



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

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate

1. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the Republic of Zimbabwe. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations the Honourable Robert Gabriel Mugabe and to invite him to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. MUGABE (Zimbabwe): I had occasion to congratulate Mr. Peter Florin upon his election to the presidency of the forty-second session of the General Assembly last September. His has been a busy watch. He has already been called upon to preside over several resumed sessions of the forty-second General Assembly, and now he is called upon yet again to guide the work of this third special session devoted to disarmament. In all these tasks he has acquitted himself with great skill and dignity. We are much indebted to him.

3. The Secretary-General has steered the Organization with calm purposefulness and firm determination during the past year. He has brought his good judgement to bear on many international crises and has played a pivotal role in the search for solutions to some very intractable conflicts. We are grateful to him and assure him of our continued support.

4. Today we find ourselves at the crossroads. We have a choice to make and time is not on our side. To avoid the nightmare of a nuclear catastrophe, the time is now, the place to do it is here, and the decision is really quite simple. To the extent that the choice is between the continued survival or the annihilation of our race, there can be only one rational choice to make: survival. But to choose life entails having to make urgent decisions and to plan for a different tomorrow. For, if there is one point that should be crystal clear to all with regard to the arms race and the threat of nuclear war, it is that we cannot go on as at present. The current obsessive pursuit of unilateral security by the big Powers has been like chasing a chimera. It has not resulted in ensuring security for anyone but, instead, has triggered an arms race unparalleled in history. In short, it has increased, not lessened, insecurity; fanned, not calmed, fears; and now threatens the very existence of the human race on this planet.

5. We live in a world armed to the teeth, and yet each increase in arms breeds not increased safety but fear. For how long can we continue to delude ourselves that deterrence, a doctrine that necessarily implies escalation, can indeed guarantee peace? And what nature of peace is it that requires about 55,000 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of the nuclear Powers, the equivalent of 1 million Hiroshima-size bombs, over 2,000 times the destructive power of everything used in the Second World War, and the equivalent of some three tons of that for every man, woman and child on Earth.

6. States are in danger of becoming largely irrelevant to the security interests of their citizens, except perhaps to the extent that they threaten such interests. Surely, there must be a more rational way of ensuring peace than through the instruments of fear and insecurity. The citizens of the world must at present be bitterly disillusioned about the role of the State as guarantor of their physical and psychological safety. How can anybody be secure when all we are offered is "assured mutual destruction"? What we all want is assured mutual survival and not mutual annihilation.

7. The founders of the Organization were already convinced of the illusory character of the unilateral pursuit of security. That is why they set down the collective security provisions of the Charter. Unilateral pursuit of security is untenable. The world, as has been repeatedly stated, is now a global village. Acid rain, holes in the ozone layer, destruction of tropical forests, nuclear plant accidents, the AIDS pandemic, rampant narcotics trade, recurrent international terrorism, pervasive recession and so on are familiar enough phenomena to convince any head-in-the-sand ostrich that security cannot be assured by one nation or group of nations, no matter how militarily or economically powerful. We are in this thing together, and the sooner we wake up to this reality the better for our common security.

8. While contacts among the super-Powers are to be commended, it is regrettable that in the past they have confined their endeavours more to managing the arms race than to curbing it. After decades of talks between the super-Powers on nuclear issues, and such agreements as SALT I,¹ SALT II² and the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems,³ we still have more, not fewer, nuclear weapons than before those treaties.

9. A measure of control or limitation for one type of armament has characteristically resulted in an exponential compensatory growth in other types of armament, totally negating what benefits might have accrued from the limitation. We sincerely hope that 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 will not suffer the same fate. That agreement is historic in that, for the first time in our age, we witness a disarmament measure rather than a mere arms-control measure. Notwithstanding its modest effects on the ground, it is an important psychological breakthrough for mankind.

10. We must now build upon that achievement and work hard towards the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world within a specific time-frame. To this end we are particularly pleased to note that one of the declared goals currently being pursued by the two super-Powers is a 50 per cent reduction in their strategic nuclear arsenals. If achieved, such an agreement would constitute a significant milestone in ensuring the continued existence of the human race.

11. The international community has already set itself several tasks and has established priorities in the field of disarmament. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [*resolution S-10/2*], the first special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, specifies in paragraph 45 that priorities in disarmament shall be "nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, . . . including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reduction of armed forces". These priorities remain valid today.

12. The Final Document also states in paragraph 47 that "Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization." It was with this in mind that the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare in September 1986, declared that removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe is not one issue among many, but the most acute and urgent task of the present day.

13. Removing this threat consists of two sets of actions. At one level, our struggle entails extracting undertakings from those that possess nuclear weapons that they will not use them. This can be done through binding commitments not to use nuclear weapons. In this regard, we welcome the declarations made by some nuclear-weapon States that they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons.

14. We are also heartened by the joint declaration of the President of the United States and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at their meeting at Geneva in November 1985 that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. The corollary of that statement is that neither side would ever wage such a war. The sincerity of that declaration will be seen partly in the results of the current super-Power summit in Moscow, and partly in the progress the two super-Powers make towards a 50 per cent reduction in their strategic arsenals. In this regard, we understand that the meeting in Moscow is over and that perhaps not much has been achieved.

15. On another level, our struggle must involve the elimination of the means of waging a nuclear war. Clearly, while declarations of non-use are welcome, one cannot be certain that nuclear war is impossible

until nuclear weapons no longer exist. Therefore, the elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth is the most important element of our undertaking.

16. Again, going back to the Final Document, the consensus of the international community is that the achievement of nuclear disarmament requires the following stages: first, cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems; secondly, cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, and of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; and thirdly, a comprehensive, phased programme with agreed time-frames, whenever feasible, for a progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination at the earliest possible time.

17. It is in the pursuit of those ends that the Non-Aligned Countries have advocated the urgent adoption of a comprehensive programme for disarmament, as called for by the consensual decision of the international community in 1978. The Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, has been charged with this important task. Progress has been disappointingly slow. We urge all States, in this context, to agree to specific measures and to a time-frame for the prevention of nuclear war and for nuclear disarmament. It is time the Conference on Disarmament submitted draft proposals on this subject to the General Assembly. If the inability of the Conference to produce draft proposals is the result of a flaw in its working methods, then this special session presents a suitable opportunity for a review of those methods.

18. In pursuing nuclear disarmament the non-aligned countries have given the highest priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Only a ban on all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time can stem the qualitative and quantitative development of nuclear weapons and the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear war.

19. Pending the achievement of nuclear disarmament, the international community should ensure that countries which do not possess nuclear weapons are not made victims of such instruments of mass destruction. We are aware that the only credible guarantee for non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons is the total eradication of nuclear weapons. However, in the short term binding arrangements whereby States undertake not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States would engender some degree of confidence on the part of non-nuclear-weapon States. It cannot be stressed enough that the efficacy of non-proliferation in large part hinges on the sense of security that non-nuclear-weapon States feel against nuclear blackmail or attack.

20. A further step that can help reduce the danger of nuclear war in the period before the achievement of nuclear disarmament is the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We welcome the establishment in 1986 of the South Pacific nuclear-free zone. There

are now two nuclear-weapon-free zones, excluding largely uninhabited Antarctica, and there are proposals for the establishment of further such zones in Africa, the Middle East, south Asia, the Nordic region and Central Europe. The Final Document of the Tenth Special Session states that the establishment of such zones is an important disarmament measure and should be encouraged.

21. We must, however, state our disappointment at the continued non-implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [resolution 2832 (XXVI)]. Seventeen years after the adoption of the Declaration in 1971, the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean is still being frustrated in its attempts to call the implementation conference by those States which argue that peace has to prevail in the Indian Ocean region before the Declaration can be implemented. The urgency of the issue has been emphasized not only by the General Assembly, but also by the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, held at Lusaka in 1979. We do not believe that the argument that peace must first be secured in the Indian Ocean is serious. It appears to us that the problem is a lack of good will in the *Ad Hoc* Committee. That lack of good will was shown when the Committee failed even to agree to hold one preparatory session at Colombo, at the kind invitation of the Sri Lanka Government—that at the very moment when a solution to the Afghanistan problem was removing one of the major excuses given by those States opposed to a conference on the Indian Ocean. We again appeal to all States to co-operate with the majority in the *Ad Hoc* Committee so that the Declaration can be implemented.

22. In this regard, the issue of the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa is particularly pertinent. Almost two and a half decades ago, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, meeting at Cairo, adopted the Declaration, stating their wish to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons. Today, not only is the Declaration unimplemented, but nuclear weapons have now been introduced into the continent. The régime that possesses those weapons—South Africa, that is—has not only the strategic motive to want to use such weapons at some stage, but also practises a racist doctrine which will serve to erase any psychological inhibitions against using those weapons. This is especially so since the only possible targets for the weapons are black Africans, a people the racist Pretoria régime has historically treated as sub-human. Is it not ironic that those Western States which proclaim their commitment to non-proliferation with such vigour turn out to be the ones to have given a nuclear capability to South Africa, a State that has refused to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex] or to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards?

23. The situation created by the nuclearization of South Africa is extremely serious. The Disarmament Commission should quickly submit recommendations to the General Assembly on ways and means of combating South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability. I also wish to recall that at Harare in 1986 the heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries

called upon the Security Council to take effective and concrete measures to meet the danger posed by the acquisition of nuclear capability by the South African racist régime. We regret that the Council has not moved to heed this call. We should like to urge that body again from this podium to act to remove this threat to international peace and security.

24. Chemical weapons constitute another ominous cloud hanging over the fate of mankind. Evidence of the use of chemical weapons in our time makes the destruction of the stocks of these weapons which are in national arsenals even more important. It has become clear that the 1925 Geneva Protocol⁴ is not enough. To have a means of retaliation in the event of a chemical-weapon attack, States have stockpiled such weapons. Again, we can only be assured that chemical warfare is a thing of the past when chemical weapons no longer exist. To this end, we urge the early conclusion of a chemical weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and providing for the destruction of existing stocks. We are pleased to note that problems relating to the verification of a chemical weapons convention are nearing resolution. The Conference on Disarmament has already made impressive strides in the drafting of the convention, and we now urge it to finish this task and consign chemical warfare to history.

25. The Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [resolution 2222 (XXI), annex] has already designated outer space as the common heritage of mankind. The moves currently under way to militarize outer space not only negate this concept but also constitute an ominous new dimension in the arms race. It is always easier to prevent rather than to cure. Outer space at present is largely unmilitarized. Let us enjoy its benefits without also inviting its dangers. As stated at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries:

“outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind, should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and for the benefit and in the interest of all countries, regardless of their level of economic or scientific development, and . . . should be open to all States”.⁵

States are enjoined to refrain from the threat or use of force in their outer space activities.

26. Satellites that can be used for military purposes should be brought under international control, and all States, particularly those with major space capabilities, should adhere strictly to existing legal restrictions and limitations on space weapons. The Conference on Disarmament, which has been charged with the task of preventing the extension of the arms race into outer space, should engage in urgent negotiations to conclude agreements towards that end.

27. Conventional armaments are also emerging as an ominous dimension of the arms race, particularly with regard to their qualitative improvement. Special consideration should be given to newly emerging technologies that are fashioning a new generation of weapons of mass destruction, whose effects are so

similar to nuclear weapons of mass destruction as to blur the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons, thereby legitimizing the possession of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility to start the process of limitation and gradual reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces with a view to achieving security at a lower level of forces and armaments.

28. The non-aligned States also consider that the curbing of the military activities and rivalry of the great Powers and blocs beyond their boundaries is an essential element in their own security. We call for withdrawals from such areas by all foreign military forces. Similarly, we call for an immediate cessation of all activities involving the dumping of nuclear and other industrial wastes on the territory of third world countries. We in Africa, in particular, condemn the attempt by certain industrialized countries to use our continent as a vast garbage dump for these noxious wastes. The twenty-fourth session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 26 to 28 May 1988, has condemned in the strongest terms the dumping of nuclear waste by some French companies on the African continent. Are we Africans that easily expendable? We feel angered and disgusted.

29. The International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, was a landmark achievement which served to highlight the fact that expenditure on arms represents a twofold blow to the security of mankind. It not only increases the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, but also exacerbates non-military threats to security, such as poverty, hunger and illiteracy. The Assembly will also recall that the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development entitled "Our Common Future"⁶ stated categorically that poverty was a major cause of environmental degradation.

30. The International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development pointed the way to sanity and rationality. This third special session on disarmament provides us with an opportunity to take the first step forward. The international community must go beyond the mere acknowledgement that there is a relationship between disarmament and development and that there are military and non-military threats to security. It must act! If nuclear weapons appear physically more threatening, let us not forget that in 1987 the toll from hunger-related diseases was equivalent to a Hiroshima every two days, that is, 200,000 dead every two days. The third special session should move boldly to implement the action programme contained in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development;⁷ specific provisions must be made for keeping the subject under constant review; and mechanisms should also be instituted to manage the transfer of resources released as a consequence of disarmament measures to development purposes. The world expects no less of this session.

31. Finally, we are pleased to note that this special session will be considering the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the effectiveness of the disarmament machinery. Non-aligned countries have always stressed the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Having defined its fundamental purpose as saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, the United Nations could assume no lesser role or centrality to the most urgent task of our time. Some of the shortcomings of the machinery—for example, those pertaining to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament—I have already alluded to. I have no doubt that these questions of machinery will be examined closely in the present session. I should, however, like especially to commend the work being done by the World Disarmament Campaign. The emergence of an informed public opinion is pivotal to restraining some of the more chauvinistic tendencies of national Governments.

32. The challenge that faces us is a daunting one, but it is not beyond the ingenuity of humanity to solve. This special session provides us with an excellent opportunity to review and rededicate ourselves to all the goals we set ourselves in 1978. If at times the task looks too hard and the will begins to flag, let us remind ourselves that failure to agree is not an option. We all have one supreme interest, namely, continued survival.

33. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the Republic of Zimbabwe for the important statement he has just made.

34. The General Assembly will next hear an address by the President of the Argentine Republic. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. Raúl Alfonsín and to invite him to address the Assembly.

35. Mr. ALFONSÍN (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have been summoned here with the unique responsibility of ensuring the right to life. Our presence here today stands as proof that our peoples are aware of this situation and of the need for joint efforts that will enable man to affirm his most vital, creative capacity above the forces leading him to his own destruction.

36. A world ruled by the senselessness of nuclear arms will never be able to lead to a firm détente, nor to peace and the development of peoples.

37. The arms buildup affects directly not only the normal development of relations among nations but also international economic growth, imposing limitations on the potential for development of all countries, rich or poor, producers or importers of arms, whether they have opted to be aligned or preferred neutrality and non-alignment. The volume of military investments today exceeds by far 5 per cent of the gross world product and represents over 25 times the amount of the assistance provided by industrialized countries to developing ones. In contrast with the increase of the military budgets of the super-Powers in the present decade, capital investment

transfers to least developed countries have dropped dramatically. How long will the structure of the international community be able to withstand such deep contradictions? The security of nations also requires a minimal level of welfare and economic and social development, which remains unmet in most cases.

38. This situation is made worse by the nuclear arms race and the development, at a very high cost, of new technologies linked to their complementary systems in space and to the production of new arms of "surgical" precision which confront us with dubious theories about limited nuclear conflicts.

39. Many have repeated, *ad nauseam*, that thanks to the nuclear arsenals a new world war has been avoided. The fallacy of a truth that cannot be verified is thus threatening to make a reality of the falsehood that it conceals and to cause a nuclear holocaust.

40. I ask myself, and I ask all the representatives here, if the positions of the nuclear arms States, with which they seek to justify resort to the possession and use of nuclear weapons, do not stem from a nihilist conception of human beings, defining them as a nameless mass, as a resource to be controlled or destroyed in the name of abstract considerations that disregard any respect for life.

41. The totalitarian background of that vision causes us to fear for the future of our planet and of the men and women who inhabit it. It reaffirms my conviction that it is necessary to ensure a sustained process of disarmament which may generate a climate of détente no longer based on nuclear deterrence but on rational criteria that may guarantee survival for us all.

42. We are living at a moment in history that may lead to such détente. The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have shown, through expressions that we appreciate and through some concrete efforts, their willingness to carry on a process of bilateral nuclear disarmament. The summit meeting taking place at this moment between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Moscow only reaffirms this perception. We hope that this new meeting will lay the foundations for entering, as soon as possible, into an agreement on important reductions in the strategic nuclear arsenals and for significant progress in other areas of disarmament on the bilateral agenda.

43. However, the picture is not so promising in the area of multilateral disarmament negotiations. The Conference on Disarmament is still unable to make progress on the three priority items that were established at the first special session on disarmament, in 1978: the cessation of the nuclear-arms race, the prevention of nuclear war and the banning of all nuclear-arms tests. We are not calling for an impossible Utopia, since the negotiation of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons offers a clear example of the feasibility of carrying on a process of disarmament in this multilateral forum when there is the political will towards that end.

44. In relation to this last issue, I should like to confirm before the Assembly that Argentina does not

possess chemical-weapon arsenals and that it will continue to commit all its efforts to the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons.

45. In August 1986, when the Six-Nation Initiative launched the offer to provide co-operation for the verification of compliance with the nuclear-test ban we, the participant countries, had specifically as our goal the offering of a multilateral alternative to the impasse of bilateral negotiations in this area. We believed, and we continue to be convinced, that the multilateralization of disarmament is the best guarantee for a genuine disarmament and the promotion of peace and security for all nations.

46. Imbued with the same spirit as that which inspired that offer, we have considered it timely to suggest the establishment of a multilateral system of verification of disarmament agreements within the framework of the United Nations. We believe that the implementation of this initiative will constitute a concrete step towards strengthening the multilateral system and facilitating the disarmament process.

47. Since the democratic Government took office, Argentina has shown a clear vocation in favour of peace. We have been guided by the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations regarding non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the self-determination of peoples and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Likewise, through our actions we have worked for transparency in our defence policy and in the conduct of foreign affairs, with the goal of neutralizing the appearance of potential points of regional tension. I would like to highlight, among the initiatives adopted with those ends, the conclusion of the treaty with Chile, which ended over a century of territorial disputes between our nations, and the present process of integration with Brazil, which has increased mutual trust between the two countries and which allows the exploration of areas of common interest for the benefit of the peace and security of our nations.

48. In the same spirit of peace and consistently with the provisions of the Charter, my country affirms the need to start a broad dialogue, with an open agenda and without pre-conditions, with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regarding our ongoing dispute with that State over the Malvinas, South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands and the surrounding seas. That dialogue may create conditions which will facilitate the beginning of negotiations, which, I insist, are the only method Argentina can envisage for recovering its sovereignty over those territories.

49. The fostering of transparency in military matters is no less important. Argentina, like some other States Members of the United Nations, annually submits to the Secretariat of the United Nations a report on its military expenses, in accordance with the recommendation of the General Assembly. I believe that such measures cannot be underestimated as concrete contributions towards the prevention of international tension.

50. All of us here today long for a détente consolidated on firm foundations, free of the imbalances caused by the development of relations among a few

countries that possess nuclear weapons. But the future of the world continues to be hostage to the unilateral decisions which those States might adopt. Under these circumstances, it is very hard to imagine anything beyond a temporary reduction of tensions among the principal actors in the international arena.

51. We know very well that the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral forum for negotiation in this area, demands the consensus of all its members to make progress in its tasks. Thus, every agreement reached within it directly commits all the participants in the negotiations carried on. No one can elude the commitments undertaken without suffering serious political and economic damage as a consequence. This undeniable fact is the reason why we are convinced that multilateral negotiations on disarmament are the only guarantee in the consolidation of a lasting *détente*.

52. To conclude, I should like to remember the men who led the United Nations in its early years when very serious international tension prevailed. Those were critical years in which the survival of the multilateral system was decided. Their work was imbued with a deep faith in the principles of the Charter and in the value of committing even one's own life to the task of defending them.

53. Many years have elapsed, and I believe that we are all aware of the crisis that is affecting this multilateral system today, the system which is our own and for which we, and we alone, are responsible. Let us not allow this reality to plunge us into cynicism and indifference. I sincerely hope that, led by the example of those who preceded us and as deserving heirs of the legacy bequeathed to us, we may undertake the essential task of recovering for ever the right to life for all mankind.

54. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the Argentine Republic for the important statement he has just made.

55. The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden, Mr. Ingvar Carlsson. I have great pleasure in welcoming him and inviting him to address the Assembly.

56. Mr. CARLSSON (Sweden): Let me begin, Mr. President, by extending my sincere congratulations to you upon your election as President of this important session of the General Assembly.

57. Since the end of the Second World War a handful of nations have acquired the capability of destroying not only one another but all other nations as well. The deployment of nuclear weapons has placed humanity under a threat unparalleled since the beginning of history. Nuclear arms are not just a more potent category of weapons; they are unique in the sense that their use may threaten the very survival of our civilization and of mankind itself.

58. A major nuclear war could entail the high risk of a global environmental disruption, according to the new United Nations study on the climatic and other global effects of nuclear war.⁸ The risk would be the greatest if large cities and industrial centres in the

northern hemisphere were to be targeted in the summer. The first month could see a reduction in solar energy reaching the Earth of perhaps more than 80 per cent. Beyond one month, agricultural production and the survival of natural ecosystems would be at risk. World food production would be exposed to a severe threat. The study concludes that the direct effects of a major nuclear exchange could kill hundreds of millions of people. The indirect effects could kill billions. Long-term recovery would be uncertain.

59. The very existence of nuclear weapons thus poses a mortal threat to all of us. All countries, therefore, have not only the right but also the duty to take an active part in the efforts to prevent the ultimate disaster—the catastrophe which would follow from a nuclear war. That is why we have assembled here at this time.

60. We come from east and west, north and south. We represent rich countries and poor countries, with different cultural backgrounds and political systems, but we have one thing in common: a longing for peace, security and a better life for our peoples. We have a common responsibility to make every effort to fulfil those aspirations, but the achievement of that end will depend to no small extent on the outcome of another meeting, on the discussions between the two leaders in Moscow during these very days.

61. President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev control the use of the greatest part of the world's nuclear arms. It is no wonder that their actions and their decisions are followed closely by the whole world. It is clearly the joint responsibility of the nuclear Powers to eliminate the nuclear threat and to create the foundation for peace, but lasting peace and security can be built only by the common efforts of the whole of international society. All nations should take responsibility for our common future and all should have the possibility of participating, non-aligned and neutral States as well as members of pacts and alliances.

62. The task must be to find a new basis for international security. Instead of policies deterring war, international co-operation should be directed towards preventing war. If that is to succeed, nuclear weapons and nuclear policies cannot remain a centre-piece of international relations. There should be no more atomic diplomacy. Instead, security must be achieved through international co-operative efforts. Mutual understanding must be broadened. One must learn the basic and legitimate security interests of one's opponent and understand the concerns and fears of the other side.

63. "Common security" was the expression coined in the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, which was led by my predecessor, Olof Palme. It means that in the nuclear age one must find security together with one's adversary. It means that one cannot build a safe world on the threat of mutual annihilation. It means that one cannot attain peace by frightening other countries.

64. In a sense, some important steps towards common security have now actually been taken.

65. 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—which eliminates all their land-based intermediate-range nuclear weapons, was a major breakthrough for nuclear disarmament. Today in Moscow the instruments of ratification of the Treaty have been exchanged. At the time of the commencement of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament that is a welcome and important event.

66. The dialogue between the leaders of the two major nuclear-weapon Powers is fundamental for the opening of the road to new possibilities for disarmament and co-operation on questions of international security. The Moscow meeting and the growing co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union on matters of disarmament and arms control, international security and human rights are signs of hope.

67. While thus welcoming the summit meeting I must state clearly that international security cannot be reduced to a function of relations between two States only, however powerful they may be. It is imperative that all nations come together to organize world affairs and create, in co-operation, a world secure for all. We welcome all States—and indeed the two leading military Powers—to this joint venture.

68. The issue of nuclear disarmament is of concern to all nations and all peoples. The non-nuclear-weapon States must also have a say. That has been the keynote theme of the Six-Nation Initiative since it was launched. The members of the Six-Nation Initiative include the Presidents of Argentina and Mexico, the Prime Ministers of Greece and India, the first President of the United Republic of Tanzania and myself. When the group met at Stockholm in January this year we issued the Stockholm Declaration,⁹ in which we stressed that all States have the responsibility of upholding the rule of law in international relations. Those which possess nuclear weapons have a crucial role. Theirs is the responsibility to live up to the objective of eliminating all of those weapons. The rest of us, the non-nuclear-weapon States, have a legitimate interest in the abolition of these awesome weapons.

69. In the Stockholm Declaration we stressed that there have been signs of a positive development. The INF Treaty is a historic first step, but the remaining nuclear weapons still pose a mortal threat. They must be totally abolished to avoid completely a catastrophe of global dimensions. That is why we called for a speedy agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic arms. That is also why we called for the complete abolishment, without delay, of all tactical nuclear weapons.

70. Military competition must not be introduced into new fields. It is of vital importance to prevent an arms race in outer space. Space belongs to us all. It must not be used for destructive purposes. Agreements to reduce existing nuclear arsenals must be backed up by decisive measures to check the unbridled development of new generations of even more dreadful and sophisticated nuclear weapons. The Stockholm Declaration emphasized that the single

most effective measure would be to end all nuclear-weapon tests, by all States, for all time. An effective test ban must be universally observed. That requires multilateral negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament.

71. We, the participants in the Six-Nation Initiative, have declared our readiness to contribute to working towards the speedy adoption of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Our offer to assist in the monitoring of any halt in nuclear testing still stands. The international community has a vital interest and stake in all major disarmament agreements and in the verification of compliance with them. The reality is that countries have quite different possibilities in terms of national technical means to contribute to efficient monitoring. International verification arrangements are one way to even out such differences. International verification will not replace bilateral or specific verification measures already agreed upon, but it will complement them. Each disarmament and arms control treaty would have its own specific verification arrangements, but the United Nations could and should have a central role in the sphere of disarmament. As the representative body of all nations, it is the most appropriate organization to carry out verification functions on behalf of the international community.

72. The United Nations can provide a number of unique services. It is the most suitable organ to become the central repository of data and information on verification measures. As an impartial body it can assist in certain verification measures by providing observers and experts. The United Nations will also be in a position to provide legal and technical advice on verification of existing and future disarmament agreements.

73. These are but a few examples of possible United Nations functions in this area. A systematic inventory of the functions of a multilateral verification system is needed. We believe that an outline of such a system should be prepared by the Secretary-General. We would welcome a decision of principle at this session, to promote the establishment of an integrated, multilateral verification system within the United Nations.

74. It is my clear conviction that security for the future cannot be built on reliance on nuclear weapons. Human beings are not infallible. Even if political leaders do not intend to resort to the use of nuclear weapons, there is always a risk that as long as such weapons exist they might be used. Therefore, in the long run, the nuclear option must be closed. It is high time to embark on the road that leads to that goal.

75. One important step would be to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons, and I believe that the time has come to explore the possibility of such a step. Some argue that this is a risky proposition. It is my conviction that the risk incurred by forbidding the use of nuclear weapons would be far less than the risks we are now all running because of the nuclear arms race.

76. This whole issue concerns an obligation to past, present and future generations. It has both moral and political dimensions. The question was also raised by

Olof Palme from this rostrum at the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. He stated that any use of nuclear weapons would be deeply reprehensible. He continued:

“One can speak of an international norm which is gradually gaining acceptance. The time has come to consider whether mankind should not begin to study in earnest how this utter moral reprobation can be translated into binding international agreements. We should consider the possibility of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, by international law, as part of a process leading to general and complete disarmament.”¹⁰

77. There are already many rules of international law which limit or prohibit the use of nuclear weapons under certain circumstances, but it is hard to conceive of any military objective that would be worth the enormous human suffering and material destruction that would follow from the use of nuclear weapons.

78. Now that we approach the end of the twentieth century, States and political leaders should be civilized enough to accept the rule of law in international relations. It is time to relegate the era of military violence to the dustbin of history. It is high time, also, because war in the nuclear age is no longer a viable means to a political end.

79. It is greatly encouraging that the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union have jointly declared that nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. I appeal to the leaders of the other nuclear-weapon States to make similar declarations. The rostrum of the General Assembly offers a worthy platform for such important political statements.

80. It is also imperative to continue along this path. It is worth noting that there are already unilateral declarations by the Soviet Union and China renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons. If all nuclear-weapon States were to make similar statements it would, in practice, amount to a prohibition of the use of nuclear arms by them.

81. Commitments not to be the first to use nuclear weapons should then be followed by an international agreement on a total prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Such a treaty has for several years been proposed by India in General Assembly resolutions which have been adopted with overwhelming majorities. It is my Government's opinion that a treaty on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be of great importance, but I also want to stress that such a treaty must be supported by concrete disarmament measures in all fields, including both nuclear and conventional weapons.

82. Political decisions in this direction will require vision and statesmanship on the part of the leaders of the nuclear-weapon Powers. If they live up to this challenge, future generations will praise them for their courage and resolve. If they do not, the rest of us should make it clear that we will continue to insist that they enter the only true road to a safer future—by abolishing the nuclear threat.

83. But there is also a need for a halt to the continued buildup of conventional weapons. Substantial reductions in these arms could liberate enormous resources for peaceful use, for social and economic development. That is also a reason for Sweden to emphasize strongly the need for a conventional balance on a much lower level of armaments. This should be one of the first steps in the new disarmament agenda.

84. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was adopted in this very Hall in this month of June 20 years ago. The Non-Proliferation Treaty has been a success to the extent that there has been no additional officially declared nuclear-weapon State since its conclusion. But the weaknesses of the Treaty remain: in spite of recent progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, it can hardly be said that the nuclear-weapon States have fulfilled their general commitment, the undertaking relating to the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and to nuclear disarmament. To strengthen the efforts at preventing proliferation it is necessary that not only the non-nuclear-weapon States but also the nuclear-weapon Powers live up to their commitments. It is also important that those States which have not yet signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty proceed to do so.

85. A significant naval arms buildup has continued since the Second World War. According to some estimates, the five nuclear-weapon States now possess over 15,000 nuclear weapons earmarked for maritime use, more than half of which are strategic nuclear arms. Naval forces are highly mobile, and problems related to naval armaments and disarmament are thus truly global in nature. When nuclear weapons are deployed at sea, it leads to a geographical dispersion of such weapons that causes concern. In Sweden's view, the time has come to initiate negotiations on naval confidence-building measures, naval disarmament and the modernization of the laws of naval warfare.

86. Of course, measures in the naval field must be considered in their general military context. Asymmetries related to different geographical situations of States must be taken into account. The traditional principle of freedom of navigation must be upheld. Naval confidence-building measures should contribute to increased openness and transparency, improve predictability and stability and reduce the danger of military conflict at sea.

87. The existing bilateral agreements on the prevention of incidents on and over the high seas are successful examples of such measures, and the experience gained from them is indeed encouraging. My Government proposes that at this special session the General Assembly recommend the initiation of negotiations on a corresponding multilateral agreement.

88. The huge number of tactical nuclear arms that are routinely carried around the world by the naval vessels of the nuclear-weapon States in itself constitutes a threat to international security. Additionally, it causes the increasing and legitimate concern of public opinion when nuclear-capable ships call at ports. The secrecy traditionally surrounding the deployment of nuclear weapons at sea does not build confidence. On the contrary, it is confidence-block-

ing. Therefore the nuclear-weapon Powers should abandon their outdated policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence or absence of nuclear weapons on board any particular ship at any particular time. In Sweden we do not permit visiting warships to carry nuclear arms, and we will work internationally for a new policy where assurances against such visits would be given.

89. The large-scale use of chemical weapons against the city of Halabja was a flagrant violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol⁴ and of customary international law prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. Such attacks must be universally condemned.

90. The negotiations taking place in the Conference on Disarmament on a total ban on chemical weapons have reached a final stage. The early conclusion of a convention which bans the production, storing and use of all chemical weapons should now be a high priority. All States should commit themselves to adhere to this treaty, thus eliminating the growing threat from chemical weapons. Time is working against these efforts. The longer the negotiations drag on, the more difficult they may become. It must be an urgent task to conclude these negotiations without delay.

91. The relationship between technology and disarmament is complex. On the one hand, technological change can spur the arms race; on the other hand, high technology can serve disarmament, for example, by improving the means of verification.

92. One challenge before us is to evaluate properly emerging technologies. While there is still time we must find ways and means to regulate developments that might have adverse effects. Let me take one example. There exists a distinct possibility that battlefield laser weapons for anti-personnel use might be developed. In the view of my Government, an anti-personnel laser should be considered a particularly injurious and inhuman weapon. This is an issue of such urgency that it merits speedy action.

93. In the Charter we, the peoples of the United Nations, have agreed to promote peace and security with the least possible diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. How can we then tolerate, year after year, hundreds of millions of people in the world starving while astronomical amounts of money are being wasted on an incessant arms race? How can we tolerate hundreds of millions of fellow human beings being unable to read and write while enormous resources are being poured into ever more sophisticated weapons systems?

94. We have agreed, in the Charter, that we shall employ the international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. A step in that direction was taken at last year's International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which adopted an action programme.

95. At this special session it is incumbent on us to consider how we have honoured our obligations and commitments. We have not done very well. We must move from words to deeds; we must fulfil our

promises. We must make sure that we will finally let development reap the fruits of disarmament.

96. The leaders of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have been widely praised for the Treaty on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—and rightly so. But at a gathering such as this we must also recognize the work done by individuals and groups, by trade unions and churches, by professional groups against nuclear war and many others. All these efforts have been a strong support for many of the proposals of the Six-Nation Initiative. Many of these individuals and groups have explained the dangers of a continued arms race in very expressive terms. We in the Six-Nation Initiative will continue to explain the risks, as we see them, and do our best to voice both the fears and the hopes of the citizens of non-nuclear-weapon States.

97. The INF Treaty was an important first step in an urgent process of disarmament. But more must be done—much more—and very soon. We should appeal to all citizens of the world to do all they can to increase the pressure on the nuclear-weapon States. And we should demand of those States that our interests also be taken into account.

98. Together we can create a true common security.

99. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Sweden for the important statement he has just made.

100. The Assembly will now hear an address by the Prime Minister of Japan. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Noboru Takeshita and inviting him to address the Assembly.

101. Mr. TAKESHITA (Japan):* On behalf of the Government and the people of Japan, I wish to express to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I am confident that, under your impartial guidance and with the benefit of your abundant knowledge and experience at the United Nations, this special session will be particularly fruitful.

102. The President of the United States of America and the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are about to conclude their meeting in Moscow. Those two great countries have tremendous influence over world peace and stability, and I welcome whole-heartedly their earnest efforts to stabilize East-West relations and the steady progress being made in that regard.

103. In various parts of the world, however, wars continue to rage, although in Afghanistan progress is being made towards a comprehensive settlement. In these circumstances, our meeting in this session devoted to disarmament to discuss issues of peace and disarmament is particularly significant. Japan, for its part, will exert its utmost efforts to see that this session produces appropriate guidelines for

*Mr. Takeshita spoke in Japanese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

proceeding effectively with our arms-control and disarmament efforts and establishes significant landmarks towards the strengthening of world peace and stability.

104. First, I wish to address the main topic before us—arms control and disarmament.

105. Japan experienced unspeakable horrors as a result of the atomic bombs that were dropped on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Japanese people solemnly pray that nuclear weapons will ultimately be eliminated so that a nuclear holocaust can never be repeated. Every August services are held in Hiroshima and Nagasaki to mourn those who lost their precious lives in the explosions and to renew our pledge to work for peace. This year will be the first time that I shall attend these services as Prime Minister.

106. The fact that nuclear weapons are stockpiled in such enormous quantities as to be capable of annihilating the human race many times over is a source of profound concern, not only to the people of Japan but to peoples around the world. Japan and other non-nuclear-weapon States acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in the fervent hope that the nuclear-weapon States would in good faith conduct negotiations towards nuclear disarmament in accordance with the relevant provision of that Treaty. Therefore, Japan firmly appeals to the nuclear-weapon States to strive for the realization of nuclear disarmament.

107. The Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles has just come into force with the exchange of the instruments of ratification which took place earlier today, launching for the first time the process of an actual negotiated reduction of existing nuclear weapons. I value this highly as a significant first step towards nuclear disarmament. The United States and the Soviet Union are now actively engaged in negotiations to reduce substantially their strategic nuclear weapons, and I was heartened to learn that they gave added impetus to those negotiations at the summit now under way in Moscow.

108. It is truly epoch-making that the two super-Powers have reached the stage where they are not simply capping, but are actually reducing, their nuclear arsenals. I sincerely welcome this course of events, and earnestly hope that the two sides will continue to make progress in their negotiations.

109. In addition to achieving nuclear disarmament, it is vitally important to prevent an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon States. I warmly welcome the recent accession of Spain to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and Saudi Arabia's recent decision to accede as well. The Treaty constitutes the basis for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and I urge those States which have not yet done so to accede to it at the earliest possible date.

110. Japan has been working strenuously to realize a nuclear test ban, in keeping with the profound desire of its people. In 1984, for example, we

proposed at the Conference on Disarmament a step-by-step approach to decrease gradually the scale of nuclear-test explosions as verification capabilities are improved.

111. I appreciate the intensive negotiations now under way between the United States and the Soviet Union on nuclear testing. Japan very much hopes that those two countries will further step up their negotiations and ratify the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes¹¹ of 1976 and the threshold test ban Treaty¹² of 1974 at the earliest practicable date, so that they can proceed to the next phase of limiting nuclear tests.

112. I believe that those bilateral efforts by the United States and the Soviet Union should be closely co-ordinated with multilateral efforts for disarmament and arms control. The momentum of the positive developments between the United States and the Soviet Union should be fully taken advantage of to promote multilateral efforts towards a nuclear test ban.

113. Possessing advanced techniques in seismology, Japan has been contributing to the development of measures to verify nuclear testing through seismological means. We have devised a project to exchange seismological wave-form data and have been conducting experiments with a number of countries since 1986. I am happy to announce on this occasion that we plan to convene in Japan, jointly with the United Nations, an international conference to share the fruits of these experiments with interested countries, and to invite further participation in the project. I hope that this will serve as a useful step towards the establishment of a global system for the verification of nuclear testing.

114. Over the course of thousands of years, even before nuclear weapons came into being, mankind has waged war repeatedly, and since the Second World War every armed conflict has been fought with non-nuclear weapons. Thus it is clear that arms control and disarmament in non-nuclear weapons are also important endeavours.

115. Chemical weapons, in particular, are weapons of mass destruction which kill and injure people with their potent toxicity. They are also extremely dangerous because they are easy to produce and use. It is profoundly regrettable that these heinous weapons have actually been used, for example, in the conflict between Iran and Iraq, despite the prohibition of their use in war under an international convention. Should their use spread, the peace and security of the world would be seriously jeopardized. In order to prevent totally the use of these weapons, it is essential that their stockpiling and production be prohibited and, indeed, that they be eliminated globally. I therefore believe that every effort should continue to be made in the Conference on Disarmament to conclude the convention on a global ban of chemical weapons at the earliest possible date. Japan, for its part, is determined to continue its utmost efforts for the early conclusion of the convention and the establishment of an international organization to implement the elimination of these weapons.

116. Consultations are under way in Europe towards the launching of negotiations on conventional arms control. I hope that these efforts will lead to an early start of the negotiations and that tangible progress will be made towards the objective of redressing imbalances in conventional weapons in Europe.

117. In my view, it is essential to consider the following four points in the process of arms control and disarmament.

118. The first is deterrence and balance. Arms control and disarmament should contribute to the enhancement of the security of the parties concerned and thus to the peace and stability of the world. This should be done by lowering the level of armaments in a balanced manner, while maintaining deterrence and taking into account the overall balance between all weapons systems.

119. The second is regional characteristics. In proceeding with arms control and disarmament measures in a specific region, the geopolitical conditions prevailing in the region and the impact of such measures on other regions should be fully taken into account.

120. The third is transparency of military information. For the promotion of arms control and disarmament, it is important to increase the transparency of basic military data, such as those relating to military budgets. As information concerning the armaments possessed by adversaries becomes more transparent, there can be greater mutual confidence in promoting arms control and disarmament negotiations, which in turn will make possible more objective and appropriate responses.

121. The fourth is effective verification. Effective verification systems must be agreed upon to ensure that arms control and disarmament agreements are strictly observed. Of course, the methods and arrangements for verification will vary, according to the particular agreements. The most appropriate verification system for each agreement should be sought in the light of the specific objective it is intended to serve.

122. Thus far, I have expressed my views on arms control and disarmament. I should like next to state my basic ideas concerning issues of peace.

123. Peace, together with freedom and prosperity, is the supreme aspiration of mankind. The United Nations was founded 43 years ago to respond to this ardent desire of peoples throughout the world. Since then, however, even though there has been no world war, confrontations and tensions between the East and the West have persisted, and the world has never been free from conflict. Neither freedom nor prosperity prevails throughout the world. I am deeply pained as I think of the many precious lives that are being lost even at this very moment in the conflicts and confrontations taking place in various parts of the world.

124. In Asia, where Japan is located, it is important to solve the Northern Territories issue between Japan and the Soviet Union. Continuous efforts are also

called for on the part of the parties concerned towards the easing of tensions in the Korean Peninsula and the settlement of the Kampuchean problem. Furthermore, Japan strongly hopes that this year the Olympic Games in Seoul will be carried out peacefully and successfully, so that they may truly be a festival of peace. We shall spare no effort to this end.

125. I believe that, together with the promotion of arms control and disarmament, these efforts to ease political tensions among States and to foster mutual trust are indispensable for the peace and stability of the world.

126. After the Second World War, Japan adopted a Constitution which enshrines the lofty ideals of peace and freedom and firmly committed itself to the cause of peace, resolving not to become a military Power again. Charting this course, while ensuring the economic well-being of its people, is a new but worthy experiment in the history of mankind, and Japan is steadfastly committed to it. We continue to maintain, as a matter of national policy declared at home and abroad, the three non-nuclear principles of not possessing nuclear weapons, not producing them and not permitting their introduction into Japan.

127. As the Japanese people struggled to recover from the war and reconstruct their nation, they resolved to make positive contributions towards the peace and prosperity of the world. As part of this resolve, Japan is extending economic assistance to developing countries. I believe that our efforts in this regard have contributed not only to the economic and social development of these countries but also to the stability of the regions concerned.

128. I am fully aware that the increase in Japan's national strength in recent years has brought with it ever-increasing responsibilities in the promotion of world peace and prosperity and the enrichment of culture for people everywhere. Based on this perception, since assuming the office of Prime Minister, I have upheld the building of a "Japan contributing to the world" as a primary goal of my cabinet, and am endeavouring to ensure that our international responsibilities are fulfilled more effectively than ever before.

129. In the last seven months since I came into office I have visited a number of countries and have exchanged views with their leaders. On those occasions I enunciated the basic thrust of our foreign policy, which is dedicated to the building of a "Japan contributing to the world". During my recent visit to the United Kingdom, I announced the new idea of an "international co-operation initiative," which reflects my thoughts on how to implement this basic policy. The initiative comprises three pillars, namely: the strengthening of co-operation to achieve peace, the promotion of international cultural exchange and the expansion of Japan's official development assistance.

130. On the occasion of this special session devoted to disarmament, which is a forum for the discussion of peace, I should like to elaborate on the first of the three pillars I have just mentioned.

131. Since the end of the Second World War, the co-operation with a number of countries and the untiring efforts of the Japanese people themselves have made it possible for Japan to enjoy peace, to rebuild the nation and improve the life of its people. We realize, however, that not all States have been able to enjoy peace. Given its fundamental commitment to peace, Japan should make every possible effort to contribute to the realization of a peaceful world, which is the ardent desire of all mankind. Indeed, I am convinced that this is the mission with which Japan is entrusted today. I intend to promote actively "co-operation to achieve peace" in the following five areas:

132. The first is in diplomatic efforts to establish a firm foundation for peace. In order to maintain international peace and stability, it is essential to establish international relations in which confrontations or conflicts of interest between States can be resolved in a just and lasting manner without undermining the peace of the region or of the world. Japan will actively pursue its diplomatic efforts, such as those aimed at strengthening political dialogue and co-operation through international conferences, so as to foster the basic conditions for the restoration of mutual trust and harmony among States.

133. With regard to the conflict between Iran and Iraq, Japan has on its own made continuous efforts over the past five years to foster an environment conducive to peace by engaging in political dialogue with the two sides. Moreover, Japan continues to give its full support to the mediation efforts of the Secretary-General for the early implementation of Security Council resolution 598 (1987). I strongly hope those efforts will bear fruit at the earliest date with the co-operation of the countries concerned.

134. As for the issues of peace in the Middle East, my Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Sousuke Uno, is preparing to visit the region in order to explore, through a frank exchange of views with the leaders of the States concerned, how Japan can best contribute to the promotion of the peace process.

135. On Kampuchea, I intend to support, to the best of my ability, the peace efforts for national reconciliation of Prince Norodom Sihanouk. I should like on this occasion to appeal to other countries likewise to support those efforts in order to ensure that they are fruitful.

136. The second dimension of "co-operation to achieve peace" comprises international efforts to prevent conflicts. It is the task of the international community as a whole to prevent threats to world peace and stability, including conflicts among States. Japan, for its part, will co-operate even more actively with international efforts to address this problem. The United Nations has a particularly significant role to play in preventing conflicts, as reflected in the declaration on the prevention of conflicts which will be adopted by the General Assembly next autumn. Japan will step up its assistance to the activities of the United Nations in this field.

137. The third dimension is participation in international efforts for the peaceful settlement of disputes. When peace is shattered and an armed conflict

occurs, Japan will take an active part in United Nations and other international efforts towards achieving an early cease-fire and a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Indeed, once a cease-fire has been achieved through such international efforts and once peace-keeping activities under United Nations and other auspices are under way, it has been Japan's practice actively to extend financial co-operation to these activities.

138. Co-operation with these peace-keeping activities is also envisaged in Japan's recent special contribution of \$20 million to the United Nations, of which a sum of \$5 million is specifically allotted to United Nations activities on the Afghanistan issue. With a view to furthering "co-operation to achieve peace", I intend also to consider dispatching personnel in fields which are appropriate to Japan, such as the supervision of elections, transportation, communication and medical services.

139. Moreover, I believe that, for the purpose of preventing conflicts or achieving their peaceful settlement, it is essential to establish a communications network so that information can be transmitted between the Secretary-General and the countries concerned without delay.

140. The strengthening of assistance to refugees is the fourth area of co-operation for peace. Resulting directly or indirectly from conflicts in various parts of the world, the problem of refugees continues to be a source of concern. Assistance to refugees is necessary not only for humanitarian reasons but also for the purpose of bringing about the genuine settlement of conflicts. Japan will further increase its assistance bilaterally as well as multilaterally through international organizations such as the United Nations. I should like to add that Japan is ready to contribute, for example, through substantial financial assistance, to international efforts towards the voluntary repatriation of Afghan refugees.

141. Positive contributions for reconstruction represent the fifth area of co-operation. Japan is ready to contribute vigorously to international co-operation efforts towards reconstruction once a conflict is peacefully resolved. For this purpose, Japan intends to make available the experience and enthusiasm of its people, in terms of personnel as well as financial resources.

142. As science and technology have progressed, mankind has extended its activities from land to sea, to air, and recently to outer space. Viewing the earth from outer space, it becomes dramatically clear that the earth is the common and irreplaceable home of all mankind. We owe it to posterity to preserve this planet Earth as a truly safe and comfortable homeland for all peoples. We must save it from annihilation by weapons of mass destruction and free it from incessant armed conflict and political confrontation. No progress can be made through discord and confrontation; rather, it is only through trust and co-operation that the future of mankind can be ensured.

143. Now, it behoves us more than ever before to reaffirm peace as the common aspiration of mankind. Upholding our lofty ideals, we must continue to work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons

and general and complete disarmament, which are mankind's ultimate objectives. I believe we should rededicate ourselves to the realization of these ideals by striving to settle conflicts peacefully, by avoiding confrontation and by steadily implementing arms control and disarmament measures.

144. It is the duty of our generation to do our utmost to foster progress and the well-being of all mankind. Let us strive to surmount every obstacle so that we may co-operate with one another to build a truly prosperous, peaceful and harmonious world, free from conflict, starvation and disease.

145. It is with this earnest appeal, Mr. President, that I conclude my remarks today.

146. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of Japan for the important statement he has just made.

147. Mr. GARCÍA-VELASCO (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, I should like to begin my statement by conveying to you the most sincere congratulations of the Government of Ecuador on your well-deserved election as President of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

148. If we bear in mind that, as stated in the Charter of the United Nations, the peoples and not only the Governments expressed their determination to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", we can understand why, virtually from the moment of its establishment, the United Nations has devoted its best efforts to the vital task of disarmament, in order to give effect to its fundamental purpose of ensuring the maintenance of international peace and security.

149. The phenomenon of the arms buildup is largely the result of the presence or persistence of conflicts, disputes, tensions and distrust which threaten peace or disrupt peace. Therefore, the treatment of disarmament issues cannot avoid the study and application of peaceful methods for the resolution of all kinds of international situations or disputes either through organs of the United Nations or through the activities of the various regional organizations or by other methods chosen by the parties.

150. Co-operation in the peaceful settlement of the problems that divide them is an obligation incumbent on all States, and that simply means faithful compliance with one of the basic mandates of the Charter, which provides for the use of peaceful methods, "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

151. Within this context are the statements made by His Holiness Pope John Paul II during his recent tour of several South American countries to the effect that it is necessary to find appropriate solutions for the border problems that still exist among Latin American countries. The authoritative voice of the Pontiff of the Catholic Church constitutes an appeal of the greatest importance to the Governments of the

region to overcome the differences that weaken the solidarity and co-operation among them for the full development of their peoples.

152. Solid foundations for international peace and trust will be built by removing the spectre of the arms buildup and armed conflicts, through real disarmament measures involving all protagonists and, at the same time, by improving and consolidating the instruments available to the international organizations for co-operating in the peaceful settlement of existing disputes between their member States.

153. It is to be hoped that from this special session of the General Assembly measures will emerge that will satisfy that just and urgent aspiration of all peoples.

154. Achievement of the ideal of general and complete disarmament is certainly one of the most vital wishes of mankind as we near the end of this twentieth century. With growing anxiety, the peoples of the Earth have observed the uncontrolled arms race that has been unleashed during the past four decades, and the ominous lesson of the Second World War has failed to limit, let alone abolish, the production and distribution of the most sophisticated means of death and destruction.

155. The United Nations has spared no effort in confronting this grave danger and seeking means of averting it. The countless resolutions adopted by the General Assembly year after year at regular sessions, as well as at special sessions on disarmament, bear witness to its continued interest in this vital issue.

156. In regard to a problem in which the very survival of mankind and of civilization are at stake, and one which affects States and their security interests, there cannot be active parties and passive parties, because disarmament cannot leave anyone indifferent. While the responsibility of the super-Powers may be greater, it is true that in decisions concerning the future of mankind there are no guardian angels to guide us but only actors who wish to play their roles and fulfil their responsibilities in a drama directly concerning them.

157. For that reason Ecuador believes that the United Nations should continue to be the appropriate forum for examining and discussing all questions relating to disarmament. Convinced that the threat or use of force should be outlawed in international relations and that all disputes between nations can and should be resolved by peaceful means as contemplated in international law and the Charter of the United Nations, Ecuador is faithful to the ideal of general and complete disarmament under strict control, which, in order to be effective, must be universal and also must make use of all the techniques made available by modern science. The so-called collateral or partial control measures are not and cannot be an end in themselves but are only steps towards the great goal of general and complete disarmament, the only goal to which mankind can dedicate itself in order to avoid annihilation and self-destruction.

158. Among disarmament measures, Ecuador believes that priority should be given to the following: first, elimination and non-proliferation of nuclear

weapons and destruction or effective limitation of the means of delivery for such weapons; secondly, a complete ban on all types of nuclear testing; thirdly, a complete ban on the testing or production of new weapons of mass destruction, including chemical, biological, radiological and meteorological; fourthly, a substantial limitation of conventional armament; and fifthly, the reallocation to development of the resources thus released.

159. From the war of total extermination practised by the peoples of antiquity, mankind seems to be tragically proceeding to its point of departure, a future total war of extermination, which has ceased to be fiction and has become a terribly real prospect in view of the existence of nuclear devices with the power of apocalyptic destruction, which began in the hands of one Power, then passed into the hands of five others, and before the end of this century might be in the hands of at least twenty countries.

160. Therefore, to move forward along the path of creating trust and security in the troubled world in which we live, it would be necessary in the first place for the nuclear Powers to reaffirm definitively their political decision to proceed to mutual, gradual and substantial reductions of their nuclear arsenals with a view to their complete elimination by the year 2000, which would enable the men, women and children of every latitude to live free from the fear of nuclear holocaust.

161. An encouraging step was taken by the United States and the Soviet Union on 8 December 1987 with the signature of the INF Treaty, which was recently ratified. Even more auspicious are the negotiations at present being carried out in Geneva between the two Powers with a view to reducing their strategic nuclear arsenals by 50 per cent.

162. Ecuador notes this process with hope, and we strongly urge the parties involved to make every effort to bring about its prompt and satisfactory conclusion, as an important step towards the total elimination of those instruments of mass destruction. However, until that time comes, it is urgent that, by means of a treaty, every nuclear State should formally commit itself, in the event of conflict, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against another, particularly against a non-nuclear country.

163. To eliminate the means of mass destruction from the face of the Earth, it is urgent that there be a complete prohibition of all testing of nuclear devices, which only serve to refine and produce new weapons, while they poison the Earth's environment and damage the health and the lives of large segments of humanity. Ecuador formally appeals to all the Powers that have conducted and are conducting nuclear tests to agree as soon as possible on their complete prohibition not only in the atmosphere, on the seabed and in outer space, as contemplated in existing treaties, but also in the soil and sub-soil of our planet.

164. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace is a healthy and valuable contribution to world disarmament. Ecuador resolutely supports their creation and possible expansion. The Treaty of Tlatelolco,¹³ to which Ecuador is a party, demonstrated Latin America's rejection of

nuclear weapons and the region's adherence to its aspirations of peace. Similarly, the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Governments of the Organization of African Unity in 1964, is one of several important regional initiatives to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Ecuador enthusiastically supported the declaration of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic [*resolution 41/11*], a concept which we hope will spread to other marine environments.

165. But peace, if it is to be indivisible, must extend also to outer space.

166. Space law is, without a doubt, the sphere where science has shown the most extraordinary creative capacity, and technology has used that capacity to give it practical content. However, it is necessary that jurists make their innovative contributions as well to ensure the universal necessity to maintain outer space as a dimension of peace and to enable its exploration and use to redound to the benefit of all mankind.

167. With respect to exploration, it is very urgent to prevent an arms race into outer space because once these new systems of weapons become a part of national arsenals, it will become very difficult to eliminate them.

168. As regards utilization, it should be pointed out that space law must be based upon international co-operation, taking into consideration primarily the concepts of common interest, the common heritage of mankind and the principle of equity, which must complement the ideas of freedom and equality if justice is to be effective.

169. If nuclear disarmament and elimination of nuclear tests are primarily the responsibility of the Powers that possess such weapons, it is equally true that responsibility is shared for the urgent elimination of all chemical, biological, radiological or meteorological weapons. Those weapons with ignoble and inhuman characteristics which threaten equally the belligerents and the helpless civilian population, must be the subject of a ban without reservations or limitations.

170. The prohibition of nuclear tests must necessarily be accompanied by an obligation not to develop and produce new weapons of mass destruction. Not to do this would be unardonably unfair because we would be closing one door while opening another in favour of a handful of Powers who could thus ensure the position of hegemony which they now enjoy because of the nuclear arsenals and technology they possess.

171. The convention that should be concluded on prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction will have the support of Ecuador.

172. The arms race in the sphere of so-called conventional weapons is taking on a gravity that cannot be underestimated. On the contrary, it seems to constitute a growing and uncontrolled danger to the fragile peace and security of the world, and a

treaty on its reduction and limitation is becoming increasingly urgent.

173. Recent reputable publications provide the following alarming statistics: at present, conventional weapons and forces constitute more than 80 per cent of total military expenditure world-wide, which is about \$1,000 billion per year; from 1945 to date there have been approximately 150 armed conflicts, local or international, in various parts of the planet, and the victims total approximately 30 million people.

174. Today, we see formal wars and minor armed conflicts that can be prolonged and, possibly, spread due to the stockpiling and dissemination of these so-called conventional weapons, which are increasingly sophisticated, abundant and deadly.

175. The sale of weapons, in addition to demonstrating that worship of the golden calf is stronger than any moral or humanitarian reason, contains an obvious contradiction. On the one hand the developed countries that sell weapons are urging the developing countries to devote their efforts to promoting human rights and socio-economic plans and programmes for the benefit of the masses of the people while, at the same time, substantial financial resources are devoted to the supply of war *matériel* on the basis of national security needs they themselves have created by establishing imbalances between the military arsenals of neighbouring States in a single region.

176. These tragic realities are repugnant to mankind's conscience and call for urgent solutions by the international community.

177. As in the struggle against drugs producers and consumers have a shared responsibility, so in the problem of conventional disarmament, users and producers have similar responsibilities. In both cases, the trade amounts to many billions of dollars. Both affect the life and health of peoples, but the only ones who receive massive profits are the dealers.

178. It is not possible to promote development and programmes of economic and social improvement in developing countries and, at the same time, encourage the investment of substantial and sometimes excessive resources in the acquisition of military *matériel* that contributes only to impoverishment and instability. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, reiterated the necessity that the vast sums devoted by the world to the arms buildup be diminished and made to serve the development of those peoples that so sorely need it.

179. Ecuador fully agrees with the Final Document of that Conference,⁷ although we understand that it is not easy to establish a precise relationship between possibilities for global disarmament and the application to development of the resulting savings. For this it would be necessary to create complex financial mechanisms for which the United Nations, through UNDP, might provide the appropriate administrative machinery.

180. Weapons, it has been said, are the enemy of development. To eliminate that enemy, it is necessary first to achieve nuclear disarmament and, concomitantly, a balanced and gradual reduction in conventional weapons through control mechanisms that might be agreed upon within the United Nations, in regional forums, or bilaterally, as the case may be.

181. It is clear that States, in exercise of their sovereignty, must possess the necessary weapons to maintain and protect their security. But that sovereign right does not excuse excesses and the over-arming that automatically imperil international peace and increase poverty.

182. It would seem that in this untrammelled arms race, we are disregarding what constitutes a painful reality, especially in the developing countries, that the threat to national security today is primarily internal: it is the threat of hunger, unemployment, the concentration of land and wealth in a few hands or in large corporations, and the lack of equal opportunity for education, health and housing. It is necessary at this time for the energies and resources devoted to this absurd arms race to be reallocated for the benefit and well-being of mankind.

183. If the nuclear Powers are, to a great extent, responsible for the spiralling arms buildup, it is up to them to release a part of those large resources to promote the establishment of better living conditions in all countries, and especially in the developing countries. Help to them is not, and should not be, a humanitarian or moral practice but a true duty of international co-operation, one which is not being fulfilled when, for every dollar spent on arms, only a few cents are earmarked for satisfying the legitimate development aspirations of the 68 per cent of the population of the world that makes up the so-called third world.

184. Moreover, if we wish to be sincere, we must appeal to reason so that the developing countries, saturated with social tensions and demands, can abandon the arms race and return to the inalterable virtues of the law.

185. As regards regional disarmament, Ecuador reaffirms its commitment to support the building of a permanent order of peace and co-operation that will make possible the effective limitation of weapons and put an end to their acquisition for offensive, warlike purposes, in accordance with the Declaration of Ayacucho of 1974. The United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America, which was established in 1987, is called to fulfil an important role in this our common purpose of ensuring that links within Latin America may be inscribed within the framework of concord, solidarity and a concerted effort as an indispensable basis for regional unity. Ecuador will give its resolute co-operation in the fulfilment of that and other noble purposes pursued by the Centre.

186. My country trusts that the moral and intellectual attributes of man as a rational being will enable him to preserve his civilization and the cultural heritage accumulated over the centuries, rejecting the horrors of nuclear war. We trust also that States will

be equal to the task of maintaining relations that reject war and force as the means of creating, changing or suppressing rights. Ecuador's irrevocable and traditional dedication to peace leads us to reaffirm our support for the United Nations, our common instrument for ensuring universal peace. Ecuador is convinced of the imperative need to persevere in the noble endeavour of reducing, and if possible definitively eliminating, instruments of death, as a tribute to the priceless gift of life.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 944, No. 13445).

²Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitations of Strategic Offensive Arms (see CD/53/Appendix III/vol. I, document CD/28).

³United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 944, No. 13446.

⁴Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Biological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925 (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

⁵See A/41/697, annex, Part I, para. 36.

⁶A/42/427, annex.

⁷United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.1X.8.

⁸A/43/351, annex.

⁹A/43/125, annex.

¹⁰See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 40th meeting, para. 215.

¹¹*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 27*, vol. II, annex III, document CCD/496.

¹²Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests (*ibid.*, *Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 27*, annex II, sect. 13, document CCD/431).

¹³Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068).