/49, in which it is suggested, inter alia, that the agenda of the General Assembly be rationalized by grouping or merging related items to the extent possible and by

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

setting an interval of two or **more years** for the **discussion** of **certain items**. We **also welcome** the **efforts** undertaken by former and present Chairmen and **other officers** of the **First Committee** and other **distinguished persons**.

The Twelve have noted with interest the recommendations concerning the work of the **First Committee** contained in the draft **resolution submitted** by **Cameroon**, which **deserve** our **full consideration**.

The **Twelve consider** that the **Disarmament Commission** makes a **useful contribution to** deliberations on disarmament problems, which allow for in-depth **examination of specific issues** that cannot be undertaken elsewhere. **Members of the Twelve** will continue to **participate** actively in the work of the **Disarmament Commission**.

The member States of the European Community have always attached great importance to the work of the Conference on Disarmament **as** the permanent **multilateral** negotiating body. **We consider** that the earliest **possible conclusion** of a **comprehensive, effectively** verifiable ban on chemical weapons remains one of the most urgent priorities in the Conference on Disarmament. The **successful conclusion** of such a convention would make **a** direct and lasting contribution to **international** security and greatly enhance the authority of the Conference. **We** hope **also** to **see** the agreed enlargement of the Conference on Disarmament **implemented** at an early date.

In the light of the **financial problems** of the United **Nations**, it is more **essential** than ever that in all **areas** of United Nations activity on disarmament issues we **strive** for the best possible use of **resources**, and avoid unnecessary duplication of work. The **Twelve** see the Department for Disarmament Affairs **as** having a primary co-ordinating role in **this respect** and appreciate very much the value of the work done by the Department. Studies conducted under United **Nations auspices** should be related to **specific** practical **objectives** and be the **subject** of

(Mr. Jaeger, Denmark)

proper **consultations**. The Secretary-General's Advisory **Board has an important** role in co-ordinating **studies** in order to avoid overlap **with other** studies. We **support** the draft resolution **submitted by some members** of the Twelve on the **subject** of United **Nations** disarmament **studies**.

In conclusion, the Twelve believe **that the** third **special** session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should consider **the role of the United Nations** in **the** field of **disarmament**. Improvements in **the** handling of disarmament **issues** by the United **Nations** would enhance the **possibilities** of making **constructive** and stimulating **contributions** to new developments in **the field** of **disarmament**.

Mr. von STUELPNAGEL (Federal Republic of **Germany**): My delegation would like today to **discuss some aspects** of the forthcoming **third special session** of the General Assembly devoted to **disarmament**. My delegation **does this against the backdrop** of the manifold expectations **regarding** the **objectives** and priorities of multilateral disarmament **in the** foreseeable **future** that were **expressed** in the **general** debate. We act **with the firm intention** of promoting a **very** tightly scheduled preparatory process.

Any **observer who carefully** followed the contribution made to the general debate could **not but welcome** the improvement in the **climate** in which the **disarmament** dialogue **is** generally **conducted** and the move towards a preparedness to broaden the **basis** of **consensus on many** priority **items** and rendering controversial **positions** **more objective**. We expect that **positive** trend to be **further** strengthened by the genuinely **historic** progress towards real disarmament that we **are** witnessing in Geneva. A treaty **providing** for the elimination of **an entire class** of **nuclear missiles** - I am speaking of what is known **as** the INF agreement between the United **States** and the Soviet Union - is imminent. Moreover, negotiations aiming **at a** **50 per cent** reduction in the strategic **nuclear arsenals** of the two **super-Powers**

(Mr. van Stuelpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

have gained momentum. I add to this favourable picture the prospect of the conclusion of an early agreement at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on a global ban on chemical weapons.

Yet the Pact remains that the world is ever-armed, and more armament will not promote or consolidate stability. All concerned are therefore under the obligation to exploit every chance to take arms-control and disarmament measures that will reduce conflict, maintain security and promote stability. Such action hinges upon the following premise, as stated in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament:

"The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage. At each stage the objective should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces." (resolution S-10/2, para. 29)

The translation into reality of this legitimate call must be accompanied by a process which, in the final analysis, might be termed the elementary chemistry of universal efforts for disarmament - that is, the process of mutual confidence-building. It is a process growing out of measures taken in common accord which must prove their worth over a sufficient period of time and therefore cannot be based exclusively on declaratory statements. Ensuring peace with ever fewer arms is a task whose implementation and results must be carefully safeguarded. Building confidence through openness and transparency in the widest sense of these terms is an indispensable integral part of this process.

(Mr. von Büchel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

A review and **critical assessment** of the results **achieved so far** justify the **statement that it has not been possible** to translate **the principles and Programme of Action of the Final Document of the first special session** of the General Assembly on **disarmament** to a satisfactory **extent** into confidence-building, **objective** information and confidence-creating **transparency**. **The consensus that, in 1978, generated the Final Document can and must be put to work.**

(Mr. von Stuelpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

There **is no doubt** that the Final Document of the first **special session** of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament **continues to** represent the most substantial and **comprehensive consensus document** of the international **community in** the field of **arms control and** disarmament. But **it cannot be** overlooked that in the **course** of the decade **since** its adoption, **it has** not led to satisfactory **results**. **Central issues - such as the appropriate approach to the** world-wide prevention of 011 wars, the reduction of **tension and conflicts in many** parts of the world and the excessive build-up of **armaments**, which is still **continuing on a** global scale - have remained **controversial** and do not hold **out concrete prospects** for early and easy solution. Lack of **consensus on** the implementation **of** the Final Document, individual and selective **interpretation** of its principles and **work** programme, and **increasing** neglect of a sound relationship **between security requirements and arms control and disarmament expectations have** finally **hamstrung the United Nations and other multilateral forums in** their efforts **to contribute more** effectively to the process **of disarmament** and the maintenance **of** international peace and **security and** of comprehensive stability at ever-lower levels of **armament**.

The **Final Document of** the first special session **of** the General **Assembly** devoted to disarmament **came about** at a complicated and tense phase of international relations. Confidence-building at that time **was a none-too-substantive notion** far removed from today's concept, which has **been substantiated by concrete ideas and** defined by target-oriented **agreements**. **Looking back, it is gratifying to note that** it was under **those circumstances that the** comprehensive **consensus** document was adopted. Its failure **to materialize in its essential parts is due** less to a **lack of Political will among** the central actors **on the political stage** than to highly complicated constellations of predominantly **mutual misgivings on a regional and global scale**.

(Mr. von Stuelpnagel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

Confidence-building is the pace-maker and catalyst of concrete developments. Neither one will suffice in itself to generate progress relevant to security or create lasting stability. Those objectives can be reached only by joint action. Never before in the post-war era has the conviction been so firm that security cannot be enhanced by more **and** more arms and that balanced disarmament is feasible, and desirable, without diminishing security. Awareness of the complicated security relationships has grown. The perception of priorities, prerequisites and interrelationships in the realization of the principles and programme items of the Final Document has been enhanced. The prospects for broadening and further substantiating the basic consensus on the principle questions of security and disarmament represented in and by the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and subsequent documents are, however, incomparably more **favourable** than those at the time of their adoption by consensus almost 10 years ago. It **was** with that in mind that we submitted draft resolution **A/C.1/42/L.39**.

The disarmament dialogue today is forging ahead on a broad front, with clear aims and a desire for results. Multilateral disarmament must avail itself of that trend. The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament must make a contribution to reinforcing the commitment to disarmament and to making it **irreversible** by all parties in a manner relevant to security. The question of how that can be achieved, of course, remains open.

It would make no sense to **look** back and decry the failure to implement the principles and mandates of the Final Document of the first special session of the General **Assembly** devoted to **disarmament**. At the most that would have heuristic value; **there** would be hardly any historical value in such an endeavour. Security relations, on the one hand, and the arms race, **on** the other, are intrinsically of a dynamic nature. Their **mechanisms** and **manifestations** mutate and change. The same

(Mr. von Stuelpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

holds true of the stage on which they are played out. What is needed, **therefore**, is a forward-looking review and **implementation** of the Final Document **duly taking into consideration** the new developments **that have taken place** in the field of disarmament and related **areas since** 1978.

A narrow, **static** approach will not **serve** the purpose for our common deliberations) we need a dynamic, broad and comprehensive approach to security, **taking due account** of the legitimacy of individual and collective **self-defence** and of the requirement that military potentials **must not exceed defensive needs**. **Such an** approach to the implementation of the Final Document and **its** adequate adaptation to **new trends** and findings will **surely not be** easier, but **it** will be **more realistic** and promising.

Given the dynamic character of the subject-matter, **it would be a mistake to** tackle our task by narrow-mindedly relying **exclusively** on the tools provided by the 129 **paragraphs** of the Final Document of the first special **session** of the General **Assembly** devoted to disarmament, **as** agreed upon in common accord. **It** should be permissible to **use other notions** and other approaches in a **complementary manner whenever** and wherever **their use** would **be** conducive to **settlement** of our **problems**.

I would recall that, **since the** International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held **last summer**, the notion of **security in the broadest sense** of the term has **found its** way into a new **consensus document**. A legitimate **means** for improving the chances of implementing the action programme would **be to** pay specific **attention to those areas where initial substantive results** have been reached and **where** further **progress can be expected**. Binding, balanced and verifiable agreements and conventions create the **confidence** that is needed for accelerating and intensifying the disarmament **process**, while growing confidence

(Mr. von Stuelpnagel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

will open new avenues. A more flexible and tolerant approach to the Final Document Of the **first** special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in a **spirit** of comprehensive international co-operation, in particular on a regional **basis** and extending to all **questions** of peace, security and disarmament, is **indispensable**.

It gives **us** **satisfaction** that the report of the Preparatory **Committee** for the third **special session** of the **General Assembly** devoted to disarmament conforms to that perception in the **provisional** agenda it proposes.

Confidence-building geared to **arms** control and disarmament, as **well as** to tangible steps towards **strengthening** security and safeguarding peace, is a world-wide **task** transcending the framework of **East-West** relations. The third special session **will** help define the current disarmament situation **and** provide an opportunity to discuss our future **course**, provided that we **seriously use** the session **as** a forum for reaching agreement on further steps. The third special **session** of the General Assembly devoted to **disarmament** should be guided **by** the indispensable interrelationship between confidence-building **and** the implementation of legitimate security-building and **stability-promoting steps**, and **should** undertake to define **its** action programme in the light of recent developments and perceptions.

As members are aware, we carried **out** methodical preparatory **work** in formulating the Disarmament **Commission's** catalogue of guidelines. We are making an effort to **finalize** those guidelines **for** the third special **session** on disarmament, **in both the substantive** and the procedural aspects. **We** are hopeful that **confidence-building**, will be given **its** due place both in conceptual and practical terms in the agenda of the third special session on disarmament, and that the

(ML. von Stuelpnagel, Federal
Republic of Germany)

unanimous adoption of operative principle 8 on a universal scale will become reality as the point of departure and the motivating force for new co-operative disarmament thinking. That is why we submitted draft resolution A/C.1/42/L.48, in the hope that it could achieve consensus.

Mr. LAWSON-BETUM (Togo) (interpretation from French) : Mr. **Chairman**, the delegation of Togo **has** already had the pleasure of **congratulating** you and the **other** officers of the Committee **on your election** to **guide** the work of the **First** Committee. In speaking once again this **delegation expresses its satisfaction** at the **oalm spirit** of constructive **dialogue characteristic** of our deliberations under your clear and far-sighted **guidanoo**.

History **teaches us that exercise** of the legitimate right of **States** to **eaurity** **has sometimes** resulted in **excesses** that have **ondangered** the future **of peoples** and global balance. Militarism **has** often **ueod** that right to exploit and **exacerbate** national feeling.

Thus, after racial **prejudice** and **expansionism** led to the **most** bloody war of our time, national **cheviniom** and fanaticism **are still** to be found at the heart of certain belligerent **acts** and local conflicts. In addition, a **search** for national prestige has **sometimes** **yioldod** to the will to dominate and **justified** armament. Moreover, having experienced **the adveruo conoeauences** of **oonfliote** and of the **frenzied** arms race, the **poopl00 of the world** are by no **means parties** to various concepts of security **that are supposed to protect them**.

For a long **time now**, **everything has proceeded as though** national and international **oaurity** were the **oxcluniva** domain of **rulers and** certain **specialists**. That is the **possibility** **opened up by the decision** taken by the **General Aesembly** at its **twelfth special session** to **launch** the world **Disarmament** **Csmpoign**, a campaign **designed** to inform, educate and **spread understanding** and public **support** for the **United Nations objectives** in the **epheree** of **acme control** and of **diarmament**.

It is **obvious** that the **success** of thin campaign will be measured according to the **ability of** public opinion **positively** to **influence** the classical and modern concepts of **secur i ty**, which **are** at the **root of** military rivalry. For **public**

(Mr. Lawson-Batum, Togo)

opinion to acquire such a **capability**, information and **education efforts must effectively reach the greatest possible** number of vital national **elements**, in particular the young people who are the wave of the future.

Since the launching of **that** campaign **the work on** information, **publicity** and **education** undertaken by the United Nations has **proved** very encouraging if we take into account the **variety and** growth in the **distribution** of publications on disarmament, the **dynamic quality** of the information **machinery** of **the Organization**, the **pursuit** of scholarship **programmes** on **disarmament**, and the enthusiastic reception public opinion has given the **campaign**.

To **assure greater dissemination** of information on disarmament, in particular in the developing countries, the translation into local language of certain publications **should be encouraged**, and there should be more radio and **television programmes** and films, for the combination of **word** and image **can have an enormous impact** on perception and comprehension of the **realities** of the world. **Thus** peoples in the **most remote corners** of the globe **would** be able better to **understand** the **dangers** of the **arms race** and the **causes** and manifestation of conflicts and would **become** aware **of** the **importance** of disarmament.

The active **support** of the United Nations for numerous **seminars and regional conferences organized** on **disarmament** are another **positive** element in carrying out this campaign. **That support should be continued** because such meetings bring together **numerous representatives** of **groups targeted by the campaign and cover a wide** variety of topics dealing with disarmament, which **in turn gives rise to constructive debates on its global aspects, its multidimensionality and its regional implications**. In the light of **their importance**, it would be extremely useful to **organize** at least two **such meetings** a year.

(Mr. Lawson-Botum, Togo)

The success of the campaign also depends on the effectiveness with which the five target groups can mobilise and sensitize public opinion to obtain its support for disarmament efforts. The launching of the campaign has contributed to stepping up the activities of non-governmental organizations in the sphere of disarmament and therefore it is essential that they be further involved in meetings organised on this topic; they could then share their experiences in the field.

Among the target groups, we believe elected representatives and the mass media should play extremely important roles. Because they are parties to the process of political decision-making, the elected representatives are in a position to communicate and assess, on the highest political level, the views and concerns expressed by their constituents and the various bodies specialized in the disarmament field. The receptivity of elected representatives to public opinion would then be reflected in the organisation of large-scale national debates likely to influence the definition of defence programmes. As for the mass media, because of their great ability to mobilize and sensitize public opinion and education, they should be able to act as follows: first, to ensure the greatest possible coverage of national, regional or international meetings on disarmament; secondly, to establish periodic programmes of analysis and explanation of the various aspects of disarmament; and thirdly and finally, to ensure the broadest possible publicity for efforts of the United Nations and other organizations to promote disarmament as well as for both obstacles encountered and positive results achieved in negotiations on arms limitation and disarmament.

(Mr. Lawson-Betum, Togo)

For to be successful, the efforts of our Organization to promote disarmament must benefit from the continuous support of Member States and regional organizations. Togo's commitment to the ideals of peace, security and disarmament is well known and was demonstrated again this year in its activities in celebration of the International Year of Peace. In this regard, we should note, inter alia, the organization of the second national seminar on peace, disarmament and the security of states, held from 12 to 14 March 1987. That seminar ended with the adoption of the Lomé appeal for peace, disarmament and the security of States, in which the seminar observed that all initiatives for peace and international security should be encouraged and supported, in particular the actions of the United Nations and the efforts continually being exerted by regional, governmental and non-organizational organizations for the attainment of peace. In addition, the seminar expressed the hope that the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament would achieve concrete results that would allow us to make progress on the difficult but necessary path of general and complete disarmament.

Pursuant to resolution 44/63 J of 12 December 1984 and 40/151 G of 16 December 1985, as well as the clearly expressed wish of the African States, the establishment of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa represents both recognition of the mission of peace of Africa and an important contribution to the disarmament efforts of the United Nations.

The keen interest of African leaders in the functioning of the Centre emerges clearly from paragraph 8 of the Lomé programme of action adopted by the twenty-third summit conference of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). That paragraph stresses the crucial importance of the Centre, which must serve as a central clearing house to promote the co-ordination and harmonization of

(Mr. Lawson-Notum, Togo)

activities of research, study, documentation and information in the interdependent areas of peace, security, disarmament and development, in co-operation with the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Moreover, operative paragraph 7 of resolution **AHJ/Res.164** (XXIII) of the **OUU** speaks of the commitment of the **African** Heads of state and Government to the ideals of peace and disarmament. It urges Member States to attach particular attention to the question of disarmament and to popularize it through study and educational programmes in the context of the World Disarmament Campaign.

The activities carried out by the Centre during its first effective year of functioning clearly indicate that it is extremely dynamic as a result of the material and financial support it receives from the Member States and the United Nations system.

Here it seems appropriate to note the valuable assistance given by the Centre and the United Nations to the ad hoc group of governmental experts entrusted with the task of applying a recommendation of the OAU's Ad Hoc Committee of Fourteen, a document reflecting the views and positions of African states on the relationship between disarmament and development. Having been endorsed by the Conference of Heads of State and Government, that document was submitted as Africa's contribution to the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

(Mr. Lawson-Betum, Togo)

There are two important initiatives that are significant also of the active role the Centre intends to play in fulfilling its mandate. First, the Centre and the United Nations Secretariat are co-operating in organising a seminar of scientists, researchers and African representatives on the role of Africa in the application of nuclear science to peace and development. Secondly, preparations are under way to set up a programme of activities with a view to establishing and strengthening confidence, security and development within the framework of the Economic Community of the Central African states.

Of the 150 conflicts that have ravaged the developing world during the past 42 years, more than 30 have taken place in Africa, causing more than 4 million deaths. Aside from border disputes, the results of colonialism and the balkanisation of the continent, greed and external interference, as well as the distrust created by the transfer of the East-West ideological confrontations, have been at the source of most of these conflicts. In addition, the maintenance of the odious system of apartheid, the persistence of the illegal occupation of Namibia, and the acquisition of nuclear capability by South Africa are all serious threats to the stability of Africa. To strengthen the unity of the continent and to promote its economic independence, the African leaders attach great importance to maintaining the balance of Africa and therefore to the elimination of the causes of the conflicts that ravage the region. The promotion of good-neighbourly relations and of economic integration, attempts to settle certain crises by African means, as well as the struggle against apartheid, are all initiatives that demonstrate the will of the African Heads of State to see the continent free from confrontation of any kind.

As regards its mandate, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa can therefore serve as an ideal framework for an

(MC. Lawson-Batum, Togo)

intenuification of research on the origins and underlying causes of the disputes and conflicts, and also for identifying the security requirements and the means of preventing and settling crises.

In order for the Centre to be in a position to carry out its mandate to the full, it must therefore be given the material and financial means necessary for its functioning. In this regard, the delegation of Togo welcomes the outstanding efforts made by the Secretary-General to make the Centre operational, as well as the generous assistance which certain Member States and private organizations have given the Centre. It is highly desirable that this body should also benefit from the contributions of other donors. For its part, the Government of Togo has resolved to continue, to the best of its ability, to make its contribution to the Centre. In addition, it would be useful to continue to try to determine the contribution which could be made to the Centre by other bodies, agencies and programmes of the United Nations system.

The persistence of regional conflicts and the risks of the internationalization of one of them reminds us that the virus of war is not about to disappear. It is therefore essential for us to redouble our efforts to ensure the victory of the ideals of peace, security, disarmament and development. To that end my delegation suggests that the work of sensitizing public opinion to the cause of disarmament should also be directed towards those who are seeking to buy armaments and those who sell them.

Despite these obstacles on the road to peace and disarmament, it is important for us to remember always that wars are conceived in the minds of men and that it is in the minds of men that we must build the defences of peace.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call on the Secretary of the Committee for some announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary) : I should like to inform members of the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/42/L.2 - Belgium and Portugal; L.5 - Australia; L.26 - Viet Nam and the German Democratic Republic; L.28 - Viet Nam; L.59 - Australia; and L.74 - Australia.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. NAZAKKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply in connection with the statements made by the representatives of the United States and France at yesterday's meeting of the First Committee regarding my statement yesterday.

Frankly speaking, I was surprised that my statement gave rise to such a stormy reaction on the part of two colleagues on the Conference on Disarmament, since my intentions were in no way to start a polemic. On the contrary, the main stress in my statement was on the favourable prospects for a successful conclusion of the negotiations concerning the ban on chemical weapons.

The statement of United States Ambassador Max Friedersdorf involved, inter alia, a dispute regarding the authorship of a number of initiatives in the field of banning chemical weapons. I must state that the question of authorship sometime is extremely complex. I have, at least a few times, been a witness to situations in which it seemed to us that we were accepting United States proposals. And in answer we heard the words, "Your views are very interesting, and we shall study them". An author would hardly need time in order to study the proposals which he himself has already put forward.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

I unconditionally and fully agree with Ambassador Friedersdorf's view that the most important thing is to bring positions closer together and to move forward towards conclusion of a convention on the total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, rather than to establish who first said what.

This is also completely true of obligatory challenge inspections. The statement of the United States representative on this matter could thus be understood as meaning that the question of such inspections should be resolved radically, that is, with respect to all facilities and sites regardless of whom they belong to, and that the United States is no longer insisting on article XI of its draft Convention (CD/500). That article, as is well known, deals with the possibility of refusal of challenge inspection. If that is so, if our understanding is correct, then we accept that statement and take note of it with satisfaction.

We are also gratified at the fact that, judging by the reactions of the representative of the United States, the details put forward by us at Washington in September of this year on the bilateral exchange of data do not give rise to any objections on the United States side. That can only be welcomed.

In connection with what was said concerning the visit to Shikhsny, of course it is true that the visit to Toole was organized earlier than the one to Shikhsny. Nobody is disputing that. However, the Soviet aide was in fact really the first to give a comprehensive demonstration of its entire range of typical chemical munitions, and that is what I was affirming in my statement yesterday. The models demonstrated at Shikhsny give an exhaustive picture of the Soviet chemical-warfare arsenal. At Toole in 1983, as far as we know, only a few models were shown for the purpose of demonstrating their destruction.

(Mr. Nazarkin, USSR)

If our specialists who visit **Tooele** this year will get a chance to become equally well acquainted with the chemical-warfare arsenal of the United States, that will be quite satisfactory. We hope that the arms race will **be** replaced by competition in the area of strengthening confidence-building measures. Tooele and Shikhany are examples of precisely that kind of competition, which can **accelerate** negotiations on a convention to ban **chemical** weapons.

On the other hand, the beginning of the production of binary weapons is of profound and serious concern to us. The situation that has emerged is rather strange. For 18 years the United States abided by the moratorium on producing chemical **weapons**, but now, when the conclusion of a convention on their prohibition and destruction has become a realistic and accessible goal, they break the moratorium and begin producing a new generation of chemical weapons. Furthermore, this is taking place after the Soviet Union has ceased the production of chemical weapons. This timing inevitably gives rise to the doubts I mentioned yesterday, and they can be dispelled only by the speedy conclusion of a convention which will ban all forms of chemical weapons, including binary weapons.

The same is true of yesterday's statement by the representative of France, Mr. Morel. We believe that security should be ensured not through the creation of new types of weapons, which in this case are chemical weapons, but rather through a ban on chemical weapons, including the destruction of existing stockpiles - on the basis of the principle of undiminished security, of course - and the dismantling of the production base for the manufacture of chemical weapons.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.