

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**7th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 3 June 1988,  
at 3.25 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

*President* Mr. Peter FLORIN  
(German Democratic Republic).

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (*continued*)**

1. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will first hear a statement by the Vice-President of the State Council and of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Carlos Rafael Rodríguez and inviting him to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on your election to the presidency. We are pleased that your proven skills and well-known experience have been placed on this occasion at the service of problems as serious as the ones we are now considering. We also welcome our friend the Secretary-General.

3. The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being held in an international situation that allows us some degree of optimism. Thus it stands in contrast to the atmosphere that prevailed during the first and second special sessions of our work for disarmament.

4. In effect, the documents of the first special session reflected what constituted the overwhelming opinion of the representatives of countries and was then a universal consensus of the peoples, giving priority to the need to do away immediately with nuclear threats and proposing a series of measures which, had they been applied, would have quickly led us to improve the international situation that prevailed at that time.

5. However, while the General Assembly was advancing along the road to peace in 1978, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] were persuaded to increase their military budgets by 3 per cent.

6. That contradiction between the universal desire for disarmament and the denunciation of the nuclear threat, on the one hand, and the specific steps that were taken towards a worsening of the military situation, on the other, became clearly evident and prevalent two years later, when the doctrine of military supremacy was embraced, when negotiation was replaced by confrontation and when the United States military budget was increased from \$130

billion at the time of our first session on disarmament to nearly \$300 billion today.

7. Thus an arms race developed that increased the international community's annual expenditures to the incredible figure of \$1,200 billion, at a time of international economic stagnation and serious crisis for countries that still aspire to development. We recall these data because they may mark the difference between a path to which we should not return and a present that is still too uncertain to be cause for permanent rejoicing.

8. Our session has opened under the auspicious sign of the Moscow meeting. Participants have not yet been able to agree on the definitive elements of a treaty that, as has been proposed, would eliminate 50 per cent of strategic nuclear weapons. But that does not discourage us because the two most important Powers of our era have negotiated in a spirit of conciliation at Moscow and signed agreements on various aspects of the international situation which indicate a substantial change in their political relations. They reaffirmed that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, and they have already set limits to strategic nuclear weapons. The aggressive speech delivered by the President of the United States in the British Parliament, which seemed to lead to an insoluble confrontation, has been left behind. Now there is another tone and other expectations. They are backed up by the fact that something as unprecedented as the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles has been achieved and because, after the vacillations that seemed to endanger its ratification, the Senate in Washington announced its definitive approval and the ratification documents were submitted in Moscow.

9. It would not be too optimistic to say that we have the possibility of seeing a profound change in international political relations. Until recently mankind was forced to harbour the idea, sinister in its prospects, that the dispute between the capitalist and the socialist societies would be solved only through a military confrontation. This brought us to the uncertain, bitter eve of a nuclear conflagration in which only a few people ventured to state that mankind would survive, since, according to the implacable judgement of the scientists, mankind would be doomed to disappear at the same instant that nuclear weapons, which the major Powers have, were used.

10. The idea of military supremacy as an instrument of international politics seems doomed once and for all. While the fear of mutually assured destruction is still useful for discouraging those who want to continue the nuclear war, it is beginning to

give way to some degree of mutual trust, without which disarmament would not be possible.

11. Objectively one must admit that, in this victory of good sense over irrationality, considerable merit goes to Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. When he proposed his programme for achieving the elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the century, it seemed nothing but an unattainable dream. All the analysts, however, now admit that his powers of persuasion, his realistic policy and his clarity in dialogue have made it possible, in the Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington meetings—and now at Moscow—for the two parties gradually to eliminate what seemed to be irreconcilable differences and advance towards positions of disarmament and peace. The fact that Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze met 27 times in a short period of time in a search for practical solutions shows that the era when some thought that their international purposes could be achieved only through a policy of force and arrogance has given way to laborious, systematic negotiations. This will to negotiate has the resolute support, in favour of peace and disarmament, of all the European socialist countries of the Warsaw Treaty. Meanwhile, most of the capitalist countries belonging to NATO have recently shown a sense of realism, an openness and political tact that enable them to contribute to this vital agreement.

12. If anyone can claim victory in the change that seems to be fast approaching, it is the people. In large cities the world over they demonstrated against nuclear war and the growing arms buildup. They demanded negotiation and rejected the idea that a nuclear war could be won by any of the belligerents, considering it ominous and irresponsible. It was a unanimous voice that came from the throats of hundreds of millions. Neither their universal clamour nor the rationality of the Soviet Union's positions would have sufficed to lead the world towards peace, however. A positive response by the United States was also required.

13. The latest events seem to indicate that the American Administration is heading in that direction. The subject is too important to be approached on the basis of petty criteria. Therefore, if Mr. Reagan takes the road to peace, no matter in how vacillating a manner or however slow his steps, Cuba, which considers him its implacable adversary, which cannot forget his threats and which is not yet free of his economic and political pressures, would not fail to recognize that positive attitude on his part.

14. There are other efforts that should not be forgotten. In particular, I should like to mention the tenacious efforts of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, six countries linked in one way or another to the non-aligned countries, whose contribution we all acknowledge. Their emphasis on verification directs our attention to that essential aspect of disarmament.

15. There is nothing more important in the advance towards the definitive elimination of nuclear weapons than the establishment of mutual trust. One expression of that trust consists of stopping the

creation of new technologies aimed at finding different lethal ways to use atomic resources and to give them more sinister effectiveness. We must also achieve something that was put forward at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and that has been a unanimous aspiration of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries ever since it was created: the elimination of nuclear tests. Only the maintenance of distrust—which is very negative for any negotiations—can explain the fact that in the midst of such negotiations research directed towards bringing about the extermination of the other side continues. The continuation of nuclear tests would be no less negative, for their only purpose can be intimidation or the mutual intention—by those who have already begun a dialogue directed towards peace—to annihilate the other side. If technological research and nuclear tests continue, the spirit of searching for agreement will disappear.

16. The obstacles still to be overcome are immense and call for firmness and determination by both parties. The most immediate of these obstacles is the insistence on maintaining the so-called strategic defense initiative [SDI]. As we all know, SDI is unrealistic from the technical point of view and has an offensive role related to the possibility of a first strike. We will not rid ourselves of the threat of war simply by transferring it to outer space. SDI guarantees nothing; it will only prolong and aggravate the arms race. Disarmament constitutes a process—the gradual elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional weapons to levels compatible with national security, and an end to naval superiority. In the midst of that process, there will be moments of tension and disagreement, but at the end there will be peace and disarmament—goals that justify the challenge that we should strive to meet.

17. We all understand that, while the elimination of the nuclear threat is our main and most urgent task, to which we should devote our greatest, most sustained efforts, there is another kind of weapon which, although not so overwhelmingly devastating, still causes terror and revulsion in peoples. Such is the case with chemical weapons, the result of one of the worst abominations of our times—the concentration of scientists on finding the most effective methods to destroy their fellow beings. When one understands what the hundreds of thousands of technicians and scientists now devoting themselves to spreading death could offer in the service of human beings, especially in promoting development, one wants peace even more.

18. Even though chemical weapons are qualitatively less destructive than nuclear weapons, they are no less horrible and reprehensible. The fact that they can be disguised in the form of apparently inoffensive binary weapons adds a component of deceit that only increases opposition to them. We in the Non-Aligned Movement join in the denunciation of chemical weapons and express our support for accelerating the negotiations now under way until a comprehensive, conclusive programme is achieved that will make it possible to identify and destroy them, wiping them out completely.

19. No other group of nations has more reason to rejoice over the prospect—no matter how uncertain—of an international agreement that prevents nuclear conflict and leads us towards disarmament than the underdeveloped countries.

20. The special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, attended by representatives of more than 100 countries, was held from 26 to 30 May 1988 at Havana to discuss the problems that are being presented before this special session of the General Assembly. In that meeting, speaking for the third world, the non-aligned countries reaffirmed their position on peace and adopted a plan of action that the member countries will implement during this special session of the General Assembly and after it [*A/S-15/27 and Corr. 1, annex I, para. 64*]. It contains the main elements of the positions of non-aligned countries. What those positions and that plan stressed, above all, was that peace could not consist only of preventing the universal devastation that a nuclear war would cause but rather that peace was also a necessity and a right of all; and that regional conflicts are aggravated because they are maintained by the broadest contradictions at the global level. It was stressed—and this is the main thing—that peace was an essential prerequisite for development and that, in turn, development was one of the key elements of peace.

21. Ever since their 1961 Cairo meeting to prepare for what would later be their first conference, the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries considered safeguarding peace to be one of their most important objectives. Together with development, peace was on the agenda of the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1961, where our Movement was founded. One of the first things that the participants in that Conference did was to send a message to the heads of State of the two main Powers, calling for them to seek peace together. That call has now been renewed.

22. Twenty-seven years after the Belgrade meeting, today's tragic reality confirms that the climate of confrontation that led to arms buildup exacerbated the tragic economic and human situation of the underdeveloped countries. The last decade, in which appropriations for war have steadily grown and in which we have been drawing dangerously close to nuclear confrontation, has been a period of permanent, serious retrogression for the economies of the countries that want to emerge from underdevelopment, a period in which their backwardness has been perpetuated.

23. At a time of excessive international liquidity, an irresponsible policy of loans was promoted, and we were urged to take credits. Then, without any warning, the credits were cut off, and our creditors demanded payment of the debts. The rise in the interest rate multiplied our indebtedness without our receiving any funds with which to meet those demands. Now we are asked to increase our exports, but the prices paid for our products are steadily dropping, and a policy of trade preferences limits our access to the main world markets. In the last few years, unequal terms of trade alone have caused us

losses of over \$80 billion. The only thing we in the underdeveloped countries can do is restrict our imports, which increases the poverty of our peoples. It is the workers, the farmers, the middle classes, and even the industrialists—who are being ruined by the stagnation of investments and by the lack of hard currency with which to purchase raw materials—who have to pay the \$1,200 billion that we owe. We are paying the debt servicing with 30 to 40 per cent—or more—of the value of our exports. We desperately need foreign financing in order to promote the development of our countries. Rather than this, the underdeveloped countries—especially in Latin America—have become net exporters of capital to the international finance centres, having sent out more than \$125 billion in the last few years. We keep on making payments on an unpayable debt that has paralyzed us economically.

24. Therefore, we need a new international atmosphere in which, instead of squandering billions of dollars on nuclear missiles, bombers, planes equipped with nuclear bombs, tanks and conventional weapons, we will use those funds to promote world development. Fidel Castro proposed this here at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, in 1979, speaking at the 31st meeting on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

25. Any serious analysis of the international economy will show that the only solution for the international economic problems that are causing the capitalist economies to stagnate and are holding back the economic progress of socialism lies in making genuine consumers of the hundreds of millions of human beings who live in the third world, isolated from the market. Do away with marginalization and make them—including the more than 120 million who, according to the statistics, live in abject poverty—buyers of the merchandise produced by the developed countries. A developed third world could solve the crisis of the modern world economy, but the developed world is too busy looking inward at its own problems and thus far has been concentrating on manufacturing devastating weapons and discovering new forms of universal destruction. Only peace can lead it to think about the third world's needs and about the possibilities that will arise from its development.

26. We also state that if we want total peace, while giving priority to halting the nuclear threat, we must not forget the regional conflicts—which are, to some extent, a consequence of the global contradiction. We should remember the attempts to include the Central American situation in the framework of the East-West confrontation and to justify aid to the Nicaraguan counter-revolutionaries and the inciting of the war against Nicaragua—which, it was claimed, were efforts to keep that small Central American country from becoming a threat to United States security—as if that were really possible—at the instigation of Moscow and with the support of Cuba.

27. Israel would not be so arrogant and brutal, persist in denying the Palestinians' rights or hold on to the Arab territories if it were not supported by its strategic reserve status in the present United States Government's military plans.

28. Let us also recall that when Angola asked Cuba for help in defending its territory against the South Africans—who are responsible not only for *apartheid* but also for keeping Namibia as one of their possessions—and Cuba, with enormous logistic sacrifices, sent its fighters to defend Angola's independence, there was talk of Moscow's influence, of Soviet strategy. And now, when Cuba has confirmed its decision to withdraw its forces from Angola once Namibia achieves independence and Angola receives the guarantees it demands, efforts are being made to ascribe Angola's and Cuba's negotiating actions to the contingencies of the international situation rather than to the Angolan-Cuban concept that, at this time, in view of South Africa's difficulties and the needs of United States policy, it is possible to achieve a negotiated solution in southern Africa.

29. All this confirms that the climate of international insecurity, the global contradictions that have kept us on the brink of war, are creating a rarefied atmosphere that not only affects the major Powers involved in the possible conflagration, but also extends to our own countries. Thus, the solution of regional problems will help to clear the international atmosphere by eliminating tensions. Such has been the case in Afghanistan. Developments in the Kampuchean issue also open up prospects there. Resolving the tragic situation in El Salvador, as its people hope for, will also help in this effort. Puerto Rico and other peoples under colonialism are also waiting.

30. Thus, peace interests us not only as regards the future of mankind—for we cannot survive without it—but also as an influential element in the immediate life of our countries.

31. The example of the military bases testifies to this. No backward country needs them in order to achieve its own aspirations, yet there are dozens of military bases in countries that do not belong to the military alliances. Some of them were established as a result of previous military occupation; others constitute a virtual rental of national sovereignty, to which countries eaten away by poverty are forced to resort because they have no economic alternative. Sometimes the military base is the price a tyranny has to pay for survival—the base gives it the foreign support it requires. Perhaps the most intolerable example is the Guantánamo naval base, established on Cuban territory 80 years ago, imposed on us by the American occupiers even though our people had opposed it. It is still there, an insult to our national sovereignty. Cuba has not accepted it, cannot accept it and will never accept it. That part of our national territory should be returned to us.

32. As we draw closer to the conditions for peace and as disarmament advances, the system of international bases will become ever more irrational, and it will become possible to eliminate them.

33. The fact that we are giving priority to the issue of nuclear war—which leads us to support the Washington agreements and to place growing hope in the advances achieved in the Moscow talks on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons—must not make us overlook conventional weapons, which are more destructive now than in the Second World War, when they killed tens of millions of people. There-

fore, we are interested in the Vienna talks, in which members of NATO and of the Warsaw Treaty Organization are discussing this topic. We want those talks to succeed as quickly as possible. Above all, the transparency of information should prevail in this. Some people prefer to harp on the supposed overwhelming superiority of the Warsaw Treaty States and not accept the Soviet offers to explain the most complete data, which would make it possible to reduce the discrepancies.

34. Even though we are impatient over the need for an agreement, we must not despair. Far from becoming an obstacle, the years of discussion may be a beneficial contribution to definitive stabilization. For our part, we—the medium-sized and small countries—are also obliged to set limits on our own conventional weapons. This is directly related to our geographical position and our political situations.

35. We might ask if the level of Angola's conventional weapons should be determined by those of the African countries that are its friends or by that of its threatening South African neighbours, who support UNITA.<sup>1</sup>

36. We should define whether Nicaragua's defence mechanism should be reduced fairly in comparison with those of its Central American neighbours or whether the power with which the United States is threatening it should be taken into account—for the United States does not consider that the counter-revolutionaries it has massed and directs in Honduras are sufficient.

37. Cuba does not possess any offensive weapons. It does not want to have any weapons other than the minimum necessary for guaranteeing that its domestic peace is not disturbed. However, it is obliged to organize its defence not on the basis of its Latin American and Caribbean neighbours—with whom it has no disputes whatsoever—but taking into account the thus far uninterrupted hostility of the nearby United States, which has forced us to turn the war waged by the army into a war of all the people, in which the entire population, including the elderly, homemakers and children, would take part along with the members of the armed forces.

38. All of these things in the global sphere that influence the domestic situations of our countries show us that those of us who are not protagonists in the nuclear war cannot resign ourselves to being anxious spectators watching negotiations from afar without taking part in them; rather, as members of the international community, we are duty-bound to be modest but passionate participants in this battle in which disarmament and peace are the ultimate goals. That is why we attach so much importance to the discussions in the United Nations. While the main controversy has to be determined by the two biggest Powers of all time—and nobody can pretend to ignore this—the assurance of disarmament and the attainment of peace require the participation and consent of the international community, which can be achieved only by means of the discussions, resolutions and agreements of the United Nations. This should give it the unquestionable universality it needs.

39. Cuba joins in this still incipient hope that encourages us all on coming to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

40. Our people are aware of the nuclear threat, which was nearly imminent for us 26 years ago, but we do not accept the idea that mankind can be destroyed. We will join all efforts to prevent that, both on the world scale and at the local level. We can do little to prevent an atomic conflagration, but we will not be remiss in doing what little we can. We are ready to do our part to ensure a negotiated peace in Central America. In Angola, the negotiations now under way confirm that when Namibia's independence and Angola's territorial integrity are guaranteed, the time will have come for the Cuban forces to leave southern Angola.

41. Cuba is a socialist country and, as such, subscribes to peace as a permanent policy. At the same time, it is part of a third world that needs peace and aspires to development. It is a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the vanguard of the third world. This special session of the General Assembly can help us advance towards these goals. Therefore, we support this meeting as part of an historic change to which we should all be committed. Cuba is, entirely.

42. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I thank the Vice-President of the State Council and of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba for the important statement he has just made.

43. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia): I should like first to express my delegation's sincere pleasure and satisfaction at seeing you, Sir, presiding over this momentous third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are convinced that, with the outstanding qualities of dedication and skill you so amply displayed during the regular as well as the resumed meetings of the forty-second session of the General Assembly, you will again guide our deliberations to a successful conclusion.

44. Ten years ago, as the first special session on disarmament wound up its work, there was universal hope that the quest to put an end to the arms race would acquire a vital new impulse. The Final Document of that session [*resolution S-10/2*] set out the basic principles, priorities and Programme of Action for progress towards the unanimously accepted goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

45. In contrast, the 1982 second special session on disarmament became mired in mutual recriminations and failed to build upon the solemn commitments undertaken four years earlier.

46. We must now face up to the reality that the international disarmament strategy adopted in the Final Document has by and large remained unimplemented. The competitive acquisition of armaments, especially nuclear weapons, has expanded beyond all rational proportions. Weapons of awesome destructive power continue to be added to the arsenals of nations at an unrelenting pace. Ever more regions of

the world are being drawn into a seemingly headlong rush towards a nuclear holocaust. Even the oceans and outer space have not been immune to this deadly contention.

47. This perilous situation facing all of us today is directly attributable to four decades of unbridled arms competition, with its source primarily in the East-West conflict. Furthermore, the record of past negotiations clearly shows that the primary purpose was not so much arms reduction or disarmament, but rather the controlled expansion and regulation of certain aspects of the arms race. As a result, even while negotiations on these accords were in progress, the technological potentials, some of which are still on the drawing board, were already being directed towards the development of ever-more sophisticated weapons systems, thus negating whatever progress could be achieved at the negotiating table. This, unfortunately, is the regrettable legacy of arms control over the past 40 years.

48. At the same time, however, we should also recognize certain positive developments and trends in recent years. Since the historic Reykjavik meeting in October 1986 between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, the two super-Powers have shown a greater disposition to engage in substantive dialogue and negotiations on a range of issues of critical importance to their bilateral relationship as well as to the interests of the world at large. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, now ratified by both sides, will be of timely significance, not only for Europe but also for Asia and beyond, in contributing to enhanced international security and stability. This first step should be followed by further agreements on the more complex issues of space and strategic arms and provide added impetus to the multilateral disarmament negotiations in Geneva. Therefore we hope that the summit meeting in Moscow, concluded only a few days ago, will accelerate the momentum towards tangible progress in those areas.

49. Over the years there have also emerged common perceptions and a heightened awareness of the globalized nature of certain fundamental problems now confronting the international community. Consequently there is an increasing convergence of common interests and wider realization that in an increasingly interdependent world no country or region can hope to achieve optimal economic development and national security on its own. If nothing else, the revolution in communications and transportation has bound us all together into one global community.

50. Notwithstanding these positive and reassuring trends, if we are to avert the possibility of nuclear war, reduce the frequency and destructiveness of conventional conflicts and ease the socio-economic burdens of armaments, then a fundamental reorientation will be needed in our thinking on disarmament and security in all aspects—military, political, economic and social. We should at long last recognize that peace in the nuclear age is indivisible, as nuclear weapons have fundamentally altered perceptions and calculations of national and international security. Likewise, we should realize that greater security cannot be bought by increasing military spending,



nor can it be imposed at the expense of others, for a nuclear conflict will inevitably engulf the whole of humankind. The destiny of each nation is inextricably bound up in the collective security of all nations.

51. What is called for is a global framework of negotiations based upon the dynamic process initiated at the first special session on disarmament. To bring this about, efforts must be made at all levels—subregional, regional and, most important, the global, multilateral level.

52. In this context my Government has consistently called for a comprehensive approach within which disarmament should be pursued. In Indonesia's view, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should, as its name literally denotes, consist of an all-encompassing and mutually supportive set of measures in all relevant areas, leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control as the final objective. The negotiating process itself could proceed in time-bound phases, while ensuring at each phase the development of appropriate methods and procedures so as not to diminish the sovereign rights of States or their legitimate national security interests.

53. Such a comprehensive approach would, *inter alia*, involve: the elaboration of the stages of nuclear disarmament, including the responsibilities of nuclear Powers and the role of the non-nuclear States; the identification of the duties and obligations of the nuclear Powers to refrain from the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear States and their duties and obligations in the prevention of nuclear war; the search for alternatives to doctrines of deterrence and reliance on nuclear weapons; the prohibition of the development, production or use of other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and radiological weapons; the prevention of an expansion of the arms race into outer space and into the seas and oceans; the limitation and reduction of conventional armaments, including their transfer aspects; and the enhancement of the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament and its relationship to negotiations conducted in bilateral, regional and other restricted forums.

54. My delegation expects this session to come to grips with these critical issues and to provide concrete guidelines for negotiations and the appropriate machinery required. In this task our premise and basic framework must remain the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament, for there can be no doubt that the principles and priorities contained therein remain as valid today as they were 10 years ago. Thus the stage would be set for the implementation of the Programme of Action through the adoption of concrete and forward-looking measures.

55. In the search to de-escalate the nuclear arms race, no other measure would have such decisive impact as a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon testing, that is, stopping all tests in all environments for all time. Yet, for all the solemn reaffirmations of existing treaty obligations, and in spite of years of protracted debates and deliberations, no tangible

progress has been made in attaining this paramount objective.

56. Clearly, the stage-by-stage approach contemplated by the United States and the Soviet Union, involving, *inter alia*, a joint verification experiment, is still quite far from meeting the litmus test of unambiguous commitment to a comprehensive, multilateral test-ban treaty. The two major nuclear Powers, which together account for the overwhelming number of nuclear-weapon tests, should agree on an immediate moratorium, to be followed by substantive negotiations within a specific time-frame on a comprehensive test ban. It is essential that in their bilateral disarmament negotiations this top-priority issue not become obscured or shelved. In this regard, Indonesia, together with other non-aligned States, has proposed the early convening of a conference to consider amendments to the partial test-ban Treaty<sup>2</sup> in order to convert it into a comprehensive treaty.

57. The specific characteristics of chemical weapons and the magnitude of their indiscriminately destructive effects on civilians and combatants alike have long since convinced my Government of the need for the early finalization of a convention to outlaw the existence and use of these deadly weapons. Considerable progress has been made in the negotiations in Geneva, and the conclusion of such a convention is no longer a distant goal but is a distinct possibility. In this context, we have on many occasions emphasized our view that partial solutions should be avoided and that the legitimate interests of all countries should be taken into account. Of no less importance is the need to refrain from any actions that might hinder the ongoing negotiations, including the production and introduction of new generations of chemical weapons.

58. The world-wide aversion to nuclear weapons is also manifest in the heightened interest in establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones. In our part of the world, this is exemplified by the entry into force of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Rarotonga) and the ongoing efforts of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia.

59. Having already led to an agreement in principle on the establishment of such a zone in South-East Asia, these efforts were given further impetus during the third ASEAN summit meeting, held last December at Manila. We in ASEAN are at present engaged in the elaboration of an appropriate instrument to be subsequently presented to the other regional States and nuclear Powers for their concurrence and endorsement. My delegation believes that the success of these endeavours would be a significant step in transforming South-East Asia from an area of recurrent tension and strife into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones would contribute significantly to nuclear arms limitation, including the strengthening of non-proliferation, by progressively reducing the geographical areas within which nuclear weapons can operate.

60. Much effort has been expended on the quantitative aspects of the arms race, often to the neglect of the qualitative dimension. In recent years, however, the international community has begun to pay great

er attention to the close interlinkage between these two fundamental elements of the armaments equation. It is therefore appropriate and timely that at this session the impact of rapid technological advance and innovation on the buildup of armaments and the disarmament process be subjected to particular scrutiny. Apart from its beneficial effects, which are obvious and numerous, technology has also continuously spawned new generations of weapons, both nuclear and non-nuclear, of ever-greater destructive power and at ever-mounting cost. Equally disturbing is the fact that technological developments constantly outstrip the pace of negotiations, thus offsetting whatever progress has thus far been made in arms limitation. Hence, it is of the utmost importance that we embark on a thorough assessment of these developments and trends, with a view to elaborating new common understandings and guidelines for our work on disarmament in the years ahead.

61. The rising concern over technological innovations further fuelling the arms race has now acquired even sharper focus with the looming spectre of the militarization of outer space. Indonesia shares the forebodings of all other non-aligned countries that such a development would start an irreversible chain of action and reaction, accelerating the competition and escalation of the arms race in both offensive and defensive weapons. The introduction and application of ever more sophisticated technologies would inevitably be accompanied by a quantum leap in the level of resources expended on armaments.

62. In addition, the viability of existing agreements, such as the 1967 Outer Space Treaty<sup>3</sup> and the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty<sup>4</sup> would be undermined. Ultimately, the outbreak of nuclear war would become much more likely, for such an expansion of the arms race would introduce a further destabilizing element into the already precarious strategic environment and exacerbate the nuclear arms race on Earth through the introduction into outer space of weapons systems capable of striking targets in both environments.

63. Any militarization of outer space poses a direct threat to the security of the non-aligned and neutral nations and would critically impact on their ongoing programmes of peaceful satellite communications. It is of utmost importance that the sanctity of the Outer Space Treaty be preserved, including the principle that outer space, as the common heritage of mankind, be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all countries. Given the accelerated pace of developments in space weaponry, this session should stress the need for new and far-reaching measures, particularly on halting the development of anti-satellite weapons and on preventing the emergence of dual-capable surveillance and monitoring systems in outer space.

64. Ever since the United Nations adopted the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)], my Government has been acutely aware of the potential benefits that its implementation would bring for the littoral and hinterland States as well as for external Powers. Considering its strategic location, encompassing major sea lanes vital for international trade and commu-

nication, and the dynamics flowing from a multitude of regional and extra-regional factors, the importance of maintaining peace and stability in the Indian Ocean is self-evident. The fact that its littoral and hinterland area is overwhelmingly comprised of newly independent and non-aligned States eager to harness their abundant resources for development free from great-Power rivalry and competition adds poignant urgency to the establishment of zonal peace in the Indian Ocean.

65. These aspirations, however, are being seriously set back by the growing militarization of the Indian Ocean, which has instilled a pervasive sense of instability and insecurity, both region-wide and beyond. The Indian Ocean zone of peace cannot materialize as long as naval manoeuvres, the fortification of foreign military bases and other manifestations of military power projection by external Powers continue unabated. Nor can resort to the principle of freedom of the high seas be used as a pretext to justify the ever-growing military activities in the Indian Ocean.

66. The complex ramifications of the problems involved and the differing perceptions of them can be addressed comprehensively only through the long-pending international Conference on the Indian Ocean. Indonesia and the non-aligned States, therefore, remain firmly committed to convening the Conference no later than 1990 as a *sine qua non* to securing the objectives of the Declaration.

67. While many of the issues under discussion have already found expression in the Final Document of the first special session [resolution S-10/2] and the Concluding Document of the second,<sup>5</sup> it is only recently that the international community has focused attention on the dangerously neglected issue of the naval arms race and naval disarmament. Much useful groundwork has already been done by the General Assembly, including the expert study on this question prepared by the Secretary-General.<sup>6</sup> Member States have thus become increasingly aware of the particular characteristics of naval armaments and the mode of operations of naval forces in the overall context of the global arms race. Apart from the fact that no less than one third of the world's nuclear arsenals are destined for naval deployment, the distinguishing feature of sea-based nuclear forces is their ability to proliferate geographically throughout the world and to be deployed along any coastal point. While the stationing and movement of tactical nuclear weapons on land are restricted by explicit treaty provisions, their naval deployment can place any State at risk.

68. As an archipelagic country, located astride important waterways linking two oceans and two continents, Indonesia cannot but feel extremely concerned at the horizontal and vertical proliferation of sea-based strategic and tactical nuclear weapons. We strongly believe, therefore, that this session should build on the progress already made by defining certain principles and establishing guidelines on measures for naval arms limitation and disarmament, including confidence-building at sea.

69. In recent years, efforts to spur conventional disarmament have gained increased prominence.

This is understandable, given the global prevalence of conventional armaments and their extensive use, the ever-growing expenditures involved and the latent risk that conflicts waged with conventional weapons might escalate into nuclear war. New technologies and the increased sophistication they have brought to conventional weapons systems have also profoundly transformed traditional notions of conventional warfare. Moreover, since the international transfer of those weapons is principally conducted in the context of great-Power rivalry, the independence and non-aligned status of many States are being placed in jeopardy. For all those reasons, the need to curb the development, production and transfer of conventional armaments has become self-evident.

70. In identifying possible concrete measures, however, it should be emphasized that the widespread accumulation and qualitative development of conventional arms are being pursued precisely by those States which already possess the largest military arsenals and which produce, sell, acquire and deploy the largest share of such armaments. It cannot be contended that conventional arms *per se* are a greater threat to the survival of mankind than nuclear weapons, or that conventional arms in the possession of developing nations in some way threaten international peace and security more than the nuclear and conventional weapon arsenals of the major Powers and their alliances. Hence, efforts to reduce and limit conventional arms should be placed within a comprehensive context, focusing on both supplier and recipient countries rather than on a particular group of countries, and should be directed towards the primary causes of the conventional arms race.

71. With the convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held from 24 August to 11 September 1987, the inherent linkages between those two predominant concerns have been explicitly recognized. In that forum the international community signalled its resolve to move the relationship beyond the realm of political and moral desirability and into the sphere of operational practicability. Therefore, rather than merely reaffirming this and the far-reaching implications of the arms race for development, we should at this session adopt decisions that will actually promote the agreed need for a conscious reallocation of disarmament-released resources towards socio-economic development, especially that of the developing countries. Mindful of the action programme adopted by the International Conference,<sup>7</sup> we should seriously consider making concrete recommendations on the establishment of an international financial mechanism as a means of giving tangible expression to the acknowledged link between disarmament and development. In that way this session would make a singular contribution to the building of a viable framework for our future action and continuing efforts in this field. Such a decision would also constitute an important step towards the conscious restructuring of the international order so as to ensure greater justice and equity in economic relations and greater restraint and rationality in security policies.

72. Verification of compliance with disarmament agreements is rightly an issue of vital concern to all nations, as it represents a crucial component in the

implementation of those agreements and in promoting confidence-building. Indeed, it is of no less importance to the non-nuclear States that such agreements be strictly observed and faithfully carried out. In recent years technology has made and continues to make rapid improvements in the reliability and comprehensiveness of verification measures, yet distrust and suspicion continue to frustrate attempts to achieve arms limitation accords. My delegation therefore supports the Stockholm Declaration of the Six-Nation Initiative, of 21 January 1988,<sup>8</sup> on a strengthened multilateral framework for ensuring peace and stability during the process of disarmament. Specifically, we believe the establishment of an integrated, multilateral verification system within the United Nations would represent a reliable as well as an impartial means to overcome apprehensions and doubts over the implementation of agreements.

73. It is clear that if we continue to temporize over the arms race, ameliorating its symptoms rather than dealing with its causes, we will run the increasing risk of equivocating ourselves into oblivion. In the few areas where progress has been made on some disarmament issues, the pace of negotiations has been too excruciatingly slow and the scope of agreements reached still too limited in nature. We should in all fairness recognize, however, that those shortcomings cannot be attributed to the United Nations, for the record shows that since its inception the Organization has spared no effort and has expended more time and resources on this question than on any other issue of international concern and interest; yet today we are as far away from the goal of greater collective security as envisioned by the Charter as we were four decades ago.

74. It cannot be denied that the pursuit of unilateral security through the accumulation of arms has proved to be a dangerous illusion; hence, to persist in a colossally wasteful arms race that is completely disproportionate to requirements of self-defence or even to the degree of national security obtained would amount to an irrational and counterproductive course of action. The only rational alternative would be to seek common security for all through total nuclear disarmament and balanced reductions to progressively lower levels of conventional armaments.

75. The non-aligned countries have consistently maintained that the security of the vast majority of nations cannot and should not be held hostage to the perceived security interests of a handful of powerful States. Disarmament and the preservation of world peace are tasks too vital to be left exclusively to the major Powers and their alliances. It is only through the multilateral approach and the strengthening of all institutions for multilateral co-operation, especially the United Nations, that negotiations on all issues relating to disarmament can be conducted in the larger context of safeguarding global peace and security, rather than in the narrow confines of great-Power rivalry. To that end it is imperative that we reaffirm the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament and commit ourselves to enhancing further the effectiveness of the machinery and procedures of the multilateral disarmament process, as laid down in



the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament.

76. The convening of this third special session on disarmament, with the participation of so many delegations at a high political level, reaffirms the profound sense of urgency with which we all view the overriding need to terminate the arms race, with all its incalculable consequences for mankind as a whole. It is the sincere hope of my delegation that through constructive dialogue and concerted action we may be able to transform the timely opportunity of this session into a watershed of concrete achievement and progress towards our common goal of greater peace, security and prosperity for all.

77. Mr. TOTU (Romania): On behalf of the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Mr. Nicolae Ceaușescu, I am deeply honoured to convey cordial greetings to the participants in this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. He also wishes this prestigious forum complete success in its efforts to build a new world free of weapons and war and to safeguard the supreme right of peoples, of all human beings, to existence, to life in freedom, independence and peace, in accordance with their vital aspirations.

78. Romania attaches great importance to this special session and its objectives. The Romanian people is deeply committed to disarmament and peace in accordance with the country's general policy aimed at peaceful development and coexistence with all other nations. That commitment rests on the conviction that the social and economic progress of any country is strongly dependent on safeguarding world peace, security and co-operation.

79. It is my great privilege now to present to the Assembly the views and proposals of Romania and President Ceaușescu on disarmament issues and the line of action, as we see it, to be taken by States for their solution.

80. We shall soon mark the tenth anniversary of the first special session devoted to disarmament. Unfortunately, this anniversary provides no reason to rejoice. For the past decade the arms race has continued unabated at an ever-increasing pace. Military expenditures will exceed \$1,000 billion this year, with the most harmful effects for all countries. The nuclear-weapon stockpile can destroy all life on our planet several times over. As a logical consequence of that dramatic reality, the world economic crisis has worsened and the gap between the rich and the poor countries has widened further. On the other hand, new sources of tension have emerged in the world in addition to those that existed 10 years ago. True, some positive events have taken place recently; however, they have not yet proved able to bring about radical changes in the political climate on a world-wide scale. The world is still faced with grave and complex problems which require a new line of thinking, a new approach to the settlement of the issue of war and peace conducive to a radical change in international affairs.

81. Romania believes that the United Nations, which gives expression to the will and interests of the world community, is called upon, while reiterating

the aims and principles of the Final Document of 1978, firmly to lay the groundwork for the adoption of a comprehensive programme for nuclear and general disarmament. Such a programme would provide the necessary framework for the action to be taken by international forums and States alike in all disarmament areas. It would have to be finalized on the basis of the draft which is now under consideration in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, while also taking into account the proposals which will be submitted at the present session.

82. The final document to be worked out by us should express the commitment by all States to act resolutely for disarmament. Therefore it should provide very clearly for a close relationship between bilateral, regional, and universal multilateral negotiations so that the measures to be adopted at such negotiations would complement and support each other.

83. In line with its foreign policy of peace and co-operation among nations, and motivated by the desire to contribute to a successful conclusion of this special session, Romania submits to this distinguished world forum the following considerations.

84. In view of the serious danger posed by the existence of nuclear weapons to mankind's present and future, this special session should arrive at an agreement on actions to be taken in order to speed up the negotiations on nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of such weapons.

85. The conclusion of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is a modest beginning. Its importance will be enhanced to the extent that it is followed by new agreements. Therefore the General Assembly should call upon the Soviet Union and the United States to conclude a treaty on the 50 per cent reduction in strategic weapons at the earliest possible time this year.

86. To achieve nuclear disarmament—the fundamental goal of all mankind—Romania proposes the following.

87. First, besides the nuclear Powers, all interested States should take part in disarmament negotiations.

88. Secondly, a general programme of nuclear disarmament should be worked out as soon as possible. Such a programme should, as a primary and long-term goal, provide for the reduction of nuclear weapons until their total liquidation by the year 2000. This goal should be achieved in stages, according to a clear timetable.

89. Thirdly, a special body for nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons should be set up. Such a body would be the venue for negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, cessation of testing of such weapons, and working out of the general programme of nuclear disarmament.

90. Fourthly, in view of the danger of the ever-wider proliferation of nuclear weapons all over the

world, the States possessing such weapons should withdraw nuclear weapons within their own national frontiers.

91. Fifthly, Romania proposes the negotiation of a programme conducive to curbing technological improvements in nuclear weapons and cessation of the production of fissionable materials and delivery vehicles. All nuclear disarmament agreements should contain provisions to ban the development of new military technologies in the respective fields. So that nations all over the world may play a more important part and make a larger contribution to the achievement of nuclear disarmament, the United Nations should become a forum to monitor and control military technologies so as to end the development of new weapons of mass destruction.

92. Sixthly, new negotiations should be started, with the participation of all States, on the elimination of short-range nuclear weapons.

93. Seventhly, as a part of nuclear disarmament, international co-operation projects should be set up for the utilization of fissionable materials for exclusively peaceful purposes.

*Mr. Ould Boye (Mauritania), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

94. Eighthly, the United Nations should extend its support to the endeavours of States which initiated the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world or proclaimed themselves or cities thereof free of nuclear weapons. It should also see to it that the nuclear-weapon States guarantee the status of such regions as nuclear-weapon-free zones. All this would sustain and speed up the process of nuclear disarmament. In this respect the United Nations should call upon the Balkan States, as well as those in the northern and central parts of Europe and in other parts of the world, to begin negotiations with a view to setting up in those regions zones of peace, co-operation and good-neighbourliness, free of nuclear weapons.

95. Package two: in view of the danger posed by the expansion of the arms race into outer space, steps should be taken to renounce the militarization of outer space and its utilization exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind. Romania proposes the following: first, the conclusion of an international treaty on the utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes only which would provide for the renunciation of the use of space for military purposes; and secondly, the regulation of the launching of satellites and other objects into outer space.

96. Package three: with a view to ensuring conditions of security and stability for all States, reducing the danger of war and achieving disarmament and, in close relationship with practical action conducive to the reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons, all chemical weapons should be eliminated. In our view this should result in the following: first, implementation of a programme of action reiterating the banning of the use of chemical weapons and stipulating the cessation of the production of all kinds of chemical weapons and the liquidation of existing stocks; secondly, a pledge by States that until all chemical

weapons have been destroyed they will not in any circumstances resort to such weapons, and thirdly, the encouragement by the United Nations of setting up chemical-weapon-free zones in the Balkans, central Europe and other regions of the world as an action to support the on-going negotiations of the convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and their complete elimination.

97. Package four: with a view to safeguarding international peace and security and strengthening confidence and détente among States, of the utmost importance would be the undertaking of measures conducive to a sizeable reduction of troops, conventional armaments and military expenditures. As is known, taking the view that the reduction of military expenditures is an important step towards effective disarmament, Romania decided, as the result of a national referendum in November 1986, unilaterally to cut its troops, armaments and military expenditures by 5 per cent.

98. In line with its policy of disarmament, the Socialist Republic of Romania proposes the following: first, the annual reduction by States of their military expenditures so that by the year 2000 the reductions would amount to at least 50 per cent of present expenditures; and secondly, adoption at this session of principles that are to govern the negotiation and conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures as agreed upon by the Conference on Disarmament. This would create conditions conducive to concrete negotiations on the matter. Thirdly, each disarmament agreement should also provide for an appropriate reduction in military expenditures.

99. In view of the fact that Europe is faced with the largest concentration of troops and conventional weapons, and considering the background set by the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, we believe that it is high time to start reductions in conventional weapons also. This process should be accompanied by resolute action to stop any modernization of short-range nuclear weapons.

100. In this respect we propose the following: first, States participating in the two military alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Treaty—should start negotiations on these issues, to be attended by all other European States, by the end of 1988. These negotiations should lead to a sizeable reduction in troops and conventional weapons by at least 20 per cent by 1990, by 30 to 35 per cent by 1995 and by 50 per cent by the year 2000. The reductions should apply first of all to such types of weapons as tanks and armoured cars, military aircraft, missiles and warships. Secondly, as soon as negotiations have begun a moratorium should be called whereby the troops, armaments and military expenditures of each country in the two alliances would be maintained at the 1988 level. Thirdly, the negotiations on conventional disarmament should aim at setting the military balance of the armed forces, armaments and military expenditures of the States of the two alliances at the lowest possible level. Fourthly, a study should be made and specific proposals worked out on the number of troops and armaments that are a necessary minimum for the defence of countries. Fifthly, as an important

part of conventional disarmament, military bases on the territory of other States should be dismantled and the foreign troops withdrawn within national borders. Sixthly, the Warsaw Treaty and NATO States should start concrete negotiations conducive to a simultaneous dismantling of the two military blocs. The process should start with the dissolution of their military organizations.

101. Package five: under existing international conditions and in order to make possible the implementation of a set of measures conducive to the elimination of the threat or use of force, we believe it is necessary: first, to work out rules consistent with existing international conventions that would govern the movement and conduct of naval forces on the high seas, including prior notification to the United Nations of naval military activities and limitation of movements and concentrations in certain areas; and secondly, to establish within the United Nations a committee for the peaceful utilization of seas and oceans.

102. Package six: with a view to eliminating sources of suspicion and tension and reducing the danger of military confrontation, the adoption of new confidence- and security-building measures in Europe would be of the utmost importance.

103. We propose the following: first, prohibition of the flight of aircraft and the passage of military vessels and submarines carrying nuclear weapons in the vicinity of other States; and secondly, an international treaty forbidding any attack against civil nuclear installations, both in case of armed conflict and in time of peace, as well as any terrorist act against such installations.

104. Thirdly, the adoption of new confidence- and security-building measures, such as: limitations on the number of armed forces taking part in military activities and the setting up of ceilings on the number of war vessels and aircraft participating in such activities; renunciation of the conducting of military manoeuvres close to the frontiers of other States; the establishment along the borders between NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries of a corridor free from nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction, offensive arms, and ultimately from troops and armaments, except for the forces of order and border guards; and a prohibition on stationing new troops and setting up new military bases on the territory of other States.

105. Fourthly, disarmament requires that the military doctrines of States should be re-examined and that the doctrines based on resort to war, especially to nuclear weapons, and to offensive armed forces should be replaced by exclusively defensive ones.

106. Package seven: the implementation of measures aimed at curbing the arms race and at disarmament requires strict and effective control with respect to the commitments assumed by States, so as to encourage and sustain the steps conducive to disarmament. In this respect we propose the following: first, the United Nations should contribute towards working out verification and control procedures which would stimulate negotiations in the field of disarmament; and secondly, an international body

should be established within the United Nations, open to the participation of all States, which would ensure unbiased monitoring and control for the implementation in good faith of disarmament measures agreed upon through bilateral, regional and universal agreements.

107. Package eight: in view of the direct relationship existing between disarmament and the elimination of underdevelopment, Romania submits the following proposals. First, an international development fund should be established, under United Nations auspices, to be financed from the resources made available as a result of disarmament measures. The fund would be used to assist economic and social development, especially of the developing countries, as recommended by the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Secondly, the General Assembly should recommend that all disarmament agreements to be concluded from now on should stipulate that the funding made available through disarmament should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

108. Package nine: current world conditions also require the democratization of international relations and active participation of all States in the settlement of the grave and complex problems facing mankind. The United Nations can play an important role in this respect, which makes it necessary to take new actions, such as: first, the establishment of a United Nations special body for the settlement of conflicts between States through negotiations, good offices, mediation or conciliation, bearing in mind that tension and conflicts are both a cause and a result of the arms race; secondly, States conducting disarmament negotiations at a bilateral or regional level should systematically keep the other United Nations Member States informed of progress and the results of their negotiations, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General or through other channels; thirdly, the role which could be played by the Secretary-General, either directly or through his special representatives, should be enhanced, and he should act and contribute to overcoming the difficulties that may arise in the process of negotiations; and fourthly, the United Nations should launch a call to all States for "disarmament through facts", whereby they would be invited to initiate unilateral actions, or base them on mutual example, in such fields as the freezing and cutting down of armaments, troops and military expenditures. Such initiatives taken by States in response to the call of the United Nations should be registered at Headquarters and communicated to other States.

109. Package ten: the deterioration of international conditions as a result of the intensified arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, threatens the peace and security of the whole of mankind and the very existence of life on our planet. That is why peoples and world public opinion are called upon to be ever more active in opposing the dangerous trend of events and imposing resolute action on the field of disarmament.

110. A great responsibility in this respect devolves upon scientists. They have the calling and the moral duty to act to halt the arms race and to eliminate nuclear weapons, so that the great scientific and

technological achievements of the human mind might be used in the interests of life and the advancement of mankind.

111. In presenting to this special session of the General Assembly the views and the proposals of the President of Romania on the need to halt the arms race, first in the nuclear field, and to proceed with general disarmament, the Romanian delegation reaffirms its determination to act in close co-operation with the delegations of all other participating States, for the attainment of the historic goal—the liberation of mankind from the nightmare of a world holocaust.

112. It is our firm belief that the international community has the strength to determine such a course of action. The United Nations itself can prove its sense of responsibility and the necessary political will, so that the present special session could, through its decisions, contribute to curbing the dangerous trend towards further confrontation, to the adoption of effective measures of military disengagement and disarmament and to the elimination of the use and threat of the use of force in international relations.

113. As stated recently by President Ceaușescu, "We have to look with confidence at the future of mankind, in close relationship with the need to eliminate nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, to ensure the independent development, peace and progress of all nations." That message is a call addressed to all States and peoples all over the world to spare no effort and to unite in order to build a better world, a world which would be free of weapons and wars, in which each and every nation could devote its energy to free and independent development, to its own economic and social advancement.

114. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): I have the honour to convey to you, Sir, and, through you to the representatives present here, greetings from my sovereign, His Majesty King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev, and his best wishes for the success of this special session of the General Assembly. Allow me to extend our most sincere felicitations to Mr. Peter Florin on his election as President of this session. Having noted the great skill and wisdom with which he successfully guided the work of the forty-second session, we are confident that he will lead this special session to a fruitful conclusion. I wish also to avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts to advance the purposes and principles of the United Nations and to strengthen the cause of international peace and security.

115. A whole decade has elapsed since the international community adopted the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That document—rightly characterized as the charter of disarmament—was of historic significance, inasmuch as it marked the very first time that the world community achieved a consensus on a comprehensive international disarmament strategy.

116. Yet, assembled as we are here a full 10 years after that landmark event in international relations, can we truly proclaim that the promise of that first

disarmament session has borne sweet fruit? Is the world today a safer place because of the adoption of the Final Document? Has its reaffirmation and the launching of the World Disarmament Campaign, consequent on the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1982, brought mankind any closer to its long-sought goal of security in disarmament? Will the billions of people represented in this Hall view this special session as a worthy, visible move towards the attainment of the ideal of general and complete disarmament? Or, as some critics charge, will it be seen as another stylized—and costly—ritual in multilateral diplomacy?

117. The frank answer to that important question will depend on whether the international community is prepared to back euphonious words and phrases with concrete and co-ordinated action. In this context, my delegation wishes to go on record as stating that all Member States—big and small, nuclear and non-nuclear—have a responsibility to contribute to the translation of disarmament concepts into everyday life. And while it goes without saying, of course, that the super-Powers and all other nuclear-weapon Powers have the major responsibility, particularly in matters concerning nuclear disarmament, Nepal is convinced that every other State has a corresponding responsibility and contribution to make to the disarmament cause.

118. Such a role, we believe, is especially suitable in the area of conventional disarmament. In fact, without in any way minimizing the utter imperative of nuclear disarmament, we are convinced that the time has come for all States—in particular, militarily significant States—to demonstrate the same quality of compromise and statesmanship that the international community seeks from the super-Powers and other nuclear States in the area of nuclear disarmament.

119. Coming back more specifically to the developments in the domain of the arms race since the second special session, my delegation is acutely conscious of the great technological advances that have occurred, including those enhancing the destructive power, reach and accuracy of weapons of mass annihilation. Nor are we unaware that, even as progress on various disarmament proposals is under way, concerted efforts are being made to seek ever more costly and sophisticated new categories of weapons and weapons systems, including those designed for outer space.

120. On the other hand, my delegation can hardly ignore or overlook traces of the proverbial silver lining in the otherwise ominous swirls of clouds darkening the skies of mankind. In this context, my delegation in particular notes and warmly welcomes the recent exchange in Moscow of the instruments of ratification of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—signed last December in Washington.

121. This treaty—which for the first time eliminates an entire class of nuclear arms—is a disarmament milestone that truly deserves international

acclaim. Indeed, in spite of the fact that the intermediate-range and shorter-range land-based nuclear missiles with which it is concerned comprise only a very small fraction of the total nuclear weaponry arsenal, it marks the very first time that a whole category of nuclear weapons is to be dismantled: hence, a first step towards disarmament. That hopeful aspect of the INF Treaty apart, my delegation considers the innovative nature and scope of the verification triad enshrined therein—on-site inspection, inspection by challenge and unobtrusive use of satellites—as not only valuable *per se* but as having the potential for positive application in subsequent disarmament accords.

122. Another encouraging development is the success of the recent Moscow summit meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union and, in particular, their reaffirmation of their goal to achieve a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in their arsenals of strategic offensive arms. That, combined with a relaxation of tension in a number of traditional hotbeds of regional strife—in and around Afghanistan and Central America, to cite but two specific examples—provides additional ground for hope that a new impulse will be injected into the endeavours of the international community to achieve its long-sought objective of greater security for all at progressively lower levels of armament.

123. At this stage, I must underline that my delegation noted with great satisfaction that considerable progress has been made in Geneva in recent years in negotiations for a convention on chemical weapons. In our view, the recent intensive use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq conflict has generated even greater urgency to achieve this long-awaited convention. We have been encouraged in this regard by, and were honoured to join in, the unanimous adoption by the Security Council of resolution 612 (1988) of 9 May 1988. We hope that it will serve as an auspicious augury for a chemical-weapon-free world.

124. Coming now to the area of new developments and trends in the disarmament process, I should like at the outset to record our deep sense of alarm and dismay—alarm at the dangerous escalation in the arms race; dismay at the shameful waste of mankind's precious, limited resources in the production of weapons of doom.

125. My delegation is gravely concerned not only at the recent, intensive use of chemical weapons, but equally at the general proliferation of missiles and missile warfare. The eruption of the "war of the cities" in the Iran-Iraq conflict underlines a very sombre trend: whereas it has been estimated that in the 1960s civilians suffered a death rate of 52 per cent, in the 1980s the figure stands at the horrific level of 85 per cent.

126. Another worrisome new development affecting international security pertains to the acceleration of the arms race at sea. Given that oceans are without borders; that naval forces of nuclear Powers are routinely nuclear-armed; that ships, submarines and surveillance aircraft operate in close proximity with one another, practising mock attacks or shadowing one another; and recalling that in recent regional conflicts naval vessels have been employed as the

first resort, it would be naïve to believe that the naval-arms race constitutes a problem affecting, and to be addressed by, the super-Powers alone. As the ramifications of the naval arms race are truly global—affecting even land-locked countries like my own—my delegation would strongly urge that it receive the attention clearly due it.

127. I have already referred briefly to conventional disarmament in the context of what the role and contributions of the non-nuclear-weapon States should be, in Nepal's view, at this period of the arms race. That is a position that we in Nepal have cherished for long. Indeed, Nepal's concern in this regard was succinctly summed up by the King at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in 1979, in these words:

"While big Powers have been proud to show upon humanity the ever-impending Damoclean sword of nuclear weapons, it is unfortunate that this value system should have allured even the countries of our ranks at the expense of their own peace and development for the region and the world."

128. I should add that Nepal is equally firm in its conviction that conventional disarmament can be resolutely promoted by the international community by tackling its regional aspects and also the important question of international arms transfers.

129. Without minimizing the urgency of achieving substantial progress in the area of nuclear disarmament, it can hardly be ignored that since the end of the Second World War more than 150 wars have been fought with conventional means; that 1987 alone witnessed an estimated 22 conventional wars; or that the most rapid growth rate in military spending has been in the third world, where the purchases of sophisticated conventional weaponry have increased fivefold in a quarter of a century. We hold that conventional disarmament can be promoted, among other means, through appropriate regional arrangements based on the principles of openness and mutual trust, transparency and predictability. Such an approach, we believe, should eschew military concepts that extend defence well beyond national borders in keeping with the dangerous doctrine that "defence in our world has unlimited frontiers".

130. The goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control has for many decades served as the guiding beacon for Nepal in shaping its position on disarmament questions. That will remain the case. Nepal, however, also continues to support the concept of regional disarmament as an effective complement and pragmatic step-by-step approach to international disarmament. We believe this is in no way incompatible with the principle of universality of the United Nations.

131. We remain convinced that regional disarmament tends to mitigate the effects of the global arms competition however it is applied and contributes to strengthening regional and international security. As a matter of principle, Nepal has thus firmly supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in various sensitive regions of the world, for example, in South Asia and the South



Pacific, as useful additions to the existing repertoire of confidence-building and conflict-limiting measures.

132. Beginning right here in 1971, when it lent its whole-hearted support to the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*], Nepal has endorsed proposals for the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in South-East Asia and for a Mediterranean peace zone. Similarly, Nepal has supported the initiative for the denuclearization of the Antarctic. At the forty-first session of the General Assembly, Nepal was honoured to co-sponsor a draft resolution declaring the South Atlantic a zone of peace and co-operation, which was later adopted [*resolution 41/11*] by an overwhelming majority, reflecting the international community's awareness of the intimate linkage between peace and development.

133. Apart from being an ardent advocate-by-support of regional disarmament, Nepal has also attempted to make a modest contribution to this worthy and timely cause as an advocate-by-example. Thus, as early as 1975, King Birendra formally proposed that Nepal be declared a zone of peace—a proposal, I am very pleased to disclose here, which has gained the valuable support of 91 Member States, for which I take this opportunity to express my delegation's deep gratitude.

134. As a small, developing country situated in a sensitive part of the world that has witnessed armed conflict in the past, it is only natural that Nepal should harbour no desire to become a flash-point for hostilities in the future. That and the fact that it can ill afford to squander its very limited resources on activities that do not directly contribute to its socio-economic uplift are the only motives of Nepal's peace-zone proposal.

135. In the context of regional disarmament and confidence-building measures, I should like to propose that this special session of the General Assembly—which takes place against the encouraging backdrop of some “new thinking” on global security in the nuclear age—take up not only the usefulness of establishing additional nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace but, indeed, also the concept of a zone of peace encompassing the territory of a single Member State. I should like, in this regard, to direct the attention of the Assembly, if I may, to studies on the legal status of peace zones in international law by the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee, which enjoys permanent observer status with the United Nations.

136. In this connection, I wish also to emphasize that because the concept of peace zones is fundamentally rooted in immunizing a well-defined strategic area with a potential for, or history of, conflict from precisely such an eventuality, recognition of the same would represent a useful complement to the inventory of confidence-building and conflict-limiting instruments currently available to the international community. We further hold that international developments, including regional conflicts, concerning single strategically placed countries tend to underscore as much.

137. Let me now outline Nepal's position with respect to important disarmament issues not addressed thus far. High up on that list of priorities is the need to prevent an arms race in outer space. There is, then, also the urgency of concluding a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments. Such a treaty would greatly narrow the race for the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, which constitutes an important dimension of super-Power arms competition. My delegation would hope that the recent agreement on verification principles and procedures set out in the INF Treaty would facilitate fulfilment of that desirable goal.

138. A comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty would also, in our view, strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime by, among other things, inducing States which are not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] to accede to it. My delegation continues to hold that non-nuclear-weapon States which are not members of military alliances are entitled to categorical and legally binding assurances that none of them would be the target of a nuclear attack. In this context, Nepal would be ready to join or support any initiative in the Security Council or elsewhere towards that end.

139. Nepal has long acknowledged the nexus between disarmament and development. We recognize that both overarmament and underdevelopment represent threats to international peace and security. In the context of our troubled times, when the world's annual military budget equals the income of 2.6 billion people in the 44 poorest nations, we would strongly urge that this session give serious consideration to the implementation of the action programme adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development<sup>7</sup> less than a year ago.

140. The third special session on disarmament should, we believe, also give serious thought to the role of the United Nations in disarmament and the effectiveness of disarmament machinery. My delegation has appreciated the role of the United Nations in the disarmament process in the past and would welcome any initiative to entrust the United Nations with new responsibilities. In particular, at this stage we could support the creation of a United Nations multilateral monitoring and verification capability in the disarmament field. We believe such machinery could help ensure compliance not only with existing disarmament agreements but also with a comprehensive test-ban treaty and a chemical weapons convention which, it is hoped, will be concluded in the near future.

141. On another level, my delegation appeals to the international community to provide the necessary support to enable the United Nations regional disarmament centres for Asia, Africa and Latin America to effectively discharge their respective mandates. For its part, His Majesty's Government of Nepal stands fully committed to providing all possible assistance to the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia, which is to be sited in its capital, Kathmandu.

142. In any case, my delegation hopes that the third special session on disarmament will reaffirm the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the process of disarmament, albeit the importance of bilateral initiatives on the part of the super-Powers in the field of arms limitation and disarmament is acknowledged.

143. In conclusion, my delegation would like to emphasize the need for the third special session on disarmament to recognize and reaffirm the principles and priorities established in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. We hope that by focusing on the future and identifying points of convergence this session will help to build a consensus that could lead to the successful conclusion of long-sought-after disarmament agreements. We believe that the report of the Preparatory Committee [A/S-15/1] could be a useful basis for this exercise, and we pledge our whole-hearted support and co-operation to you, Mr. President, in contributing towards that laudable end.

144. Mrs. MUYUNDA (Zambia): Allow me, at the outset, to congratulate Mr. Florin of the German Democratic Republic on his well-deserved election as President of the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly, the third special session devoted to disarmament. My delegation is confident that his immense diplomatic skills and experience, qualities which he so amply demonstrated during his successful presidency of the forty-second session, will enable him to steer this session to a most fruitful conclusion. I also wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the other officers of the Assembly on their election. I should like to assure the President and his team of the full co-operation of my delegation as they carry out their mandate.

145. The significance of this third special session on disarmament cannot be overemphasized. It is taking place in the aftermath of very important developments, notably the signing on 8 December 1987 by the United States and the Soviet Union of the intermediate-range nuclear forces treaty and its subsequent ratification, the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, from 25 to 28 May at Addis Ababa, the special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at Havana from 26 to 30 May and the just-ended Moscow summit meeting of the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union.

146. Although the INF Treaty eliminates only a small fraction of existing nuclear weapons, much of its significance lies in the fact that it is the first actual disarmament measure that eliminates an entire class of nuclear weapons. It is, therefore, a very important first step which my delegation hopes and trusts will continue to be built upon as the community of nations strives towards the goal of creating a world of security and order based on human understanding rather than the threat of human annihilation.

147. The issue of disarmament has also preoccupied the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity, which, at its forty-eighth session, held at Addis Ababa from 19 to 23 May, issued an

important document outlining the views of African States on the various issues to be discussed at this special session. That document contains ideas and recommendations to which this session should give serious consideration.

148. The recent Havana meeting of the non-aligned countries also came up with important decisions and ideas which undoubtedly represent a significant contribution to this special session as well as to the cause and process of disarmament.

149. As for the just-ended Moscow summit meeting, it is the view of my delegation that its significance is more than merely symbolic or ceremonial. It is our sincere belief that the summit meeting has broken the ground for improved relations between the two super-Powers and has laid the necessary groundwork for further negotiations to achieve significant reductions of the strategic nuclear arsenals of these Powers.

150. It is against this background that my delegation views the significance of this third special session devoted to disarmament. If the spirit of optimism, mutual confidence, sincerity and compromise that has given rise to the aforementioned developments could be replicated at this special session, decisions and conclusions of historic importance would be achieved. We should take advantage of the immense opportunities that have been created and translate them into concrete, forward-looking and self-propelling disarmament measures. It would be tragic if we were to allow the current momentum, the result of arduous, painstaking and persistent efforts, to dissipate due to our failure at this session to display the necessary political will to make concrete and practical recommendations and to ensure their implementation.

151. The first important task that this special session should perform is that of reaffirming the validity of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. No attempt should be made to try to revise or replace that historic document. Instead, we should devote our energies to finding ways and means of overcoming the obstacles that have prevented its implementation, particularly its Programme of Action. My delegation firmly believes that the failure to implement the Final Document is not due to an inherent weakness in the document itself. Nor do we believe that the Final Document has become outdated in the ten years of its existence. On the contrary, it is even more valid today than it was 10 years ago.

152. The second task of this special session should be to reaffirm the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Attempts to push the United Nations to the periphery, with the ultimate intention of excluding it altogether, should be vigorously resisted. In a world as interdependent as ours, where events in one country or region affect those in other areas, especially as regards nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, which have made borders and other criteria for human separation irrelevant, all nations and peoples have an equal stake in determining the fate of the world. In my delegation's view, and as the Final Document clearly indicates, multilateralism is not mutually exclusive in

relation to other forms of organization; they are complementary. Our support for the imperative need to reaffirm the central role of multilateralism in disarmament, through the United Nations, is not at the expense of unilateral, bilateral or regional efforts.

153. Nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority on the international agenda. In this endeavour, the ultimate goal is general and complete disarmament. To this end, my delegation believes that a comprehensive test-ban treaty is the most effective mechanism for stopping the further qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. Once this is achieved, the process of reversing the nuclear arms race and the subsequent reduction of existing stocks would be greatly facilitated.

154. The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is yet another important mechanism for speeding the process of nuclear disarmament. The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific by the Treaty of Rarotonga is, thus, a significant contribution to the process of nuclear disarmament. It is in this spirit that this special session should assist the efforts of the African States to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, adopted by the Organization of African Unity in 1964. The efforts of the African countries to translate the Declaration into reality have been undermined by the acquisition of nuclear-weapons capability by the racist régime of South Africa, with the collaboration of some Western nuclear-weapon States and Israel.

155. South Africa's acquisition of nuclear-weapons capability has emboldened the racist Pretoria régime to commit acts of aggression and destabilization of its neighbours in a vain attempt to deter those countries from supporting the legitimate struggle of the people of South Africa for majority rule and the abolition of the evil system of *apartheid*.

156. It is our hope that those who collaborate with the racist régime of Pretoria in the nuclear and military field will use this special session and the good will that surrounds it to stop all such collaboration, thus giving a much-needed impetus to the efforts of the African countries to implement the declaration of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

157. Furthermore, mention should be made of the fact that disarmament in the southern African region should be seen against the backdrop of racist South Africa's policy of unprovoked aggression and destabilization of the front-line States and other States in the region. As long as the system of *apartheid* exists in South Africa, that country will continue to use force, not only internally, but externally as well, thus threatening international peace and security. In the process the front-line States and others which are the victims of South Africa's external aggressive policy component are compelled to spend the meagre resources they have on defensive measures at the expense of their development.

158. My delegation is gravely concerned about reports relating to the dumping of nuclear waste on the African continent. This dumping not only undermines the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa but also unnecessarily exposes the Africans to the lethal dangers of radiation. This special session

should categorically call on the countries that are behind this dumping to cease forthwith.

159. The creation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace has been on the agenda of this Assembly since 1971. We believe that the time has come for this region to be freed from the presence of nuclear weapons in and around this area. To this end, we in Zambia support the holding of an international conference at Colombo to address the issue of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We urge the countries that have stood in the way of the conference to give up their obstructionist position.

160. My delegation is also concerned about the escalation of the naval arms race. We consider the high seas as the common heritage of mankind, which should be free of nuclear weapons. The naval arms race poses problems in the already complex issue of verification and threatens the progress that has been made on issues such as confidence-building measures.

161. Another issue which is of great concern to my delegation is that of the extension of the arms race into outer space. We do hope that the special session will help focus sufficient attention on this question. Every effort should be made to evolve a strategy that will make outer space free from nuclear weapons and their delivery systems so that it would forever remain a domain for peaceful purposes, used for the benefit of all mankind.

162. One of the urgent tasks facing mankind today is the conclusion of a treaty that will effectively ban chemical weapons, including binary weapons. The frequent use of these inhuman weapons in recent times makes it all the more important that measures be taken to strengthen the 1925 Geneva Protocol<sup>9</sup> proscribing chemical and biological weapons. Let us use this special session to generate momentum towards resolving the problems which the Conference on Disarmament has been experiencing in its efforts to negotiate a treaty on chemical weapons.

163. I should like also to make some remarks regarding the item on the relationship between disarmament and development. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was held from 24 August to 11 September 1987 here at United Nations Headquarters, was a great success despite misgivings in certain quarters. It cannot be overemphasized that full and lasting international peace and security cannot prevail as long as the greater part of the world's population lives in squalor, ignorance and abject poverty. The world cannot therefore justify the spending of as much as \$1,000 billion annually on the arms race. Even in the richest countries in the world, the arms race and development do not complement each other; they compete with each other. It is a competition in which the arms race will always emerge victorious. The human race can ill afford to coexist with the arms race.

164. It is therefore very important that we give due consideration to this question at this special session, for without peace and security the prospects for development will remain bleak, and without development international peace and security will be under

permanent threat. We hope that the proposal for the establishment of a disarmament-for-development fund will receive the boost it so badly needs and that due attention will be given to the question of the machinery for follow-up action and the action programme.

165. My delegation believes that we should be able to produce a final document that will reflect a common commitment to efforts to enhance international peace and security on the premise of disarmament rather than on that of the accumulation of instruments of self-destruction and that we should be able to chart a course in which all countries will rely on collective endeavours rather than on destructive parity, a course in which resources—finite resources—will be used in the most rational rather than the least rational way to promote the common good. This is a monumental challenge, all the more so because the consequence of inaction could be a global catastrophe.

166. Mr. JAMEEL (Maldives): On behalf of the Government of the Maldives I wish to congratulate Mr. Peter Florin on his assumption of the presidency of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I also wish to express my Government's sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for his abiding commitment to the ideals of the United Nations and his dedicated endeavours to promote the objectives of the Organization in enhancing peace and justice in the world. I should like also to take this opportunity to commend the Chairman and members of the Preparatory Committee for the excellent work done in preparation for this important session of the General Assembly.

167. When in 1983, at its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly decided that the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be held not later than 1988 [*resolution 38/73 I*], little would it have realized the significance of the year 1988. For the first time in the history of any disarmament conference we are beginning on a note of optimism, albeit a cautious one. The year 1987-1988 has witnessed the hitherto almost impossible fact of the meeting of the two super-Powers on the subject of disarmament with a common interest. The conclusion and recent ratification of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles have successfully demonstrated that, given the political will of the parties, no task, however complex and difficult, is impossible to achieve. We are indeed happy to note this single but significant landmark in our long and determined striving for comprehensive and complete disarmament.

168. The stage has thus been set, and I earnestly hope that the note of optimism on which we are now beginning will be further consolidated and reinforced during this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in the days to follow.

169. It will be recalled that the Charter of the United Nations was adopted with the determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. War was outlawed, and all Members of the

United Nations are under an obligation to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force and to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of States. It is disheartening to note that, despite the outlawing of war and the existence of such obligations, the current level of global military spending has increased by between four and five times since the Second World War and continues to increase still further. Furthermore, several States have stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, biological and bacteriological and other forms of weapons which could spell the total destruction of the world and of the human heritage over and over again.

170. Article 4 of the Charter, which prescribes the criteria for admission of new Members of the Organization, stipulates an obligation on all States, original as well as new, big as well as small, to demonstrate their ability and willingness to accept the obligations contained in the Charter. States which possess the power to destroy each other, or to become a potential threat to international peace and security by stockpiling arms, have the ability to reduce their arms and are under an obligation to demonstrate that ability. They must also be willing to do so. Unfortunately, the records reflect only that the willingness has not so far been forthcoming.

171. Obviously, the concept of armament and the process of the arms race are generally linked with the concept of security, but interpretations of such linkages tend to be too narrow in the present-day realities of a world characterized by mutual interdependence and mutual interest. The Charter adequately envisages mechanisms for the protection of the territorial integrity and political independence of States from external threats and aggression.

172. The Charter itself is based on the fundamental principle of sovereign equality of States. The regional and collective security mechanisms enshrined therein can be further strengthened by the collective will of the nations.

173. Threats to security arise from continued attitudes and the pursuit of colonial domination, illegal acquisition of territory, policies of *apartheid* and other forms of racial discrimination. Threats to peace and security arise also from resort to force in the settlement of regional and bilateral disputes. Encroachments on the legitimate rights of nations and peoples to pursue their economic and social development free from outside interference also lead to security problems. These threats are and will indeed remain of the utmost global concern. Such threats and infringements not only cause destruction, instability and misery but also result in the degradation of the environment and the retardation of the socio-economic development of the entire human race. Such a scenario leads to increased tension, mistrust and aggression. The world, which is already over-armed, cannot prevent those threats except through the collective will of nations. Efforts to build mutual trust and confidence and to bring forward that collective will are the tasks of this important gathering.

174. Here, I should like to emphasize that, although significant and important, the bilateral approaches to

arms reduction can never substitute for the multilateral mechanism for world peace and disarmament. On the contrary, the bilateral and multilateral endeavours should complement and reinforce each other. Bilateral and regional arrangements affecting disarmament should be viewed as valuable contributions by the parties concerned to a global effort in which all nations are partners.

175. In this context the role of the United Nations and its organs remains of primary importance. It is also in this global context that we should conceive the relationship between disarmament and development and consider them as being two pillars on which international peace and security can be built.

176. Let us not miss this opportunity to review thoroughly and carefully the principles and priorities involved in this crucial issue. Let us at the beginning and always reiterate our conviction of the need for compliance by all States, without any exception, with the Charter of the United Nations, in particular its provisions on the prohibition of the threat or use of force in our relations with each other and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Policies and strategies which advocate régimes of balance in power or pursue an endless race for superiority must be discarded and prevented from rising again.

177. Then, based on the wide recognition of the relationship between disarmament and international security, as well as between disarmament and development, let us embark on a feasible but courageous programme of action which could produce results leading to comprehensive and total disarmament.

178. Such a programme should address the most immediate issues while paving the ground for the solution of more complex and difficult problems. Though it may be suggested that no tangible results would be forthcoming from any programme of action without first enhancing an atmosphere of confidence and trust among nations, we feel that time should not be wasted in just debating among ourselves which comes first. In this regard, and specifically on confidence-building measures, many valuable suggestions have already been made here and in a number of other relevant forums, and we feel that those suggestions deserve serious attention and perusal. The transparent and unrestricted flow of information on military spending by individual States and its effects on the development and the general economy of those States would not only enhance the accurate data needed for planning and implementation of various programmes related to disarmament but would also help us to realize the gravity of the problem and to believe in our own disarmament efforts.

179. In addressing the most urgent needs my delegation feels that, while strictly adhering to our commitments to prevent by all means the probability of a nuclear war, accelerated efforts should be made to finalize and conclude a treaty to ban effectively the testing of all nuclear weapons and devices.

180. Negotiations at the bilateral, regional and multilateral levels for the reduction of arms, both nuclear and conventional, must continue in a prevailing atmosphere of good will and a sense of purpose.

In this process, I emphasize again the important role that the United Nations and the Security Council, as well as the Secretary-General himself, can play.

181. The effectiveness of the United Nations and other international bodies created to carry out disarmament-related activities should be improved. I am referring particularly to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament and IAEA. It is essential that we improve and strengthen the existing machinery which maintains international peace and security and monitors the non-proliferation and disarmament programmes. We also feel that a new integrated monitoring system under the United Nations is now needed, and that may include a mechanism for utilizing high-technology means for the dissemination and exchange of relevant information. My delegation notes with satisfaction and interest that some specific proposals in this regard have already been made by some States. Verification issues and transparency of information will remain among the most important and complex aspects of disarmament. But the recent achievements in the negotiations between the two super-Powers have proved that tangible and applicable modalities can be worked out on difficult subjects too.

182. Pending the achievement of progress in arms reduction, we should intensify our efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation régime envisaged in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex].

183. Also, we sincerely believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in various parts of the world would contribute to the global disarmament efforts. While implying a positive bearing on the issue of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and arms control, the establishment of such zones also helps to create an atmosphere of confidence which will allow the countries of the region to concentrate on much more needed endeavours for promoting the well-being of their peoples. Needless to say, it was for those reasons that my country, the Maldives, supported the concept and endorsed the proposals for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

184. My delegation also believes that the conclusion of a chemical-weapons convention should be expedited. Meanwhile, it is important to encourage and promote strict observance of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.<sup>9</sup>

185. We also feel that the international community should prevent the spreading of the arms race to outer space.

186. The richer and more developed countries are under an international obligation to bridge the widening gap between the rich and the poor. One may recall here the several resolutions on the reduction of poverty and the call for a new international economic order adopted by the General Assembly and UNCTAD. The reduction of global military expenditures will increase the availability of resources at both national and international levels for this cause. On the other hand, the reduction of



armaments will itself contribute to reducing threat and tension and thereby enhance security, which will correspondingly provide opportunities for better and more effective utilization of resources for development.

187. The action programme contained in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development<sup>7</sup> is indeed commendable and deserves the widest support.

188. In conclusion I wish to express the hope that this session will be successful and will mark the beginning of a new phase of constructive efforts in the field of disarmament. My delegation also hopes that the results of this session will be a significant contribution to the objectives and goals the community of nations shares for peace and harmony in the world.

189. Mr. SORIA GALVARRO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the name of the people and the Government of Bolivia, under the presidency of Mr. Víctor Paz Esstensoro, and on behalf of the Foreign Minister of the Republic, Mr. Guillermo Bedregal Gutierrez, I wish to welcome Mr. Peter Florin's election as President of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, knowing as we do that his experience and prudent leadership will contribute to the success of this world gathering. At the same time I wish to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his skilful and responsible management.

190. Since 1945 the United Nations, faced with an international setting ruled by threats, aggression and wars rather than by reason, respect and solidarity, has sought the establishment of an international system based on strict compliance with the purposes and principles enshrined in its Charter in order to ensure world security. Bolivia and its constitutional Government are not mere exponents of the concerns of Bolivia's men and women, children and elderly who wish to live in a world of peace; they are also mindful of the yearnings of all human beings on this planet, our only home, which we must preserve.

191. The time has come to respond appropriately and responsibly to this world need, steadfastly committing ourselves to a concerted struggle to bring about complete disarmament. May God shine his light upon us and guide the leaders of the military Powers so that in the not-too-distant future our entire planet may be a great zone of peace and well-being.

192. We have once again come together in order to achieve agreements that will make it possible to curb the threat of the arms race, which is the chief enemy of peace and progress for mankind. Peace is indivisible, and the nuclear and conventional arms buildup is incompatible with it. The expenditures entailed in the arms race contrast strikingly with the plight of the so-called developing countries, which are crushed by a deep economic crisis threatening their political and democratic stability and condemning their peoples to live in inhuman conditions inconsistent with human dignity.

193. The funds currently allocated to military purposes could well be redirected to the major economic and social programmes our peoples sorely need to fight poverty, suffering and death. The paradox lies in the fact that Governments, lacking funds for development, find themselves forced to suppress internal pressures and meet external threats through military buildups leading to greater expenditure and indebtedness. This irrationality not only undermines life but also shows that those leaders who hold power are using it as a weapon of self-destruction, forgetting that they themselves are also creatures of flesh and blood.

194. Like the other Member States, my delegation is convinced that the limitation and reduction of world military expenditures would make a substantial contribution to the progress of developing countries. The establishment of an international development fund, with contributions from savings generated by genuine disarmament and a ban on arms buildup, offers a positive way for the countries involved to show in a practical fashion their willingness to contribute to peace and development. It is regrettable that the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development does not include a single proposal for the creation of such a fund to channel resources released by disarmament measures to the development of the so-called third-world nations.

195. There can be no doubt that the foundations of lasting peace lie in practical and urgent recognition of the relationship between disarmament and development, that lasting peace can be achieved only through a reduction of military expenditures to the lowest possible level. In this connection, agreements on freezing military expenditures must be achieved in the near future, so as to contain the arms race, relieve international tensions and eradicate poverty.

196. On the other hand, the present instability in the world economy is having serious repercussions on the poorest countries. The burden of debt goes well above the sum of \$1,000 billion, an amount that, paradoxically, is equal to the amount of money spent worldwide on armaments within a period of less than one year. If we review the daily mortality rates worldwide we are driven to the terrible but inevitable conclusion that the cost in terms of human suffering from hunger and disease may be equal to or even worse than that resulting from a nuclear holocaust.

197. The accumulation of nuclear and conventional weapons threatens to thwart the efforts of developing nations to establish a new international economic order. Prompt decisions by the international community to achieve fairer relations and to free our peoples from servitude, backwardness and poverty would be the best guarantee for consolidating a new era of peace and stability around the world.

198. We are consequently faced by the vital need to lay the foundations for the building of a different world, a world that contains no room for the mistakes of the past, one which can replace armed confrontation with dialogue and in which the yearnings for peaceful coexistence and harmony can day by day be turned into reality.

199. Notwithstanding that United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament have been directed to the adoption of accords for the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, disarmament is too sensitive an undertaking to be left to the ministrations of only a few countries which, in spite of being Members of the Organization, forget that there is a world forum to resolve the problems that affect us all. Disarmament must be considered and studied from a global point of view, since it is fundamental for safeguarding the existence of all peoples. We are convinced of the importance of the role that multilateralism can play in disarmament, and we acknowledge that existing machinery within the United Nations provides an appropriate framework for that objective.

200. Bolivia, as an active member of the world community, urges those who bear responsibility for peace or destruction to step up their efforts to find ways to resolve their differences, which give rise to human anguish and to our daily nightmares of uncertainty and death. They hold the remedy for mankind's ills.

201. The international community appreciates that the disarmament process is taxing and complex and that the interests at stake are hard to reconcile, but what the leaders of the great military Powers must understand is that these ideological differences are small when compared to the grandeur and higher interests of mankind. God grant that the light of reason will shine upon them and that they will not subordinate life, happiness and the peace of mankind to petty, irrational and childish arguments over who has one missile more or less. The security and development of mankind demand total disarmament.

202. On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the opening for signature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an attainment of our peoples in the field of world peace, my Government reaffirms once again its endorsement of and commitment to that instrument and hopes that the Treaty will continue to contribute to new agreements on the prohibition of the use or threat of force.

203. Until 8 December 1987, the prospects for disarmament were remote; after that date the world has welcomed, with optimism, the first step taken by the United States and the Soviet Union with the signature in Washington of the Treaty on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, which has now been ratified. That shows that if there is mutual trust and awareness of the danger resulting from the production of weapons of mass destruction, we can reach momentous agreements to save the world from annihilation.

204. The results of the fourth meeting in Moscow between the leaders of the two super-Powers were not the best response to our concerns, but they are proof that there is seriousness and a commitment to the great task of disarmament. However, Bolivia regrets that during that meeting the United Nations, as the supreme world forum, was not mentioned, let alone taken into account in their deliberations.

205. Bilateral and multilateral negotiations must continue leading to a broader disarmament process,

not merely in the nuclear sphere but also in the conventional, at the worldwide level. It would be extremely unfortunate if the reduction in nuclear weapons were to be offset by a buildup of conventional weaponry.

206. Despite the signature of treaties the arms race continues apace. New nuclear weapons continue to be produced and other warlike devices are tested. It would be advisable for the Soviet Union and the United States, the two countries that possess 95 per cent of the nuclear weapons, to strengthen the peaceful role played by the United Nations and firmly support the negotiations and activities of the Disarmament Commission and the Security Council.

207. Likewise, it is essential to preserve outer space and our ecosystems free from military facilities that could alter the balance of the world once and for all. It is accordingly urgently necessary to observe the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water<sup>2</sup> and to conclude a convention banning the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and covering the destruction of existing stockpiles.

208. Activities fostering a decent, just and prosperous life for mankind would be sterile if there were only partial reductions confined to certain kinds of arsenals. The safety of mankind and its future require total and complete measures.

209. In order to ensure conditions for the attainment of disarmament my delegation wishes to express its support for the Stockholm Declaration<sup>8</sup> issued at the third summit meeting on 21 January 1988, in which the call was made to nuclear-weapon States to take decisions to prevent nuclear disaster and which presents options to resolve crises through a multilateral international verification system to ensure the fulfilment of disarmament accords.

210. This is a moment of world concern over the arms buildup, and it is important, therefore, to mention that while the arms industry may be a secret empire the trade in weaponry is visible and daily. Just as there are unscrupulous merchants of death who grow rich on the clandestine sale of machine guns, there are also Governments of very rich nations which foster the arms business. Multilateral action in the United Nations must also be directed to a ban on the sale of any kind of weapon which spreads death and destruction.

211. War, nuclear explosions, the stockpiling of conventional weaponry, the saturation of the seas and outer space with nuclear weapons, chemical warfare and other biological forms of destruction seriously affect international life. The proliferation of conflicts in various parts of our planet constitutes another cause of concern to the international community, as does the growing tendency to resort to the use of chemical weapons. These weapons produce effects the duration and nature of which cannot be foreseen. There is an urgent need for their complete elimination, which would make an effective contribution to the non-proliferation of other kinds of arsenals.

212. With respect to the creation of denuclearized zones, Bolivia, in keeping with its principles, supports all initiatives that would serve to establish such zones pursuant to the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. Convinced that denuclearized zones represent a significant contribution to international peace and security, we re-emphasize Bolivia's determination to work for the establishment of a zone of peace and security in the South Pacific, the benefits of which may serve to preserve the sovereignty, integrity and life of the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean.

213. In view of its profound and basic implications for the security, peace and development of the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean, and with the agreement of the Assembly, I should like to quote part of the statement recently delivered by the Foreign Minister of Bolivia at the first special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries held from 26 to 30 May 1988 at Havana. He said:

"When we talk of disarmament, and we are fully aware of the momentous human importance of this matter, Bolivians and Latin Americans cannot disregard the existence of arms hegemony in the South Atlantic and the existence of a policy of force, which is a vestige of colonialism, working to the detriment of the sovereignty of the brother Argentine Republic.

"In effect, the approach to the question of disarmament is inevitably related, in our hemisphere, to the peaceful and negotiated settlement to be achieved between two mature nations which are duty-bound to seek an agreement resulting in the restoration of Argentina's sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands.

"Disarmament is also inherent, in its deep historic concept, in the final attainment of peace for the peoples of Central America. The illegal traffic in weapons; the encouragement of a violence born in other climes and resulting in fratricidal confrontation; support for irregular groups and the financing of activities incompatible with international law—these are all extremely serious issues which make a mockery of the universal principles laid down in the Charter. This is of particular concern to those countries in which non-alignment is the hallmark of their international conduct and the driving force behind their national beliefs, regardless of official ideology. Such activities, which serve artificially to foster hostilities rooted less in reason and intelligence than in jingoistic sovereignty, are simply unacceptable for pluralistic democracy and those principles of peace and fraternity which govern the conduct of most non-aligned nations.

" . . .

"For control of armaments and real and effective regional disarmament, it is essential to cure the old wounds inherited from the past, which in Latin America still cause suffering for our peoples and threaten the future peace and development which

Bolivians call for. I am referring to the matter of Bolivia's access to the Pacific Ocean which was usurped by Chile 109 years ago, which today is a time-bomb ticking away against peace and security in the region, given the unbridled arms race imposed in Chile by the military régime of General Pinochet, to consolidate his presence in that territory and which serves as a direct threat to his neighbours, particularly Bolivia."

214. During this session we have before us a momentous task, namely to assess and approve the progress made in the field of disarmament, and also to study the implementation of agreements reached to date by the countries directly involved in the arms race. Consequently, my delegation does not simply reiterate its commitment to co-operate actively in these measures; it also proposes that, with the support of all, the 1990s should be declared the decade of total disarmament and development.

215. If we all work together and actively for life, happiness, development and the well-being of mankind, we are sure that the third millennium will also represent the birth of an age of peace and harmonious coexistence among our peoples.

216. God grant that we may soon be able to enjoy lasting peace in the world community, linked in the brotherhood of justice, prosperity and development.

217. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 5th plenary meeting, I now call on the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, Mr. Syed Sharifuddin Pirzada.

218. Mr. PIRZADA (Organization of the Islamic Conference): The holding of the third special session on disarmament is an event of major importance for the United Nations and for the international community. It is a matter of particular satisfaction, therefore, for me to address this session as the Secretary-General of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, representing 46 countries and more than a billion Muslims.

219. The framers of the Charter, having lived through the horrors of the Second World War, were fully convinced of the need to promote international peace and security with the least possible diversion of the world's human and economic resources to armament. Accordingly, they conferred specific responsibilities on the Security Council and the General Assembly for disarmament and the regulation of armaments.

220. Far-sighted as they were, they could not have forecast that some four decades after the adoption of the Charter the world, instead of having learned from its harrowing experience and moving towards a life of peace, free from weapons of mass destruction, would be spending more than \$1,000 billion dollars per year on arms, living in a tension-ridden and conflict-riven world, moving from crisis to crisis, on the edge of a nuclear catastrophe, of annihilation, and living on borrowed time.

221. For four decades the United Nations has been making consistent efforts to control the spread of nuclear and conventional weapons and for four decades, despite lofty and no doubt sincere declarations by Member States about their commitment to the goal of disarmament, the arms race has been extended to all quarters of the globe and threatens to expand even into outer space. This fact alone speaks volumes for the climate of mutual distrust and suspicion that has prevailed since the Second World War, as well as the chasm that exists between words and actions in the field of international relations.

222. The year 1978 was regarded by many of us as a watershed. In that year, at the first special session on disarmament, the international community succeeded in setting forth, by consensus, a comprehensive disarmament strategy which was to be the guideline for future disarmament efforts within and outside the United Nations. The first special session on disarmament reiterated and re-emphasized the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It approved specific measures intended to strengthen the machinery dealing with disarmament issues within the United Nations system. It adopted a programme of action establishing the priorities and the measures to be undertaken by Member States as a matter of urgency in the field of disarmament. However, despite the agreements reached at the first special session and the General Assembly's subsequent Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade [*resolution 35/46, annex*], the years following the special session saw ever-increasing military expenditures, a growing disregard of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly in respect of the non-use of force in international relations, and a stalemate in the negotiating process on all disarmament issues. The result is that the Programme of Action laid down in the 1978 Final Document remains unimplemented.

223. The second special session on disarmament, held in 1982, was a disappointment. Consensus could not be reached on any proposals pertaining to nuclear disarmament, chemical weapons, regional disarmament, disarmament and development, and so forth. The session was "rescued" through the adoption of a Concluding Document<sup>5</sup> which merely reaffirmed the validity of the 1978 agreements and urged Member States to consider proposals designed to secure the avoidance of war. The failure of the second session was due primarily to the tense international climate, which had its inevitable impact on the atmosphere of the discussions during the second special session.

224. It is significant that the third special session is being held at a time when the air is full of promise regarding the possibility of deep cuts in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers. The signature of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—has marked a beginning of the process of nuclear disarmament which the world community hopes will be pursued diligently in order to reach, eventually, the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament can provide an impetus not only to the reduction in strategic nuclear weapons but also to

other areas of disarmament with which the international community has been grappling for a number of years.

225. I should like to touch briefly on some of the issues with which the third special session on disarmament is being called upon to deal. However, before doing so I should like to express our appreciation to the Preparatory Committee for the session and, in particular, its Chairman, Mr. Mansur Ahmed of Pakistan, for their efforts in preparing the groundwork for the session. The informal paper prepared by the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee contains most of the elements which should be included in the final document of this session. The special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana in May, also adopted documents which could be taken into account during the discussions at this session. In our view the final document emerging from our deliberations must place greater emphasis on the possibilities of the future rather than the failures of the past. It is in this spirit that I would venture to make some comment on the issues involved.

226. The Organization of the Islamic Conference [OIC] has, since its very inception, been deeply concerned about the escalating arms race. Its membership has consistently lent support and contributed positively to the efforts of the international community to promote the process of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, which concerns weapons that pose the most dangerous threat to humanity. There can be no gainsaying the fact that a nuclear war must never be fought. However, despite a recognition of this fundamental truth, the preparations for a nuclear war have been going on apace for decades, with the result that today there are more than 50,000 nuclear warheads deployed world-wide, with a variety of delivery systems, including land-based ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and long-range bombers. There has been a continuous drive to produce ever more sophisticated, varied, accurate and destructive nuclear arsenals.

227. The consequences of a nuclear war which may be triggered either because of a deliberate decision based on miscalculation or through human or technical error are unimaginable. There must, therefore, be a radical change in thinking, and doctrines of deterrence must be replaced by those which assure mutual safety and security, in a world free of nuclear arms.

228. The steps required for nuclear disarmament include the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapon systems, cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and a comprehensive programme for progressive and balanced reductions of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate elimination. We see the INF Treaty as a welcome first step towards nuclear disarmament, and we invite the two super-Powers and other nuclear-weapon States to reach an early agreement for deep cuts in their strategic nuclear arsenals. While the recently concluded summit between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan has not resulted in the

signing of the agreement on cuts in strategic nuclear weapons, we hope that the two sides will continue to engage in serious and purposeful negotiations in order to arrive at an early agreement on this issue.

229. Meanwhile the matter of qualitative improvements and further sophistication of existing nuclear arsenals must also be addressed and must lead to the conclusion of a nuclear-test-ban treaty. It is only by this yardstick that the sincerity of the desire of the nuclear-weapon States to bring vertical proliferation to an end will be judged. If the nuclear-weapon States do not agree on the prevention of vertical nuclear proliferation, surely their demand for horizontal non-proliferation will lack moral validity.

230. While the members of the OIC are in favour of strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation régime, some hold the view that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is discriminatory, since the obligations undertaken by the nuclear-weapon States under the Treaty do not bear any comparison with the obligations undertaken by the non-nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, even these lesser obligations have not been honoured by the nuclear-weapon States. In our view, the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime must be accompanied by the unimpeded transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, under appropriate safeguards, to non-nuclear-weapon States, as provided for in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. There must also be a solemn commitment by nuclear States that they will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and that they will dismantle their nuclear systems within the shortest period possible.

231. In the context of nuclear disarmament the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a vital collateral measure. The collusion between the racist Pretoria régime and Israel and the clandestine manufacture of nuclear weapons by them pose major threats to their respective regions as well as to the non-proliferation régime. We believe that the proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, including particularly Africa, the Middle East and South Asia, must be implemented in order to eliminate the possibility of acquisition or manufacture of nuclear weapons in those regions and to serve the twin objectives of non-proliferation and reduction of tensions.

232. The repeated use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq conflict has brought home the urgent need for the early conclusion of a chemical weapons convention at the Conference on Disarmament and meanwhile to ensure strict compliance with the 1925 Geneva Protocol.<sup>9</sup> Chemical weapons are a particularly inhumane form of warfare, and their use has been rejected by the international community. It is unfortunate that despite general agreement on principles, the negotiations regarding the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention have dragged on since 1971 and the convention has yet to be finalized by the Conference on Disarmament.

233. Another area of particular concern to the international community and to the membership of the OIC is the possibility of an arms race in outer space. The desire of the international community to prevent an arms race in outer space was clearly

expressed at the first special session on disarmament, which recalled the spirit of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty.<sup>3</sup> Since then a number of proposals have been made regarding the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It would be self-defeating if the efforts to bring the arms race under control on Earth were simultaneously accompanied by militarization of outer space, which would be bound to lead to a much more expensive and dangerous arms race.

234. While nuclear weapons pose the threat of total destruction, the proliferation, sophistication and easy availability of conventional weapons have served to fuel more than 150 conventional conflicts fought since the Second World War. The need for national security leads many small and underdeveloped nations to invest large percentages of their national incomes in the purchase of conventional weapons to deter predatory neighbours. In order to reduce conventional armaments and armed forces in various parts of the world, it is imperative to ensure that smaller countries be given concrete assurances of security. Any reductions must also be balanced and proportional. The issue of arms transfers has agitated the minds of some thinkers on disarmament, who have proposed limits on such transfers. It is our view that arms transfers would have to be judged in the context of the threat perceptions, as well as the indigenous production capacity of the countries concerned. Reduced arms expenditures in developing countries through reductions in conventional weapons and in the size of standing armies would certainly lead to accelerated economic development as well as an easing of regional tensions.

235. The present session may also wish to devote attention to the naval arms race. This field merits examination, since in recent years super-Powers, the major sea Powers and also some developing countries have been increasing the numbers and sophistication of their fighting ships and weapons, *inter alia*, through the acquisition of nuclear submarines, thus dangerously increasing the reach and capabilities of their naval forces. In view of this development, proposals for the establishment of zones of peace, such as the one for the Indian Ocean, could suffer further setbacks.

236. The question of disarmament is closely linked with international security. There is an increasing recognition that the strengthening of international security must be sought through the removal of suspicion and mistrust, through disarmament as well as through addressing the economic, social and other non-military causes of insecurity. Security has national, regional and global dimensions, both military and non-military, which must be pursued in all their aspects.

237. While the super-Powers are involved directly in various aspects of global international security, the security concerns of other countries, particularly the smaller countries, are primarily limited to their bilateral relations and the situations in their regions. The 150 or so conventional wars since the Second World War have all been fought in the third world and have so far been limited to the use of conventional weapons. The possibility that some countries



may acquire a nuclear force and may be prepared to use or threaten to use it in bilateral conflicts to establish their dominance cannot be ruled out. Thus the regional aspect of international security and disarmament cannot be lost sight of, and necessary principles and guidelines must be adopted in this respect.

238. The issue of international security and the need for confidence-building have been in the forefront of the concerns of the Islamic world. It was in the pursuit of this goal that the Seventeenth Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers, held at Amman from 21 to 25 March 1988, approved the establishment of a five-member group composed of eminent personalities from the Islamic world to draw up specific proposals and recommendations in this important field.

239. The noble twin objectives of peace and progress have always been among the highest aspirations of mankind. However, while hundreds of billions of dollars are being consumed on wasteful expenditure on armaments in search of ever-rising thresholds of security, a similar commitment to development assistance appears to be lacking. A fraction of the amount being spent on armaments would make a major contribution towards a qualitative improvement in the lot of hundreds of millions of people who are living in subhuman conditions of poverty, hunger, malnutrition, disease and ignorance. The organic linkage between disarmament and development is well known. It is also agreed that these twin objectives are a shared responsibility of the developed and developing countries. We trust that at the third special session on disarmament the General Assembly will be able to build upon the agreements reached at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987.

240. The holding of the third special session on disarmament is in itself a reiteration of the fact that the strengthening of international peace and security through disarmament remains the primary objective of the entire international community. It is not sane to employ our best brains, our vital capacities and our finite resources for the destruction of mankind. We must utilize them for the promotion of the economic and social well-being of all peoples, for the reduction of international tensions, for the strengthening of international peace and security, for ensuring equity and justice for all nations and peoples on the basis of sovereign equality, for banishing the threat of war and destruction, and for making the world a safe haven for future generations.

241. Allow me to conclude by quoting a particularly moving paragraph from a speech by the late President Eisenhower of the United States:

“Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of the labourers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.”

242. We are confident that with their collective wisdom, experience and foresight, the leaders, thinkers, academicians, intellectuals and diplomats gathered here will be able to adopt the necessary decisions to halt the mad race for armaments, which can only lead to destruction.

243. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second, and should be made by delegations from their seats.

244. Ms. BAILEY (United States of America): My delegation understood that the purpose of this special session was to explore various arms control and disarmament issues in an effort to reach agreement to help set the agenda for the multilateral consideration of these issues.

245. However, the Vice-President of Cuba has introduced hostility and confrontation into this session. He has made personal attacks against the President of the United States. He has stated that Puerto Rico is a United States colony and he has accused the United States of being responsible for most of the regional conflicts in the world. His direct personal attack on the head of a State Member of the United Nations is a violation of the traditions of this body.

246. My delegation rejects the falsehoods spread by Cuba that Puerto Rico is a colony of the United States. The United Nations, by resolution 748 (VIII) adopted by the General Assembly in 1953, decided that Puerto Rico had achieved self-determination. In that respect I note that the people of Puerto Rico will again elect their Governor and legislature in free elections this November. When will Cuba hold free elections with a genuine choice among candidates? The world has been waiting since 2 January 1959.

247. It is particularly curious to hear Cuba express such fulsome support for peace and disarmament. Cuba maintains the largest military establishment in Latin America and is a major exporter of mercenaries and arms. It is Cuba which has embarked upon expansionist policies in Latin America and Africa. We hope that this body will not be subjected to further extraneous remarks during its important deliberations.

248. Mr. COVARRUBIAS (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since my country has been alluded to by the representative of Bolivia, my delegation wishes to state that it is surprising that the delegation of Bolivia uses a special session of the General Assembly devoted to the important issue of disarmament in order to refer to a bilateral issue totally unrelated to the purposes of this meeting.

249. However, I am first of all compelled to state categorically that, contrary to what was said by the representative of Bolivia quoting his Foreign Minister, Chile has never usurped any nation's territory. Between Chile and Bolivia there is no dispute or matter capable of affecting the peace of America or

peaceful relations between States. The border between our countries was set once and for all pursuant to an international treaty signed in 1904, the negotiations on which were based upon a Bolivian proposal. That treaty was signed nearly a quarter of a century after the end of the conflict which occurred between our two countries in the second half of the nineteenth century. It received overwhelming support from the Bolivian people, who elected their principal negotiators to the presidency. The treaty, in article 2, recognized the "absolute and perpetual sovereignty" of Chile over the territory in which Bolivia is now seeking an outlet to the sea. The Bolivian delegation, in its statement, appeared to be unaware of the existence and force of that treaty and, consequently, is only misleading this Assembly.

250. The peaceful settlement of disputes, strengthened by that treaty, cannot in any way represent a threat to international peace and security. Accordingly, and notwithstanding what was said by the representative of Bolivia, there is no time bomb which might affect healthy coexistence in our region.

251. In the same vein, I wish categorically to deny that my Government is involved in any arms race that would in any fashion represent a threat to its neighbours. Chile has no quarrel with its neighbours, nor does it feel threatened by them. Accordingly, there is no possible justification for such an allegation of an arms race, particularly in order to consolidate a claim to national territory in Chile which has never been at issue.

252. Furthermore, my country's commitment to peace has been demonstrated, *inter alia*, in the recent signature of a treaty of peace with the neighbouring Argentine Republic.

253. We regret that the Assembly's attention has been distracted from the important issues which it should be discussing here by a matter which is totally extraneous thereto.

254. Mr. SORIA GALVARRO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With all due respect to representatives present here, having listened to the words of the representative of Chile I feel it appropriate to make the following comments.

255. We must take stock of and bear in mind the reason for this world gathering. What has brought us here is disarmament, and disarmament is something which cannot be confined, practically or academically, to the destruction of machine-guns, rockets, or bombs.

256. Disarmament is a much broader concept, a global concept, and is linked to development. It is linked to well-being, to peaceful coexistence, to good-neighbourliness and a felicitous future for mankind. Disarmament is linked to all that free people wish for: democracy, peace and justice. It is linked to a better world.

257. The supreme purpose behind all of the efforts being made by the international community in various forums and negotiations taking place at the bilateral and the multilateral levels, such as those which have been under way here for the last few days,

is mankind, the human being: his life, well-being, development, spiritual peace, peaceful coexistence, and harmonious and rational life with his fellows.

258. God created man for good, not for ill, not for destruction or death. The dialect of mankind's life, this rich and immortal heritage, has been left to us by our greatest thinkers, such as Aristotle, Plato, St. Augustine and others. This right, this essence of man, is not simply a divine inheritance, but also a legal right—the basis, indeed, of international law. Unfortunately, however, it can be breached by an irrational pursuit of weaponry, war and debt, besides by the abuse and usurpation of the heritage of others, interference in internal affairs and lack of respect for the sovereignty and dignity of nations.

259. Is it not contradictory and incomprehensible that while the international community seeks ways of resolving the challenges of poverty, wretchedness and unjust economic relations, which cause so much grief for mankind, paradoxically, there are other countries which clearly have developed a war industry and armed forces? In the case of the Republic of Chile, in the Latin American region, it has perhaps the most powerful military complex in our continent. That is known to everybody. It is not news, nor is it an exaggeration.

260. The representative of Chile is, of course, challenging the historic truth, Bolivia's inalienable right to a sovereign and usable, appropriate and continuous outlet to the Pacific Ocean. The representative of Chile is saying that Chile has never usurped anything from anyone, but I ask the Assembly why, then, a war took place in 1879 and why Bolivia lost 400 kilometres of coastline and 158,000 square kilometres of coastal territory. Was it because they did not belong to us? One cannot lose something which does not belong to one.

261. Everyone here is aware of the document which, in 1900, recorded the thoughts of the then Chilean Government through Abraham König, the Chilean representative in Bolivia. He said that Chile seized Bolivia's coast because Chile knew that it was rich in natural resources; that Chile otherwise had no interest in retaining it. And what did that plenipotentiary say with respect to the "rights," if they can be so called, of Chile over Bolivia's coastline? He said that the right and title of Chile with regard to Bolivia's coastline were the result of war, victory, which is the fundamental law of nations.

262. If Bolivia had no sea, then how is one to explain, given the lack of such a coastline, the fact that for more than a hundred years various democratic Chilean Governments which were sensitive to and acknowledged Bolivia's need for an outlet to the sea negotiated with Bolivia on repeated occasions the question of a solution to this problem? The latest negotiations took place not long ago and involved discussions chaired by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Bolivia and Chile and were held last year at Montevideo, the capital of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay.

263. Does it not seem paradoxical, if no problem exists, for two Governments which do not have diplomatic relations to meet at the very senior level

of Minister for Foreign Affairs and for the democratic Government of Uruguay in a spirit of Latin American solidarity to offer its own soil as a venue for such a meeting between two countries?

264. What was said by the representative of Chile serves only to demonstrate the lack of commitment to the search for a solution through dialogue—a fundamental principle which Bolivia cannot renounce. Bolivia does not resort to devices such as threats to attain anything; it resorts to dialogue and amicable negotiations. That was the spirit of the meeting at Montevideo. However, only a few days after the ministerial meeting the international community learned of the overbearing, arrogant reply by the Chilean Government to Bolivia's proposal for the attainment of an outlet to the Pacific—a reply which was incompatible with peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourliness and which was, in fact, totally inappropriate.

265. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I regret to have to interrupt the representative of Bolivia but the 10-minute time-limit has expired. I therefore request him to conclude his statement.

266. Mr. SORIA GALVARRO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In conclusion, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the Assembly for your forbearance. I think the situation with regard to Bolivia's right to an outlet to the Pacific Ocean is quite clear and known to all representatives.

267. Ms. BAUTA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When my delegation heard that the United States delegation had requested to speak during this meeting it thought for a moment that it intended to announce a decision by its Government to renounce the possession or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons or to abandon its aspirations to strategic defence; unfortunately, that was not the case.

268. In fact, I must say that the majority of our countries, victims of an adverse economic situation resulting from an unjust economic order, are making colossal sacrifices in order to be appropriately represented in this forum, a forum which we respect and in whose role we believe. Clearly, not all the countries represented here are in a similar situation. We therefore find ourselves in the sad position of witnessing painful demonstrations of political short-sightedness. This is the sole possible explanation for the reaction by the United States delegation to the statement of the Vice-President of the Republic of Cuba, whose political importance, objectivity, strictness and accuracy of analysis are quite clearly beyond the understanding of the United States delegation. If any critical reference was made here or elsewhere today or in the past at international gatherings with regard to United States behaviour, it is not a result of anybody's obsession or mania but simply of the systematic breaching of the norms of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations by that country.

269. Allow me to mention four matters for the information of the United States delegation. First, elections in the Republic of Cuba, my country, take place every two years. The percentage of the Cuban

population that takes part—and the Government of Cuba can legitimately take pride in this fact—is something which the present United States Administration cannot even dream of.

270. Secondly, this Organization has also recognized the positive role played by the glorious internationalist soldiers of my country in support of the defence of Angola, at the request of whose Government they are on African territory. The presence of Cuban internationalist troops in Angola would perhaps not have been necessary if the United States had not continued to support the expansionist, aggressive forces of the racist *apartheid* régime.

271. On the other hand, paradoxically, the United States delegation has referred to the amount of weapons possessed by the Republic of Cuba. The amount of weapons that my country possesses and the resources that it devotes to the defence of its sovereignty are determined solely by the threats, harassment and acts of aggression from which we have suffered at the hands of the United States Government. No country in Latin America is afraid of weapons that Cuba may or does possess.

272. Finally, I shall not refer to the question of the colony of Puerto Rico. I simply recommend that the United States delegation consult the texts of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which, I am sure, the Organization can supply to it if it so wishes.

273. It is clear that to understand the matters I have referred to and attempted to enlighten the United States delegation on, something more than just a pretty voice is necessary. The elements necessary to understand these situations are clearly not matters learned on the Broadway stage or found behind the scenes in television studios.

274. Mr. COVARRUBIAS (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We do not wish to contribute to distracting the attention of the Assembly from the important matters of world-wide ramifications which are before it. We would state simply that we stand by what we said a few minutes ago and completely support our country's position.

275. Ms. BAILEY (United States of America): I think that when we reach the point where we have to resort to mentioning someone's profession I would have to reply by mentioning all my professions. But that would be a pity; we would be here all night, because I am more than Broadway. You are not attacking my country now; you have made a personal attack which I will not accept in this Hall. Broadway, TV—we all have to eat.

276. Many, many years ago I was here and spoke to the Cuban representative about the same subject-matter, Puerto Rico. Unfortunately, he pulled the same trick. He went up to that podium and brought up Broadway or whatever it was. I am not going to stand up and sing "The Star-Spangled Banner"; you can bet on that. I never mix my profession with what I am doing here. This is my country, your country, the country of all of us, and I am here strictly for

business. We have all gotten older. What a pity we do not all get wiser. To talk about matters in the wrong way simply defeats the purpose of what this is about. The boards of Broadway, the TV halls and all that have long been forgotten whenever I sit in this seat. I am here for my business and the love of the entire world because I love God, I love truth and I want to see peace on this Earth and there is no money that can buy me, and I thank the representative of Cuba and will send her a resumé of all my professions.

277. Mr. SORIA GALVARRO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): With all due respect to representatives who have patiently spent several hours in this chamber, on behalf of the Bolivian delegation I wish to state for the record our commitment to what we said earlier following the statement by the representative of Chile.

278. Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I will be brief in view of the advanced hour. I think it is high time for the United States delegation in the Assembly to understand that this is a serious gathering and that here we require delegations which will take positions and attitudes of a responsible nature.

279. I am sure that the United States delegation would have been far more helpful if it had come here to make specific disarmament proposals, if it had announced, for example, that it was using the opportunity offered by this session in order to renounce first use of nuclear weapons or to begin a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons or to announce that it was going to freeze its military expenditure with a view to assisting development around the world, given the relationship between disarmament and development. Far from it, though.

It has employed this forum in order to attack multilateralism yet again. I am quite sure that this kind of show is part of the United States policy against multilateralism.

280. This is a serious assembly where we come to talk about serious things and not to strike poses which are more fitting to the television studio or television ads.

*The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

<sup>2</sup>Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964).

<sup>3</sup>Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).

<sup>4</sup>Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 944, No. 13446).

<sup>5</sup>*Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Special Session, Annexes*, agenda items 9-13, document A/S-12/32.

<sup>6</sup>*The Naval Arms Race* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.86.IX.3).

<sup>7</sup>*Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.IX.8), para. 35.

<sup>8</sup>A/43/125, annex.

<sup>9</sup>Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925 (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).