



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

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will first hear an address by the Chairman of the Military Council and Council of Ministers of the Kingdom of Lesotho. I have great pleasure in welcoming Major-General Justin M. Lekhanya and inviting him to address the Assembly.

2. Major-General LEKHANYA (Lesotho): Mr. President, on behalf of His Majesty King Moshoe-shoe II, the Government and the people of Lesotho, and on my own behalf, I wish to congratulate you on your unanimous election to the presidency of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your wide experience and diplomatic skill characterized your presidency of the Assembly's forty-second session. We are certain that you will guide the deliberations of this session to a fruitful and successful conclusion.

3. The great and noble cause of peace has brought us to this important session to deliberate on the vital issue of disarmament. The task before us is not an easy one. Since the end of the Second World War, we have been rapidly and inexorably drifting away from the ideal world of peace and security for all, as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, and towards a world of tension and confrontation.

4. This situation has weakened the lofty values of peaceful negotiations and has well-nigh institutionalized resort to violence and armed conflict to resolve disputes. Inevitably, this development has led to increasingly heavier expenditures on armaments and has precipitated what has commonly come to be known as the arms race. The arms buildup is no longer confined to the super-Powers but is spreading to engulf practically all countries of the world.

5. We are also deeply perturbed not only by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction but also by the increasing use of sophisticated and deadly conventional arms deployed in regional and sub-regional conflicts.

6. As mankind perfects its ability to kill and destroy and as countries of the world fill their arsenals with all manner of arms, it is also sad that we continue to receive reports of the rampant use of chemical and other toxic weapons in international conflicts. The

most disturbing feature of these developments is that they are brought about by the overriding self-interest and for the financial profit of arms manufacturers world-wide, especially in the developed countries.

7. The underlying cause of the arms race is the super-Powers' conflicting claims to spheres of influence. This has brought about mistrust and tensions on a global scale, feeding into regional disputes and conflicts. It would appear, therefore, that a new international political order is essential, one which seeks to reconcile these conflicting claims by political and diplomatic means. This, coupled with other confidence-building measures, would be conducive to disarmament. In this regard, it is important to underline the significance of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

8. We have come to the United Nations with great hope and high expectations that this special session will give impetus to the cause of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. We have to agree that the arms race has had a debilitating effect on world peace and prosperity. We have to admit the painful reality that the arms race and the military buildup within nations have fuelled the ever-increasing material distress of more than half of the world's population, which has been denied its most basic needs of peace, security, food and shelter.

9. This special session of the General Assembly on disarmament should seek to bridge by consensus the great divide which has plunged nations into frenzied preparations for war. With sufficient political will we can all meaningfully address the burning issue of disarmament by dealing boldly with its quantitative and qualitative aspects, and also by resolving the political disputes that hinder progress on the global reduction and final elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

10. Since the inception of the Organization of African Unity [OAU], Africa has been concerned about the spread of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. At the first session of its Assembly of Heads of State and Government, at Cairo in 1964, the organization adopted a Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. It is our fervent hope that all countries in Africa, including those that have not signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex], will not introduce nuclear weapons into the continent; neither should any country contract to accept the dumping of nuclear waste.

11. Similarly, it is our view that disarmament and the continuation of nuclear tests are mutually exclusive. If we are here discussing the merits of disarm-

ament, how can we at the same time logically condone nuclear tests? We appeal to the military Powers genuinely to consider the cessation of all nuclear tests as a prerequisite for total disarmament.

12. The idea of peace buttressed by arms is untenable, since it is based on the dubious principle of deterrence. Deterrence is fear, and in fear there is no hope for peace. We are convinced that parallel disarmament, which embodies simultaneous reduction of both nuclear and conventional weapons, will help us break out of the cul-de-sac of deterrence.

13. Disarmament is a complex issue which can be painfully slow if not frustrating, but this should not deter the global efforts now in motion. Increasingly, it is being influenced by political factors which are seemingly uncontrollable. But after this session, all nations must begin to seek new ways to cultivate the political will that is a prerequisite to fostering the process of peace and disarmament.

14. We are told that world expenditure on arms buildup and military installations exceeds \$500 billion a year. The development and manufacture of arms is a massive exercise which deploys large numbers of people and astronomical amounts of other resources at the expense of the world's socio-economic development.

15. It is clear from the foregoing that the world is endowed with vast resources which, as indicated, are being spent on the production and procurement of weapons. Thus, it is not for lack of resources that the world today is still bedevilled with the scourge of ignorance, hunger, disease and lack of basic shelter. Would not, therefore, the redeployment of these resources be a major part of the answer to these problems? It is our contention that this is not only a possibility but that it can—and, we plead, should—be done.

16. On 8 December 1987, history was made when President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev signed the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty. It is even more gratifying to note that the treaty has since been ratified by the two Governments. The significance of that event is that it proves beyond any shadow of doubt that total nuclear disarmament is possible. It illustrates the power of diplomacy over rhetoric. It also drives home the lesson that reduction of world tension can aid the process of disarmament. These two great nations must be encouraged to accelerate their nuclear disarmament negotiations so that the momentum created by this historic treaty is not lost.

17. We wish to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for keeping the issue of disarmament alive within the Organization. In this regard, we wish to emphasize the important role the United Nations can play in promoting and fostering multilateral negotiations within the spirit of Article 26 of its Charter. Much as we appreciate the progress made in bilateral super-Power arms control and disarmament negotiations, we would urge involvement of the United Nations in these negotiations as envisaged by the Charter, to which we are all party.

18. Even as we gather in this great Hall, situations of tension and war still prevail in many parts of the globe, particularly in the Persian Gulf, the Middle East, Asia, Central America and Africa. In several parts of these regions, war and strife continue unabated and millions of people continue to suffer under the yoke of foreign occupation and oppression.

19. It is necessary to accept and recognize that the security of one country, or a group of countries, cannot be at the expense of the security of other countries. Security for one should mean security for all.

20. Lesotho is situated in a region which has known very little peace. The resort to arms as the final arbiter in international relations and the arrogant impunity with which some countries use force in their international relations and disputes with others have strengthened the myth that might is right. As a small nation, Lesotho would not last in this modern-day jungle of survival of the fittest. For a nation which has survived on diplomacy, we propose to the world that this is the most viable alternative for the survival of mankind.

21. We have a dream that this special session on disarmament, in view of the emerging international political will and mutual accommodations, will herald a new era in international relations in which nations, in the words of an ancient prophet, "shall beat their swords into ploughshares".

22. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Chairman of the Military Council and Council of Ministers of the Kingdom of Lesotho for the important statement he has just made.

23. Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): On behalf of the delegation of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania, allow me sincerely to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly of this special session devoted to disarmament. Our warm felicitations are also addressed to the Secretary-General, who has made unsparing efforts to enhance the role of the United Nations in dealing with the major problems of our time, including disarmament, the preservation of peace and international security.

24. During the last decade the United Nations has three times convened the General Assembly into special session to discuss this issue. This fact alone is of real significance and shows the great concern the arms race has caused among the international community. The Government of Albania and the Albanian people join in the legitimate preoccupations of the democratic peoples and countries. They consider the arms race a universal concern and disarmament an urgent demand of the time which is closely linked with the destinies of the peoples, with the present and the future of mankind.

25. This special session on disarmament offers an opportunity to describe and assess the scale and dimensions of nuclear and conventional armaments, along with the threat posed to mankind by the manufacture, perfection and sophistication of all kinds of weapons. It is also proof of the international

community's determination to grapple seriously with this problem by looking at things as they are and voicing the truth as it is, convinced that in that manner the deliberation of the problem will be put on the right track and that we shall deal not merely with the symptoms but with the root cause of the phenomenon.

26. Ten years ago, when the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was held, world military expenditures amounted to \$400 billion; at present they amount to \$1,000 billion. That fact alone shows that, despite all the talk about disarmament within and outside the United Nations all through these years, the world has not seen any real disarmament. On the contrary, the arms race has continued at even higher rates, assuming new qualitative dimensions. All the decisions and resolutions adopted so far by the Assembly have been muted by the bitter reality of the arms race and covered by nuclear-test fall-out.

27. When considering armaments and the arms race, it is only natural to look for and identify their real causes. In this case the answer is clear and unequivocal: the arms race is, in the first place, a concentrated expression and by-product of the hegemonistic and expansionist policy of the two super-Powers and their aggressive course. The main protagonists of this unrestrained arms race, which is taking place on land, in the sea and in the air and which is extending even into outer space, are the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, which, together with the military blocs they lead—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] and the Warsaw Treaty—account for about \$800 billion of military expenditures.

28. The super-Powers need armaments because their whole policy relies on and proceeds from the position of strength and is aimed at imposing their diktat and domination on others, including their own allies. However paradoxical and anachronistic, it is no accident that four decades after the Second World War foreign troops and weapons continue to be stationed in Europe and that there is no intention of removing them from there.

29. It must be stated that while the arms race is going on intensively, especially between the two super-Powers, their propaganda race—which manifests itself in various forms and ways, such as the proposals and counter-proposals on disarmament put forward by them—is proceeding with just the same intensity. To illustrate this, it would suffice to mention chronologically the proposals and agreements of the years 1963, 1971, 1974 and 1987 closely related with the names in the well-known disarmament jargon, like NPT, ABM, SALT, INF, START and so on.

30. It is a well-established truth and a universally accepted fact that the arms race and the stockpiling of weapons have occurred, more than anywhere else, in Europe on both sides of the line dividing the two blocs.

31. As far as Albania is concerned, it has on more than one occasion stated its determined position against bloc politics, which constitute the main factor

in confrontation and the existing colossal stockpiling of arms in Europe, which in turn have provoked those feelings of animosity and the lack of confidence and understanding among European countries and brought about a situation in which whole generations of Europeans are born and brought up in an atmosphere of mutual hatred, distrust, fear and insecurity.

32. It is beyond any doubt that these pacts constitute a political diktat against the European peoples and countries, intended to prevent them from finding the desired ways for the normalization of the situation on the old continent, which would free it from the pressure and tutelage of the super-Powers and create the conditions necessary for establishing fruitful and equal co-operation among the European peoples.

33. Recently, we have been witnessing different assessments—at times even euphoric—of the Soviet-American INF Treaty, which, even when implemented, will eliminate only a symbolic fraction of the gigantic nuclear buildup of the super-Powers in and around Europe. Hence, it will not as yet mean securing peace in Europe and averting the threat of war in the world. That treaty would assume real significance only if it were followed by other important and truly effective steps towards disarmament.

34. Let us not forget that today we speak of the existence of some 50,000 nuclear warheads of such destructive power that they might call into question the very existence of life on our planet. As if all that were not enough, nuclear tests have continued without let-up. During 1987 alone 16 such weapons were added to the nuclear arsenal every week. In the light of those figures, which indicate the high-rate dynamics of the arms race, we see no profoundly convincing reason to be over-enthusiastic about the latest idea of the super-Powers on the deep cuts in their strategic weapons. Most likely, what we must deal with in this case is a delayed step on their part to dispose of the super-stockpiles of those weapons. In essence, that measure, too, aims at preserving the balance of power which warrants a kind of security for them, whereas the threat of mass destruction hangs like the sword of Damocles over the rest of us. In other words, their security rests on the insecurity of the others.

35. History, especially that of these recent decades, has shown that the immediate and long-term interests of the super-Powers have compelled them, regardless of the rivalry which represents a constant in their relations, also to come to terms and reach compromises in order to define the rules of the game for the control of the balance of forces, especially the nuclear ones. Usually talks have been held and accords have been concluded when parity has been reached and the need for a pause felt—and that is dictated by propaganda motives, as well as by economic, military and political reasons. In the final analysis this is calculated to gain time before entering a new round of the arms race. Hence any reduction, however substantial, of one category of weapons would not be credible or assume real value if it were followed by other steps aimed at compensating with another category of weapons even more sophisticated and dangerous. In that case we would have to do with a symbiosis of real armament with false disarmament.

36. At present there is much talk about contacts and talks between the two super-Powers that are often depicted as the only hope of averting war and safeguarding peace. We are of the opinion that all countries and peoples, big and small, must have their role to play and must have their say in matters of international politics, which must not be reduced to a monopoly of the super-big; neither should the international community's role be reduced to that of providing a décor for the scenarios of the super-Powers, nor to that of an audience which simply takes note of their decisions.

37. With regard to the meetings between the leaders of the super-Powers, certainly nobody can deny them the right to meet and talk about their own affairs. What is unacceptable and inadmissible, in our view, is that they should discuss on behalf of others and decide for them behind their backs. The fact is that regional conflicts have become their main and favourite topic of discussion in those meetings. Now they no longer make a secret of the fact that they are discussing and adopting decisions about Afghanistan or Central America, the Middle East or southern Africa, while ignoring the States directly concerned and disregarding the interests of their peoples. Therefore, we hold that the institutionalization of the meetings between the super-Powers into a forum which can adopt decisions binding on the others is very dangerous and should not be accepted.

38. The problem of disarmament cannot be dissociated or considered separately from present-day international developments on the political, economic and social plane, nor can it be viewed in isolation from relevant security aspects. Today we are living in a turbulent world ridden with complicated situations fraught with real threats to peace and international security.

39. The Middle East continues to remain a hotbed of aggravated conflicts and increased tension, where a heavy traffic and a large-scale arms trade is also carried out. This grave situation is, in the first place, the result of the expansionist policy of United States-backed Israel, which continues to keep Arab lands under occupation and to intensify violence and genocide against the Palestinian people. The Albanian people and Government condemn the Israeli policy of stepping up the aggressive course and suppressive measures, such as those taken recently against the Palestinian population in Cisjordan and Gaza. Israel and those who back it up must be aware that such a policy has no future, for one cannot threaten an entire people with extermination, let alone that generation of Palestinians who were born and brought up in conditions of foreign occupation and are ready to make any sacrifice to win their national rights.

40. Grave and explosive is the situation in the Gulf, where the fratricidal war between Iraq and Iran has been going on for years, accompanied by enormous arms sales to both sides in the conflict. This war, which has taken a heavy toll on these two peoples, ought already to have been put an end to by those who are daily suffering its grave consequences.

41. The situation is no better in southern Africa. The policy of the Pretoria régime of *apartheid* against

the Azanian people and against Namibia, which it holds under occupation, and the policy of aggression and reprisals against neighbouring countries are an affront to the whole international community.

42. In Central America the efforts of the countries in the region to solve their own problems so as to live free and independent are faced with the imperialist policy of brutal interference in their internal affairs.

43. The fact that the arms trade is channelled primarily to those hot spots means adding fuel to the fire, which is no doubt making matters worse.

44. These situations, the hotbeds of tension and regional conflicts in several parts of the world today, have been brought about particularly by super-Power rivalry and interference, which constitute the main reasons behind their existence and instigation. Moreover, the super-Powers have on many occasions claimed legality for this interference in the name of protecting their "vital interests". It is this imperialist logic that propels them into open attempts to make the law and practise diktat in present-day international relations.

45. The Socialist People's Republic of Albania considers the decisions taken by some countries not to allow nuclear weapons to be stationed on their own territories, or warships carrying nuclear weapons to call and anchor at their ports, as a realistic stand in conformity with the interests of their own peoples. These efforts are just as positive as they are encouraging, for they not only contribute to the strengthening of the independence and sovereignty of the respective States, but also are concrete steps to safeguard peace and security.

46. As a European and Mediterranean country, Albania follows with special attention all developments which affect the interests of peace and security in our continent and region. Like many States of this basin, we cannot fail to see and point out the threat posed by the presence and constant increase of the military fleets of the United States and the Soviet Union in the Mediterranean. This presence has more often than not endangered the freedom and independence of the Mediterranean countries and peace in the region. The interests of the Mediterranean peoples and those of peace of stability in the area and beyond call for the withdrawal of the super-Powers' fleets from our Mediterranean basin.

47. The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones has for long been a topic for discussion and proposals within and outside the United Nations. There is no doubt that the creation of such zones is a matter to be decided by the countries and peoples in which these weapons are placed. The removal of foreign weapons, especially nuclear weapons, is a step to be hailed and supported, in the first place because these weapons are foreign and the countries in which they are deployed have virtually no or only partial control and power over them. It is obvious that their removal not only would strengthen the sovereignty of the countries in which they have been deployed but would also reduce the political and military complications they entail. However, it is necessary for such measures not to remain circumscribed within a regional framework alone, for the weapons of the super-

Powers deployed around the globe are capable of reaching and hitting these nuclear-weapon-free zones too.

48. It is an established truth that nuclear weapons are a serious threat to mankind and that a nuclear war would have catastrophic consequences. But this truth is in no way good reason to forget about the danger posed by conventional weapons. We cannot overlook the fact that in the past four decades or so after the Second World War some 150 local wars and conflicts in which more than 17 million people perished have been fought with such weapons. Therefore, when discussing disarmament, the priority of nuclear disarmament should not lead to our disregarding the importance and indispensability of conventional disarmament.

49. In our days there is more and more talk about the correlation between disarmament and development. The countries and peoples which continue to suffer from the consequences of colonial oppression and neo-colonial exploitation are more than justified in feeling deeply concerned and indignant at seeing the very ones who have robbed and continue to rob them of their national assets spending hundreds of billions of dollars on the production of all types of weapons and remaining ready to sell a good part of these weapons, thus further plundering them through arms sales.

50. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development was held from 24 August to 11 September 1987 within the framework of the United Nations. Albania joined its voice to those who condemned the arms race and its main protagonists, who lack a sincere desire to disarm. They are even less ready to do so for the purpose of releasing funds to be used for development. On the contrary, what we see is that the super-Powers have stepped up the arms race to unprecedented levels, accompanied by the arms trade which today has become a most lucrative business for the arms producers. This lethal trade not only ensures the traders' presence in, and increases their inroads into and influence on, the States and zones where these weapons are sold, but also gobbles up the monetary means of those who badly need these means for their national development. It is no accident that during 1985 alone the United States and the Soviet Union together accounted for 63 per cent of arms exports in the world.

51. The arms trade and the mechanism of debts as an expression of unequal international economic relations have become subtle ways and means for the exploitation and subjugation of peoples in our time.

52. The peoples of the world aspire to avert the threat of war, to preserve peace and international security. But the imperialist Powers, the two super-Powers in the first place, should not be allowed to speculate and play with these sincere aspirations of the peoples by merely talking incessantly about disarmament while in fact continuing to arm themselves with all types of weapons of mass destruction.

53. The Albanian Government maintains that true and effective disarmament should start with the dissolving of the politico-military blocs of NATO and

the Warsaw Treaty, as well as with the removal of American and Soviet bases, fleets and troops and their return within national boundaries.

54. Albania is a small country without any foreign bases or soldiers on its territory. This reality has been enshrined in its Constitution, in which it is explicitly stated:

“The establishment of foreign military bases and the stationing of foreign troops in the territory of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania is prohibited.”

There is no doubt that in this way we defend our freedom and independence and render our modest concrete contribution to the cause of the preservation of peace and security in the Balkans, the Mediterranean and beyond.

55. In conclusion, my delegation would like to state that the problems of disarmament are connected with the vital interests of the whole of mankind. We believe that they can be faced up to and oriented towards a solution through the sincere common efforts of all the peoples and countries of the world and by resolutely opposing the hegemonistic policies of the super-Powers.

56. Mr. DIAKITE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): Allow me, Sir, on behalf of my delegation, to address my warmest congratulations to you on your well-deserved election to the presidency of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your qualities as a statesman and a skilled diplomat, which allowed you to direct the Assembly's forty-second session so successfully, are undoubtedly an earnest of the success of our work.

57. In the past month the international situation has been marked by a series of events which undoubtedly will have beneficial effects on this session. I refer to the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa, which devoted a major part of its work to the problem of disarmament; the special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana; and the meeting in Moscow between the President of the United States, Mr. Ronald Reagan, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev.

58. We would also add that other, earlier events of no less importance had already made a qualitative contribution to reducing international tension, thus stimulating a positive approach to the disarmament process. We would like to single out, *inter alia*, the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, the Treaty of Rarotonga on the creation of a denuclearized zone in the South Pacific, and the treaty signed in Washington on 8 December 1987 between the United States and the Soviet Union on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles.

59. Those actions in favour of disarmament, which should be encouraged and continued, should not cause us to overlook the unfortunate reality of a world the very existence of which is threatened by the dizzying arms race.

60. The arms race draws on its own logic, that is, to seek the absolute weapon. The lack of trust in inter-State relations, ideological conflicts, the increase in hotbeds of tension, hegemony and the interference in the internal affairs of States have led to a search for security by means of an unbridled arms race. That is indeed an ephemeral security when one realizes that today a nuclear war cannot be won and should never be unleashed. The escalation of the arms race is such that the total explosive power of the world's arsenal of nuclear weapons is approximately equivalent to a million times that of the Hiroshima bomb and could therefore destroy our planet several times over.

61. The international community surely cannot have forgotten the sufferings of the last two world wars. When the Charter of the United Nations was adopted we declared ourselves "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". However, mankind is not lacking in resources to meet the great challenge of the arms race. At a time when humanity has penetrated the secrets of the moon and is on the way to conquering the stars, surely the achievement of that objective is not beyond our capacity. The provisions of the Charter have plotted the path, and the two previous special sessions of the Assembly on disarmament have proved to be important landmarks.

62. During the first special session on disarmament, in 1978, a Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] was adopted by consensus, containing a Programme of Action which aroused great hopes at the time, because it was the first time the international community adopted measures and a genuine strategy to promote disarmament. That session also reaffirmed the central role which should be played by the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Four years later the General Assembly, in the course of its second special session on disarmament, confirmed the validity of the document adopted in 1978.

63. The existence of legal instruments such as the Geneva Protocol of 1925¹ and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*], of 1972, has unfortunately not prevented the manufacture and use of those weapons of mass destruction. It is our earnest hope that the negotiations which are under way in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament will lead to the conclusion of a convention which will banish once and for all the manufacture and use of chemical weapons.

64. Conventional weapons are killing people every day. According to recent statistics such weapons have been used in more than 150 local conflicts and have caused 20 million casualties since the Second World War. They alone account for 80 per cent of world military expenditure, estimated to be about \$1,000 billion a year.

65. That picture is hardly reassuring. It is a reflection of a world where fear and the lack of confidence in international relations predominate. It is high time that the international community took energetic steps to put an end to this vicious cycle if we want, as the Charter suggests, really to save future generations from the scourge of war.

66. The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements freely concluded between the States of a specific region is, as we see it, an important step in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and safeguarding international peace and security. This should be encouraged by the United Nations and respected by those Powers possessing nuclear weapons.

67. My delegation welcomes the establishment, through the Treaty of Rarotonga, of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Pacific. That treaty is an important step towards disarmament.

68. In 1964 Africa took a step along those lines when it adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. Unfortunately, the acquisition of nuclear capability by the South African minority régime, with the complicity of its allies, has compromised the achievement of the purposes of that Declaration and has hindered the efforts by the African States to promote disarmament, peace, security and development. South Africa's nuclear capability represents a danger for the black majority in South Africa, for the front-line States, for the African continent as a whole and for international peace and security.

69. We shall never cease condemning the racist régime of South Africa, with its nuclear capability, and we decisively denounce those States that collaborate with the Pretoria régime in the nuclear field. During this special session we ought to ask the Security Council to exert pressure on South Africa to force it to abide by the resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly those with regard to a binding international commitment concerning the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the placing of all nuclear installations under IAEA surveillance.

70. Unfortunately, added to the South African nuclear threat is now the problem of nuclear waste. During the most recent meeting at Addis Ababa the African States unanimously declared that the dumping of nuclear and industrial waste in Africa was a crime against Africa and the African peoples.

71. The third special session, by identifying the problems which up to now have proved obstacles to the implementation of the Final Document of the first special session and by providing appropriate solutions, will make an effective contribution to the achievement of the purposes of disarmament.

72. In Addis Ababa, at the twenty-fourth OAU summit meeting, the heads of State and Government of Africa elected the President of Mali, Mr. Moussa Traoré, to the presidency of that continental organization. At that important meeting, the African leaders carried out an in-depth analysis of disarmament questions and drew up a document that reflected the

positions of Africa. However, I must emphasize here that the African positions should be seen in the context of the global action pursued by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for general and complete disarmament.

73. Being convinced that the third special session on disarmament provides an opportunity to speed up the process of disarmament at the multilateral level, the African States have proposed, *inter alia*, that at this session the General Assembly should reaffirm the validity of the Final Document of the first special session, as well as the conclusions contained in the Concluding Document adopted at the second special session;² that it should proceed to analyse non-military threats to security and their impact on the peace and development of African States, particularly the most deprived; that it should reaffirm the relationship between disarmament and development; that it should reaffirm the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the part played by the World Disarmament Campaign and the Organization's other initiatives to sensitize world public opinion; that it should condemn the racist régime of South Africa for having gained nuclear capability and should also condemn the collaboration between Israel and South Africa in the nuclear field; and that it should identify specific and effective steps with regard to verification in order to facilitate the implementation of disarmament agreements.

74. Africa aspires to peace and security in order to guarantee its economic and social development, but the insecurity created by South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia and its continuing racial oppression and *apartheid* against our brothers in South Africa, the Pretoria régime's aggression against the front-line States, its policy of destabilization and occupation of the territory of Angola and all forms of interference in the internal affairs of African States have greatly hindered our efforts in that direction.

75. The reversal of the arms race or its cessation necessarily implies the creation of a climate of confidence and also a real political will. My delegation considers that any initiative, any bilateral or multilateral negotiation, is worthy of our attention. For that reason, we welcome the progress made by the United States and the Soviet Union in seeking a solution to the disarmament problems. We call upon the other nuclear-weapon States to join in the process of nuclear disarmament that has thus been initiated.

76. Our community is a whole. The events taking place in the North have an impact on the South, and what happens in the South should not leave the people in the North indifferent. The economic crisis, hunger, malnutrition, sickness, poverty, indebtedness and the deterioration of the environment are all threats to international peace and security. Just a portion of the billions of dollars annually swallowed up in military expenditures could substantially help to bring about the beginning of a solution to the numerous economic, social and cultural problems which confront humanity generally and the developing countries in particular. Surely we should be inconsistent if, after proclaiming in the Charter our wish for international solidarity, we were to do nothing at all to achieve that objective. We now have an opportunity, at this third special session, to prove

that the well-being of mankind, the future of mankind, is the focus of our attention. The outcome of the work done at this session will indicate whether we are resolved to perpetuate the existence of our planet or whether we wish it to disappear. My delegation, for its part, prefers to be optimistic, being convinced that wisdom will inform our work.

77. Mr. ABDOUN (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, your outstanding leadership contributed to the success of the proceedings of the forty-second session of the General Assembly. We are therefore certain that you will devote all efforts and time to this important special session, which is dealing with a serious and complex question, one which has a direct bearing on the survival of the human race and of the planet Earth and the life on it.

78. The family of nations is meeting for the third time in special session to give its full attention to the need to curb the arms race, to reduce military expenditures and arsenals and to focus on the importance of adopting a multilateral approach in this context.

79. This session reflects the deep concern of the international community regarding the future of mankind in the shadow of a grave nuclear threat. This third special session devoted to disarmament, like the first two, truly reflects the unshakeable faith which the family of nations places in the vital role which the international Organization can play in the process of disarmament and in consolidating international peace and security through a serious and persistent search for initiatives which can contribute to reducing differences among States and to facilitating a qualitative and quantitative limitation of the present arms race, in conformity with the spirit and objectives of the Charter, including the principles regulating the process of disarmament itself. This would reinforce the principle of the maintenance of international peace and security with the least squandering of human and economic energies. An international security régime has become an absolute necessity, especially since the first nuclear explosion, which took place before the end of the Second World War and just as the Charter was being signed.

80. Although there are many local and regional hotbeds of tension around the world, we have to pay tribute to the détente which the 1980s has seen in the relations between the two super-Powers and consequently between the two major military blocs. This led to the conclusion on 8 December 1987 of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, which was ratified during the recent summit meeting in Moscow. We wish also to pay tribute to the political leadership of the Soviet Union and the United States for their efforts to achieve further progress in nuclear disarmament, including the intent to reach agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of their strategic arsenals by the end of the year in order to eliminate these weapons completely by the year 2000.

81. Notwithstanding an improvement in the international climate, the qualitative and quantitative arms race has continued apace since the Second World War. Some believe that the INF Treaty is only the beginning of a new era of armament, which is the

logical consequence of the changes which have taken place in the priorities and the strategic and military systems of the two super-Powers. As a family of nations we should resist any temptation to yield to doubt, for that would only contribute to an acceleration of the arms race vertically and horizontally.

82. This special session must as its primary duty list the underlying causes of a continued arms race, which race diminishes hope for the establishment of a new system of international security. These causes can be summed up as follows. Distrust and conflicting interests continue between the two major military blocs, and their efforts to protect themselves by producing ever more sophisticated and destructive weapons have led them into a vicious circle from which it is difficult to emerge. The mania for military secrecy and the fear of the unknown have redoubled the fears of each side about the other, and that fear is contagious. An important share of human creativity and innovative capabilities is being devoted to the military sphere. Finally, there is a lack of international political will to protect future generations from the scourge of a devastating nuclear war, and the dependence on theories of nuclear deterrence brings us no closer to real peace and security.

83. This negative international climate has led to a tragic situation of defeatism and negativity, which might be summed up as follows. World military expenditures every year amount to the income of 2.6 billion people living in 44 different developing countries. The world spends 2,900 times more on armaments than on peace-keeping forces, and poverty and unemployment spread as military expenditures increase. In 1987 about \$930 billion was spent for military purposes, which represents \$1.8 million per minute. Regional and local conflicts are increasing in number and in intensity more than ever before. Last year alone there were 22 such conflicts. Here it should be said that the number of victims of such conflicts is greater than the toll of the Second World War.

84. The inevitable outcome of everything that I have said is that States are facing growing difficulties in their relations with one another, and consequently a growing number of regional and local conflicts break out, especially in countries of the developing world, and economic problems at the international level continue to get worse, especially for the developing countries. All this is paralleled by an increased production of weapons, including new armaments, and thus the positive spirit which existed at the first special session has disappeared.

85. This special session of the General Assembly, proceeding from the positive spirit of the two preceding special sessions, must review with the greatest seriousness the present international situation. It must also evaluate the developments in the area of disarmament in order to prepare concrete, practical and appropriate measures. It must also consider the role of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and the effectiveness of its disarmament bodies, as well as its information and educational activities, especially in the light of the growing role of the non-governmental organizations and world public opinion, which all oppose war. We must

adopt a precise programme concerning disarmament and must with further action prepare the ground for negotiations on general and complete disarmament. Here, absolute priority must be given to nuclear disarmament negotiations, then to the weapons of mass destruction and finally to the reduction of the military forces of States.

86. All this may necessitate urgently taking the following measures. All nuclear tests must be stopped by all States. Conventional weapons and their unlawful trade must be reduced. We must prevent the use of nuclear forces or the threat of their use against non-nuclear countries. More denuclearized zones must be established—and respected as such by the nuclear countries—in the Mediterranean, the Middle East and the Indian Ocean, and we must implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We must also put an end to nuclear co-operation with racist régimes, in particular South Africa and Israel, because they represent a direct danger to security and peace in Africa and the Middle East. We should consider the possibility of more States acceding to multilateral disarmament agreements. Finally, we must prohibit the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, destroy the existing stockpiles and speed up the process of concluding a comprehensive convention for that purpose. There is much more to be considered in the field of radiological and environmental weapons and concerning the sea-bed and the ocean floor, outer space and verification and compliance.

Mr. Perera (Sri Lanka), Vice-President, took the Chair.

87. As the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was a success and laid the foundation for confidence among the States of that community, we have now to follow that example to increase a confidence-building spirit and principles among other States as an alternative to resorting to armaments to defend their security. We believe that regional measures for disarmament are a first step on the way to international disarmament, but this does not prevent States from keeping the defensive capability they need to ensure their security. Here we must recognize the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament as one of the Organization's primary responsibilities. We must also recognize the non-military threats, which are felt particularly by the developing countries and which directly affect their security and peace. Above all, there is an urgent need to establish a new international economic order and to stress the organic link between disarmament and development and to enable the United Nations to implement the action programme adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.³ There can be no security if people lack bread, and no peace in conditions of fear and mutual distrust.

88. The international community has thus far failed to achieve most of its aspirations because of some negativity in deliberative and negotiating disarmament forums as a result of the desire of some to monopolize all disarmament matters in order to serve their own strategic purposes and of their striving to safeguard their own national security at the risk of the security of other countries. That is why

current disarmament machinery, including the Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament, lost their effectiveness.

89. The community of nations is today at a historic crossroads. We are faced with the possibility of annihilation by war, or of prosperity for one and all. If, in the past, we had waged war relentlessly on poverty, ignorance and sickness and had worked to ensure respect for the dignity of the human person and for fundamental human rights, regardless of race, language or religion, we would have to reject and denounce war, for it is the greatest threat to mankind. We have to eliminate the causes which induce others to wage it. Wars are primitive solutions that have never provided permanent security for the peoples of the world. Ensuring the prosperity and security of the world is today the most pressing task of the international community. Indeed this is our greatest challenge today, a challenge that must be met with determination.

90. Mr. MAHBUBANI (Singapore): When the first special session on disarmament was held in 1978—10 years ago—global arms expenditures stood at \$400 billion. By the second special session, in 1982, they had risen to \$600 billion. By the third special session—today—they are approaching \$1,000 billion. A cynical observer might well argue that since the proliferation of special sessions on disarmament has only resulted in increased global military expenditures, perhaps the special sessions should be abolished. The same observer might well add that if the Member States are truly sincere in their desire to reduce global military expenditures, they should not hold another disarmament conference to find the source of the problem. They should only look in the mirror.

91. The point of this introduction is not to question the goal of disarmament. In a world where, as was stated in the Havana Appeal of the recent special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries [*A/S-15/27 and Corr.1, annex II*], two thirds of the world's population live in abject poverty, it is sinful to consume scarce resources on wasteful military expenditures. Another observer, Mr. Homero Hernández Sánchez of the Dominican Republic, said:

“The cost of one nuclear submarine would pay for the education of 16 million children in underdeveloped countries for a school year, and the cost of a mobile intercontinental missile would feed 50 million malnourished children in those countries properly and still leave enough money to set up 60,000 health centres and build 340,000 primary schools.”⁴

92. If we all believe that such expenditures are criminal, we should also pause to ask ourselves why we continue to pursue the same beaten track and organize yet another disarmament conference reiterating the same old ideas when the historical record shows that such approaches have failed to change the prevailing situation. To use a popular contemporary symbol, what we need in the field of disarmament is some *glasnost* and perhaps some “new thinking”. Conventional notions have to be discarded. For

example, while we automatically equate peace with disarmament, it is puzzling that since the end of the Second World War, the most peaceful continent on the Earth has been Europe, even though it is the most highly militarized region of the world, with more weapons, nuclear and conventional, per square mile than any other part of the world. So, with the hope of sparking off some new thinking at this third special session, we offer four unorthodox, paradoxical and perhaps even theoretical points.

93. The first point, which is paradoxical, is that while we are meeting in auspicious circumstances, in 1988, the timing of this conference is inauspicious. Perhaps this special session should not have been held in 1988.

94. Speaker after speaker before me has already elaborated on the auspicious circumstances. They are best symbolized by the remarkable warmth that the leaders of the two super-Powers displayed towards each other at the recent Moscow summit. Terms like “evil empire” have disappeared from their lexicon. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—has been ratified. It has been suggested that the cold war is over.

95. Significantly, a similar thaw has also affected Sino-Soviet relations. Perhaps as a consequence of this new global environment, there have been equally remarkable developments in the third world. Soviet forces are withdrawing from Afghanistan. Significant direct negotiations have been held on Central America and southern Africa between adversaries who previously refused to speak to each other. Perhaps reflecting this new mood of global optimism that hangs in the air today, the editors of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* decided to move the hands of the nuclear clock backwards from three minutes to six minutes before midnight, suggesting that the world has become a safer place.

96. Yet despite this global optimism, 1988 is not an auspicious year for a session on disarmament. The reasons for this are obvious, but they are difficult to convey frankly in a diplomatic forum. In one super-Power, a new administration will take office in six months, perhaps with a radically different approach to arms control and disarmament issues. In the other, a significant political evolution is taking place, symbolized by the major party conference that will be held at the end of this month. In such a setting, even though bilateral relations between the two super-Powers have improved and will improve significantly, it is not yet clear that they have achieved a common vision on multilateral disarmament. As the Yugoslav professor Miodrag Mihajlovic said in a recent issue of the magazine *Yugoslav Review of International Affairs*, “A useful and successful dialogue between the two nuclear Powers does not automatically guarantee results on the multilateral negotiating plane.” The evidence suggests that the super-Powers will be coming to this conference with different agendas, and when they disagree it is unlikely that this special session can achieve very much.

97. My second point, which I know is heretical in this forum, is that while nuclear weapons are obvi-

ously horrible and terrifying and threaten the extinction of mankind, they may paradoxically be good for world peace. In historical terms, we live in an unusual era. In the past, most major conflicts have taken place directly between the major Powers. Since the Second World War, however, there has been no direct military confrontation between the two super-Powers. No Soviet or American soldier has died fighting the other. The fear of crossing the nuclear threshold has created a barrier that has so far prevented a global conflict.

98. This helps to explain why not a single human being has died from nuclear weapons since the Second World War. By contrast, more than 20 million, and some figures suggest 30 million, people have died from conventional weapons. It is therefore puzzling that we continue to stress that priority should be given to disarmament of nuclear weapons. The Final Document of the first special session on disarmament states that "Removing the threat of a world war—a nuclear war—is the most acute and urgent task of the present day." [*See resolution S-10/2, para. 18.*] The facts, however, suggest otherwise. More wars were fought in 1987 than in any previous year on record; four fifths of the deaths were civilian and all were killed by conventional weapons. Indeed, the evidence suggests that if nuclear weapons were totally abolished, the present restraints on a global conflict would be removed. Instead of seeing local conflicts, we might see a new world war, fought with modern conventional weapons, which, as several speakers have said, could equal nuclear weapons in their destructive capacities today. But to avoid any misunderstanding of this controversial point, let me stress right away that we should continue to educate the world on the horrors of nuclear warfare so that we kill any impulse that any leader may have anywhere to attempt using them. However, even while we do so, we should plan for the future on the basis that all the nuclear Powers will retain the nuclear option to maintain the balance of power.

99. It is, of course, obvious that the super-Powers do not need more than 50,000 nuclear warheads to maintain the current balance. This excessive number of warheads should be reduced. Indeed, they will be reduced in the coming years, not because of the pious declarations that we make at such disarmament conferences but because both super-Powers have come to realize the sheer absurdity of their situation. The United States and the Soviet Union together contribute between 55 per cent to 60 per cent of global military expenditures, and if the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries are included, they make up 75 per cent to 80 per cent. These enormous military expenditures were sustainable when the super-Powers believed that this would increase their global political influence. However, something significant has happened recently. Both super-Powers are beginning to realize that if they continue this pace of military expenditures, they will end up like "two dinosaurs, circling each other in the sands of nuclear confrontation", to use a colourful image evoked by Mr. Gorbachev.

100. Today, both super-Powers are aware that a new industrial revolution, powered by advances in computers, robotics, biotechnology, nuclear fusion, space exploration and ultra-high-speed travel, has

been unleashed. Like previous industrial revolutions, it could dramatically alter the balance of power in the world. Nations riding on that industrial revolution will move into positions of technological, industrial and material superiority. Those that do not will end up like the dinosaurs. Since I have no doubt whatsoever about the ability of the super-Powers and their allies to take care of their own interests, I am confident that in the next two to three decades, there will at least be a brief respite from increased global military expenditures by the super-Powers as they strive to put more resources into economic development. The question that hangs over us today is whether the other States of the world, especially the smaller States, will follow their example.

101. My third point, which is even more heretical so I will keep it very brief, is that while acquisition of arms is a natural activity, disarmament is not. Men and arms have gone hand in hand since the creation of human society. No human society has ever existed or exists today that has not in one way or another fashioned weapons. Given this historical record, we should come to terms with our human weaknesses and perhaps acknowledge that general and complete disarmament is as natural as celibacy. It may be easy for a few to practise it, but for the vast majority, restraint is a much more feasible suggestion. This should be our motto in discussing weapons and human society instead of continuously reiterating General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) which said that "the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today". By setting such unrealistic goals for ourselves, we are avoiding the real problems which can be solved only through small and realistic steps.

102. My fourth and final point, which is unorthodox, is that while disarmament is a worthwhile goal, multilateral disarmament conferences have by and large proven to be unhealthy for disarmament. They fail for simple reasons. First, while they laud abstract goals, they fail to address the concrete reasons why nations accumulate arms. No porcupine, for example, can be persuaded in the abstract to retract its protective quills. The concrete threat in its environment will have to be removed. A Danish scholar, Mr. Hans-Henrik Holm, has tried to analyse why multilateral proposals for disarmament have failed. He notes the following:

"There is an overall focus on multilateral measures that makes it very difficult to translate the proposals into *national* policies for action and changes. This underlying confidence in international negotiations and multilateral solutions channelled through the United Nations seems misplaced at a time when the national solutions and problems are at the forefront of leaders' attention everywhere. . . There is no need for individual Governments to worry about a [multilateral] programme that can only be enacted when all the others have agreed to it."⁵

103. Therefore, the only effective way to persuade countries to reduce their military expenditures is to remove the specific causes for them. As long as country X feels threatened by country Y, or vice versa, both countries will maintain, if not increase, their military capabilities. This applies to virtually

every State Member of the United Nations. We can keep on saying, as we did at the first special session, that "The ending of the arms race and the achievement of real disarmament are tasks of primary importance and urgency" [*see resolution S-10/2, para. 1*], but while every Member State may agree with this sentiment, no country will abide by it unless it feels secure.

104. More dangerously, speeches at multilateral disarmament conferences have become a substitute for effective reductions in military expenditures. Nation-States can feel good about their commitment to disarmament by making abstract speeches lauding disarmament at international conferences while doing nothing in practice to reduce their actual military expenditures. If this was not the case, global military expenditures would not rise each year. It is also puzzling that some of the nation-States which are the most passionate in their disarmament speeches also have huge and rising military budgets and in some cases thriving arms-export industries.

105. But I do not wish to conclude on a completely negative note. Previous disarmament meetings have had some achievements including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], the meetings that have led to the impending conventions on chemical weapons and possibly even the enhancement of the partial test-ban Treaty⁶ into a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In part, we have succeeded in these areas because we have confined ourselves to specific areas where common interests could be clearly defined. General conferences on disarmament, however, have little to show for all the meetings that have been held.

106. All those who have spoken before me have agreed that it is criminal to have such enormous wasteful military expenditures when hundreds of millions of the inhabitants of the Earth live in abject poverty. It is precisely because we have so much at stake in the outcome of these conferences that we need to understand carefully why previous disarmament conferences have failed. Unless we explore new approaches and unless we break out of the conventional modes of thinking, we will continue to condemn the poor and deprived people of the world to their sad and abject existence. It is for their sake that we need to move from the well-beaten tracks at this special session and set for ourselves small and realistic goals which will result in concrete improvements for the millions in the world who look to us to deliver more than a new well-written declaration which will have as much impact on global military expenditures as previous declarations did. If we do want this special session to succeed, we have to make a radical break from the past.

107. Mr. TALHI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I would like at the outset to extend to Mr. Peter Florin our congratulations on his presiding over this special session devoted to disarmament. We are confident that his wisdom and wide experience will help this session achieve the best results. I also wish to seize this opportunity to hail the excellent relations between our two countries. We should also like to extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Assembly on their election to these prominent positions.

108. This session is being held at a time when détente prevails in the international climate. This augurs well for the success we wish to achieve in many of the complicated fields related to disarmament.

109. The world has unanimously acknowledged that nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction represent the primary danger that threatens the very existence of mankind. The development of these types of weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, their sophistication and even their extension into outer space have added to the fear and terror of the possibility of a nuclear catastrophe and the conversion of outer space from the common heritage of mankind into an arena for the arms race.

110. My country, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, finds no difficulty in supporting and endorsing all international and regional endeavours to curb and check the nuclear-arms race. One of these endeavours is the agreement concluded between the two super-Powers to eliminate their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, even if the weapons covered by this treaty constitute but a meagre percentage of the nuclear arsenals in both countries.

111. We sincerely hope that the recent Moscow summit will lead to real and enhanced détente which would in turn mean more reductions of nuclear weapons. Until this objective is attained, we stress that non-nuclear States must have guarantees against the use or threat of use of these weapons against them. In this connection, we also underline the right of these States to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Nevertheless, the fact that the two racist régimes in occupied Palestine and South Africa have acquired nuclear capabilities confirms our belief—we in the African continent and in the Arab region—that the security imbalance will persist in these two important regions.

112. We support all endeavours to achieve a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. We must pay tribute to the Six-Nation Initiative in this regard, which has positively influenced the call to eliminate nuclear weapons and stop the arms race.

113. Strengthening security and co-operation in the Mediterranean is a vital and important issue for all the countries of the region, since security there is closely related to security and co-operation in Europe, Africa and other regions. Accordingly, my country has consistently supported all regional and international efforts aimed at achieving that goal within the framework of the United Nations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the OAU. However, the continuing presence of fleets and military bases, in particular the United States Sixth Fleet, which engages in provocative naval manoeuvres from time to time, has led to destabilization of the region and has endangered international peace and security. The act of aggression against my country in the spring of 1986 by bombing civilian targets in the cities of Tripoli and Benghazi is the best evidence of the gravity of that military presence, which leads only to exacerbation of the complex problems in the region such as those in Palestine and the occupied Arab territories.

114. Thus, we cannot but call for the withdrawal of these armadas and the dismantling of their support bases. In this regard, my country welcomes the proposal to withdraw military fleets from the Mediterranean in preparation for making it a lake of peace.

115. We join those who call for and support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, including Africa and the Middle East; however, we feel that that goal remains elusive.

116. As for Africa, the links between the racist régime of South Africa and some major Western States—through the policy of so-called constructive engagement—has strengthened South Africa's nuclear capability and made it a stumbling block to efforts to free the continent of the nightmare threat of nuclear weapons and the use of those weapons against countries of the region.

117. We also deplore the fact that certain countries and industrial establishments are now dumping or storing nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa. This is yet another factor that will delay the implementation of the declaration making Africa a nuclear-free zone. My country cannot but condemn those criminal acts that gravely jeopardize the health and safety of African peoples.

118. With reference to the Arab region, the presence of the racist entity in occupied Palestine, its involvement in the Star Wars programme and its strategic co-operation with the United States will always be a source of danger for the countries of the Middle East, Africa and the Mediterranean, especially when we take into consideration that entity's conspicuous co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa. I do not think we need go into details here. In this connection, we should like to draw attention to the fact that continued material and technical support to those two régimes intensifies tension. No just person can claim that such measures serve the interests of international peace and security.

119. Strengthening international peace is a must for the human community in today's world. My delegation hopes that the overtures of détente in the international arena will alleviate if not eradicate tension, particularly in the regions of the Middle East and southern Africa. That would enable the peoples of Palestine and Namibia to attain their legitimate rights to life and self-determination. We also hope that détente between the two super-Powers will not be at the expense of the rest of the peoples of the world, especially those of the developing countries.

120. My country has always supported efforts to strengthen security and co-operation. To this end we had recourse to specialized international bodies for arbitration of and a decision on the case of the continental shelf that involved our neighbours. My country has concluded economic and cultural agreements with various States and has initiated steps for unity with Arab States. It has strengthened its bridges of co-operation with many countries through economic projects and cultural centres. My country has even declared open its frontiers and removed all

administrative and other barriers that might hinder the movement of individuals to and from it.

121. Finally, on the occasion of the silver anniversary of the OAU, my country has decided to restore political relations with a number of States and has recognized the Government of Chad. We hope that that recognition, together with the restoration of relations, will deter foreign attempts at interfering in the affairs of the continent and provide African countries an opportunity to co-operate.

122. General and complete disarmament under effective international control is one of the most pressing issues of today's world. Disarmament should ensure that each country will do away with those weapons not needed for self-defence. However, we must not lose sight of the real threat posed by the deterioration in the present economic situation, which is characterized by falling prices of raw materials, the rising external-debt burden of developing countries and curtailment of their financial resources, the spread of poverty, illness and famine, and an increasing number of refugees because of drought and conflicts. All those calamities are a direct threat to world peace and security, especially in developing regions.

123. In this regard the relationship between disarmament and development must be emphasized, since the unbridled arms race and widespread tensions and conflicts have meant wasting even more material and human resources on armaments, the magnitude of which is beyond belief. These resources could have been used to rectify the imbalance in economic relations between the rich and the poor countries.

124. These issues make it incumbent upon all States to reconsider their policies with a view to promoting peace and confidence-building measures instead of taking precautions and preparing for war. Consequently it would be possible to rationalize the use of all available resources, channelling them to serve peace, co-operation and development and investing in development assistance programmes the savings resulting from the curtailing of expenditures on armaments. However, the lack of participation by the strongest economic Power in the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held from 24 August to 11 September 1987, was not an encouraging sign.

125. In conclusion, my country reaffirms the primary role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, and we pay a tribute to its persevering endeavours on behalf of disarmament. We therefore condemn those actions which have prevented the Organization from discharging its responsibilities. We also condemn abusing the right of veto in the Security Council, which has encouraged racist régimes to persist in their expansionist and aggressive policies and has thus destabilized many parts of the world and added to their insecurity.

126. Mr. KABANDA (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): For the third time in the course of a decade the General Assembly has taken up the important question of disarmament, a subject of vital concern to world peace and security. The internation-

al community is quite properly concerned over its future in view of the tremendous danger represented by stockpiles of arms of all types and calibres. The President, Mr. Florin, has been conducting with proven ability a session whose timeliness can escape no one, particularly at a time when, on the one hand, military preparations and devices have attained disquieting levels and, on the other, when glimmers of hope can be discerned on the nuclear horizon. Thus we are all experiencing feelings of anxiety mixed with hope.

127. The reasons behind the arms race are numerous and vary from country to country. We do not intend to dwell on them here because it would be a rather academic exercise, inasmuch as it is difficult to determine with any precision the undisclosed intentions of those involved. And then any generalization would hardly be appropriate in such a sensitive area where at any time there is a tendency to invoke, in seeking to justify oneself, reasons of national security.

128. An ancient adage asked us to prepare for war as a condition for peace: *Si vis pacem, para bellum*. That was probably the basis for the bellicose behaviour characteristic of a certain era and a certain civilization in which people who had won distinction on the battlefield were awarded exceptional honours by society. The concept of deterrence—military deterrence, of course—is undoubtedly one that harks back to that era. But other eras, other values; different horizons, different civilizations.

129. While it is true that States have the right, and even the duty, to make the proper arrangements to protect their frontiers and ensure domestic safety, it is quite clear also that to produce or to acquire any means that is greatly in excess of this requirement is, at the very least, tantamount to exposing oneself willy-nilly to threatening someone else's peace and security, first and foremost one's neighbour. This is therefore another cause of the arms race. Others could be adduced because the human intellect has ever been inventive in this field.

130. Thus it could be emphasized that a show of force by carrying out military manoeuvres, particularly if this is done close to very sensitive areas, might well represent an indirect invitation to someone to arm himself in order to be able to defend or protect himself.

131. We remain convinced that weapons have never been an adequate guarantee of security, and even if it could paradoxically be averred that they have sometimes been useful in putting an end to war, they have never made it possible for people to live in an atmosphere of lasting peace.

132. It would be a truism to say that weapons were not invented to serve as children's toys or to decorate houses, and if sometimes we find them displayed in luxurious, shining display cases, if we find exhibitions of these devices which have proved themselves in armed confrontations, we would not thereby necessarily deduce that weapons had been manufactured to fill museums.

133. It has been said that the military potential now possessed by States could destroy all life on Earth 12 times over. How can mankind glory in having accumulated so much power to serve death? In the natural order of things life is the most precious thing we have. We all agree on this. We also agree that anything that endangers life is by reason of that very fact reprehensible.

134. We are coming to the end of a century during which, through science, the human mind has been able to discover a number of natural laws. Man has proved capable of directly influencing matter. Through technology he has also largely succeeded in putting matter at the service of man.

135. Man has been able to plumb the secrets of the depths of the seas and oceans. He has successfully ventured into outer space. Moreover, he has succeeded in identifying the composition and functioning of a number of living organisms, including, of course, and perhaps above all, the human organism itself. Thus man has demonstrated that he has all means available to him to achieve his real vocation: to be the master of nature.

136. However, here we are facing a fundamental contradiction. Instead of discovering in his inventions and his discoveries reasons to liberate himself and to create his prosperity, in co-operation and side by side with his brothers, man is rather governed by fear; he has almost become the slave of his works. Today, peoples and Governments are all anxious about the future. Nobody is any longer quite sure of what the morrow holds.

137. However, I shall refrain from yielding to pessimism. We still have to believe in human reason. It is a fortunate fact indeed that we have come here together, all responsible people representing sovereign States, spokesmen of the international community, to ponder the future of our world. We have a choice to make here: the choice between love and hatred. That choice is a fundamental and decisive one. If we choose love we are walking in the paths of peace, because the works of love can only be peaceful ones, a point which the Bible itself makes. But if we opt for hatred we shall then proceed to develop the "war machine". I have here been more or less quoting the 1982 Erice Statement.⁷

138. For us, Members of the United Nations, the choice is a clear one. We have chosen love, which cannot be separated from the trust which we all owe to each other. Our exercise as negotiators—because that is the role we are playing here—should be guided by that trust in all areas, particularly those which relate to the peace and security of the human race. Unless we have that trust we will not be able to achieve anything here which could be solid or lasting.

139. During the historic meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington and, quite recently, Moscow, the leaders of the two major military Powers had some encouraging talks. Some agreements have even been signed; others are still kept secret and we learn about them only in dribs and drabs—they are still on the drawing board. We might even be tempted to believe that any reason to hope for a consolidated and generalized détente must prevail over any rea-

sons which we might have to fear a nuclear holocaust. We were very pleased to note that both leaders publicly recognized that a nuclear war could yield neither a winner nor a loser and therefore that it should not be started in the first place. It would be superfluous to say that Rwanda itself believes firmly in that statement. We are most interested in any decision or action, whether multilateral, bilateral or even unilateral, provided that it can help us to take an even modest step towards disarmament.

140. On the subject of nuclear prevention considerable progress has been made. This is to be noted particularly in the case of the Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water,⁶ the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] and the Outer Space Treaty⁸ on the uses of space for the benefit of all mankind. I should also refer to the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space [*resolution 2345 (XXII), annex*], as well as the SALT I and SALT II agreements, and in the field of nuclear disarmament as such, we were very pleased to learn of the conclusion and ratification of the American-Soviet Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. As a number of delegations have done, we express our heartfelt hope that in the course of this year a treaty will be concluded on the reduction by 50 per cent of long-range nuclear missiles. These positive facts are to the credit of reason, common sense and realism.

141. The Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, which led to a series of treaties on the prevention of nuclear proliferation, was a timely occurrence. My Government adhered to it, as it has adhered to treaties which followed. But, however important that treaty is, it is, as we see it, still incomplete since it does not deal with the question of underground tests, which, unfortunately, are still being carried out in order to prove the quality of newly designed devices.

142. The Non-Proliferation Treaty undoubtedly has the merit of having slowed down, if not completely halted, the horizontal spread of nuclear weapons, but it seems to suffer from three shortcomings. First, it sanctioned the monopoly of the first three signatories while at the same time it did not affect all the nuclear Powers known up to that time; secondly, it did not require that the three original signatories should stop at least at the level reached at that time in their nuclear stockpiles; and finally, it did not prevent the nuclear club from growing. Nevertheless it is better to have treaties, albeit weak ones, than not to have treaties at all.

143. SALT I and SALT II originally gave us reason to hope that détente was finally going to become a reality. Indeed they have done something towards that end, but SALT II, which one cannot actually say was stillborn, still remains inoperative, since it has not been ratified. Let us hope that it will soon be ratified, as the INF Treaty was about two weeks ago.

144. We can also see that there has been considerable improvement in the relations between the two super-Powers. We should like to encourage them to

pursue the path of dialogue, which should make it possible to usher in the era of peace and security humanity desires so keenly. This dialogue, as we see it, goes beyond "the peace of the great". We have reasons to hope that it will indeed be followed, in a sort of ricochet movement, by a relaxation of tension in certain parts of the world. We particularly hope that this dialogue can help in rapidly resolving the war situations prevailing in southern Africa, in the Middle East, in Latin America and particularly in Central America, to mention only the regions where there are problems that will still have to be dealt with by the Assembly during the three months of the next regular session.

145. We cannot speak of weapons of mass extermination without referring to the unspeakable horrors caused by chemical weapons, which have frequently been resorted to in some contemporary conflicts. But there should not be any acquiescence in this, even less any complicity. It is our earnest hope that a universal treaty of a binding nature will be concluded on a complete prohibition of this type of weapon.

146. Finally, it is necessary to put an end to the almost unrestrained competition in the field of conventional weapons. These are particularly dangerous because they can be acquired and manipulated much more easily than the weapons of mass extermination of which we have just been speaking.

147. One might attempt to put an end to the arms race by mutual annihilation, which would mean that the fighting would end because there were no more fighters—and I am sure it will be agreed that this is hardly a good solution. One could also resolve the problem of the arms race by drawing upon the principles enshrined in international law and particularly in the Charter of the United Nations. These principles are well known to us all. They are frequently invoked, but they are difficult to respect. Nevertheless, it is the duty of all of us to respect them, because they are the regulators of relations among peoples and relations among States.

148. The arms race could be ended by strengthening regional co-operation—and here I should like to express my Government's appreciation for the establishment of machinery to promote, in the context of the Economic Community of the Central African States, mutual trust and security. It is likewise our hope that the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, at Lomé, will soon become operational.

149. There should be respect for the principles affecting sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, good-neighbourliness—since ideological coexistence is in itself a form of good-neighbourliness—respect for the right of people to self-determination and the elimination of foreign occupation. All these are principles respect for which would undoubtedly help in relaxing the atmosphere in international relations and would also provide peaceful guarantees for security.

150. Having the Security Council guarantee denuclearized zones would also be a way of ending the arms race. I am thinking particularly of Africa, Latin

America, South-East Asia and the South Pacific, but the continent of Antarctica also should, with safeguards provided by the Security Council, be officially declared a zone free from any kind of military or economic rivalry. It is a duty of the United Nations to ensure that this is done.

151. The establishment of demilitarized zones through regional agreements, which would also be guaranteed by the Security Council, would be another method. I am referring to the creation and recognition of zones which would be free of conventional weapons, and here numerous regions, if not all regions, throughout the world might be involved.

152. However, how can one speak of security in the world without referring to the fact that the economic security of most human beings—those who do not have the minimum resources for their livelihood—has been jeopardized, whereas numerous resources are used up every day in the production or acquisition of the instruments of death? Several delegations have cited some really alarming statistics. Expenditures on arms are approximately equivalent to the external debt of the entire third world. Just think how many schools and health centres could be built by using the funds now being spent on building a single nuclear submarine or a single missile. Let us compare these expenditures with the budgets allocated by those countries to the struggle against cancer, unemployment, AIDS, malaria, measles, polio, diphtheria and tetanus. To help us think about this more profoundly, let us listen to the words of Dwight Eisenhower, who said:

“Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in a final sense, a theft from those who are hungry and are not fed, from those who are cold and are not clothed.”

153. As the Assembly knows, the International Literacy Year, 1990, will be launched at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly. I think it would not be too much to ask the military Powers to take from their military budgets for 1990 amounts equivalent to the cost of manufacturing one submarine, one fighter aircraft or one tank in order to promote the cause of millions of illiterate men, women and children throughout the world. The sums thus deducted from the military budgets could go towards a disarmament-for-development fund such as a number of Members of the Organization have stated they would like to see created.

154. When all States respect the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law which we recalled earlier, when they have strengthened and enlarged the machinery for regional co-operation in Africa, Europe, Asia, and in America—and, why not, transcontinentally?—it will finally be realized that military blocs and alliances no longer have any reasonable justification for being kept in place. It will be realized that it is pointless to arm oneself in excess of what is needed to protect one's frontiers. When national frontiers break down, we shall no longer tend to think in national terms but rather in regional terms, and gradually we shall start to use a universal language, as the great African poet Leopold Sedar Senghor said. Then mankind will have initiated a new civilization and a new culture:

civilization based on co-operation and prosperity for man in peace and—why not?—culture and fraternal love.

155. The PRESIDENT: Under a decision taken at the 1st plenary meeting, I now call on the last speaker for this meeting, the chairman of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

156. Mr. PAK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I should like first warmly to congratulate Mr. Florin on his election as President of this special session. I am sure that his experienced diplomatic skill will help the session to be successful. I should like to thank him and the delegates for kindly giving me this opportunity to speak for my Government from this platform.

157. The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is convening at a time of increased uneasiness mixed with new hope. Although it is 10 years since the first special session on disarmament, the international situation is still tangled and complicated, and the question of disarmament remains out of reach of a political agreement. Persistent lack of peaceful settlement of international disputes drives them, in an increasingly serious way, from a bilateral to a multilateral dimension, thus adding new dangers. The problem of the foreign debts of the developing nations adds to the crisis of international peace and security, throwing a new light on the underdevelopment of our planet.

158. All these elements are gratefully used to keep the old concept of what is called “security through strength” from becoming obsolete. Unless this anachronistic concept is decisively eliminated root and branch, the parasitic arms race can never be stopped. The nuclear arsenals in Europe, as well as in Asia and the Pacific region, were reinforced with newer and more lethal nuclear weapons in the year following the second special session on disarmament, with the arms race as a whole being escalated from ground to sea and outer space.

159. The result of the arms race is not confined to endangering political security only; its consequences are even more acutely felt in destabilized economic security, especially in the depressed socio-economic development of the developing countries. Fortunately, the wisdom of humanity is not limited merely to watching the process of its self-extinction. Some encouraging changes in the recent international situation give us several reasons to hope for disarmament.

160. The first reason is the fact that the question of disarmament has definitely become a matter of direct interest to the majority of States and is not confined to the framework of negotiations between the few States responsible. As has been proved by the World Disarmament Campaign, the establishment of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone and the last year's successful International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, the interest of the third world nations in disarmament has been dramatically increased, and this has given a new push to the disarmament process.

161. The second reason is the emergence of the new idea of a comprehensive system of international

peace and security to replace the old one of security through strength. Realization of that proposal, jointly initiated by the socialist countries and already supported by many, would be a prerequisite to building a new world in which all nations could live in peace under a security system based on equality and independence.

162. The third reason is that, by the conclusion of the INF Treaty, a valuable breakthrough has been made in the disarmament negotiations between the nuclear-weapon States themselves.

163. Against the background of both the overall scale of the current arms race and the critical nature of the negative aspects of the international situation, these changes should be viewed as no more than a tender flower-bud in a windy field. To find a way of encouraging that bud to develop into a flower garden is a pivotal question, and in that connection all contemporary decision-makers should be tested as to their political will and capability.

164. With the consideration of a comprehensive disarmament programme in prospect, my delegation feels it necessary to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the following point. The coexistence over the last 40 years of disarmament in words and the arms race in deeds indicates that disarmament must be a question of principle, not of method.

165. One may easily recall that past rounds of arms control negotiations did not achieve their purpose; they were a prelude to a new stage or scale of the arms race. At the very moment of our gathering here to look into the question of disarmament, a more sophisticated class of cruise missile is being test-launched in one part of the world while elsewhere more than 10,900 children die of disease and malnutrition in a single day.

166. Inevitably, reality poses the question: Will this meeting open the way to disarmament, or will it just be another screen drawn over the continued arms race?

167. Many people now hail the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—as a positive step, but at the same time they do not fail to take note of the fact that the nuclear weapons affected by the treaty represent less than 4 per cent of the total nuclear arsenal. The problem is that even before this 4 per cent reduction is initiated, measures are being taken in advance to offset them. The so-called compensatory measures are not only being planned in Europe, but are actually being carried out in the Asian and Pacific region, where there is less scrutiny. Nuclear stockpiling facilities are being rebuilt or expanded, in addition to the more than 350 military bases in the region, both nuclear and conventional, while nuclear-capable warships throughout the Pacific region are being re-equipped with a new generation of nuclear weapons. We have no reason to believe that the measures taken to compensate for the 4 per cent reduction would not produce another round of the arms race, possibly far surpassing this 4 per cent.

168. Then, of course, the General Assembly, like a doctor in charge of a patient, would have to take responsibility for the Earth, which is infected with the arms race, and would have to try to make an unbiased and precise diagnosis. That is what my delegation regards as a prerequisite to a cure.

169. The halting and reversing of the nuclear arms race should continue to be the primary and foremost aim of disarmament efforts, an endeavour that requires supreme efforts on the part of the whole of humanity.

170. Before anything else, nuclear disarmament would require the nuclear-weapon States to make a political decision concerning the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons from the Earth and to undertake a practical reduction of their nuclear arsenals. A immediate agreement on several serious questions—such as a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, a 50 per cent reduction in the strategic offensive weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States, continued respect for and compliance with the arms limitation treaties already concluded, and international arrangements to prohibit the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States—would be a good opportunity for the nuclear Powers to prove their political will.

171. Unfortunately, however, the historical process since the nuclear weapon came into being indicates that by themselves the nuclear Powers would not find it easy to give up their nuclear weapons. In other words, there will be no hope of progress in nuclear disarmament without active efforts on the part of the non-nuclear States. The conclusion of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the increased efforts to create nuclear-free zones clearly demonstrate that the non-nuclear States have a role to play in nuclear disarmament—a very important and responsible role at that. The non-nuclear States should start and intensify a nuclear-weapon-expulsion campaign in an effort to reduce the geographical space in which nuclear weapons could manoeuvre, thereby diminishing their strategic importance.

172. The most effective way of bringing the campaign to a successful conclusion would be to establish and expand nuclear-free zones. At present nuclear-free zones have been established in some parts of the world, and increasing attempts are being made to denuclearize other zones. International measures would be required to encourage and co-ordinate the process on a global scale. Priority should be given to the denuclearization of the regions in which there are nuclear forces such as tactical and field nuclear weapons, the most dangerous categories, that could spark a nuclear war.

173. The prohibition of chemical and other weapons of mass destruction is an equally fundamental requirement for disarmament. An immediate freeze on chemical and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as a ban on any actions likely to harm the negotiating climate, would be needed in order to reach an agreement, without further delay, to ban the testing, production, introduction and stockpiling of such weapons and to destroy the existing arsenals.

174. The prevention of the arms race in outer space has become a question the solution of which cannot be delayed any longer if the objective of disarmament is to be achieved. This would require, especially, fuller disclosure of the injustice of the Star Wars programme and its disastrous consequences to socio-economic development, and at the same time bilateral and multilateral efforts to outlaw internationally the arms race in outer space should be encouraged.

175. Another important element in limiting the arms race is halting and reversing it on the seas. Giving international significance to the seas and actively encouraging specific efforts to bring them into the proposed nuclear-free zones of peace could be one of the major approaches to naval disarmament.

176. Disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, is a common objective for all mankind. The non-nuclear States have long believed that they have a right to demand the elimination of nuclear weapons and have actually exercised that right. It may be said that the exercise of this right resulted in the convening of special sessions devoted to disarmament and in the conclusion of a series of multilateral arms control agreements.

177. We now recognize that the non-nuclear States have not only the right to demand nuclear disarmament, but also an obligation to join in the efforts to realize it. Bearing in mind this sense of duty and the requirements of the situation, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea considers it a responsibility, with a view to general and complete disarmament, to try to exert every effort to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone of peace and to expand the zone to the whole region of north-east Asia.

178. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has already declared the area north of the military demarcation line in the Korean peninsula to be a nuclear-free zone and has taken measures to prohibit the testing, production, introduction, stockpiling and passage of nuclear weapons in the area. Accordingly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has proposed a phased and mutual reduction of forces on both sides of the military demarcation line in an effort to favour the climate for the withdrawal of over 1,000 nuclear weapons and 40,000 United States troops deployed in South Korea and has called for multinational talks to discuss related matters. The initiative includes measures to replace distrust with confidence between the north and the south of the Korean peninsula, such as entrusting neutral third parties with control over the Demilitarized Zone along the military demarcation line where the danger of conflict is concentrated and ensuring an open process of reduction verified by them. To make this process feasible, it would be necessary for prior agreement to be reached between the north and the south of Korea, as well as with the United States.

179. As in any other region, the key to progress in arms control and disarmament in this part of the world lies in constructive dialogue based on the sincere political will of the parties concerned. Dialogue is the only effective way by which proposals and initiatives can be examined and confidence

restored. This was the principled stand on which my Government, at the beginning of the year, proposed holding a north-south joint conference open to all interested political parties and social groups throughout Korea, including the Government authorities, to look into the pressing questions concerning détente and disarmament. Both past experience and the present situation call for such a nation-wide forum that could truly guarantee the broadest possible national representation, not only to relax regional tension but also to contribute to the global disarmament process by retreating from the nuclear brink in Korea.

180. A few days ago, coinciding with the beginning of this special session, an abrupt response was received from South Korea. It was not an acceptance of the joint conference, but a counter-proposal, as usual, relating to north-south talks by high authorities, which was not made through proper channels but hurriedly made public on its own. The credibility of this sudden proposal is questionable, of course, since this had been tried more than once in the past and failed each time. We should not waste time and I am ready to say from this rostrum that we are prepared to consider having such talks as part of the preparations for the north-south joint conference we proposed last January.

181. As demonstrated by the large international support for this proposal, if the United States and the South Korean authorities were truly interested in nuclear disarmament and détente, they would have no grounds for opposing the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. Suspicions have since been voiced in some circles in South Korea that this might be a "disguised peace offensive" aimed at a "propaganda campaign". But before trying first to suspect motives, it would be more realistic to be prepared to appreciate the confidence-building steps that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has taken, ranging from the unilateral reduction of its forces by 100,000 troops to the moratorium on large-scale military exercises.

182. The problem rests with the United States, the owner of the nuclear weapons deployed in South Korea. In the first place, the United States could not be justified by any means in keeping its nuclear bases in South Korea against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has no such weapons. It is the strategic point of view of the United States that the Korean peninsula is vitally needed for it to exercise military influence over the region. The approach of the United States towards the region has been defined by its policy of maintaining the present division of the Korean nation and trying to have that status internationally accepted so that South Korea will remain permanently to its strategic advantage, the last stronghold in continental Asia. Once Korea is reunified into a single confederated State it is bound to be a neutral State that would create a buffer zone in the region, exclusive of military interventions or bases by any outside Powers, which might well be beyond the interests of those who seek military supremacy in the region.

183. The extensive military buildup, both nuclear and conventional, in and around South Korea begun and sponsored by the United States, and those

frequent intimidating large-scale military exercises like the "Team Spirit" series that breed clear elements of a pre-emptive strike, could never be considered by anyone as a contribution to the security of the region.

184. Fresh concerns are mounting over the announced intention of the United States to "guarantee" by military means the "safety of the Olympic Games" this fall by sending an aircraft-carrier battle group to the shores off the Korean peninsula. I shall not go into the details of how it feels to have such a fleet of warships at one's threshold before the representatives from the Middle East, the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the South Atlantic and the Pacific, who may well have experienced the very implications it creates. One may wonder if such a demonstration of power or military provocation could possibly lead to any reduction in tension and armaments at all. If the United States has any political will for disarmament, it should primarily be reflected in the explosive spots of the world, such as the Korean peninsula.

185. Even if it had been necessary to place nuclear weapons in South Korea for the global strategic purpose of the United States, the United States is now in a position to accept the idea of a Korean nuclear-free zone and to withdraw its troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea, if it truly wishes nuclear disarmament and intends to respect the spirit of the INF Treaty, which it signed and ratified. This minimal adjustment in the posture of the United States, a major party to the nuclear disarmament negotiations, would indicate good faith to the people of the world.

186. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, one of the non-nuclear-weapon States which aspire to international peace and security, believes that its disarmament efforts are in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and will contribute to the endeavours of the Organization to achieve general and complete disarmament.

187. In conclusion, I express my delegation's expectation that the special session will achieve its weighty objectives to open a new page in the disarmament process.

188. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of the United States has

asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

189. Mr. BUCZACKI (United States of America): With regard to the statements concerning my country just made by the observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, I should like briefly to outline my Government's policy regarding Korea. First, the United States supports the peaceful settlement of the differences that divide North and South Korea. To this end, the United States favours constructive dialogue between the two Koreas and supports the 3 June proposal advanced by the Republic of Korea for initiating such a dialogue. Secondly, the United States favours the reunification of North and South Korea whenever the people of Korea so decide. And I might add that the United States looks forward to Seoul's successful and peaceful hosting of the 1988 Olympic Games and calls upon all nations, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to attend.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

NOTES

¹Protocol 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).

²*Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Special Session, Annexes*, agenda items 9-13, document A/S-12/32.

³*Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.IX.8), para. 35.

⁴See "Peace, Security and Development", *Disarmament*, vol. IX, No. 2: Summer 1986 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.86.IX.8), p. 193.

⁵See "World Disarmament—A Strategy for Development?", *Disarmament*, vol. IX, No. 1: Spring 1986 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.86.IX.4), p. 31.

⁶Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964).

⁷Reprinted in *Disarmament*, vol. IX, No. 2: Summer 1986 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.86.IX.8), pp. 163-164.

⁸Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).