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The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS (continued)

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): At this, I presume, final meeting of the Commission in 1985, I want to make a very brief statement by way of concluding remarks from the Australian delegation. It is not necessary for me to repeat my delegation's position on each of the agenda items. We participated in the work of the Commission and we made the Australian point of view known on each of the agenda items during the course of that work.

What I should like to do this morning instead is to place on the record and to share with other delegations some thoughts about what happened in the Commission during the past month.
On 8 May, at the beginning of our month's work, I made a general statement on behalf of the Australian delegation in which I referred to the three functions performed by the United Nations disarmament machinery. I describe them as the functions of declaration, deliberation and negotiation. I pointed out that the task and duty assigned to this Commission was to fulfil the function of deliberation.

One of the issues on which we were asked to deliberate during this past month was, in fact, the question of the effectiveness of the United Nations disarmament machinery. This question was brought to our attention by the delegation of Cameroon. I want to record our very deep appreciation of Cameroon's action in bringing that agenda item before us. It is clear that one of the reasons for bringing that item forward was the concern that the United Nations disarmament machinery is not performing or working efficiently. In participating in debate on the item we made it clear that we share that view, that this tripartite machinery is not working effectively or efficiently enough.

To put it quite bluntly, if anyone had any doubt about that contention, it should have been discussed this month, because in the view of my delegation the deliberative machinery that we were supposed to have operated effectively this month was not operated effectively. Too little time was given to substantive work; too much time was spent in argument about form and procedure. And this was nowhere better illustrated than in our action on the Cameroon item, the question of the efficiency of this machinery, because we spent some two weeks considering how we might approach the item. Thus, when we came to look at the item itself we had virtually no time. Therefore I say again that, if anyone had any doubt about how efficiently this machinery had been operated, that doubt should have been dismissed this month, because it is, sadly, the case - and my delegation deeply regrets this - that this vital deliberative part of our machinery was not operated effectively.

When we considered how to work on the item that was put before us by Cameroon a number of delegations questioned the need for our examining the machinery and said that, instead, what we should look to was the question of political will. At the point when we debated that question, I made clear my delegation's view that the distinction between "machinery" and "political will" in the context in which we were considering the item was a very dubious one. We pointed out that, rather than there being a distinction, the two concepts of "will" and "machinery" had a clear and organic relationship to each other.
However, I want to express my delegation's concern that the concept of political will as expressed in the debate about how we should have worked on the Cameroon item served only to obstruct our work. Instead of leading us towards agreement or compromise at an early stage, which would have enabled us then to begin substantive work, this rather grandiose-sounding concept of political will took us away from compromise and delayed our substantive work.

In my statement on 8 May I referred to the concept of mutual adaptation, and I want to repeat that now. In our deliberative machinery, where we do not vote, there is no adversary mechanism; the fundamental operative concept should be to adapt to each other's views, to find common solutions, to seek compromise. If there is any place for political will, if there is any direction to which political will, so called, should be aimed in this machinery, it is that direction: it is towards mutual adaptation, towards compromise, towards finding solutions which, while they may not be absolutely desirable in terms of national policy for us as individuals, will enable this deliberative machinery to reach common conclusions and, by that means, to make its proper contribution to the overall disarmament machinery of the United Nations - which we all, I assume, have an interest in ensuring works as efficiently as possible.

My delegation looks forward to next year's session of this Commission. We hope that we can get down to substantive work much more quickly than we did this year. We look forward to going further with the agenda item on the review of the United Nations disarmament machinery. We hope that our work in this deliberative body next year will be characterized by a far higher degree of mutual adaptation, of direction of political will towards compromise, than has been the case this year.

I want to conclude by making it clear to you, Mr. Chairman - and I would like to think that this is barely necessary - that I have offered these thoughts and these somewhat critical remarks constructively and looking to the future. And, of course, no criticism of your role and the role of the Chairmen of our Working Groups is implied. We are indeed extremely grateful to you, Sir, for the way in which you conducted our work; we thank you for that, and we thank also the Chairmen of the subsidiary bodies of the Commission this year.

Mr. Engo (Cameroon): Let me begin these closing remarks, Mr. Chairman, by reiterating the Cameroon delegation's deepest respect and appreciation for the very effective and efficient manner in which you led the deliberations of this Commission. We are convinced that whatever small measure of progress was realized
(Mr. Engo, Cameroon)

at this difficult session of the Commission was thanks largely to the commendable
guidance that you provided. We are proud that the great moment is now upon us when
the entire international community can sample something of the productive
leadership of the Orient and, indeed, of the so-called third world on global
questions hitherto categorized as falling within the exclusive jurisdiction of the
powerful giants of the age.

As this Session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission draws to an end
and we look back to our labours over the past weeks, it is with deep feelings of
remorse that we must observe once again that the Commission is about to submit to
the General Assembly yet another unsubstantive report on the results of its
deliberations. This is particularly disappointing this year, the fortieth
anniversary of the creation of the United Nations, which we had hoped would be used
constructively to rekindle and rededicate in concrete ways the international
community's commitment to the original purpose of this Organization, namely, the
maintenance of international peace and security.

The largely unproductive conclusion of this session of the Commission, in
terms of its failure to respond to the requests addressed to it by the General
Assembly, has done little to enhance the credibility and the viability of the
Commission or, indeed, of the Organization as a whole. Rather, it has contributed
to growing public frustration and disappointment at the failure of existing
multilateral institutions adequately to address the increasingly complex challenges
which form the basis of their very raison d'être.
I should like to make a few brief comments on the results of the Commission's efforts on certain specific items on its agenda this year.

First, we are deeply disappointed by the Commission's failure yet again to achieve substantive agreement on agenda item 6 regarding South Africa's nuclear capability. It now seems clear to us that consideration of this subject, to which my delegation attaches utmost importance, should be pursued in other forums. We are surprised that any delegation would find it difficult to support measures aimed at removing South Africa's nuclear threat. The racist régime in Pretoria must be treated in a special way because of the special nature of its régime. It is not a régime that can be trusted to abide by traditional norms of international conduct. Above all, it has shown no readiness to abide by United Nations decisions aimed at promoting international peace and security. To us in Africa, there is no question whatsoever that South Africa would use any means at its disposal, including its nuclear capability. That régime has already demonstrated its military ambitions in its flagrant acts of aggression and destabilization against its neighbours. We believe that it would ultimately be damaging for the international community, as a whole, for any State to continue to collaborate with South Africa in the nuclear field. There can be no such thing as "peaceful" nuclear co-operation with a régime committed to a policy that is doomed to provoke only acts of instability.

Cameroon has always fully supported the proposal for the reduction of military budgets. We continue to believe that all measures should be undertaken within the United Nations to elaborate guidelines that would lead to the concrete implementation of this proposal at the earliest possible time. My delegation also attaches great importance to item 8, the curbing of the naval arms race. We look forward to the completion of the Secretary-General's expert study on the subject, which is supposed to be submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session later this year. We hope that the results of that study will facilitate further efforts to promote agreement to promote the peaceful use of the seas and oceans of the world. We have taken note of the views expressed on this subject at the current session of the Commission. We believe that together with the Secretary-General's report, these views would help determine the nature and substance of our future efforts on this very important subject. In connection with item 9, dealing with the mid-term review of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, Cameroon wishes to re-emphasize its
view that the Declaration can only be as important as its implementation. We would, therefore, wish to place much emphasis on the need for States, in the remaining five years of the Decade to undertake to report to the General Assembly on measures undertaken to implement the provisions of the Declaration.

The question of nuclear and conventional disarmament, which was considered in the contact group of the Commission which dealt with item 4, deserves special treatment. Nuclear disarmament is, after all, the most crucial issue before the international community today. We would have hoped that agreements would be easier to reach in the Commission on a subject which every State has acknowledged to be of central importance in the disarmament field. For any agreement in this field to be meaningful, it must take account of the order of priorities established in the Final Document which places the highest priority on nuclear disarmament while acknowledging the importance of conventional disarmament. After all, the goal of the United Nations and, indeed, of the international community as a whole is the prevention of war, nuclear as well as conventional, and the maintenance of international peace and security. The search for progress, in the first place, must take into account the universality of the nuclear problem and the complex nature of the arms race in the conventional field. We continue to believe, for instance, that progress in nuclear disarmament should be sought within the multilateral framework of the United Nations and that efforts towards conventional arms restraints must take into account the various specific conditions existing in the various regions of the world.

Cameroon believes, first, that the United Nations is important for, indeed indispensable to, the maintenance of peace and security, especially for small developing countries which are struggling to improve the lives of their peoples. Without peace and security, development would be difficult, if not altogether impossible. Secondly, disarmament efforts would be futile in the absence of peace and security. Also, for peace and security to be viable and long-lasting, they must be accompanied by genuine measures of disarmament. Thus, disarmament should be pursued within the framework of the search for an effective and operational system of collective security. Such a system, in our view, can be effective only if it is pursued and developed within the framework of the United Nations, an Organization committed to universality in its membership and founded on the basis of a Charter the provisions of which have survived not only the test of time but
also the complex changes that have taken place in international affairs in the past four decades. That is why Cameroon, on the one hand, believes that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility for international peace and security, including disarmament, and, on the other hand, regrets the inability of the Organization fully and effectively to discharge that role.

The reasons for this unfortunate state of affairs are varied and complex but they are neither insurmountable nor unknown. It is clear that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make progress in a climate of confrontation and suspicion among States or if attempts are made to promote security for one State or a small group of States at the expense of others. In the nuclear age narrow concepts of security must give way to the imperative reality of common security. Above all, the international community, confronted by the ghastly prospects of total destruction in the event of a nuclear conflict, should embark vigorously on a search for non-nuclear and non-military measures of security. That calls, in the first place, for practical recommitment to and concrete implementation of the principles and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

The quest for security and disarmament and the consideration of these issues must be freed of all ideological and other differences among States and must involve all States and the international community as a whole. Only then can we seriously expect to make progress.

Cameroon's emphasis is on pragmatic and realistic approaches to disarmament efforts; to encourage areas where progress is more likely and to refrain from activities that promote divisive responses among States. Thus, Cameroon's preference is that more time should be spent on informal consultations rather than on general debates where States often repeat their strong and unchangeable positions. We should aim at merging resolutions rather than having several, often divergent and contradictory, resolutions on the same subject. This does not preclude or interfere with the sovereign right of States to propose items or resolutions for the consideration of other States in various forums. Our goal is that consensus should emerge in various forums, thus facilitating prospects for the implementation of the various resolutions.
The role of the United Nations in today's complex world, especially in the field of peace and security, will be ineffective unless it involves the major military powers, in particular the five permanent members of the Security Council. As the founding fathers of the Organization, they occupy a special place in the United Nations, and the United Nations would be incomplete, and very limited, without them. As the leading military powers and the only known nuclear-weapon States, they bear a special responsibility for peace and security and for disarmament efforts everywhere. Cameroon, therefore, attaches the utmost importance to co-operation among the permanent members of the Security Council as being an invaluable factor for progress towards peace and disarmament. For that reason a major element in Cameroon's proposals for enhancing the United Nations role in disarmament is the involvement of the five nuclear-weapon States in nuclear disarmament efforts within the framework of the Security Council. Such a development, in Cameroon's view, would build confidence and enhance the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations in all areas of its activities.

Agenda item 7, dealing with a review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, deserves special mention. After all, General Assembly resolution 39/151 G, which requested the Commission to undertake such a review, was initiated by my Government. The objective of that initiative was not to undermine any particular State or individual or to promote any particular national or individual interest. Rather it evolved from our profound concern over the increasing marginalization of the role of the United Nations in this crucial field, and from the urgency of making concrete efforts to strengthen that role. The objective, therefore, is global effectiveness for the United Nations in promoting international peace and security. We are naturally disappointed by the paltry results being submitted to the General Assembly by the Commission after its consideration of this item. These limited results are far from meeting the request of the General Assembly for a report containing findings, recommendations and proposals, drafted after a comprehensive review. We hope that the Commission will undertake, as a matter of priority, to complete its consideration of this item at its next session, in 1986. This item deals with the core of our Organization's role and activities in the field of disarmament. The final results of the
Commission's work in this field will have a bearing, one way or another, on the judgement of the public regarding the role not only of the Commission itself, but also that of the Organization as a whole.

The Cameroon delegation has taken note of all the valuable comments and views put forward by member States on this issue during this session of the Commission. We are particularly grateful for the very kind remarks made by a number of delegations about our contribution to the consideration of this item, which took the form of the views and suggestions we submitted to the Secretary-General and which appear on document A/CN.10/71. We are prepared to continue to co-operate with other delegations towards the conclusion of our consideration of this item. We must, however, express the hope that the procedural hurdles that hampered the Commission's work on this item this year are now far behind us.

I would summarize by saying that in the field of international peace and security, specifically including disarmament, the United Nations should concentrate on the following elements, which I shall list in descending order of priority: first, preventing war and promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes; secondly, where appropriate, providing a forum for, and facilitating, deliberations and negotiations with a view to reaching concrete agreements on specific measures relating to security and disarmament; thirdly, assisting States, as appropriate, in the implementation, monitoring and verification of decisions and agreements relating to security and disarmament; and, fourthly, serving as a central source of data, ideas and other relevant information in support of the disarmament activities of States and of the public as a whole.

The successful achievement of those specific tasks requires, among other things, appropriate machinery and other institutional arrangements in which Member States can have confidence, and, above all, the demonstration of political will.

While political will is a necessary - indeed, an indispensable - element for the achievement of progress, we believe at the same time that the existence or absence of confidence in the various kinds of machinery is also a crucial factor. Cameroon, therefore, considers that any review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament must cover also the functioning and achievements of the various institutional arrangements and bodies involved, including the United Nations Secretariat. That is the kind of comprehensive approach that we sought to
take in the views and suggestions we submitted to the Secretary-General on this issue. In our view, overall progress requires effective co-operation and co-ordination in the activities of Member States, all the machinery, and the Secretary-General himself. Specifically, for instance, the role of the Secretary-General in carrying out preventive diplomacy should be enhanced to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes, thus encouraging the non-use of force and measures of arms restraint and disarmament. The Secretary-General's role in this field should constantly be co-ordinated with the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The United Nations should encourage and facilitate, as appropriate, measures aimed at building confidence and at reducing armaments, especially in areas and regions of conflict. In this connection, the Organization should provide assistance to States and regional or sub-regional organizations engaged in local peace-making activities.

The role of the Secretariat should be to assist and facilitate the efforts of Member States in disarmament deliberations and negotiations or in monitoring or verification measures specifically agreed to by the Member States concerned. Studies should be undertaken only in the context of assisting consideration of specific subjects, not as ends in themselves. Secretariat structures and programmes should be streamlined to ensure effective utilization of limited resources and to eliminate waste and duplication.

The Government of Cameroon believes that, especially in view of the fact that this year marks the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, it is particularly important that the international community adopt concrete and substantive measures aimed at demonstrating in a tangible manner our collective re-commitment to the original ideals of the Organization for a world free from want and fear, a world secure and at peace.

We are almost overwhelmed by the temptation to place on record our deep sense of gratitude for the very kind and gracious sentiments expressed here in the Commission by various delegations regarding the humble contribution of our delegation and our nation; it is nice to be complimented by those whose distinction leaves no room for vanity or misguided perspectives of victory. We firmly resist that temptation, because yielding to it would appear too presumptuous. Instead, we prefer to entertain the more profound gratification of observing that our serious
concerns are widely shared, our concerns regarding the plight of lasting
international peace and security and, particularly, the critical role that we, as
contemporary peoples and as a generation, have collectively assigned to the
cherished institutions of the United Nations system through a common declaration in
a historic Charter.

It is to the future that we must turn, consciously casting a hopeful eye on
the universal response and follow-up to what each of us says at the closing of this
session of the Disarmament Commission. We know, and we want everyone to know, that
international peace and security would guarantee the security interests of each
nation, and that it is attainable if our collective will desires it.
Mr. de La GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The representative of Italy made a statement on behalf of the member countries of the European Community, thereby expressing the views of the French delegation. Therefore my delegation will confine itself to a few comments.

First of all, we note with regret that—contrary to past practice—for the first time there was a lengthy general debate lasting for a week and a discussion on the organization of work that took up half the time available to us. In spite of your repeated efforts, Mr. Chairman, to which we pay a tribute, the time for the substantive work was thus reduced to less than two weeks. We hope that the Commission will return to its earlier practice at its next sessions and devote most of its attention to consideration of its agenda items within the Working Groups.

I should like also to clarify the views of my delegation with regard to agenda item 7. The Government of France considers that the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is very important. In recent years it has, together with its partners, submitted to the General Assembly a number of proposals which are all aimed at strengthening that role: the plan for an international satellite monitoring agency, which we fervently hope will begin to be implemented in the near future; the initiative for the establishment of a provisional investigatory procedure concerning the use of chemical weapons, the need for which has been confirmed by recurrent events and by the action in this connection taken by the Secretary-General; the plan for a conference on the relationship between disarmament and development, approved last year by the General Assembly; and, lastly, the establishment of a United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

Hence the French delegation warmly welcomes the proposal by Cameroon. We fully appreciate the balanced and realistic approach to disarmament problems taken in the document submitted by the delegation of Cameroon, an approach which is completely in keeping with that of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Like the Cameroon delegation, we note that the consideration of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament necessarily leads us to the question of the role of the agencies. The first, and then the second, special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament gave them a great deal of attention, and, in our view, the current institutional system of the United Nations is not wholly satisfactory. Nevertheless, improvements can be made, not so much with regard to the institutions themselves but rather with regard to their methods and the tasks they are called upon to accomplish.
The delegation of Cameroon has very usefully restated the problem as a whole and made some proposals.

The time allotted to the Working Group chaired by Ambassador Enge - only one week - was too short to make it possible to deal with substantive issues; but the discussion was very useful, and agreement was reached on a list of items to be considered, which offers an appropriate basis for the future work of the Commission. The French delegation wishes to make a few comments on that list. These comments in fact deal with paragraph 4 of the document included in the annex to the draft report of the Commission.

Of course, the French delegation endorses the objectives defined in the first part of that paragraph, that is, the strengthening of the deliberative and negotiating functions of the institutions which have those particular roles and the strengthening of the functions of other organs, of other activities and programmes in the field of disarmament. However, we believe that the appropriate recommendations which might be submitted should take into account the mandates and responsibilities of the agencies or organs to which they would be addressed. With regard to the Security Council in particular, the French delegation is in favour of strengthening its role and is open to any suggestions that might contribute to the achievement of that end; but, bearing in mind the constitutional links between the major organs established by the Charter, we feel that the recommendations that might be submitted by the Commission to the General Assembly with regard to the Council should be relatively general in nature. It would be for the Council to implement them if it considered it appropriate.

Furthermore, in considering the item with regard to the specialized agencies, the Commission should, of course, take into account what they are called upon to do. Recommendations which would have the effect of diverting them from their tasks or of allocating resources to tasks outside their competence would serve neither their goals nor the cause of disarmament.

Lastly, the item regarding the Conference on Disarmament should, we believe, be considered with particular attention to the specific mandate of the Conference as set forth in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of 1978. While the Conference is not a United Nations organ, it is closely related to the Organization. The recommendations the Commission might make to the General Assembly in this regard should, therefore, remain within the framework established by the mandate of
the Conference. It would be for the Conference to consider them and to take whatever decisions it saw fit.

The French delegation fully intends to participate very actively at our next session in the consideration of the item on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Today we wish to express our heartfelt thanks and warm congratulations to Ambassador Engo, who very forcefully and competently guided the discussions in the Working Group. We most sincerely hope that the work carried out in future will be successful.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express to you the warmest congratulations and the gratitude of the French delegation for the capable manner in which you have guided our discussions at this session. We also extend our thanks to the Chairmen of the Working Groups, the other officers of the Commission and all those in the Secretariat who have contributed to the carrying out of our work.

Mr. SHELDY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In its 9 May statement at this session of the Disarmament Commission the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR expressed its views on problems confronting the Commission with regard to the items on its agenda. Like other delegations at recent meetings, we shall now speak briefly about the results of the consideration of these items. The central task of our era is to prevent a nuclear catastrophe and to ensure nuclear disarmament. This is set forth in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in many other General Assembly resolutions.
It was from that angle that the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR approached agenda item 4. In recent years, life itself has determined the order of the priorities in this matter - priorities reflected in several General Assembly resolutions. They are: the prevention of the first use of nuclear weapons, the complete prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons, the freezing of nuclear arsenals and then their reduction and liquidation, the inadmissibility of an arms race in space, the halting of the arms race on Earth, and others. These are domains on which there is wide international agreement - with the exception of only a narrow group of well-known States. This has been stressed again during the concluding statements at this session.

As they have done for years, the United States and its closest allies have at this session of the Disarmament Commission hampered the possibility of making progress on the working out of recommendations on those and other priority tasks. Furthermore, because of the extreme positions taken by those countries, the number of square brackets in the document considered in the contact group regarding this agenda item has not decreased; unfortunately, it has increased. If one studies the wording proposed by those countries - and there is not much of it - it becomes quite clear that behind high-sounding words no action is provided for, still less any concrete or effective measures to curb a nuclear war. Moreover, their proposals are inspired by the clear desire not to tolerate any such measures.

Unfortunately, as has been said during this session, this lack of a constructive line on the part of the United States and several of its allies was not limited to agenda item 4. It reared its ugly head also in connection with the question of curbing the naval arms race. Those States did everything to prevent even a discussion of this vital problem, let alone the reaching of agreed recommendations to start negotiations.

The result of these tactics was to delay the beginning of work on several items on our Commission's agenda. The fact that a full-fledged discussion of the problem of curbing the naval arms race did take place, despite the efforts of that group of delegations, clearly testifies to the fact that this task is urgent and timely and that further steps to solve the problem are absolutely essential. No excuses, no artificial pretexts, no fallacious allegations used by various Western delegations at will, can detract from the vital need for serious negotiations.
An analysis of the events during the past five years in the field of the struggle for disarmament, from the point of view of the fulfilment of the priority tasks enshrined in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and in other General Assembly decisions, shows that there has been practically no progress at all. The reasons are well known. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR believes that the fact that we were able to work out an agreed assessment of the results of the past five years and recommendations for the future is a positive fact. It must be noted, however, that this is practically the only consensus document on substantive matters adopted at this session of the Commission. We hope that it will serve to mobilize the efforts to forge ahead towards disarmament. To that end it is essential that all States, without exception, show by their deeds that they are devoted to the cause of general and complete disarmament, proclaimed in these recommendations.

The tactics of well-known delegations of, on the one hand, painting a rosy picture instead of the realistic alarming picture and, on the other, trying to muzzle the voice of the majority of States Members of the United Nations in the field of disarmament appeared clearly in connection with the question of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We are convinced that it is the United Nations which is destined to be the key forum in this sphere. The solution of problems confronting the Organization affects directly the fate and life of the entire international community and each one of its members. Attempts are made by some to limit the efforts of the United Nations to organizing toy machinery without any actual power and to make the United Nations a mere clearing house for abstract studies. Those attempts are doomed to failure, since they run counter to the objective demands of life itself.

Unfortunately, we must note that at this session of the Disarmament Commission progress on the important item of the reduction of military budgets, an item that has been on our agenda for many years, has been out of reach because of artificial pre-conditions designed especially to block the possibility of agreement on important steps to reduce the expenditure of material and intellectual resources on the arms race.
For many years the Commission has been seized of the problem of South Africa's nuclear capability. Here again, no progress has been possible this year - and for the same reason: the position of the Western countries. The practice of babbling about the unpleasantness of the hateful apartheid régime, while in fact refusing to do anything to hamper its aggressive designs to obtain nuclear weapons and to stop all co-operation with it in this field, will probably go down in the history books of the future as one of the most blatant examples of hypocrisy and demagoguery on the part of Western diplomacy.

Not being addicted to historical pessimism, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wishes to conclude this statement on a positive note. We express the hope that reason and a sense of responsibility will in the final analysis triumph and that the threat of nuclear war will be deflected; that the arms race in all fields will be curbed; and that the United Nations Disarmament Commission will be able to play the important role assigned to it in this matter by the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

I should now like to quote from a statement recently made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, M. S. Gorbachev. He stressed:
"The only reasonable course today is the establishment of active cooperation among all States in the interest of a peaceful future for all and the creation, development of and resort to international machinery and institutions that will make it possible to strike a fine balance between national interests and the interests of mankind as a whole. We call for sincere cooperation among the diverse social and political forces, cooperation based on goodwill, in the name of peace."

In conclusion, our delegation would like to join those that have expressed gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for the skilful manner in which you have led our work at this session and the diplomatic tact with which complex problems have been settled during the meetings, the consultations and the search for mutually acceptable decisions. These efforts were particularly apparent to those who, like us, had the honour to be members of the Bureau of the Commission.

We should also like to thank all the members of the secretariat, who have worked hard and helped us greatly.

Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken, I should like at the outset to congratulate you on the outstanding competence and skill you have demonstrated in guiding the work of the Commission, which this year has had on its agenda a number of important questions on which, unfortunately, agreement has not been reached.

I shall outline my delegation's position on a few important items submitted to our Commission for its attention.

Iraq feels that halting the arms race and achieving nuclear disarmament are the most urgent tasks because the stakes are so high: it is the future of the human race that is at issue. That is why there is such a need for serious negotiations to put an end to the production of these death-dealing weapons, for the alternative is annihilation.

There can be no doubt that the resumption of the negotiations now under way in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union following an interruption gives new grounds for hope for a reduction of international tension and the strengthening of international peace and security.

As regards item 6, on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, this is a subject of great interest to my delegation because of all the information that
has reached us on the strengthening of the nuclear capability of the South African racist régime, which is a threat to the security and stability not only of the African continent but of the entire world.

This situation has been made possible by the aid given by certain Western Powers and the Zionist entity, which continue to co-operate with the South African régime in all fields, in particular the nuclear field. The aim of this co-operation, on the basis of a plan conceived by the two racist régimes, is to reduce the Arab nation to impotence. It can be seen that there is a striking parallel between the aggressive practices of the two régimes. Their co-operation rests on completely illegal foundations. Thus, the Zionist entity is engaged in smuggling American nuclear devices, as the press has been reporting for several weeks. Who can deny that such devices will be supplied to the Pretoria régime?

I should now like to comment on item 7, concerning the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. My delegation's views on this are very clear and are set out in document A/CN.10/69. My delegation has studied the document submitted by Cameroon. We believe it is a very good, thorough document in many respects and we congratulate the delegation of Cameroon. In particular, paragraphs 45 and 46 deserve attention.

As the Commission is no doubt aware, last year my delegation was unlawfully prevented from making a statement at the Conference on Disarmament because Iran abused the consensus rule. Iraq had asked to express its views on radiological weapons - a subject which has nothing to do with the war between Iraq and Iran. But the representative of Iran again abused the consensus rule and succeeded in preventing my delegation from making the statement it had prepared on the subject, the vital importance of which was apparent in the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981.

That is why my delegation is so interested in the paragraph of the Cameroon document which states that:

"In the Conference on Disarmament, the rule of consensus should not be applied to procedural or organizational matters, including proposals to establish subsidiary organs of the Conference and requests for participation in its work by non-members." (A/CN.10/71, para. 46)

That provision is completely consistent with my Government's views, which are in keeping with General Assembly resolution 39/151 G of 17 December 1984, to which reference is made in document A/CN.10/69.
(Mr. Mahmoud, Iraq)

In connection with agenda item 8, concerning the curbing of the naval arms race, my delegation voted in favour of resolution 39/151 I on this subject last year, for Iraq attaches very great importance to the problem of foreign military bases and naval manoeuvres undertaken by the great Powers in sensitive regions of the world. Iraq hopes that the study on this subject will be a complete and useful one and will deal essentially with the two subjects I have mentioned with a view to the attainment of the objective of the dismantling of foreign bases and the halting of naval manoeuvres.

These two items were mentioned in the address to the nation by the President of the Republic of Iraq in February 1980. That declaration reflected Iraq's views on the security of the Arab nation, which it believes would be enhanced by a commitment to dismantle foreign bases and prohibit foreign naval manoeuvres in the Arab region.

As for agenda item 9, concerning implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, Iraq considers the achievement of the objectives of that Decade to be of primary importance, especially since the first part of the Decade has been extremely disappointing because of the lack of political will on the part of States, which has made it impossible to reach agreements that would contribute to disarmament, in particular, nuclear disarmament. On the eve of the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, that objective assumes its full significance, and it must be given priority.

In conclusion, I should like to congratulate the Chairmen of the Working Groups, the Under-Secretary-General and, of course, the officers of the Commission, the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Alem, and the secretariat, for their great contribution to the successful work of the session.
Mr. IBRAHIM (Indonesia): As the current session of the Disarmament Commission is drawing to a close it is appropriate to reflect on the discussions of the preceding weeks and to assess whether our hopes and expectations were real or illusory. Some members in their statements have evaluated and summarized the work of the Commission. Nearly all have expressed disappointment and disquiet over the lack of substantive progress, in particular on the priority items. We believe that no one will dispute the fact that the results of this session are certainly less than the objective requirement of achieving meaningful steps towards halting and reversing the global arms race, especially in its nuclear aspects.

In this regard it is to be regretted that in our consideration of item 4, despite concerted efforts, the Commission has once again failed to narrow the areas of disagreement, in particular on such an important issue as the prevention of nuclear war. Perhaps this harsh judgement is related less to our endeavours and more to the untenable posturings and positions of those who continue to perceive security in narrow mathematical equations of amassing an ever greater defensive and offensive potential. Clearly, with each day's delay, the arms race becomes more and more complex, as additional systems of arms are developed and deployed. It is imperative, therefore, that we not wait until the task becomes completely beyond the capacity of the international community to control. From this perspective, the Commission should persist in its efforts to make a constructive contribution, within the framework of specific recommendations that are already before us, by clarifying a number of issues that at present impede endeavours to achieve the priority goal of the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

Although item 5 has been on the agenda for some time, no substantial progress has yet been made, and there are still problems in establishing an agreed approach to reductions, establishing the veracity of data provided by States and the special responsibility of the militarily-significant States. Moreover, the urgency of this question must also be seen in the context of solving international economic problems, in particular underdevelopment and poverty. It is encouraging that during this session many of these aspects of the question have been explored and different approaches advocated. My delegation supports the continuation of these efforts, especially in the context of the prospects for wider areas of agreement on the principles that should govern further action.
The hope expressed by many members that it would be possible to conclude work during the current session on item 6 has proved illusory. It is undeniable that for the States of Africa no issue of arms control is of greater importance than the need to prevent the racist régime from achieving a nuclear breakthrough. Because of the ramifications of such a development, the Commission in the past rejected any action that could contribute directly or indirectly to South Africa’s acquiring a nuclear weapons capability. But much more definitive action is needed to compel the racist régime to turn its back on such a disastrous course. More than ever before, we are convinced that success in emasculating Pretoria’s nuclear ambition once and forever will depend upon termination of the co-operation in this field extended by some States and the extension of the arms embargo to include the nuclear arms as well.

My delegation has noted the inclusion in the agenda of two items, one on the review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, and the other on review and appraisal of the Second Disarmament Decade. The raison d’être for the inclusion of those items is that they reflect the need for the Commission to take a more comprehensive approach to disarmament issues.

As regards the review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, it should be recalled that such an exercise proved invaluable back in 1976 when it was first undertaken. On the basis of that effort the United Nations disarmament machinery was considerably expanded. Moreover, the review process was continued during the first special session devoted to disarmament which more clearly defined the roles of the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. My delegation therefore regards it as timely that, nearly 10 years after the first review, there will once again be a comprehensive assessment of the role of the United Nations. However, while some changes in the procedures and mechanisms may be in order, it is hoped that the review process will also pay due regard to the nub of the problem, namely, the need for the mobilization of the necessary political will and the concomitant need for a commitment to multilateralism. Without such a firm orientation of our efforts, no amount of tinkering with the mechanisms that already exist can generate genuine and steady progress towards our goal.
Similarly, appraisal of the Second Disarmament Decade will be meaningful only in the context of the indispensability of reasserting and strengthening multilateralism in the disarmament process. Midway through the Decade the initiation of the review has provided an opportunity to assess the status of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and to chart the future course of action. However, we are half-way through the Decade; its goals are far from being achieved. It is imperative, therefore, to pursue the objectives set forth in the Declaration with renewed determination with a view to achieving concrete results during the remaining five years of the Decade. One of these important tasks is the effective implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign and the mobilization of public opinion concerning the consequences of an uncontrolled arms race and the urgent need for meaningful disarmament measures.

Finally, with regard to item 8, on the naval arms race, my delegation believes that the deliberations on this item were useful, in particular in the context of the study that is being prepared by the group of experts pursuant to resolution 38/188 G. As we are all aware, the results of the study will be submitted by the Secretary-General to the General Assembly this year. My delegation fully shares the opinion of many delegations that the study will clarify problems pertaining to the question of the naval arms race and will therefore be helpful to Governments in their efforts to reach a decision on the necessary measures to be taken to curb the naval arms race. It is in this light that my delegation endorses the decision to refer this question to the General Assembly.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate you on the very skilful manner in which you have guided the deliberations of the Commission. Indeed, achieving consensus on complex and contentious issues must be seen at times as a thankless task. Yet through your personal involvement and tireless efforts, the Commission has succeeded in moving forward in numerous areas; and for this, too, my delegation expresses its sincere appreciation. It would be remiss of me if I were not also to express my delegation's gratitude to the Chairmen of the working groups, the Rapporteur and the members of the secretariat for their strenuous and determined efforts in the discharge of their tasks.
Mr. BENNOUNA (Morocco) (interpretation from French): At the end of the work of this Commission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf our gratitude for your tireless efforts to create a climate of dialogue and harmony during the consideration of the difficult questions on our agenda.

Indeed, there is complete unanimity about the urgent need to curb a disastrous arms race which threatens the very survival of mankind and compromises the economic development of most of the world. But the divergences are equally permanent and deep in regard to what means to employ. The question of disarmament is extremely complex in a world of increasingly heterogeneous and specific sovereign nations obligated, in order to guarantee their survival, to safeguard the balance of forces.

The arms race is often the result of a real or apparent feeling of insecurity which impels States to increase their arsenals or to conclude military alliances. The restoration of trust within an area or between areas and the creation of co-operative structures are the necessary conditions for the success of international actions in the field of disarmament.

Unprecedented technological progress and the continued sophistication of weapons of mass destruction have profoundly altered the nature of the problem, since the risks thus incurred in the future are incommensurable with the objectives pursued by States in guaranteeing their national security. Nuclear tests threaten the earth's ecological balance, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction increases the risks by increasing the number of those able to trigger this process.

Faced with such major preoccupations, my delegation cannot fail to feel a certain degree of disappointment in regard to the slowness of international co-operation in the field of disarmament. The continuity and persistence of dialogue are of course encouraging, since multilingual discussions are greatly preferable to the rumble of weapons.

Mr. Chairman, with courage and lucidity you stressed in your report on the review and appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade that

"Though the mid-point of the Decade has been reached, its goals are far from being achieved. It is a matter of regret that, in spite of the efforts of many States, no substantial progress has been made even on items of highest priority. The threat to the survival of mankind is no less today than it was at the beginning of the Decade." (A/CN.10/1985/CRP.7, annex, para. 6)
My delegation endorses the appeal contained in that document to speed things up and to make up for the delay during the first five years of the Decade, thus avoiding a further worsening of the situation. Unfortunately, there is an ever-increasing gap between the awareness and the progress of international morality, on the one hand, and technological developments, on the other, as is shown by the disquieting propensity for the militarization of outer space.

However, among the factors militating for optimism we can cite the creation within the Disarmament Commission of Working Group III, entrusted with studying the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Thanks to the competence and great experience of its Chairman, Paul Engo, as well as to the good will shown by delegations, this Group was able to make progress on this basic question. Working documents and the list of relevant topics will serve as the basis of future work of the Commission aimed at improving the institutional structures forming the framework for international negotiations on disarmament. My delegation has already stressed the urgent need to strengthen the preventative role of the United Nations, and particularly of the Secretariat, as well as assistance to States and regional organizations in order to protect them against the arms race.

The United Nations must see to the true denuclearization of the African continent and its protection against the development of tension and local conflicts which generate foreign intervention. The situation necessarily results in an increase in the military budgets of African countries, to the advantage of arms merchants and to the detriment of the standard of living of the populations concerned. The most serious danger to the security of the African continent remains, however, the growth in the nuclear capability of South Africa. Working Group II, which has considered this matter, under the firm and skilful chairmanship of Ambassador Hepburn, was unfortunately not able to adopt any recommendations by consensus. Yet this question has been on the agenda of the Commission practically since its creation and, as attested to by all the expert studies in this field, no one can ignore the fact that the racist South African régime is perfecting increasingly sophisticated armaments capable of seriously jeopardizing international peace and security. Hence, it is high time for reason to prevail over the short-term interests of some countries or of transnational corporations involved in the South African military undertaking.
As regards the global approach to negotiations on disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, we are still at the level of broad generalities; the main parties remain fixed to their original positions, which again had to be reflected in the report of the Committee of the Whole on item 4 (a) and (b). In these conditions, we may be permitted to question the usefulness of such a debate, since the main protagonists are satisfied to repeat year after year attitudes which have now become dogma. The same is true of the item on the reduction of military budgets, entrusted to Working Group I, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Tunca, and we are most grateful for his untiring work in the search for compromise.

The nefarious consequences, economically and socially, of the growth of military budgets has often been stressed. Such a situation gravely hampers the legitimate aspirations of three-quarters of mankind to a better life.

My delegation hopes that a start will be made on achieving a solution of this question during the forthcoming Conference on Disarmament and Development, to be held under the auspices of the United Nations next year. Indeed, can the production of instruments of death continue unabated at a time when the vital needs of whole populations remain unsatisfied? The future of the moral values that are the foundation of our Organization depends largely on the response given to that question.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to thank all the members of the Secretariat for their efforts in providing the Commission with everything necessary for its smooth functioning.
MRS. OSODE (Liberia): My delegation would like to express its appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for the civility with which you have conducted the proceedings of this session of the Disarmament Commission. Your willingness and ability to preside over our deliberations and to engage in consultations and negotiations, the enthusiastic co-operation pledged by delegations, as well as the positive utterances by many at the Commission's session in 1984 to strive to achieve substantial progress at this session, raised my delegation's hopes for a meaningful session this year.

Regrettably, the Commission has witnessed a repeat performance and the revealing of dangerous attitudes, inflexible positions and a series of expedients, and the unpleasant impression has been given that the Commission may be at a stage of retrogression. The results achieved at this session, I venture to say, fall short of the marginal achievements of 1984. My delegation would observe that such results have been arrived at laboriously and with apparently grudging support. If members of the Commission permit this game to continue, it could be a prelude to disaster for our Commission in years to come.

Turning to agenda item 6, the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, I should like to make the following observations: This subject arouses considerable emotions. Indeed, it does more; it is at once an extremely complicated and an emotional subject. Bearing both those considerations in mind, we have had a remarkably good-tempered exchange of views. Reliable reports have all confirmed that the development of South Africa's nuclear capability, which has taken place over the past 25 years, includes all the components necessary for weapons manufacture. It has been enhanced and accelerated by the collaboration extended to the apartheid régime at various levels by its allies through assistance in uranium extraction and processing, the supply of nuclear equipment, the transfer of technology, the provision of training and the exchange of scientists.

South Africa, with the help of its allies, has enhanced its nuclear capability by the exploitation of Namibia's mineral resources, particularly uranium. The régime has also acquired the capability to produce enriched uranium, which is an essential component of a nuclear-weapons programme. Uranium enrichment is carried out at the pilot plant in Valindaba, near the National Research Centre at Pelindaba. In the field of research and development, a new research centre has been established and a hot-cell laboratory is under construction at Pelindaba.
With such damaging evidence - and more is available - and given the fact that South Africa detonated a nuclear device in 1979, can we afford to deny its rank as a nuclear-weapon State? In my delegation's view South Africa would resort to any means, including the nuclear, to defend its policy of apartheid, to entrench its illegal and colonial occupation of Namibia and to intensify its acts of aggression and destabilization against southern Africa. We are thus left with the conviction that South Africa is a threat not only to the realization of the objectives of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa but also to international peace and security.

Sooner or later, South Africa's allies will, in one way or another, come to ask those questions of principle whose resolution they have been leaving to time and experience. Do they wish a South Africa that will be a great Power dealing with the two super-Powers as an equal? In the present world situation, the implications of that question oblige us to answer it in the negative. We hope that at our next session we can approach the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability on the basis of good faith. We begin by positing good faith, but we cannot stop there; formulations must be found by which good faith can be translated into binding commitment.

In the United Nations the question of disarmament must concentrate on the Organization's role as a forum for negotiations, as a source of recommendations and directions and as a focal point for efforts to achieve disarmament. My delegation is aware of the fact that the basic objectives of disarmament have remained constant through the years, but that the approach to the subject and the scope of the negotiations have changed. In this regard, my delegation wholeheartedly welcomed the refreshing and bold approach to agenda item 7, on the review of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament, contained in document A/CN.10/71. The acceptance of this innovative and objective approach by a respectable number of delegations is an indication that they are unprepared to relegate the Disarmament Commission to a mediocre position.
My delegation regrets that the unfulfilled ambitions and expediency of some appear to have caused a set-back in efforts to engage in such a review, which my delegation considers should encompass all disarmament items. We are pleased that this matter was somewhat resolved and that a recommendation will be made to the General Assembly for the Commission to continue consideration of this subject "as a matter of priority at its next substantive session in 1986, with a view to the elaboration of concrete recommendations and proposals, as appropriate, regarding the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament".

(A/CN.10/1985/CPR.5/Rev.1, para. 7)
The call for the review of the disarmament machinery by the General Assembly, including that of the First Committee, is fully supported by my delegation. Apart from the need to streamline the proliferation of resolutions, which are similar in many respects, my delegation is disturbed by the fact that sufficient time is not given for consultations on resolutions that are often revised and withdrawn.

With respect to the Conference on Disarmament, my delegation also supports the proposal for its review by the General Assembly. We believe that the Conference is not above the standing of the General Assembly.

At an appropriate time, Liberia will formulate its own views concerning the aforementioned Committees, including those on disarmament studies, disarmament research, the role of the Secretary-General, assistance to States and regional organizations as well as other new proposals that we may wish to submit and that would enhance the Commission's standing in 1986.

We should like to express our appreciation to the Cameroon delegation for its presentation of document A/CN.10/71, and to other delegations that presented their views to the Secretary-General, all of which we found quite useful in Working Group III. In particular, we were pleased that document A/CN.10/71 clearly defined a new integrated approach to safeguarding the security of countries and revealed the fact that some States or a group of States favoured disarmament while others promoted the arms race.

Finally, my delegation is not in a position to make any constructive comments on the remaining items as it did not have the opportunity to participate in their consideration. We should like to assure the Commission, however, that those subjects will continue to claim our interest and attention. We hope that when this Commission meets again in 1986, conflicting interests and opposing views will have been reflected upon and that there will be an opportunity to reconcile them.

In closing, my delegation would like to thank the Chairmen of the various Working Groups, in particular those of Working Groups II and III under whose astute leadership my delegation had the opportunity to work. Their efforts, I venture to say, will not have been in vain.

Mr. BENYAMINA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to congratulate you, on behalf of my delegation, on the extremely skilful manner in which you have guided our work during these past
four weeks. I should also like to extend the congratulations of my delegation to Mr. George Tinca of Romania, Mr. Davidson L. Hepburn of the Bahamas and Mr. Paul Bamela Engo of Cameroon who, during these past weeks, have spared no effort to bring the work of the Working Groups over which they presided to a successful conclusion.

Once again the Disarmament Commission has completed its consideration of the various items on its agenda but cannot be credited with having made any significant progress. This is nothing new. Indeed, it is a fact that runs the risk of becoming distressingly commonplace. For that very reason we are increasingly concerned at a trend which bears all the marks of a lasting and generalized phenomenon affecting all negotiating and deliberative disarmament forums.

Seven years after the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament a remarkable decline in the momentum that, it was then thought, would characterize a sustained effort towards genuine disarmament is to be noted. Some three years before the third special session on disarmament there are already discouraging signs of a failure, of which we shall then have to take note. However, the phenomenon is so clear that it makes it possible equally clearly to identify where the responsibility lies.

If we take the seven-year period that preceded the first special session devoted to disarmament, we see, without prejudging their merits, that more bilateral and multilateral agreements were concluded than we have ever been able to hope for in the seven years that have followed that session. None the less, an organ such as the Disarmament Commission had been placed in the background for a long time, the nuclear Powers were not all represented in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the Conference did not have the more democratic and more representative features which in some respects the Conference on Disarmament has today. The systematic and methodical approach to disarmament measures that have been taken since then, in accordance with an established hierarchy of priorities, seemed to promise that the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would have yielded more results. But what we come up against today is a clear regression, to the point where the Final Document itself is sometimes called into question. This is true to the extent that in retrospect we sometimes wonder how it could even have been adopted. Is it really necessary for the threat of nuclear annihilation to be felt even more than it is today?
We must say that the disarmament undertaking is encouraged by the prevalence of a spirit of dialogue and agreement. That spirit, if it existed in the 1970s and made a new departure possible, a departure which the first special session seemed to promise, is remarkably lacking today. Dialogue and agreement have been replaced by confrontation and unilateral action. United and multilateral efforts in the approach to international problems vie today with national egotism and heightened suspicion of international organizations. In an international climate characterized by lasting signs of profound economic and political deterioration, the very notion of security becomes a privilege reserved for power, the exclusive attribute of prosperity. The consequence of that is the marginalization of the countries of the third world, massed together in a vast geographical region subject to strategic designs.

Nothing could better reflect that approach than the way in which the question of the nuclear capacity of South Africa was considered in the Disarmament Commission. The African delegations are asked not to apply the same degree of condemnation to nuclear collaboration with South Africa for peaceful purposes as to collaboration with South Africa in the military nuclear field. It is curious that South Africa's right to develop a non-military nuclear capacity is defended so fervently when, with equal fervor, the developing countries are denied their right to have access to nuclear energy and to master and develop it for economic and social purposes.
They are required to submit to draconian international safeguards or to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, while such guarantees have never been demanded of South Africa, which is pursuing, with the generous co-operation of certain countries, a nuclear programme which one would have to be very naive to believe is restricted to exclusively non-military purposes.

It is also claimed that South Africa's military nuclear capability is not an established fact. This is in stark contrast to the suspicions speedily cast on any third-world country that engages in any significant development of its non-military nuclear activities.

The logic of this approach, naturally does not take into account the legitimate security interests of the African countries. The industrialized and militarily credible countries which even in times of crisis are increasing their arms build-up in a region of the world in which it is generally recognized that a basic balance prevails refuse to give full weight to the extremely unbalanced situation in southern Africa, where there are on the one hand poor countries faced with persistent aggression and on the other an aggressor with the nuclear capability of a military power.

The strengthening of the non-proliferation régime cannot be achieved through words alone; it must first become fact in southern Africa, a region in which, as in the Middle East, there is the constant threat of blackmail based on recourse to nuclear weapons.

What Africa expected of the Commission at this session was not sympathy, or the paternalistic understanding of any delegation, but rather the adoption of concrete recommendations, the implementation of which would be primarily the responsibility of those who undertook to help South Africa to develop its nuclear capability.

Another item considered by the Commission at this session concerned the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Consideration of this item, which already this year has given rise to very useful exchanges of views, should continue next year, and as consistently as possible, so that the Commission may be able to arrive at conclusions which can encourage and give an impetus to efforts in the disarmament field.

Procedural reforms cannot serve indefinitely to delay the one really urgent need of the day: the achievement of genuine disarmament measures. Reforms, even if they are justified - as they sometimes are - nevertheless should not prevent
consideration, in the context of this item, of things that could strengthen the Organization in carrying out its central role and its primary responsibility in the field of disarmament.

From this standpoint, we must reaffirm our common determination, stress the need for concerted multilateral efforts, in order to encourage respect for the commitments undertaken in accordance with the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

Mr. DINIS (Mozambique) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Group of African States and of my delegation, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and express satisfaction at the way in which you have presided over the work of this session of the Disarmament Commission. We wish also to thank the other officers of the Commission and the Chairmen of the Working Groups.

As the Commission nears completion of its work, I wish to express the deep disappointment of the African Group at the absence of progress, this year again, in consideration of the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa and in drafting specific recommendations to the General Assembly. That disappointment is all the stronger in that this item has been on the Commission's agenda for many years now and it seemed that there was unanimity on the existence of the threat posed by the nuclear capability of South Africa to both African countries and international security.

I wish also to express the anxiety of the African Group caused by the difficulties constantly raised to prevent the emergence of a consensus on a question which, since it poses a direct threat to their security, is the principal concern of the African countries.

We are concerned about the working methods which have thus developed and which have prevented the Commission since its establishment from achieving any real results. The responsibility for this must be shouldered by those that resort unfairly to the constraints of consensus - a consensus imposed on the majority on a matter so clear, so simple, so universal that it should have been the item most conducive to the adoption by the Commission of a significant body of recommendations to the General Assembly.

The disappointment of African delegations was only increased by the statements made by certain delegations. Thus we totally reject the allegation of one delegation that the lack of flexibility and the irrational approach of the African
delegations were responsible for the absence of a consensus on agenda item 6. Is it necessary to repeat that this is an item which has always been and always will be of paramount importance and interest for us because of its implications for international security in general and the security of the African continent in particular? Moreover, the African Group is not at all impressed by the "sympathy" expressed by that delegation for the countries in that region which are exposed to the blackmail and threats of the racist régime of South Africa. Such an expression of "sympathy" is all the more inappropriate coming as it does from a delegation which has shown little inclination to accept the simple fact of the established military capability of South Africa.

As regards the attitude of the African Group to the amendments proposed, we strove to pursue consultations in a flexible and responsible way and tried to achieve as much compromise as possible. But several of those amendments tended to undermine the essential thrust of the working paper and were and are unacceptable to the African Group.

Mr. DUBERY (India): The outcome of this session of the Disarmament Commission, which is about to conclude, cannot by any means be described as satisfactory. In fact, it is dismal and disappointing. It bears witness to the continuing paralysis of multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament, whether in negotiating or in deliberative forums.
It also shows that, because of the attitude adopted by certain countries, we are not able even to deal seriously with the present-day situation. The seriousness of the present-day situation lies mainly in the threat of nuclear war and the nuclear-arms race. We do not have anything positive and concrete to show in this respect in spite of our having considered the subject at session after session. We seem to be engaged in an exercise which is somewhat removed from reality.

Let us take the item on the review and appraisal of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. The document we have adopted on the subject hardly does justice to it. It hardly contains any review or appraisal, let alone concrete recommendations for the future. It has sidetracked the burning issue of our time by its failure to make any mention of the alarming dimensions of the threat to mankind from nuclear weapons and the well-documented escalation of the nuclear-arms race. The best part of the document reproduces the provisions of the Declaration itself without any attempt to assess progress, lay down new priorities or pass judgements. The brevity of paragraph 6, which contains the assessment of the past five years, stands in sharp contrast to the tremendous significance of the developments during those five years.

My delegation, along with the delegation of Nigeria, submitted a paper on the subject. We were prepared to negotiate that paper and we were prepared to accept any changes that other delegations might wish to submit, but it was rather regrettable that we were confronted with an entirely different approach on the part of the members of a particular alliance. According to this rigid approach, no honest effort should be made to assess or appraise the progress or lack of progress made so far. Again according to this approach, we should turn a blind eye to the developments of the past five years. It is a very vivid indication of their insensitivity to past developments that these countries were not willing even to accept mention of the "nuclear winter" finding, which is one of the most significant and sobering developments that have taken place in recent years and which has been corroborated by a number of independent studies, most of which were carried out in those countries themselves.
The same attitude has been reflected in the consideration of agenda item 4. This is the most crucial issue before the Commission. Instead of getting down to evolving a consensus, the exercise in the Commission and in the Committee of the Whole, which was charged with the task of dealing with this item, was confined to finding words and phrases which provided an indirect justification and would disguise the continuing nuclear-arms race. Instead of recommending concrete actions in the field of disarmament, the exercise we undertook - which we will be repeating in the future - was an attempt to reproduce vague and equivocal phrases and texts agreed upon in other forums. Of what use can the Disarmament Commission be to other forums if it perceives its task only in terms of taking extracts from agreements reached in those forums and passing them on to the General Assembly?

Some delegations have made much of our inability to agree to extracting the words and phrases which are not in square brackets in the compilation of proposals and sending them on as recommendations to the General Assembly. I shall ask those delegations to do some soul-searching and tell us whether this would really represent progress. Have we reached new agreement on what is not in square brackets? Are these phrases and sentences we are being asked to transmit to the General Assembly not mere plagiarizing?

It has been alleged that some of us are not showing enough flexibility in order to make progress on agenda item 4. We will show all the flexibility that is needed once we are engaged in discussing the specific issues and we are in specific negotiations. We have shown that flexibility in abundant measure in the past, but it is a trivialization of the term "flexibility" when it is demanded only for the purpose of conveying a semblance of progress, when the fact is that no progress has been made at all. The flexibility that is demanded of us relates only to the listing of items and the picking and choosing of unbracketed paragraphs of a text, as if, through the mere act of cutting and pasting, the much-needed action in the field of disarmament automatically will follow.

To cite a specific example, can we in all seriousness and sincerity make a recommendation to the General Assembly on agenda item 4 which leaves out a comprehensive test-ban treaty, measures for prevention of nuclear war and measures for prevention of the extension of the arms race into outer space? We should like to make it clear that our failure to reach agreement on agenda item 4 is entirely due to the insistence of a few nuclear-weapon States and their allies on ignoring the concern of the vast majority of the members of the Commission and perceiving
their security interests in an exclusive manner which totally ignores the security
of the rest of mankind.

Agenda item 7, on review of the role of the United Nations in the field of
disarmament, was added mainly as a result of the initiative of the delegation of
Cameroon. That delegation, and particularly Ambassador Engo, deserve our heartiest
congratulations on launching this commendable project. Because of his persistence,
clarity and single-mindedness of purpose, and the skilful manner in which he
conducted the meetings of the Working Group, we have made an extremely good
beginning in the consideration of this item. As the proverb goes, a task well
begun is half done. For our part, we shall participate more actively and fully in
the exercise once the substantive discussions on it start at next year's session,
and we shall fully co-operate with Ambassador Engo to bring this very significant
exercise to a successful end.

We completely share the disappointment expressed in this Commission at its
inability to make any recommendation on the question of the nuclear capability of
South Africa. This shows the total insensitivity of a group of countries to one of
the most serious concerns of almost all of us assembled here - a concern that
apparently has serious implications for the preservation of world peace and for the
progress and prosperity of that region.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I must place on record my delegation's deep sense of
gratitude and appreciation concerning the manner in which you have guided our work
at this session. My criticism of the dismal achievements of the session is
directed strictly to the subject-matter of our deliberations. Besides, this
failure is not unique to the Disarmament Commission but vitiates the work of all
the multilateral forums dealing with disarmament. The fact remains that, largely
because of your patience, diplomatic skill and excellent judgement, we have been
able to conclude our discussions on a series of very complex issues in an extremely
amicable atmosphere.
Mr. BANGO BANGO (Zaire) (interpretation from French): Now that the 1985 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is coming to an end, I should like to associate myself with other members of the Commission in making a few comments that my delegation regards as appropriate.

We share the feeling of all the delegations at this session that the Commission's work has on the whole not made any progress on this issue so important to all States. Although the Commission has recorded failure year after year, we do not believe that its members are incapable of reaching a positive result.

During the debates here, many representatives have stressed that the problem of disarmament and the limitation of nuclear armaments is above all a matter of the political will of the super-Powers and the nuclear-weapon countries. The super-Powers because they possess large arsenals of all types, and the nuclear-weapon Powers because they possess that weapon whose capacity for destruction needs no further proof, must be persuaded that disarmament is necessary. My delegation generally shares that view, and that is why we had hoped that this session of the Disarmament Commission, convened at a time when the two super-Powers - the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - were resuming their negotiations on this issue in Geneva, would be more fruitful than past sessions. Unfortunately, we are obliged to state that the political will for disarmament is still far from apparent.

The importance of the question of disarmament is clear to everyone. Any channels that could lead to disarmament must be explored. Thus, my delegation believes that it is up to the large States as well as the small States, to the nuclear-weapon States as well as the non-nuclear-weapon States, to discuss this question in a forum such as our Commission - above all at this time, when the proliferation of nuclear weapons on the land, the seas and the oceans and the attempt to bring such weapons to outer space have alerted world public opinion to the danger stalking the world. That is what gives a forum, such as this its raison d'être.

We have been told that States must arm themselves for reasons of security. My delegation does not completely share that opinion. Zaire believes that it is the quest for hegemony that is the primary cause of the arms build-up. It is therefore up to the international community to make its voice heard so that this unbridled race towards hegemony will come to an end, thereby sparing mankind a nuclear catastrophe.
My delegation believes that the problem of disarmament is so important that we must go on discussing it. Members will understand that, since Zaire is an African State, my delegation has focused particular attention on the problem of South Africa's nuclear capability.

In the first place, my delegation would draw the Commission's attention to the fact that we are not completely satisfied with the wording of this agenda item. In future it should read: "Question of the nuclear capacity of the minority racist régime in power in South Africa". If it were worded in that way, the question would become clearer to those who still do not want to understand that it is that régime that Africa is fighting, not the individuals who are in South Africa.

This question has been dealt with very eloquently by preceding speakers. Nevertheless, I should like to make my own delegation's contribution.

Since 1979 the Disarmament Commission has been considering the question of the nuclear capability of the minority racist régime of South Africa and has not managed to reach a consensus. Its recommendations to the General Assembly are confined to requesting that the Assembly refer the question to the next session. This year the Commission has not changed that practice. In this respect, some delegations have stated here that, despite certain compromise proposals, the drafting effort in the Working Group did not lead to any positive results.

In the first place, the working document included in our Commission's report (A/39/42) contains terms and phrases that are found in many relevant General Assembly resolutions condemning the Pretoria racist régime for its inhuman and iniquitous system of apartheid. Of course, not all those resolutions contain the words "the nuclear capability of the South African racist régime", but the idea is there. In our group, there was criticism of certain terms used in the document. But, when we want to reach unanimity, can there be anything more relevant than using terms already enshrined by past practice? Is there any better way of viewing international peace and security? Is there a different type of peace and security for South Africa than for Europe? The fact is that the proposed amendments were not designed to improve the basic text to which I have referred; rather, they were designed to dilute and distort the text, to rid it of all significance. Contributions of this type are not efforts at compromise. Why not accept terms already agreed?
In this connection, when each of the protagonists of nuclear disarmament is looking to its future, the aim of some is to protect their partners from unanimous condemnation by the General Assembly. At a time when the racist South African régime sees its isolation increasing, when it is running the risk of having its sources of financing depleted, they do not want to destroy the morale of the upholders of apartheid. This cavalier, unfriendly attitude on the part of our partners is a source of great frustration for African States and for the black people of South Africa in particular.
At a time when Botha's South Africa is benefiting from the support of the Western countries and others in its efforts to join the group of nuclear-weapon States, my delegation feels that the super-Powers could spare us their campaigns of seduction and work with us in considering this question, the very thought of which arouses fear. Those nuclear weapons, whose annual cost is estimated to be billions of dollars and which will perhaps never be used because mankind is convinced that it could not survive their use, are in the hands of a few States. My delegation shares the view of those that feel that, instead of being used for the production of weapons that will destroy us and our world, that money could wisely be used to promote the social and economic development of our peoples. In Africa there is desertification and drought, with the ensuing famine that decimates our populations. In other parts of the world there are other problems. The possessors of nuclear weapons would do better to allocate those billions of dollars to combating these scourges of our time.

Not long ago the United Nations celebrated the anniversary of the end of the Second World War. Many statements were made in which speakers vied with each other in eloquence in outlining the grim history of that war. To do away with nazism and fascism and to bring about peace, freedom and tolerance in Europe, the Europeans fought tirelessly and without respite Hitlerism. For five years, children, women and men died, some from gun-fire, some from deprivation. Others died by the thousand in the concentration camps and the gas chambers. In the concentration camps, where humiliation of all kinds was the lot of all prisoners, and in the trenches, whites and blacks died side by side for freedom. In that period of great sacrifice the children of Africa gave those of the West and those of the East, who were allies at that time, immeasurable help, even giving their own lives.

Today Africa feels that its children sacrificed themselves for nothing in sacrificing themselves for the freedom of Europe, because those who help the hideous, odious, execrable apartheid régime to entrench itself more firmly, are those very people for whom the sons of Africa died.

For 25 years the blacks of South Africa have been struggling against the oppression of apartheid. For 25 years they have looked to the world for freedom, for their freedom, and they have been given pious words. And not content with that frustration of the Africans, the Western and other countries are now helping to provide Botha's South Africa with nuclear weapons.
In this year in which our Organization will be celebrating its fortieth anniversary, Africa had the right to expect from the international community unanimous refusal to allow South Africa and the racist Botha access to nuclear capability, to that formidable weapon that would give South Africa ever greater power to pose a permanent and increasing threat to peace and security in the southern part of our continent to begin with, and then throughout the continent.

My delegation would like to recall there that since its establishment our continental organization, the Organization of African Unity, has never disregarded the importance of the nuclear weapon and the danger facing our continent. In their desire to spare our continent the dangers of ever-more-sophisticated weapons, including nuclear weapons, and to make our continent a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the Heads of State and Government of Africa adopted at the first ordinary session of the Organization of African Unity, held in Cairo from 17 to 21 July 1964, a Declaration on the denuclearization of South Africa. Since then that Declaration has been endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly, and in its resolution the General Assembly forcefully condemned any attempt, overt or covert, by South Africa to introduce nuclear weapons into the African continent and demanded that it cease immediately conducting nuclear explosions on the continent or elsewhere. That remains the wish of Africa.

We Africans have always insisted that the racist régime of South Africa is stubbornly violating relevant United Nations resolutions because of the support it receives from the West. Here we have one more striking proof of our contention; nuclear co-operation with the Botha régime. My delegation believes that the countries co-operating with the South African régime must commit themselves to ceasing all co-operation with that régime. Their responsibility will go down in history as a heavy one. What frustrated the efforts of the Working Group was the fact that the nuclear co-operation with Botha's South Africa is no longer an embarrassment to the Western countries. We Africans insist that South Africa must be democratic, tolerant and led by the majority in a multiracial Africa. But Europe is far from agreeing with us on this reality, although it is undeniable. We have faith in the future, however.
Another item on which my delegation was hoping that our work would lead to the formulation of recommendations to the General Assembly is that concerning the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. In this anniversary year of the United Nations, our Commission should have arrived at a consensus, and the elements of a consensus were not lacking. All the delegations present have been unanimous in praising the documents submitted. Unfortunately, this year's record is hardly more edifying than that of previous years, although we do have a programme of work for next year.
This item and that concerning the review and appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade in our view deserved more diligent treatment by our Commission.

A session has just gone by without our Commission's having taken advantage of the opportunity afforded it to make progress in its work. My delegation is convinced that this year's failures, much as we deplore them, should inspire us to greater resolve in this issue of primary importance for the future of mankind. My delegation is prepared to meet the challenge of this essential issue of disarmament and the curbing of the arms race. We in Zaire do not suffer from the illusion that it will be easy to achieve a consensus on such a complex issue, but we have confidence in man's ability to find solutions to the problems that confront us. Painstaking negotiations lie ahead and we are convinced that they will be undertaken.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I must say how much my delegation appreciates the remarkable way in which you have guided our work. On behalf of my delegation, I wish to congratulate you and pay you a well-deserved tribute for the skill with which you have fulfilled your responsibilities. I also offer our congratulations to the Chairmen of the Working Groups on the excellent work they did so tactfully throughout our deliberations. Although our Commission did not reach a consensus on questions on which it might have been possible to do so, we have confidence in the future and hope that the complex problem of disarmament and the curbing of the arms race will be successfully resolved, for the greater good of mankind.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate you on the wisdom and effectiveness with which you have guided the deliberations of this Commission. I should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Commission and the Chairmen of the Working Groups, in particular Ambassador Engo for his work on agenda item 7.

With regard to item 7, "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament", I made some comments the other day that I want to explain. I know that the report on this item has been adopted, but this Commission has been very clear in the past in its statements about the need for international security, and on this the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations I do not want the Disarmament Commission to fall short of its previous record.
In its report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Disarmament Commission said that it had adopted the following text by consensus.

"The Commission recalled that in parallel with measures towards disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, there should be measures for applying the system of international security as expressly provided for in the United Nations Charter ..."

That was a very clear and definite statement, and it went on:

"and as emphasized in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly; and also political or international legal measures to promote international security. In this connection, the Commission recalled the provisions contained in General Assembly resolution 35/156 J of 12 December 1980." (A/S-12/3, para. 22)

In that resolution the General Assembly

"Calls upon all States to proceed in a positive spirit towards measures under the Charter of the United Nations for a system of international security and order concurrently with efforts at effective disarmament measures".

That was the record of the Commission in previous years, and this year it should not fall short of that.

I should like to point out something very vital with regard to paragraph 6 of the report on item 7. It refers to "measures of disarmament and arms limitation" as having "an essential part to play in maintaining and strengthening international security". This is taken from paragraph 14 of the Final Document. But paragraph 13 is the vital paragraph, which establishes the concept of international security through the United Nations, and the Final Document then goes on to say, in paragraph 14, that this security should be strengthened through disarmament. We cannot now say that we want the latter without mentioning the former. Paragraph 13 clearly says:

"Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations ..."

After stating how peace can be established and that there must be effective implementation of the international security system provided for in the Charter, it goes on to say in paragraph 14 how it could be strengthened. It could be strengthened, of course, by disarmament, but after it has been established.
It may be too late now, but I do not want this Commission to fall short of its previous record, so in paragraph 6, instead of the words from paragraph 14 of the Final Document only being quoted, there should have been a quotation also from paragraph 13 about establishing international security, which is the important thing, and then maintaining and strengthening it. We speak about maintaining and strengthening international security referring to paragraph 13 of the Final Document, which speaks of the way to establish an international security system under the Charter.

These are the comments I wanted to make, in the hope that something could be done to make sure that the report of the Disarmament Commission in this fortieth anniversary year does not fall short of its previous record of stating clearly the need for international security as it was stated in the Commission's report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (A/S-12/3), which clearly repeated the words of paragraph 13 of the Final Document and then, of course, mentioned paragraph 14.
The CHAIRMAN: The time has now come for me to express my sincerest thanks for the kind and generous words members have addressed to me. That we have been able to conduct our work smoothly is entirely because of the support extended to me so readily by all delegations. I should therefore like to place on record my deep gratitude for their co-operation.

As we conclude the 1985 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, my overriding feeling, I must confess, is more one of relief than of satisfaction. A number of delegations have given their appreciation and assessment of our work in their concluding statements. Before formally closing the session, I should also like very briefly to share some thoughts with the members of the Commission.

Until this year, the Commission had, I believe, been relatively free of the procedural and organizational difficulties which, unfortunately, one has come to associate with the negotiating process in disarmament. This was largely the result of our understanding that subjects brought before the Commission in previous years enjoyed a wide measure of support, at least as far as the question of having a discussion on them was concerned.

In my view, time spent on devising ambivalent work formats to satisfy conflicting interests amounts to a negation of our responsibilities, and I hope the experience of this year will not be repeated in the future.

The only item on our agenda on which we have been able to conclude our work – as, indeed, we were required to do – pertains to the review of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. As regards other agenda items, I find myself unable to agree with those who perceive progress in subtle shifts of word or phrase.

As for agenda items 5 and 6, I am still of the view that success could have been achieved had delegations approached them with less inflexibility and a greater sense of reasonableness.

Agenda item 4 is generally agreed to be the most difficult as well as the most comprehensive item on our agenda. Under this item, the Commission is practically required to formulate a mini-comprehensive programme of disarmament – a daunting task under the best of circumstances. It would be worth while if delegations were to consider the possibility of narrowing the terms of reference of the subject and hence sharpening the focus on this item, at least on a trial basis. I can recall
the very valuable suggestion of the Chairman of the Commission at its 1983 session - namely, that the Commission might try to elaborate recommendations on the prevention of nuclear war before moving on to other aspects of the agenda item.

My experience this year has convinced me of the necessity of limiting the number of items on the Commission's agenda. The brief period for which the Commission meets makes it imperative that it be able to devote maximum time and effort to two or three items on which chances for success are better than on other items. A proliferation of agenda items, on the other hand, not only allows less time for each item but in all probability also adversely affects the level of participation.

Another important factor we must keep constantly in view is that the Commission is a deliberative body. To achieve any modicum of success, work has to be approached with sincerity of purpose and in a spirit of accommodation. It is also important not to forget that the Disarmament Commission is not a negotiating forum, where every single word of a recommendation must be negotiated as if it were part of an internationally binding treaty that would irrevocably compromise the position of a State or force it into an unacceptable course of action.

Our function is to draft guidelines, to draft recommendations. The task of negotiating agreements comes later. We must learn from our past experience; we must reflect upon our lack of success and approach future sessions positively, recognizing the need for urgent action on our part. An exchange of recriminations serves neither the work of the Commission nor the requirements of international co-operation.

Before I conclude, I should like sincerely to thank the officers of the Commission, the Chairmen of the subsidiary bodies and the Rapporteur for this session for the co-operation and support I have received from them. I am confident that all members of the Commission join me in extending appreciation to the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, headed by Under-Secretary-General Jan Martenson, the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Fehmi Alem, and all the other officials who assisted the Commission and its subsidiary bodies with great devotion. I also thank the Conference Services personnel and the interpreters for their competent work.
(The Chairman)

May I extend to all of you my best wishes for whatever you may be doing after the conclusion of the session and for a safe journey to those who will be leaving New York.

I now declare the 1985 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission closed.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.