



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

In the absence of the President, Mr. Cañete (Paraguay), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. NDONG (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Equatorial Guinea, which I have the honour of heading, considers most fortunate the election of Mr. Florin as President of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are completely confident that his great experience, effectiveness and sense of balance are a guarantee that at the end of our debate we shall have a consensus. I am also pleased to convey from this rostrum the sincere thanks of my country and Government for the tireless efforts exerted by the Secretary-General in the interest of the noble ideals of our Organization.

2. As the General Assembly holds its fifteenth special session, the third special session on disarmament, as if to hail the tenth anniversary of the first special session on disarmament, we note sadly that there exists in human relations a tense situation characterized by total mistrust and a very unbalanced pattern of economic exchanges. That mistrust and imbalance are only a prelude to a dismal failure in fulfilling our categorical and urgent mandate to maintain, conserve, protect and bequeath to mankind an ever better world—a world of which no one, absolutely no one, can or should claim to be the author or owner.

3. Perhaps, in order to make a small contribution to the Assembly's thinking and decision-taking, I might recall and emphasize that the two great wars experienced by mankind grew out of the relations of force between the States. Each side believed itself more powerful than the other, thus creating a degree of imbalance from whose consequences we are still suffering and which are in fact leading us to our own annihilation. The threat of the nuclear, chemical and conventional arsenals is not, as it once was, a threat only to certain countries but to all mankind, because if there were to be a nuclear conflagration, the disaster would not make any distinctions. Hence the imperative need for everyone to participate in consideration of disarmament issues. The cessation of the nuclear, chemical and conventional arms race would have an effect going beyond the super-Powers

and encompassing the entire international community.

4. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations in 1985, Mr. Obiang Nguema Mbasogo, President of the Republic and head of Government, said in his statement made at this same rostrum:

“In various parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America, focal points of tension are being created and maintained because these are profitable to the arms trade conducted by the political classes responsible for those tensions.

“The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction only confirms the general view that peace and security in the world are seriously threatened and that the danger of a nuclear conflict is imminent, both because of the clash of interests upheld by those who possess such weapons, but also because of the possibility that some rash action might bring about that disaster.”¹

5. The studies, analyses, theories and suggestions that have been amply presented and elaborated upon by previous speakers demonstrate the dangerous situation that now prevails in our world, which needs not further demonstration but rather immediate implementation of the disarmament programme encompassing the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons and the limitation of conventional ones.

6. The Republic of Equatorial Guinea, paradoxically, will not eliminate or diminish this monstrosity of weaponry simply because it neither possesses nor produces them, nor does it consider having them. But we do hope to eliminate and lessen the widespread illness, hunger and poverty that are the scourges of my country. There are countries that are wasting millions of dollars every minute on weaponry, while our country is talking about debts of thousands of dollars as a matter of survival; that is the irony of fortune. That is why my Government endorses all measures that the General Assembly adopts and will adopt in favour of disarmament. We have never believed in the principle of *Si vis pacem, para bellum*—if you wish peace, prepare for war—and we do not wish to believe that even today this has a place in the human conscience.

7. In the aforementioned statement, the President of the Republic clearly stated the country's position when he said, “Equatorial Guinea has acceded to several of the conventions prohibiting weapons of mass destruction, and we believe that the States [parties] . . . should fulfill those agreements.”² For this reason my Government, availing itself of this solemn occasion, wishes to address an appeal to

this universal community of nations that States renounce their ambitions and interests when these are not legitimate and that they conduct themselves according to what is set forth in the Charter of the United Nations with regard to the non-use of force, respect for the sovereignty of other countries, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, equality between States and the peaceful settlement of disputes. It appeals for sincere mutual trust and understanding in order to make possible a peaceful coexistence for the benefit of all nations. Humankind is calling out for a tranquil and secure life, a happy life. Let us not turn a deaf ear. This is an elementary and fundamental right.

8. These are the views of Mr. Obiang Nguema Mbasogo and these are the views of Equatorial Guinea when we take part in debates on the question of disarmament; these are our thoughts when we endorse the recommendations of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and these are our views when we sign and ratify agreements for good-neighbourly relations with friendly and fraternal neighbouring countries. We have a firm credo of unity, peace and justice, as required by our Constitution.

9. I have expressed my country's resolute support of all efforts made by the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the field of disarmament. However, my country believes that the super-Powers should arrive at agreements and measures designed to bring about a limitation, reduction and elimination of armaments in order to devote greater resources to the development of our peoples.

10. We feel deeply concerned at observing that the military budgets of all countries continue to increase. In some countries this is intended to consolidate their supremacy and hegemony; in others it is a survival reaction. In both cases they forget that the accumulation of any kind of weapon is a threat to all. That is the sad truth and the most shameful aspect of human behaviour as we draw to the close of the twentieth century. Still in the same statement made on the same occasion, our President stated,

"For that reason, we support proposals for the reduction or elimination of nuclear arsenals, and for the use of nuclear energy solely for peaceful purposes. Thus the vast sums spent on rearming could be used to finance projects and programmes directed towards the development of the poor countries."³

11. Given the limitation of resources for development, the reduction of world military expenditure would contribute greatly to development and would create propitious conditions for the achievement of the goals of a new international economic order, for which we have consistently called and which the developed countries have not yet granted the third world. For this reason, on the same occasion the President stated: "The problems of the third world countries must be finally resolved if we wish to strike a proper balance in the world."⁴

12. The Republic of Equatorial Guinea believes that we could inculcate the ideals of freedom, human rights and good-neighbourly relations in nations if to

this we add appropriate assistance to diminish the marked prevailing imbalance. The incessant arms race every day worsens the danger of a conflagration which, in the worst of cases, could lead to a nuclear war whose disastrous consequences for mankind are quite foreseeable.

13. The proliferation of nuclear weapons and their massive destructive potential should be limited to the maximum extent possible and in the best case completely eliminated so that the resources thus released can be used to improve the social condition of populations in general and the least favoured in particular.

14. The Republic of Equatorial Guinea is fully convinced that treaties, conventions and protocols governing disarmament in all its dimensions and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should become day-to-day tasks of our countries, so that we may fulfil the hopes of the international community for well-being and security.

15. It is my Government's hope that at the end of this debate the General Assembly will adopt a final document containing, *inter alia*, the following points: first, the immediate and total suspension of the production of nuclear and chemical weapons; secondly, the immediate and total suspension of tests of such weapons; thirdly, the prohibition of the use of all weapons of mass destruction; fourthly, a significant reduction in so-called conventional weapons; fifthly, the establishment of an international organization for the monitoring and implementation of the aforementioned; and, sixthly, the transfer of funds budgeted for military purposes to assistance and development of all populations, especially those afflicted by natural disasters.

16. If we wish to be responsible to our wives, children, relatives, families and friends, who in reality make up the present and future world, we must pool our efforts so that the noble ideals for which the Organization was founded may be realized for an ever better world.

17. Mr. TILLET (Belize): I bring greetings from the Prime Minister of Belize, the Right Honourable Manuel Esquivel, and from the people of Belize. The Prime Minister wishes us successful and fruitful negotiations and discussions at the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, in the hope that it will contribute significantly to world peace for generations to come.

18. The Belize delegation wishes to extend to Mr. Florin of the German Democratic Republic its warm congratulations on his unanimous election to the presidency of the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. With skill and expertise he has guided us through the forty-second session of the Assembly, including two resumptions, and we have every confidence that he will continue in like form at this special session.

19. The Belize delegation considers it important to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General and his staff for all their efforts in capturing the vision of States and crystallizing the importance of the third special session on disarmament. The importance of

this session is testified to by the number of high-level representatives gathered here. It is rare for such an impressive number of heads of State and Government and ministers for foreign affairs to converge at the United Nations on any issue. They are to be commended. At the same time, we recognize the personal efforts of the Secretary-General in making this possible.

20. The Belize delegation applauds the United States and the Soviet Union for their Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty. The spirit of optimism which emerged from the Moscow summit meeting between General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan has injected the third special session on disarmament with such positive enthusiasm that there is great hope for progress and success in the field of disarmament. It is our hope, as it is the hope of all those who did not participate in the Moscow summit meeting, that the super-Powers will expend no less energy, show no less good will and demonstrate no less eagerness to arrive at an effective multilateral treaty on disarmament than we have witnessed in their bilateral relations.

21. Belize joins all other nations in expressing satisfaction at the development of dialogue and co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union. We encourage such a development and hope it will continue and expand into other fields. We do so because we believe such a development will contribute to a harvest of peace around the world. But the improvement of bilateral relations between States must not be seen as an alternative to the effective development of, nor as a substitute for, universal participation and adherence to the multilateral disarmament treaty that will encompass the whole world and provide all mankind with greater security, freedom and development.

22. We need to ask ourselves why we are holding the third special session on disarmament. What is our goal? Is it a reduction of nuclear weapons? Is it the elimination of nuclear weapons? Is it the reduction of conventional weapons? Is it to produce a document? Many distinguished leaders have stated emphatically from this rostrum that the recommendations of the first special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, some 10 years ago, are still appropriate. So why are we here? We are here because we are working for global peace. Disarmament is only one avenue, an important avenue on which we embark in our search for peace. The INF Treaty is a great step in the right direction, and the commitment to work towards a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear arms is very encouraging. But in practical terms, what difference does it really make if we can destroy the world one time or 50 times?

23. If we had nine lives to live, then the capability of destroying the world five times would still be fearsome, but not quite as annihilating. But God created man with one life only—and after that comes the judgement. As long as there exists the capability of destroying the world only once, the peoples of the world can be neither happy nor content with such a reality.

24. Nuclear weapons have never been produced for the protection and the development of mankind. The sole purpose has always been the destruction of States. It is a sad commentary on our times that States have become more important than people. That has always been true whenever it has become more important to be able to destroy a nation and its people than to protect the life of one's own people and the peoples of the world.

25. No State would like to admit the truth of that statement. But let those who deny it put their military budget to a referendum of their peoples, and let their peoples determine whether it is more important to live happily and progressively or to be burdened with an unnecessary, unreasonable budget whose principal goal is the destruction of other peoples and nations. The people of the world would bring about disarmament so rapidly we would not need a fourth special session.

26. If States are not more important than people, why can we not stop the flow of arms? Exporters of arms form a large section of export trade for the industrialized nations. It is big business—and bad business to reduce it. More often than not, that trade goes from developed to developing nations. To the exporting State, the profit is more important than the people killed. To the importing State, being able to kill and destroy provides power.

27. The emphasis on disarmament has been on inanimate objects rather than on human beings. Our first proposal is that the human dimension assume the highest priority in disarmament.

28. Peace is our goal. Peace is our “why”. Disarmament will not bring peace. Would that it could. Disarmament will create a climate more conducive to development. Disarmament will make it possible for us to kill each other in fewer numbers at a time and in less spectacular ways, but it will not bring peace. If we could have complete disarmament of nuclear and conventional weapons but trust was not established between and among nations, we would start fighting with rocks; then we would make spears; and the whole process of the arms race would start over again. Military technology can today be stored on small computer chips. If trust is not established between and among nations, those chips will simply slide back into the computers, and the arms races of the twenty-first, twenty-second, twenty-third and twenty-fourth centuries will begin.

29. So trust should be given a higher priority than disarmament. That is our second recommendation.

30. A few months ago an Iraqi plane attacked a United States ship and killed some United States servicemen. It was a mistake. Appropriate apologies were made, and the incident was peacefully defused. Had an Iranian plane made the same mistake, with the same weapons, killing the same number of servicemen, would the outcome have been the same? Why not? Trust, and lack of trust. Peace is not determined by the number of weapons in the possession of States, but by the degree of trust in relations among States.

31. Another area where trust is critical is among the States that are within reach of developing their own nuclear weapons. These States are being asked by those that already have nuclear weapons to impose self-restraint. States that have the capability of crossing the nuclear threshold cannot be expected to exercise restraint while those States that possess nuclear weapons reduce insignificant supplies of nuclear weapons and maintain the ability to do research on and test weapons not covered by any disarmament conventions.

32. Our third recommendation is that research on and testing of new weapons be discontinued simultaneously and by the end of 1988.

33. We spend a lot of time discussing confidence-building measures because we are both unwilling and unprepared to do the things already agreed upon which will improve trust among nations. I refer to a principle which has found expression in the Charter. The quickest way for trust to develop among States is to abide by that principle, which is: non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. The attitude of large States that, by virtue of power, they have the right to interfere in the internal affairs of small States—and their readiness and willingness to do so—has played a key role in destroying peace in the last 40 years. Establishing and maintaining puppet Governments and destabilizing national Governments and economies should be viewed as a breach of the principle of non-intervention. When the super-Powers meet and decide what will happen in Central America, the Middle East, Afghanistan, Kampuchea or southern Africa the principle of non-intervention is violated, and such actions should be seen as interference in the internal affairs of States.

34. The Belize delegation calls upon Member States to abide by the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, as a means of developing trust among nations. That is our fourth recommendation.

35. The urgency of controlling nuclear weapons has been made clear to all of us. In addition, during this debate chemical weapons have been given great prominence. It seems almost like there is a conspiracy not to make conventional weapons an important issue. In this regard the Belize delegation was pleased by the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Speaking on behalf of the Twelve, he said:

“in the field of conventional weapons, we Europeans see an urgent necessity to achieve progress in disarmament. Conventional disarmament is an integral and important part of the overall disarmament process. Expenditure on conventional weapons and troops places a heavy burden on the social and economic development of most countries. It is conventional weapons that have been the cause of untold suffering during wars in recent years in various parts of the world.” [See 8th meeting, para. 57.]

36. The thousands of refugees who find a haven in Belize are not running away from nuclear weapons. The more than 2 million refugees in Pakistan did not

run away from nuclear weapons. The refugees in Thailand and in other South-East Asian nations are not running away from nuclear weapons. Although South Africa has nuclear weapons, it is not these weapons that are killing the people of Soweto and Namibia and retarding the development of Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana and other front-line States. It is conventional weapons that are causing havoc throughout the world—big business which has become more important than the lives of the people these weapons destroy. It has been estimated that since the Second World War there have been over 150 local wars and conflicts. While their victims have been primarily from developing States, the sponsors have often been developed States. But the people and territory consumed in these conflicts are from the third world. An estimated 17 million have died in these conflicts owing to the use of conventional arms. None have died as the result of nuclear weapons.

37. Our fifth proposal is that a treaty banning the production and marketing and limiting the use of conventional weapons be negotiated simultaneously with a nuclear treaty.

38. When illegal production, trafficking in and use of drugs form a partnership with conventional weapons, as they have already done, the world community is presented with an immediate threat which must be given the highest priority on the United Nations schedule, as well as in individual States' agendas. Belize supports the proposal made by the Honourable Arthur Robinson, Prime Minister of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago,

“that this special session request the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the criminal responsibility of persons who use or authorize the use of prohibited weapons . . . which cause unnecessary human suffering, or who engage in illegal drug trafficking across national frontiers, and submit that report to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session, in 1989”. [See 5th meeting, para. 52.]

That is our sixth proposal.

39. In summary, we have proposed, first, that the human dimension assume the highest priority in disarmament; secondly, that trust be given a higher priority than disarmament; thirdly, that research and testing of new weapons be simultaneously discontinued, and by the end of 1988; fourthly, that we should adhere to the principle of non-intervention as a means of building trust; fifthly, that a treaty banning the production and marketing of conventional weapons and limiting their use and a nuclear-weapons treaty should be simultaneously negotiated; and, finally, that the Assembly make the request to the Secretary-General that I have just mentioned.

40. But the greatest of those is trust.

41. Two nights ago I was reading a school assignment with my 11-year-old daughter from a book called *The Secret Garden*. The following quotation is from that book:

“When I was at school my geography told us the world was shaped like an orange, and I found out

before I was told that the whole orange doesn't belong to nobody. No one owns more than his bit of a quarter and there's times it seems like there's not enough quarters to go around. But don't you—none of you—think as you own the whole orange or you'll find out you're mistaken, and you won't find it out without hard knocks. What children learn from children is that there's no sense in grabbing at the whole orange—peel and all. If you do you'll likely not get even the pips, and them's too bitter to eat."

42. Let us learn from the children. There is no sense in grabbing for the whole orange. We do that because of distrust among nations. Conventional and nuclear weapons are developed because of our distrust, and they fuel and feed that distrust. Let this third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament dedicate itself to building trust among our peoples and nations. Trust between the United States and Central American Governments themselves will bring a harvest of peace in Central America. Trust between the Soviet Union, Afghanistan and Pakistan and its allies will bring peace to Afghanistan. Trust between Israel and the Arab States is the only way to peace in the Middle East. Trust in southern Africa is the only alternative to a bloodbath in that region.

43. As I am speaking some of you will be saying, "We cannot trust them". Yes, I understand that; I know. Trust is a difficult relationship to establish, but without it peace is impossible. So let us begin. Let us begin right here, right now. We have already agreed to the first step. Forty-two years ago we agreed to it in the Charter of the United Nations. It is the principle of non-intervention. Let us commit ourselves to the principle of non-intervention and begin a relationship of trust.

44. Finally, there is a teaching in the Christian religion known as the Golden Rule. It is a teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ himself. There is no greater confidence-building measure than this, no matter how often, or how long, or how many of us meet to find those measures. It is the quickest and most effective way to establish and maintain a trust relationship, so essential to peace. Jesus said: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

45. Mr. ST.-FHARD (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): It is an honour for me to extend to Mr. Florin our warmest congratulations on his unanimous election to the presidency of the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly, the third devoted entirely to disarmament. The choice is a tribute to his country and also a very clear tribute that our delegations decided to pay to him as a man and a diplomat. We should like also to pay a tribute to the other officers of the Assembly. With their help the President will be able to guide our frail vessel to a safe harbour. The delegation of Haiti assures him of our full support.

46. We would like to express Haiti's thanks to the Secretary-General, not only for the great interest he demonstrated in our country by visiting us in June 1986 but for his untiring work in the search for peace at all levels. Under his discreet and effective leadership a solution to the crisis in Afghanistan is now well

under way, thus demonstrating the role of the United Nations in the service of peace throughout the world.

47. It is an honour for me to repeat to the international community the devotion of the new head of State of Haiti, Mr. Leslie F. Manigat, to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law. On 7 February 1988 he said:

"No Government can be more sensitive than is mine to the obligation to comply with our international commitments. My presence as President of the State is, I believe, the greatest guarantee that there can be of this. I have so often taught young people in universities in many parts of the world that the principle of international relations is based on the old traditional adage, *pacta sunt servanda*. Haiti will play its part as a lover of peace and an apostle of international harmony as best it can, modestly, admittedly, but with dignity and effectiveness, at the five levels of island solidarity, regional solidarity, hemispheric solidarity, Western solidarity and universal solidarity. The United Nations system, where the equal sovereignty of States can still be freely expressed—and that is something to which we are quite rightly sensitive—is in our view of major significance."

48. The nuclear weapon, controlled by a handful of nations, is the most evil form of the sword of Damocles now hanging over the head of the human race as a whole, including those who own those terrible weapons. It is as though the sufferings of Prometheus were simply the lugubrious prelude to the dark night of history of the fateful punishment of man, who, penetrating the *sanctum sanctorum* of the atom, has stolen from the jealous gods the secret of his own final destruction. Can we still save ourselves from the threat of a nuclear apocalypse? Certainly we can, provided that, *hic et nunc*, we commit ourselves to reversing the arms race and embrace with passion the vision of the new possibilities that have been opened up through the dialogue of the two super-Powers. The Government of Haiti welcomes this first step taken by President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev on the winding, stony and difficult path of mankind's very long march towards disarmament.

49. The euphoria of the moment, however legitimate and spontaneous it may be, must not conceal the picture of the macabre reality haunting mankind.

50. The hands of the clock of history are speeding up. The old dictum of *tempus fugit*, time flies, is becoming more cruelly true. Man may well win his race against the clock provided that everyone—large and small, weak and strong, rich and poor, coming from the North and the South, from the East and the West—does everything he can to transform the will of the peoples into action by Governments, "redeeming the time," as the Apostle says, "because the days are evil."

51. After all, is the arms race not continuing despite the INF agreement? Even if the parties to the INF Treaty were to comply scrupulously with the commitments entered into, thus honouring the old precept *pacta sunt servanda*, because the missiles involved

represent only 3 to 4 per cent of nuclear weapons there would be an enormous amount left over, about 96 per cent. If by a true miracle those same parties to that agreement were to attain their goal of a 50 per cent reduction in their respective arsenals, the planet Earth would continue to face the hideous spectre of the remaining 90 per cent contained in the accumulated arsenal of the cartel of countries possessing nuclear weapons.

52. The destructive power of modern nuclear weapons is about 1 million times greater than that of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fifty-five thousand nuclear warheads, the equivalent of 1 million Hiroshima-type bombs, or about 2,000 times more than all of the firepower used in the Second World War, or the tidy little sum of three tons of nuclear fire for each man, woman and child making up the 5 billion human beings who have occupied since July 1987 our small planet, the global village the future of which is seriously endangered, according to the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, entitled "Our Common Future".

53. Faced with this picture of a mankind technically able to destroy itself 50 to 60 times over without striking a blow, without any chance of survival for any trace of any form of life on this planet, how can one fail to say that perhaps Sigmund Freud abandoned prematurely the concept of Thanatos, the death wish, which he opposed to Eros, the life wish, which also included preservation? *Quid faciam?* What can we do?

Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) took the Chair.

54. May the voice of Haiti, through me, join the concert of voices of peoples, in particular those of the Hibakusha, the only human beings to have witnessed from front-row seats the nuclear tragedy of the planet in August 1945, calling for a halt to the nuclear arms race and for complete nuclear disarmament.

55. The statement that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought might one day seem to our children to be the most precious achievement of the recent Moscow summit meeting. This session can do no less than place the fundamental issue of preventing nuclear war at the top of its agenda. Since there is a danger in our house we must be vigilant; we must have no illusions. Let us work tirelessly to conclude a treaty banning nuclear tests and guaranteeing non-nuclear-weapons States against even the threat of the use of nuclear weapons until the advent of a safe and sound world.

56. As there is little time we shall pass over the other aspects of the programme of action to be undertaken by this session and the follow-up mechanisms to be established.

57. My delegation welcomes the progress achieved at Geneva for a possible verifiable ban on chemical weapons which would supplement the 1925 Geneva Protocol.⁵ We wanted to express our great interest in the consideration of many of the ideas which have been put forward on verification systems. The possibility of verification is, to a great extent, one of the

pillars underlying trust. The prophet Jeremiah, in the seventh century B.C., lamented, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Here, as in other areas of armament, particularly nuclear, we believe in the central role that the Organization must play now and in the future.

58. As for the chimera of transferring this mad arms race into the tiniest interstices of intergalactic material, including the famous black holes of outer space, this reminds us of the Tower of Babel. East and West would both do better to abandon this plan. Only then would this fragile planet in which the dangerous arms race holds humanity hostage find itself better off.

59. I should like to mention conventional weapons in passing. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbook for 1987 offered to universal consciousness a macabre picture: a total of 36 armed conflicts throughout the world, involving five and a half million soldiers belonging to 41 countries; in other words, about a quarter of the 165 nations of the world.

60. The third world, to use Alfred Sauvy's term, has become since the end of the Second World War both the centre of the conventional weapons' trade fair and the deliberately preferred laboratory for testing such weapons. It is no longer a secret to anyone that the arms race costs about \$2.5 billion per day and that conventional weapons amount to 80 per cent of this deadly trade. Seventy-five per cent of those conventional weapons are in the arsenals of the third world.

61. Do we really need a fertile imagination to understand the dynamics of what is inspiring the gun merchants? If we take account of the vast scope of the network of destruction in which these tools of death are enveloping mankind, should we not pursue the gun merchants even more mercilessly than we are now pursuing the drug merchants? How are they different from the underworld of drug trafficking? My delegation firmly believes in the imperative need not to abandon our struggle against death. Whether death is advocated by the drug merchants, the gun merchants, the bacterial merchants, the toxic gas merchants or those selling nuclear weapons, it is all the same: they all trade in death for profit.

62. My delegation attaches the greatest importance to establishing a realistic strategy for implementing the action programme adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship Between Development and Disarmament,⁶ held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987.

63. It becomes more intolerably dangerous each day that the North continues to inflate its proverbial wealth by constantly increasing the impoverishment of the South. This tendency, if not reversed, will eventually detonate a conflagration which, in the final analysis, will lead to an apocalyptic end for all the inhabitants of our planet.

64. Although the threat of nuclear winter is real and frightening, my delegation, representing the least developed country in the reputedly least developed

hemisphere—some say this perversely—would recall that many of our fellow citizens are suffering from maladies arising from hunger. In 1987 alone the world figure was 200,000 deaths, the equivalent of one Hiroshima every two days. To those who no longer worry themselves about the threat hanging over our heads we would say *resquiescant in pacem*. Hunger and famine are wreaking havoc in the world, sowing death and destruction. This is Armageddon every day.

65. The international community, through the United Nations, can eliminate this scourge by taking up the 1955 proposal of the late Edgar Faure, the French Prime Minister, that a special fund for development be established and funded by savings made from the astronomical amounts that are spent on overarmament. From 24 August to 11 September 1987 he worked here in the United Nations with us once again, believing more than ever that his proposal was right. My delegation would like this special session to take him seriously and by way of a commemorative tribute give concrete effect to the Faure proposal. My delegation takes this opportunity to pay reverential tribute to the memory of that great man, a citizen of France and a citizen of the world. The international community can do this.

66. There is little chance that the nations will reach an adequate level of security and disarmament unless the imperative of the dynamic relationship between disarmament and development is taken into account. Perhaps Isaiah, 740 to 680 B.C., 3,000 years ago, was right: "Woe to them that . . . stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong."

67. In the famous words of a great American Negro spiritual, "Ain't gonna study war no more, ain't gonna study war no more". This special session of the General Assembly gives us an excellent opportunity to move ahead in mankind's crusade for peace and survival through disarmament and development. Let us seize this opportunity and hang on to it; as the Cajun people in Louisiana say to their children, "Don't drop the potato!" In the darkest hours of their great migration from Acadia to southern Louisiana, the potato symbolized survival, hope and faith, as Belizaire, the Cajun, once told me. Of this faith Saint Paul said to us, "For we walk by faith, not by sight". Many have difficulty in seeing what there is to see, in any event.

68. May I in conclusion offer to all this prayer to the Prince of Peace, Allah, Jehovah, the God of Mahatma Gandhi, the God of all, the God of the Haitian peasant, who calls the Lord of history the "Gran-Maitr-La", a prayer taken from the liturgy of last Sunday's worship service at the Brick Presbyterian Church on Park Avenue, which has been in existence since 1768. This was the church inaugurated by Dr. Rodgers, the chaplain of General George Washington.

"O Divine presence, reconcile us through your spirit, inspire us as we struggle to go free from every bondage, enable us to be humble peacemakers, ready healers, stalwart friends of justice. Empower those in the United Nations, and all of us, women and men of every race and condition, to

live as good neighbours in the global village, united in your justice and peace. Amen."*

69. Mr. CHOUDHURY (Bangladesh): The occasion for which we are all gathered here marks a significant watershed in the history of our endeavours for peace. Once again the United Nations is focusing its attention on one of the most crucial subjects of our times—disarmament. The success of our deliberations could ensure the continuance of our civilization, which stands more threatened in our generation than ever before. Our failure could push us closer to the brink of disaster.

70. It is deeply gratifying to note that we have a person of your qualities, Mr. President, to guide us. I know from experience that your task is arduous. You have been performing it with great dexterity and diligence, with a feeling for the gravity of the issues involved. This is deserving of the highest praise. To me this is all the more heartening because you represent a country, the German Democratic Republic, with which Bangladesh has ties that we cherish most warmly. My delegation is also deeply appreciative of the efforts of the Secretary-General in the sphere of disarmament.

71. The vast arsenals in the world today are a cause for concern. The 100 million people of Bangladesh share this anxiety with others around the globe. I bring with me a message to this assemblage: the urgings of my people for peace, their plaintive appeal for a global environment in which they, like many others, could resolutely pursue unfettered their quiet efforts to secure for themselves an acceptable quality of life.

72. There is, I am happy to be able to note, a glimmer of hope on the horizon, streaks that appear to brighten with each passing day. The super-Powers have now signed the treaty on intermediate-range nuclear weapons, thereby eliminating an entire class of weapons for the first time in history. The meeting of their leaders has enlarged the hope for a deeper cut in their strategic arsenals. These developments have led to a greater understanding between them, with positive implications for the globe.

73. Secondly, another welcome development has been the accords on Afghanistan. For these, the leaders of the United States, the Soviet Union, Pakistan and Afghanistan and the Secretary-General deserve our plaudits. Perhaps it is too soon to pass judgement on the agreements. Nevertheless, their signing has inspired a new hope generated from the deep sense of responsibility these leaders have displayed towards the future of humanity. May I assure them that the peoples of the world are solidly behind them in their quest for these noble goals.

74. A third reason for optimism is the possibility, in the not-too-distant future, of an agreed convention on a ban on chemical weapons. These are horrendous instruments of mass destruction, and their use is a sad commentary on the ethics of our age. They were condemned and prohibited by the Geneva Protocol of 1925,⁵ which was the first genuine disarmament agreement but is now, sadly, honoured more in the breach than in the observance. I understand consid-

*Quoted in English by the speaker.

erable progress has been made towards that end at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. I hope the Conference will soon be able to determine the means for a ban on the possession, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for the destruction of existing ones.

75. Finally, I am pleased to observe the more assertive and independent role of the non-aligned and developing countries, both individually and in unison, in the sphere of disarmament. They have now been advocating distinct positions on such issues as bilateral and multilateral negotiations, regional disarmament, security and development, a comprehensive test ban, chemical and radiological weapons and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The Final Communiqué and the Plan of Action of the special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 26 to 30 May 1988 [A/S-15/27 and Corr. 1, annex I], deserve to be heeded. I have no doubt that these countries will be able to play an effective and constructive role during this special session.

76. These trends, however, must not transform our confidence into complacency. We currently spend more than \$1,000 billion on arms procurement. We live in a world where there exists an explosive power of almost four tons of dynamite for each living person. We have over 50,000 nuclear warheads, sufficient to obliterate the total global population hundreds of times over. Our conventional armaments include more than 140,000 main battle tanks, 35,000 combat aircraft, 21,000 helicopters, 1,100 major warships and more than 700 attack submarines—a most formidable armoury for destruction.

77. This stupendous expenditure on armaments is unjustified and unethical on at least two major counts. First, if their purpose is to shore up security, that is not being achieved. What could be more threatening to peace and stability than the poverty, hunger, squalor and despair of a vast majority of the global population of 5 billion people, whose Governments are unable to provide them with adequate resources for a decent existence? The total amount disbursed globally on official development assistance is less than 20 per cent of that spent on weaponry. Is it not simply incredible that the smallpox eradication programme, a major success of the United Nations system, should cost less than 33 per cent as much as a modern nuclear submarine? The cost of four days of global expenditure could, I believe, be sufficient for a programme to control malaria in the world.

78. Secondly, the presence of the massive armaments and their increasing sophistication raises the probability of their use. Even today, regrettably, dozens of wars are being fought, many of which could increase in magnitude and engulf us in a mighty conflagration. Irrational régimes like those of Israel and South Africa, which are in illegal occupation of territories and which keep their people in repressive subjugation, would have a propensity to use these weapons for their vicious ends. The picture, therefore, is one in which optimism blends with pessimism to provide the backdrop for our discussions.

79. At this the third General Assembly special session on disarmament, we must exchange views and share ideas so as to devise modalities for narrowing the differences between us in the sphere of disarmament. We must seek to broaden the international consensus of philosophical attitudes towards the subject. We should not only undertake a pragmatic assessment of the objective situation but also be future-oriented in identifying possible areas where agreements could be forged. There should be adequate concentration on nuclear disarmament, which should have the foremost priority. At the same time attention should be given to measures for the limitation and reduction of conventional arms, which have killed over 25 million people since the Second World War, and pursued resolutely within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament.

80. The present session must be able to preserve the letter and broaden the spirit of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament [*resolution S-10/2*]. That Magna Carta of disarmament set out the goals, enumerated the principles and ordered the priorities in this field. Stressing the central role and primary responsibilities of the United Nations in this sphere, it specified measures intended to strengthen the international and multilateral machinery dealing with the relevant issues. The second special session on disarmament, in 1982, in its Concluding Document⁷ reaffirmed the validity of that Final Document and the solemn commitment of the Member States to it. We at this session must do the same.

81. This special session must also provide some ideas on how the process of development could receive a fillip from the disarmament measures. The subject was, as we all know, discussed at length at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held at United Nations Headquarters last year. The acknowledgement of the concept of a linkage between these two phenomena and security is increasingly gaining ground. Over time, this will surely make more converts and form a perennial item on the agenda of relevant private and public debates.

82. If the global community wishes to rid itself of the fear of total annihilation, it appears to me that the way to do so would be to follow a five-point programme of disarmament. The components of the programme should be the following.

83. The first is a comprehensive test-ban treaty. To date we have had well over 1,600 nuclear-test explosions of different sizes and varieties. A comprehensive test-ban treaty would narrow arms competition by rendering impossible further qualitative development of nuclear weapons. Even if some States were to produce first-generation fission devices without tests, it is unlikely that those untested, unsophisticated weapons would ever be used, for fear of effective reprisals; nor would any State be prepared to build a stockpile of such weapons. By their commitment to a comprehensive test ban, nuclear-weapon States could signal to all others their determination to give up the arms race, and that would surely lessen the chance of proliferation. Adequate security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States would also reduce their urge to go nuclear. Also, what the so-called modernizing industrialization is sub-

jecting our environment to is bad enough; we cannot afford to make it worse through nuclear testings.

84. The second component is a comprehensive programme of disarmament. So far in the 1980s preparations for nuclear war have cost \$427 billion; preparations for conventional war in Europe have cost \$736 billion, and in Asia \$588 billion. Most of those sums have been spent on the development of vast arsenals. The world cannot afford this any more in economic, emotional or political terms. What is absolutely essential, therefore, is a reduction of arms within the framework of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

85. It is true that nuclear weapons constitute the greatest threat and demand priority attention. At the same time, it is also true that all wars now being waged are conventional. These weapons are acquiring increasing sophistication through technological advance, and precision-guided munitions are now able to hit exact targets at great distances. The differences in terms of destruction caused between these and some low-yield nuclear weapons are being gradually and alarmingly reduced. Therefore I believe that if States have developed force structures and conventional capabilities that have become a cause of apprehension for others, reductions must be made in a balanced and equitable manner so that, while not affecting their genuine security requirements, stability is enhanced at lower military levels.

86. The third component is restraint in naval activities. The need to curb the naval arms buildup is quite clear now that there is a perceptible increase in the importance of sea-based weapon systems. It has been estimated that the nuclear Powers have more than 7,200 submarine-launched ballistic missiles of strategic capabilities and over 5,900 tactical nuclear warheads among them. The increasing sophistication of submarines and their armaments is giving them first-strike—therefore, theoretically destabilizing—capabilities. Procurements by other growing navies in the world are a cause for both regional and global concern.

87. Such developments not only spread fear and apprehension but also deter the peaceful uses of the sea and its resources. There is therefore a clear case for transparency and restraint in naval activities in every region. The criteria for legitimate security needs of States for naval buildup should be carefully formulated. Verification procedures should be established and should be appropriate, universal and non-discriminatory.

88. The fourth component is confidence-building measures and verification. The importance of confidence-building measures has been correctly identified in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as necessary to strengthen international peace and security and to build confidence among States. Europe has shown the way in this matter, and I am happy to note the acknowledged importance of this concept among States of that continent. The same should apply to other regions of the world as well. States should have confidence in the behaviour patterns of their neighbours. This process could vastly reduce tension in every region of the world.

89. Compliance with agreements reached among States should be verifiable. The importance of verification, both as a concept and as a set of procedures, is acquiring a very significant dimension. For instance, if we do have a comprehensive test-ban treaty, a global seismic system would be needed to verify compliance. It has similar relevance in the naval and other spheres. I am happy that considerable technical work is being carried out in this respect.

90. The fifth component is the expanded role of the United Nations. Nearly all the States of the world are represented in the United Nations. Disarmament is an important enough subject to be the concern of all. This house, with its universal representative character, and its Chief Executive, the Secretary-General, should therefore play an effective and expanded role in disarmament matters. This recognition was underscored by all Member States when they committed themselves to the Charter, which views the maintenance of international peace and security as the principal purpose of the United Nations. Furthermore, this was to be done with the least diversion to armaments of the world's human and economic resources. The United Nations can and must make an important contribution to encouraging agreements and also setting up verification procedures. This role is gradually acquiring more prominence, and rightly so.

91. In this context, I should like to add that the sole multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament matters, the Conference on Disarmament, needs to have its membership reviewed by this special session with a view to its expansion. At the first special session on disarmament I asked for such a periodic review. The present session also provides us with an excellent opportunity to do so. An expanded Conference on Disarmament could be made more representative of the global political situation. This could be gradually achieved over a limited time-frame, maintaining the Conference balance and thus enhancing its ability to function more effectively.

92. The Bangladeshis are a peace-loving community with many aspirations but severe resource constraints. Our main goal has been providing for our people a decent existence. I am happy to be able to say that we expect to reach self-sufficiency in food production in the 1990s. We have also managed substantially to reduce the growth of population. We were encouraged by its acknowledgement by the United Nations as reflected in the selection of President Hussain Muhammad Ershad for the United Nations Population Award for 1987.

93. For all these activities we require a regional and global ambience of peace. This leads us to hope for a world where force and the threat of its use could be abjured as an instrument of policies of States. Our constitutional commitment weds us to the concept of general and complete disarmament. Our decision to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (xxii)*, *annex*] was based on our firm conviction that there can be no durable peace except through the elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons in their stockpiles.

94. If disarmament is rhetoric today, we must try to transform it into reality tomorrow.*

95. Mr. FLEMMING (Saint Lucia): Please accept my congratulations, Sir, on your election as President of this fifteenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly. I have the utmost confidence that our deliberations will be successful under your sage guidance.

96. We meet here again, at this third special session devoted to disarmament, as mandated by Articles 1 and 26 of the Charter, that is, in one more attempt to maintain international peace and security by the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments. Saint Lucia is one of the few States that maintain no standing armed forces. But my reason for taking part in this great debate may be summed up with Dante's cogent phrase, which says that "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who remain neutral in times of great crisis."

97. This debate is not new. Over a half century ago, the two international peace conferences at The Hague, in 1899 and 1907, sought to bring about the elimination of "excessive armaments", and as early as 1946 this Assembly passed a resolution which called for the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes. In 1959, almost 30 years ago, the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the international community to take the necessary steps towards general and complete disarmament [*resolution 1378 (xiv)*]. Since then the Assembly has adopted over 800 resolutions on arms control. Yet in the past three-and-a-half decades, world military expenditure has quadrupled in real terms, and since 1945 the number of States known to possess nuclear weapons has gone from one to five, and several others are believed to have nuclear arsenals while still others are known to be on the nuclear threshold.

98. We are all involved; none of us dares to abscond before saying "*mea culpa*". But everywhere there is agreement that the arms race continues to be mankind's greatest folly. At the end of their summit meeting at Geneva in November 1985, President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev agreed that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Yet the possessors of nuclear weapons are reluctant to give them up for fear of a prophecy in Arnold Toynbee's statement that "Each time a new weapon was invented in the past, people said that it was so terrible that it must not be used. Nevertheless it was used." No one wants to be caught without. Should Armageddon come, everyone wants to take part in the killing process. No one trusts anyone. It is no wonder that many years ago Chancellor Oxenstierna admonished his eldest son to "go and see with how little wisdom the world is governed".

99. We have for too long fondled the implements of war as though we believed Voltaire's cynical aphorism that "God is on the side of the big battalions". Despite the welcome potential of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—signed in Washington on 8 December 1987 between the United States and the Soviet Union, the approximately

50,000 warheads in the arsenals of the major Powers still constitute an explosive power of some 13,000 megatons, equal to four tons of dynamite for every man, woman and child on Earth. Some experts believe that the use of only 10 per cent of the world's strategic nuclear weapons could result in the near total destruction of human civilization.

100. While nuclear weapons have for some time now cast a dark, ominous shadow over the peace, security, and indeed the very existence of mankind, it is conventional weapons that continue to make the most noise and do the most damage.

101. From nascent origins at Bandung, for almost three decades the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which Saint Lucia is proud to be a member, has interposed itself between the military blocs of East and West and has sought to find a middle ground in the ever-escalating military competition. But though our Movement encompasses most of the world's developing countries, we have been unsuccessful at restraining both East-West military competition and naked aggression among ourselves. Indeed, all too often we have allowed ourselves to become willing proxies in the East-West struggle.

102. Since the end of the Second World War, the developing countries have fought over 150 wars, involving some 80 countries and causing more deaths than that caused by the Second World War. And, of the almost \$1,000 billion spent on armaments last year, 80 per cent was spent on conventional weapons, much of them bought by developing countries. Yet most of the 500,000 women who will die from complications of pregnancy or childbirth this year live in the third world, where women often run 100 times more risk of dying in pregnancy than do women in the developed countries. The child mortality rate in some developing countries that are facing internal insurrection is as high as 375 per 1,000, and, sadly enough, most of these deaths could be prevented by basic health care costing less than \$2 dollars per capita.

103. During the 26-day duration of the special session, almost one million children under age five will die in the developing world from infections and prolonged undernutrition. The developing countries now account for about 17 per cent of world military expenditure, and \$1,000 billion of world debt. We maintain 15 million troops, yet in aggregate we have fewer than 2 million doctors and only about 23 million teachers. There are still over 600 million people in the world who cannot read or write; and an equal number are plagued by hunger and malnutrition. Most of them are in the developing countries.

104. How can we continue in this military insanity when directly before us lies the ultimate Malthusian nightmare? Long before the middle of the next century, we will be faced with a world population of over 10 billion, 8.5 billion of whom will live in the developing countries, where basic resources are already in scant supply.

105. In my own region, Latin America and the Caribbean, increasing poverty now affects some 35 per cent of the population, or more than 130 million people. While the onerous debt burden approaches

*At this point the representative was taken ill and was unable to finish his statement.

\$400 billion with no genuine relief in sight, and net financial transfers to the developed world from our region now average \$25 billion annually, every dollar we spend on weapons is like a noose around the necks of the poor of the Latin American and Caribbean region, ever tightening, sapping the very life from their souls. Yet every year our arms expenditures seem to buy us less security. The more armed we become, the more suspicious and insecure we become. It is a seemingly never-ending vicious cycle. In retrospect, for the developing world the credo of last year's International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development should have been "No development without peace; no peace without development". We all know which must come first. Deep down, I feel that all of us in the developing world know that there is an inextricable, inverse relationship between our arms expenditures and financing for development. It is a zero-sum game. When one goes up, the other must go down.

106. The American President, Dwight Eisenhower, more than three decades ago, appropriately pointed out to us that "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in a final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, from those who are cold and are not clothed."

107. We cannot break this mad escalation of arms expenditures and increasing weapons stockpiles because disarmament is dictated by national policy and domestic political considerations rather than by any serious commitment to internationalism. Over the years, here and there, we have seen small signs of hope which indicate that the necessary political will may yet be wrenched from the hearts of men, as, for example, in the consensus reached in September 1986 at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe on significant improvements in the measures included in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, and, indeed, also in the verification component of the INF Treaty of last year.

108. But such hopeful indicators have come only in the midst of egregious signs of puerile regression. Take, for example, the fact that since 1925 the Geneva Protocol has prohibited the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, but rumours about and accusations of the use of chemical weapons continue to plague the international community to this very day.

109. It is said, *Si vis pacem, para bellum*—if you want peace, prepare for war. By such a measure it would seem that no one wants peace more than the leaders of today's nation-States, since we are engaged in perpetual preparation for war. In 1973 the General Assembly recommended that all States permanent members of the Security Council should reduce their military budgets by 10 per cent and allot 10 per cent of the funds thus released for assistance to developing countries. Had that objective been realized, last year alone it would have released tens of billions of dollars for useful purposes. After all, current world military expenditure represents more than 5 per cent of the total world output and is therefore 25 times more than all the official development assistance given to the developing countries. Yet in the past five

years the net outflow of resources from the developing world has amounted to over \$85 billion.

110. High military budgets have long been proved to increase unemployment and inflation, worsen balance of payments, destabilize exchange rates and decrease international trade.

111. Exactly a decade ago the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament concluded with the unanimous adoption of a Final Document which expressed alarm at "the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuing arms race" [see resolution S-10/2, first preambular paragraph]. At that session, we were able to agree on a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, sect. III]—which, unfortunately, remains moribund.

112. Only six years ago the second special session on disarmament failed to meet expectations in that it was unable to adopt the envisaged comprehensive programme of disarmament. But it did create a heightened international awareness of disarmament issues, exemplified by the fact that more than 5,000 representatives of 157 countries, the United Nations Secretariat and non-governmental organizations participated, including 18 heads of State and 44 foreign ministers. It also became the focus of world attention, triggering world-wide demonstrations in favour of disarmament, including a rally in front of this building which drew almost 1 million people.

113. The report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development has already warned us that

"the world can either continue to pursue the arms race with characteristic vigour or move consciously and with deliberate speed toward a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order. It cannot do both."⁸

114. It has been suggested that Governments ought to get out of the way and let the people get on with the business of disarmament. One of the main tasks of this special session must be to redefine the traditional concept of national security, away from the militaristic point of view and more toward greater economic and social equanimity in the world. If we fail in that simple task, perhaps it is time that we got out of the way.

115. Mr. SUAZO TOMÉ (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Honduras wishes at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at its third special session devoted to disarmament. We believe that your experience in the field of disarmament will greatly contribute to the success of our work, and we are prepared to extend our fullest co-operation. Similarly, we express our congratulations to the other officers of the Assembly.

116. We sense now an atmosphere of optimism, a greater degree of confidence that at this third special session devoted to disarmament the peace movements all round the world will gain favour. We know that Governments as well as non-governmental orga-

nizations have contributed significantly to establishing that new atmosphere.

117. Given the uncertainty inspired by the possibility of a world-wide conflagration and the fact that several countries already possess nuclear weapons, we cannot allow this opportunity to pass without seeking to ensure that the third special session will be what everyone hopes it will be: a session leading to the adoption of vigorous resolutions and principles that all of us will undertake to respect honestly.

118. The 8th of December 1987 marked a milestone in contemporary history, when the two super-Powers signed, in good faith, the treaty on the elimination of land-based intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The leaders of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have demonstrated to the international community that they can achieve positive results when there exists the determination to guarantee the security of all mankind. The ratification of the treaty by both countries is a significant step towards the denuclearization of the entire world and towards reserving the use of nuclear energy for peace and the development of nations.

119. In connection with this development, we must also recall that the concepts of security and peace are not a subject for discussion exclusively by the great Powers. They are clearly more concerned with controlling nuclear weapons and chemical and biological weapons, but other countries are concerned over the conventional arms buildup and the quantitative and qualitative development of such weapons.

120. Everyone is well aware that a large share of the budgets of third world countries is spent on the military, with the emphasis on conventional weapons. Hence we believe that we cannot focus all our efforts only on the elimination of nuclear weapons and chemical and biological weapons—both of which could destroy all living beings in the world.

121. Honduras was one of the 15 members which, through the Group of Latin American States, participated in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament. Hence my country's interest in achieving total disarmament so that mankind might live in an atmosphere of peace and development and we might devote more of our energies to solving the social and economic problems of our peoples.

122. Since its foundation the United Nations—and indeed the whole of the international community—has not had to face a single nuclear war. However, we have witnessed countless conventional wars, which continue to cause millions of victims and great destruction of the infrastructure of many countries. Consequently, we are convinced that the regulating of conventional weapons, because of the frequency of their use and the death and destruction they cause, should increasingly attract international attention.

123. Nuclear weapons are the preserve of the developed countries, which can earmark large amounts for nuclear research, but at the other extreme are the poor countries, which in some cases

devote up to 80 per cent of their budgets to maintaining large armed forces equipped with conventional weapons, while their peoples suffer the consequences of the diversion of large sums of money which could be used to promote their health, education and development.

124. In recent years the question of conventional weapons has begun receiving more attention, although to date no satisfactory solution to the problem has been found. That is why it would be more effective to tackle the limitation of arms and conventional disarmament within a regional context than to try to apply broader concepts to diverse situations and environments. The most recent meetings of the leaders of the two super-Powers lead us very clearly to understand that there is a way to achieve agreement on nuclear weapons. However, I wish to emphasize that my country, like other developing countries, continues to aspire to conventional disarmament, especially in the Central American region.

125. Without prejudice to discussing other matters that affect international security, the most disturbing is the arms buildup. Beginning in 1978 the Central American region has seen an increase in conventional weapons as a result of the internal conflicts in some countries of the region and the participation of hegemonistic blocs, thus modifying the balance of forces which had traditionally been maintained in Central America. New combat techniques have been introduced, along with foreign advisers. Military personnel has increased fivefold, with the exception of some cases like that of my own country, which with 23,000 troops, including the police force, has the smallest armed forces of the four Central American countries with such forces.

126. We cannot fail to mention the costs for our peoples in political, social and economic terms. The very sizeable appropriations of financial resources absorbed by the arms buildup could be channelled to productive areas, so that our peoples could meet their needs, at least minimally.

127. My delegation is confident that this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will achieve positive results, for the good of all mankind and genuine peace.

128. Mr. BIFFOT (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on 31 May the delegation of Gabon welcomed your nomination by consensus to the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The days which have passed since then have confirmed that our choice was the right one. The Gabon delegation extends to you and to all those who have been elected to assist you in your work our congratulations and assures you of our continuing co-operation.

129. We realize that the satisfaction we have all felt since 31 May, indicative of the success of the preparations for this session, is to a large extent the result of everything that the United Nations has been able to do under the leadership of the Secretary-General. Because of his constant work for disarmament, peace and international harmony, my delegation would like to extend to Mr. Perez de Cuellar the respect, encouragement and sympathy of the people

and Government of Gabon, and particularly of the President of the Republic, El Hadj Omar Bongo, a tireless pilgrim for dialogue and peace in Africa in particular.

130. The meetings at Addis Ababa from 19 to 28 May and at Havana from 26 to 30 May were two very important ones, the agendas of which clearly and forcefully reflect the importance attached by the members of the OAU on the one hand and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries on the other to the issue of disarmament and, as a corollary, to this special session of the General Assembly.

131. The agenda for this session has 16 items, and many of those items have more than one sub-item. It would be immodest for us to venture into the agenda, particularly since the 140 speakers who have preceded us at this rostrum have given us the fruits of their thinking on one or more of those agenda items. Accordingly, my delegation will confine itself to one question: what is the purpose of all this coming and going from one country to another, from one continent to another? What is the purpose of all these meetings on disarmament?

132. Far from being a farce, as some people of ill will might think, meetings on disarmament and the fact that they continue to be held have a real advantage. They present the reality to us that individuals, peoples and States have all given thought to the inevitably fatal danger of the accumulation of both conventional and above all nuclear weapons to the existence of human life and to life on our planet. They have considered that this is a matter of importance and that without any further delay it is necessary to concentrate all the reflections, analyses and conclusions, in short, all the energy that has been devoted to the subject, in order to prevent the annihilation of our universe.

133. This thought also leads us to note that there has been a kind of transfer, a shift of armed conflicts from the developed countries, where they used to occur every 20 to 30 years, to the developing countries. Indeed, while the developed countries have known peace since the end of the Second World War, the developing countries have increasingly become hotbeds of military confrontation. In 47 years there have been about 145 armed conflicts and 20 million dead. These are disturbing figures when one takes account of the fact that the number of conflicts per year continues to increase.

134. It is also noteworthy that conventional weapons, which are regarded by developed countries today as operationally less satisfactory, are being shifted away from the producing countries to the developing countries. One notes that more than one sophisticated weapon is to be found for offensive operations in a growing number of third world States. The question that arises is: is there not a danger that the reduction of medium- and shorter-range nuclear weapons might be carried out to the detriment of the developing countries because of a transfer of such weapons to Africa, Asia, the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean?

135. While we welcome the results of last December's agreement between the United States and the

Soviet Union, and while we welcome the will to negotiate which was recently restated at the Moscow summit, Gabon would invite the United Nations and the international community as a whole to urge those who produce and those who possess nuclear weapons to give thought to the situation and examine their conscience so as to ensure that the reduction and then the elimination of such weapons does not lead to any temptation or need to transfer either the weapons themselves or their related waste products to the developing countries.

136. Our thought thus leads us to the following principle of international security: any research on disarmament, any attempt to implement disarmament shall be conceived of and carried out in such a manner that security provided to one territory, one State, one continent, and so forth, shall not, at any point or in any way, be a reason for trouble, concern or fear to any other continent, State or people.

137. It is, *inter alia*, because—at least from a certain point on—he was always, or almost always, afraid that the Emperor Nero ended up spreading terror for the sake of his own security. Fight and flight have always been and remain the two main kinds of conduct that are prompted by fear and insecurity.

138. Our analysis leads us finally to the urgent need to establish an international code of conduct, a kind of preliminary to any peaceful, reassuring coexistence among peoples, nationalities and continents.

139. Gabon for its part has always done its utmost to ensure that peace, harmony and security should be permanent characteristics of our planet, and of Africa in particular. That is why our “policy of being open to the world” and “azimuthal diplomacy”—to use the expressions of our President—have always been the two objectives of the Government of my country. This policy and this diplomacy as President Bongo said in his message of 12 March last to the people of Gabon, “have enabled us to broaden our circle of friends and, above all, to establish solid relationships of active and close co-operation with many countries”.

140. The work of the President of the Republic, has been extremely eloquent in respect of peace and security. At the national level he reassured people by, *inter alia*, releasing—and I do mean “releasing”—all political detainees, thus making Gabon one of those few countries where there are no political detainees. At the international level he always advocated dialogue and concert in the conduct of international affairs, in particular in putting an end to regional conflicts.

141. Against this background I should emphasize that the last meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Organization for African Unity on the Chad-Libya dispute, held last May at Addis Ababa, confirmed and consolidated, 10 years after the Committee was set up—what commendable persistence in working for peace!—the cease-fire between Chad and Libya. This led to a reaffirmation of the willingness of the two parties concerned to have a just and lasting peace restored in that area. It led also to the expression of a

resolve to re-establish and normalize the relations between those two States.

142. The work of President Bongo on behalf of international understanding and security is on a par with that of the great pioneers and Nobel Peace Prize laureates.

143. The few moments I have taken to describe this work complement my thought on the urgent need to establish an international code of conduct which would guide us in ways of thinking and acting and being within this large family which is our universe. Peace and security, the foundations of all coexistence at the intergroup level, as well as at national and international levels, can be attained and can last only if there is a universal resolve to ensure the primacy of understanding and a spirit of ecumenicalism over the motivations and dictates of self-centredness and the logic of emotions.

144. Mr. ANDRADE-DIAZ-DURÁN (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, allow me to convey to you and to the other officers, as well as to the Chairmen of the Working Groups at this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, our warmest congratulations on your election and our appreciation of the very valuable work you have all been doing from the beginning of this special session, whose objective is of vital importance to the international community. There can be no doubt that to preserve international peace and security it is indispensable for there to be the necessary political will and that the existing means and multilateral mechanisms should be used to ensure the best possible results in order to give effect to the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and thus to be able to safeguard future generations from the scourge of war and its terrible aftermath of death and destruction.

145. The delegation of Guatemala offers its resolute co-operation in attaining the objectives set by the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament.

146. I should like also to extend a special greeting to the Secretary-General, who has spared no effort in seeking ways to enable this multilateral Organization, the most representative at the international level, to contribute to resolving the great political, economic and social problems that afflict our contemporary world.

147. This special session of the General Assembly on disarmament is taking place at a propitious time, after the signing and ratification of the agreement by the two super-Powers on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, coinciding with a period of political détente at the international level which facilitates negotiations towards the gradual and definitive resolution of various crises and sources of tension.

148. It is very significant that at this special session on disarmament we have heard the authoritative voices of Presidents, Prime Ministers, foreign ministers and other distinguished personalities, who have expressed basic agreement on the absolute need to attain the goals and objectives set forth in regard to this matter since the founding of the United Nations,

and particularly those set forth during the first and second special sessions on disarmament.

149. Disarmament and the struggle against the arms race are matters of vital importance to the Organization. From 1946 to date a number of efforts have been made to give impetus to the world campaign for disarmament. In 1946 the Atomic Energy Commission was established. In 1947 the Security Council formed a Commission for Conventional Armaments, which it requested to formulate proposals for the general reduction of armaments and armed forces. Both commissions, unfortunately, failed to achieve the objectives for which they had been established. In 1952 the Assembly merged the two aforementioned commissions and created the Disarmament Commission, but its work also was limited. In 1957 and 1958 the membership of the Disarmament Commission was expanded to include all States Members of the United Nations, and it is important to emphasize this, since it was recognized that disarmament efforts were the responsibility of all States making up the international community. From 1959 onwards the United Nations carried out disarmament efforts with two parallel approaches. The General Assembly included on its agenda the item "General and complete disarmament under effective international control", and at the same time fresh impetus was given to disarmament issues in the bilateral context.

150. The General Assembly designated 1970 as the beginning of the first United Nations Disarmament Decade and appealed to Governments to intensify their efforts to achieve effective measures for ending the arms race. However, it was not until 1978 that a special effort was made to strengthen the role of the United Nations in this area. At the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] was adopted, which set forth the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, by means of a Programme of Action [*ibid.*, *sect. III*] which set the priorities and measures that should be adopted with respect to the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, conventional weapons and those considered excessively harmful or having indiscriminate effects, and also with regard to the reduction of armed forces.

151. Despite the fact that the General Assembly designated the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, the international situation prevailing at that time had an adverse effect on the implementation of the Programme of Action which had so laboriously been negotiated. As tensions increased, military expenditures simultaneously increased, which once again demonstrated a lack of confidence in the international negotiating machinery and a failure to comply with the generally accepted rules of international law.

152. The United Nations convened a second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament in 1982, at which it was not possible to reach a consensus on any specific disarmament action. Nevertheless, at that session the Assembly reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document of the first special session and expressed its deep concern at the deterior-

ration of the international situation. It emphasized the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war and the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in this field, as well as the need to find appropriate procedures leading to the elimination of the arms race.

153. Today we are meeting again in a special session of the General Assembly which promises significant advances in the disarmament field. Everyone is aware that in the international arena there are portents of substantial agreements in the disarmament sphere. In this context, we welcome not only the constructive dialogue between the two super-Powers but also the results of that dialogue, among which we would highlight the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, of 8 December 1987, and also the intensive negotiations to reach an understanding on substantial reductions of strategic nuclear weapons. Although that reduction of armaments represents only a very small percentage of existing weapons, it shows that there is a real possibility of achieving new agreements of greater scope.

154. Guatemala shares with the developing countries the view that this is the best time for a continued effort leading to positive negotiations to overcome the confrontation phase and thus to open the door to peace and development. The international community is hopeful that it will be possible at last to curb the arms race and that the immense investments in the manufacture of engines of death can be devoted instead to programmes of co-operation and assistance for the economic and social development of our nations. Guatemala emphasizes the direct relationship between disarmament and development, as was so aptly stated by the five Central American Presidents in the declaration at the Esquipulas II meeting of August 1987, when they affirmed that peace and development are inseparable.

155. In truth it is frightening to consider that arms expenditures at the present time amount to approximately \$2 million per minute. From 1960 to date military expenditures have doubled; a million million dollars a year is consumed in the arms race, while one fifth of that amount could be used to eradicate hunger from the world until the year 2000, and a small amount could be used to resolve the problem of the external debt of the developing countries. From 1968 to the present the international monetary transfers for the acquisition of weapons have tripled, and we observe with the greatest concern that the developed countries have allocated for arms expenditures sums vastly greater than those destined for economic assistance for development.

156. It appears absurd that, on the one hand, the deterioration of the international economic situation is becoming so acute that the abyss between the rich and the poor nations is growing deeper while, on the other hand, the untrammelled expenditure on creating instruments of destruction to threaten the very survival of mankind should continue.

157. Humankind proclaims the right to life and, accordingly, calls for the right of peoples to live in peace. The immense scientific, technological and financial resources should be placed in the service of

their comprehensive development and should not be used to subjugate or destroy mankind. It is necessary to pool our efforts to eradicate hunger, poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, disease and so many other evils that afflict us; but in particular it is the wish of the nations and peoples of the world to achieve a stable and lasting peace that will make possible the survival of all in the context of unqualified respect for human rights.

158. The peoples of the world demand the eradication of the shameful system of *apartheid*, the elimination of racial discrimination, religious intolerance, colonialism, neo-colonialism and all other forms of oppression. We therefore reaffirm our faith in the fundamental principles of international law, emphasizing amongst others the principles of the sovereign equality of States, self-determination of peoples, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, independence, territorial integrity, non-use of force in international relations and the principle of undertaking co-operation in the spirit of solidarity to resolve economic, social, cultural or humanitarian problems. These fundamental principles may lead to the establishment of a new international economic order based on equity and justice, as has been declared by the United Nations.

159. Latin America has been a pioneer in regional efforts for arms limitation and the advancement of disarmament. The Treaty of Tlatelolco banning nuclear weapons from our region and its two Additional Protocols,⁹ signed in 1967, created the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world. It is important to point out that in that first arms-limitation agreement verification was provided for through an international body for which a permanent monitoring organ was established called the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [OPANAL].

160. In Lima, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America has been in operation since October 1987. We view as of great importance the fact that the United Nations and the international community should give to that kind of initiative the necessary financial and technical support to enable them to fulfil the objectives for which they have been set up, as an additional token of support of regional efforts for general and complete disarmament and one of the effective and appropriate measures of the World Disarmament Campaign.

161. The five Central American countries have laboured tirelessly and consistently in advocating a political solution to the regional crisis. The Esquipulas agreements, signed by the Presidents of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Guatemala, are the unequivocal expression of the fact that the political will of their Governments is there and a reflection of the feeling of their peoples that a major agreement must be reached to open up a new chapter in the history of their relations in order to secure a firm and lasting peace within a framework of democracy, pluralism and respect for human rights.

162. It is only fair to acknowledge that dialogue and negotiation at the Central American level have been greatly encouraged by the determined effort of the

Contadora Group and the Support Group, which generously provided their good offices in an effort at mediation that made it possible to avert a generalized military clash in the area and fostered significant advances on matters of security and on political, economic and social problems, embodied in the Document of Objectives¹⁰ and the final draft of the Contadora Act on Peace and Co-operation in Central America,¹¹ which included a specific section on disarmament proposing advanced systems of verification and control.

163. It is our view that we must end the arms race which has unfortunately taken place in Central America, stimulated by a number of factors. Guatemala, which has stayed out of that arms race, considers it absolutely indispensable for there to be gradual and significant disarmament in order to avert the risk or threat of war and to make it possible to invest our limited resources in programmes of economic recovery that will ensure development and once again strengthen our integration at various levels, towards which international assistance and co-operation must be oriented, as contemplated in the special plan of economic co-operation for Central America, unanimously adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 42/231.

164. Guatemala also supports the establishment of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and co-operation and the diplomatic efforts to find a definitive solution with regard to the rights which Argentina claims in that area.

165. Guatemala supports regional and subregional efforts to create nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world, in conformity with the guidelines set out in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as one of the most appropriate avenues for reducing areas of tension and thus strengthening the principles and purposes that inspire the Charter of the United Nations in the preservation of international peace and security.

166. Guatemala identifies with the Six-Nation Initiative—made up of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania—seeking the creation of a political atmosphere favourable to peace negotiations and considers that the United Nations is the multilateral forum *par excellence* in which to seek appropriate disarmament solutions. We consider equally necessary the negotiation of binding legal instruments that may lead to the prohibition of nuclear tests and the establishment of a multilateral system of effective verification and control, ensure the use of outer space for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and promote the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

167. It is likewise our view that we must continue efforts so that negotiations may reach fruition in an international agreement prohibiting the production, stockpiling, transport and use of chemical, biological and bacteriological weapons. In this connection, Guatemala joins with others in condemning the use of this type of weaponry, and in the name of the thousands of innocent victims of these weapons, we appeal for their aberrant use to cease immediately.

168. We also take the view that at this special session we must reaffirm the relationship that exists between disarmament and development, as has already been declared by the international conference held in August and September last year at United Nations Headquarters, which recognized the close and multidimensional relationship existing between these two concepts.

169. To achieve disarmament, as the international community seeks to do, it is necessary for each and every one of us to make the greatest effort to shed ideas of predominance and intellectual, political, racial, religious or any other form of intolerance. We all have a responsibility to the extent of our abilities and potential to face the threats closing in on mankind: war, terrorism, drug trafficking and oppression must be fought mercilessly.

170. Mankind has the right to aspire to peace and development in order to realize its complete fulfilment. It is the responsibility of the international community to create conditions that will enable mankind to live in freedom, and in the enjoyment of its dignity and fundamental rights.

171. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at our 5th plenary meeting, I now call on the observer of the League of Arab States.

172. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): As the special session on disarmament closes its general debate and starts drafting its final document, it is my pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you on your election as President of the historic session of the General Assembly and to compliment you on the manner in which you guided its deliberations. The session has been fruitful, constructive and informative. It will be judged as having enlightened the international community as to the dangers of continued armament and the waste of opportunities for the growth and expansion of the human condition.

173. This perhaps was and continues to be the moment to reflect on the spirit that prompted the Assembly's deliberations, the purposes of convening this special session and the future direction that the process of disarmament should take. The issue of disarmament is of direct interest and relevance to mankind as a whole and to developing nations in particular. There is a universal conviction concerning the urgent need to expedite the process of disarmament in general, starting with the more deadly and sweeping nuclear and chemical weapons that are indiscriminate in their murderous consequences.

Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

174. A widespread sense of relief has enveloped the international community as a result of the signing of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and the concomitant relaxation of tension between the two super-Powers. The Moscow summit coincided with the beginnings of this special session, thus giving credence to the relative optimism that permeated the discussions and deliberations in this Hall.

175. There is a distinct and prevailing conviction that the INF Treaty should unleash the possibilities of achieving the more vital and comprehensive strategic arms reduction talks treaty before the end of this year. This will entail an agreement to reduce nuclear weapons by 50 per cent. Inasmuch as it can be done, it should be done.

176. True, the Moscow summit raised public expectations. Public awareness of the potential for reconciliation has brought many of mankind's ambitions and anticipations within our reach. What seemed unattainable a few years ago, or even a few months ago, has become realizable, thanks to the various scientific and technological accomplishments in the field of verification, inspection and detection. The improvements in scientific research that are intended to enhance confidence-building, among the super-Powers in particular, must be made available to enhance the various measures that can speed up the processes of disarmament in many other regions and among many countries. The reassuring steps in the field of disarmament must reinforce and be reinforced by the necessary political will to contain and resolve conflicts and ripen the sense of security that ensures peaceful relations.

177. We who are disadvantaged in the field of arms production see in the accelerated pace towards disarmament an additional impetus to address more aggressively and constructively our developmental priorities. Reallocation of funds from armaments to development would help uproot many of the causes of poverty, illiteracy, disease and famine which have plagued most of the third world countries.

178. It follows that as we all move towards strategic and nuclear disarmament, it becomes more feasible and practical to focus on addressing regional conflicts.

179. From this point of view it becomes prudent, besides being morally necessary, for our nations to chart a course that will ensure a gradual reduction of armaments consumption so that we can concentrate on the urgent need to redress the social and economic dislocations in our respective societies, long disfranchised and for centuries excluded from partaking and sharing in the benefits of the industrial, scientific and technological revolutions by colonialism and the greed and exploitation of modern-day economic exploiters and imperialists.

180. Human societies have always yearned for harmony and peace. Concepts such as justice, liberty, happiness and equality remained objectives to be achieved, yet in many instances elusive. Evolution towards reaching the goals was never an easy undertaking. They remain ideals to be realized instead of accomplishments to be improved upon. History is made by those who confront the obstacles to these ideals and not by those who deem it practical or realistic to shy away from the challenge. Obstacles to realizing ennobling visions of a desirable tomorrow should be admitted, but one should never submit to their being permanent or inevitable.

181. Advanced weapons technology must be a compelling incentive to address the roots of conflicts and to seek their resolution equitably, fairly and

justly. In this respect our Arab region faces two major conflicts imposed upon us, and in both instances—the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Iraq-Iran conflict—we have sought recourse at the United Nations and its various mechanisms to redress our legitimate grievances and put an end to the violations of Arab territories and Palestinian human, legal and national rights. We believe that the United Nations is the proper framework for the resolution of conflicts, but we also believe that when United Nations resolutions remain without implementation or are deliberately defied, then those in contempt should be penalized. Unless violations are made costly the incentive to comply will be minimal, if not non-existent. In this respect we deem it necessary to assert that an enhanced process of disarmament must be accompanied by giving credence to United Nations resolutions and effectiveness to its mechanisms and agencies.

182. Disarmament is not, therefore, an isolated process, but its pace is contingent on a multiplicity of factors, policies and trends and also includes nuclear as well as conventional weapons.

183. We in the Arab nation are faced with a serious threat caused by the nuclear capabilities of Israel and the fact that it does not subscribe to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Much has been stated about Israel's systematic refusal to be subject to inspection, not only by the appropriate United Nations agencies entrusted with this task, but also by United States Senate and Congressional committees charged with determining whether heavy water sent to Dimona is used, as it is supposed to be, for "peaceful purposes".

184. I do not want at this juncture to burden the Assembly with the weight of evidence that proves Israel's threatening postures and its possession of nuclear power intended for aggressive purposes. Suffice it to put forward the information made available and questions raised by two distinguished scholar-experts on the subject in the editorial pages of *The New York Times* of 25 November 1987 and 17 March 1988. Law professor Gary Milhollin of the University of Wisconsin states, on 25 November:

"For nearly 30 years, countries have sold nuclear materials around the world with the requirements that the importing nations promise to use them for peaceful purposes and permit on-site inspection. These two pledges are the main barrier between civil and military use of the atom.

"It now appears that—for the first time in history—a country, Israel, has broken the peaceful use pledge With this, the entire framework of non-proliferation seems threatened. Does anyone care?

"Israel has just admitted that, for more than 20 years, it has been making plutonium in its Dimona reactor with heavy water imported from Norway

"Israel had promised to restrict the plutonium to peaceful use and to allow international inspections of plutonium made with Norway's heavy water. According to the Central Intelligence Agency, however, Israel is using the heavy water to make

bombs. And Israel refused to allow any inspections.”

“ . . . America admits that heavy water sent to Dimona was not inspected for the first 17 years after it was exported. Moreover, America has not asked for the kind of inspection that would show what the water was used for.

“ . . . Neither world security nor the nuclear export trade can accept such a breakdown in nuclear protocol. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, and every other effort to combat proliferation since the 1960s, assume that the peaceful use and inspection pledges will be kept. To preserve the credibility of their policies against proliferation, Norway and the United States must now enforce their rights.

“ . . . both Norway and the United States have the right to conduct inspections in Israel to assure that the heavy water is and has been used for peaceful purposes. If Israel refuses, both would have the right to withdraw the heavy water summarily

“All these rights are clear They are the one sure way to deal with proliferation.

“Why aren’t they used? Why doesn’t the State Department, perpetually in search of something to do about proliferation, inspect its heavy water in Israel? Why doesn’t it ask Israel to honor Norway’s rights? . . . The answer seems to be that the United States endorses Israel’s bomb”.

185. Leonard Spector, author of the annual series on the spread of nuclear arms for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, examines the implications of Vanunu’s secret trial—in *The New York Times* of 17 March 1988—as well as Israel’s not allowing any inspections of its Dimona nuclear facilities and raises the following questions:

“If Israel has not been producing plutonium for bombs at Dimona with the Norwegian material, why won’t it allow the inspections? If it has been misusing the Norwegian material, how does it justify this breach of a key non-proliferation accord? How has Washington reacted? Is it pressing Israel to come clean?

“Is Israel’s nuclear program an issue in American-Israeli relations? Are President Reagan or Secretary of State George P. Shultz raising Israel’s recent nuclear advances in the current round of talks with Mr. Shamir? Was the issue raised privately last November? When was the last time top-level American officials objected to Israel’s apparently continuing nuclear buildup?”

And he concludes:

“Finally, the press should ask itself a question: Why has it been so reluctant to tackle this issue? Unless there is greater public exposure, it is hard to imagine intensified diplomatic efforts to restrain Israel’s growing nuclear capabilities.”

We agree with these conclusions.

Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) resumed the Chair.

186. Security Council resolution 598 (1987), pertaining to the Iraq-Iran conflict, has been on the record since July 1987. It is still awaiting implementation. In the intervening period, no follow-up resolution has been adopted. An arms embargo on the non-compliant party is not yet in place. The credibility gap is widening, and the scope of operations has also been widened against other Arab States of the Gulf. This lapse endangers nations from empowering the Security Council, or recognizing what the Iraqi Foreign Minister today [20th meeting] described as the “mandate of the Security Council”. Mr. Tariq Aziz articulated the concerns of many of us when he pointed to an “ominous departure from the Charter” and from Security Council resolutions.

187. The Arab commitment to maximize the effectiveness of the United Nations was reaffirmed in the resolutions of the Arab League summit meeting held at Algiers last week, from 7 to 9 June, which asserted the urgent need to implement Security Council resolution 598 (1987) in order to bring to an end the Iraq-Iran conflict and called upon the United Nations to sponsor a fully authorized and an effective international conference to bring about a comprehensive and just resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

188. The Palestinian uprising has been a vivid case of how non-violent resistance movements against Israel’s coercive and repressive occupation can be sustained by the political and moral support the uprising generated and received. It is an example of how a disarmed people, insisting on its inalienable right to self-determination and freedom, can heroically and successfully confront and challenge an occupying force armed to the teeth. Of course, the suffering and harassment the Palestinian people are experiencing, visited upon them by a ruthless occupier intent on perpetuating their disfranchisement and dispossession, has been agonizing. Yet, the more brutal is the armed occupation, the more resilient and innovative are the methods of this unarmed Palestinian uprising. To paraphrase the inspiring statement of President Arias Sanchez of Costa Rica, I can say that there is a new world springing up in Palestine. The recognition of the power of non-violence by the armed Israeli occupiers was amply demonstrated by the reckless deportation of Mubarak Awad—who arrived last night in New York—and by the phantom “victory” of the armed occupier over a Palestinian botanist, a graduate of Rutgers University, who with two other botanists was teaching their compatriots how to plant vegetable and fruit seeds to render the Palestinians—under duress of occupation—self-reliant and able to pursue their unarmed resistance against the armed occupier.

189. I mention these two recent examples to emphasize that Israel and its shrinking supporters are not against “violent” resistance but that Israel finds non-violence equally threatening to its violent expansionist, racist and annexationist objectives. Parenthetically, the sooner the United States admits what it knows, the better for the process of disarmament and resolution of this regional conflict.

190. The Palestinian non-violent uprising is a contribution to the spirit and ideals that can give this special session on disarmament significant results. This non-violent uprising must be politically rewarded if non-violence is to be perceived and accepted as the means for attaining legitimate objectives. The lessons of the Palestinian uprising are intimately relevant to the impulses that make disarmament necessary but also an ethical imperative.

191. In conclusion, I would say this: I come from a small Arab country, the Lebanese Republic. Lebanon for the past 15 years has been ravaged by the violence of imported conventional arms. The pain that has been experienced by every Lebanese family borders on a collective traumatic experience. The unrestricted arming of various factions has weakened the national and central authority. It has rendered Lebanon an arena for account-settling. In southern Lebanon, we witnessed UNIFIL trampled upon by the Israeli invader in June 1982. We now witness Israel sustaining its violent destabilizing role by preventing UNIFIL from fulfilling its full mandate. We witness the violent consequences of Israeli armed intervention that prevent the restoration of national reconciliation. We have determined that Israel's continued occupation of south Lebanon is emasculating the prospects of restoring Lebanon's territorial integrity.

192. All this has happened because Lebanon is the best example that diverse religious and communal groups not only can coexist but in unity can co-discover the unity of diversity. We have seen Lebanon exasperated but resilient, factionalized but united, exhausted but productive, damaged but still building, justifiably introspective but genuinely looking for redemption through the moral power of the United Nations, its Charter and its resolutions. Lebanon has a vested interest in the success of this special session on disarmament. Its destiny should be on mankind's conscience. It has been the testing ground for many armaments. May this special session help transform Lebanon into an arena for testing the session's objectives: those of disarmament. Lebanon can be, wants to be and urges the Assembly to make it the pilot project for the future course of disarmament.

193. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): We have heard the last speaker in the general debate. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in exercise of their right of reply.

194. Mr. GHAAVEHCHI-MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Iraqi Foreign Minister in his statement this morning resorted as usual to distortions and to twisting facts, pursuing his propaganda policy that the bigger the lies, the greater the possibility that they will be believed. He said today:

"Our region has in fact been witnessing a great increase in the use of force, armed aggression, occupation, expansion at the expense of others and interference in their internal affairs. The region has also been seeing an ominous departure from the Charter, international law and respect for [United Nations] resolutions" [*see 20th meeting, para. 59*].

195. Now let us briefly review Iraq's actions, which have been contrary to all these principles that it claims to advocate.

196. First, armed aggression. On 22 September 1980, 12 Iraqi armoured and infantry divisions invaded the territory of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Prior to that naked act of aggression, Saddam Hussein, in the Parliament and before television cameras, had unilaterally abrogated the 1975 Algiers agreement existing between Iran and Iraq.

197. Secondly, occupation. After that aggression, more than 22,000 square kilometres of our territory fell under the occupation of Iraqi forces. Some Iranian cities, like Naft-shahr, are still under Iraqi occupation.

198. Thirdly, expansion. Pursuant to its expansionist plans, the Iraqi régime renamed many Iranian cities in the province of Khuzistan. The Iraqi Government called that province "Arabistan". It gave the name of Mohamarrah to the city of Khoramshahr and renamed all the occupied cities, as can be seen in maps published by Iraq at the outset of its invasion.

199. Fourthly, departure from the Charter of the United Nations. One should ask the Iraqi Foreign Minister whether aggression, occupation and expansionism are compatible with his perception of the Charter. Which provision of the Charter allows Iraq to shoot down civilian aircraft, to attack mercantile vessels and ships, to bombard cities and civilian quarters and to use poisonous gas?

200. Fifthly, international law and the principle of respect for United Nations resolutions. The following quotations suffice to demonstrate Iraq's respect for international law.

201. On 26 March 1988 there was an editorial in *The New York Times* from which I quote the following:

"Again, Iraq stands credibly accused of resorting to chemical weapons in its seven-year war with Iran

"The [Iraqi] deed [in Halabja] is in every sense a war crime

"It was not [Iran] who started [the war], bombed the *USS Stark* and escalated the 'war of the cities', firing missiles into civilian areas."

The editorial also said:

"Iraq signed [the Geneva Protocol] in 1931, and now violates both letter and spirit of the treaty. The victims are not even Iranian soldiers but Iraq's own Kurdish citizens."

202. On 29 March 1988 we read the following in the newspaper *Le Monde*:

"Iraq implicitly recognized on Saturday, 26 March, that it had used chemical weapons. In an official communiqué, Iraqi leaders, gathered together under the presidency of Mr. Saddam Hussein, denounced the condemnation of Iraq by

international bodies and foreign countries that had accused it of using chemical weapons, and they affirmed 'Iraq's right as well as its determination to use all the means at its disposal to counter the Iranian invasion'. In an unprecedented gesture, the communiqué denounced Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar for his unequivocal condemnation of the use of chemical weapons

"The newspaper *Al Thawra*, the organ of the ruling Baath Party, said that no one had the right to dictate to Iraq the 'type of weapons it should use to defend itself'."*

203. Forty Members of Parliament of the British Labour Party in a statement on 30 March said the following:

"We call on the United Nations to send a special team to the town of Halabja to investigate the massacre committed there. The international community must condemn the perpetrators of that appalling crime and brand Saddam Hussein as a war criminal."

204. What kind of respect does Iraq have for United Nations resolutions? After the adoption of Security Council resolution 612 (1988), Iraq has on many occasions violated that resolution by using chemical weapons. *The New York Times* reported today that once again Iraq had engaged in chemical war in Shalamchah and also in several Iranian townships. Later reports indicate that today—the very day when the Prime Minister of Iraq delivered a statement—Iraqi warplanes dropped chemical bombs on Bol-Hassan village near Baneh and in the Iranian Kurdistan, killing 2 villagers and poisoning 10 others. The chemical attack was carried out at 0430 hours GMT.

205. Meanwhile, regarding what the Iraqi Foreign Minister said about the situation of prisoners of war, I would like to quote exactly the latest communiqué of the International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC] of 23 March. It said, "In the Iran-Iraq conflict chemical weapons have been used, killing a great number of civilians in the province of Soleymanieh." As can be seen from that statement, no mention was made of prisoners of war, but rather of the inhuman chemical attack. The ICRC has not complained about the situation of Iraqi prisoners of war in Iran.

206. Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is indeed strange to hear the representative of Iran speak about distortions and falsifications, whereas in actual fact he represents a régime based on distortion, falsification, lies, and charlatanism. It is strange to hear the representative of Iran speak of aggression, expansionism and interference in the internal affairs of other States when his country is based on those very principles, principles of aggression, expansionism and intervention in the internal affairs of States. It is precisely that policy that has led to the war, a war that has been waged with such tragic results.

207. The Iranian régime forgets that it declared war on Iraq on 4 September 1980 and advanced deep into

Iraqi territory. That aggressive, expansionist régime forgets its aggression against the Gulf States. That régime also forgets that its offense against Kuwait and that day after day it is attacking merchant vessels of States that have nothing to do with the war between the two countries. That régime also forgets its expansionist aggression against the pilgrims in the Holy City of Mecca. That régime forgets its interference in the internal affairs of the Gulf States and all the manoeuvres it has engaged in to overthrow existing régimes and replace them by régimes similar to the backward, aggressor régime that rules in Teheran.

208. Curiously enough, that representative evokes the Charter of the United Nations and international law, whereas his is the country that by its conduct violates the Charter and international law. It is quite curious that that representative speaks about United Nations resolutions when he represents a régime which, so far, has not respected any United Nations resolution relating to the war and the settlement of that conflict by peaceful means. The latest of those resolutions was Security Council resolution 598 (1987).

209. The representative speaks about the Algiers agreement on relations between the two States, yet it is the very régime that has violated that agreement ever since it came to power in February 1979. That régime has made statements to the effect that it was an imperialist agreement, an American agreement, signed by the Shah with Iraq. That régime forgets its actions against prisoners of war, actions that violate the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, of 1949. That régime also forgets its actions against children when tens of thousands of them were hurled into the mine fields to clear the way for the aggressive, expansionist army to occupy more Iraqi territory.

210. That representative has spoken of all these principles; he speaks about so many principles which his own régime has violated and continues to violate.

211. The territory of Fao and the lands east of Basra and Shalamchah which were freed some time ago were Iraqi lands—lands occupied by the Iranian army, that same expansionist army that continues to realize its territorial ambitions at the expense of other countries in the region.

212. The representative of Iran said that Iraq had admitted using chemical weapons. Before you all I challenge him to bring evidence in support of the statements he attributes to Iraqi leaders. Certainly Iraq defends its land. We have said that in order to free our country from those occupying it and from the Khomeini barbarity, we were prepared to use all the weapons at our disposal.

213. But the real war criminal is Khomeini. It is Khomeini who has sown destruction in Iran, who has sown destruction in neighbouring States, who brought about chaos and destabilization. All the world knows the extent of the consequences of his deeds. He is the war criminal, and he is the one who bears full responsibility for this state of affairs. We are not the only ones who say it. Former Iranian Prime Minister Bazargan, in a letter addressed to

*Quoted by the speaker in French.

Khomeini three weeks ago, accused him of being a war criminal and of being responsible for the destruction of Iran and for the tragic affliction of the Iranian people by his backward régime, a monstrous régime which sows chaos, destruction and death in a region that used to be peaceful.

214. Mr. GHAAVEHCHI-MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Iraq is responsible for the aggression and occupation which began on 22 September 1980. Did Iran occupy Iraqi territories at the outset of the war, occupying 22,000 square kilometres? We were not ready even to defend ourselves, let alone attack our neighbour. That is the reason why in less than two weeks we lost a vast expanse of territory. Iraq is responsible for the violation of all internationally recognized norms of conduct; witness its attacks on civilian airliners, ships and cities. The shooting down of the aircraft of the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of Algeria and killing him is an example. Iraq is responsible for the repeated and verified use of chemical weapons—in fact the representative of Iraq said so here implicitly.

215. Iraq has violated the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and customary law. The Iraqi ruler is a war criminal by reason of the violation in Halabja of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Iraq has violated Security Council resolution 612 (1988) by today's chemical attacks on Shalamchah in Iraq and Baneh in Iran.

216. Iraq is responsible for obstructing the efforts of the Security Council for the implementation of resolution 598 (1987). We have accepted the Secretary-General's implementation plan, which Iraq has rejected. We have given a positive response to the Secretary-General's latest proposal on the establishment of a working group for the implementation of the plan; Iraq has rejected it.

217. Regarding what Bazargan has said, this shows that we have freedom in our country; everybody can express his views. Has anybody been able to do that in Iraq? Nobody has seen that happen.

218. Mr. SUMAIDA (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The war erupted on 4 September 1980. It was begun by Iran against Iraq in an attempt to occupy its territory, to change its régime and to control that region. When Iraq responded to Iran's active aggression on 22 September 1980 the Iraqi armed forces did not advance into any territories other than those occupied by Iran, a large part of which was Iraqi territory in accordance with the Algiers convention, and which was used by Iranian artillery to shell Iraqi villages and towns along the borders. This was a legitimate act to defend our people, our territory and our sovereignty.

219. On 28 September 1980 when the Security Council adopted resolution 479 (1980) on the ceasefire, Iraq was the first to declare its acceptance of that

resolution. The position of Iran was well known; it rejected that resolution. Therefore, Iran is responsible for everything that has taken place since that date, for the death and destruction in the region up to today. Iran has continued its intransigence, continued to reject all international resolutions and continued to show its contempt for this Organization; it has continued to disregard the authority of the Security Council in solving the problem by peaceful means, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

220. We are defending our territory against that monster which has been resurrected from the past, which is threatening the security, integrity and independence of the region. We are defending not only Iraq but also human civilization. We are defending the noble human values against that backward monster. We have broken the back of that monster in Fao, and we have cut off its legs in Shalamja. We shall cut off its head in Halabja.

221. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): We have thus concluded the general debate, which as members know has included consideration of item 9, entitled "Review and appraisal of the present international situation, especially in the light of the vital objective of terminating the arms race and the pressing need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament".

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 45th meeting, paras. 86 and 87.

²*Ibid.*, para. 88.

³*Ibid.*, para. 87.

⁴*Ibid.*, para. 85.

⁵Protocol 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).

⁶*Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.IX.8), para. 35.

⁷*Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Special Session, Annexes*, agenda items 9–13, document A/S-12/32.

⁸See *The Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.82.IX.1), para. 391.

⁹Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068).

¹⁰*Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-eighth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1983*, document S/16041.

¹¹*Ibid.*, *Fortieth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1985*, document S/17549, annex V.