

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**13th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 8 June 1988,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Legwaila
(Botswana), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. DE MOURA (Angola):* The President's conduct of the forty-second session of the General Assembly, his devotion to the cause of peace and disarmament and the firmness with which we see him presiding over our work allow us to have confidence in the success of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Angolan delegation assures the President of the support necessary for the performance of his duties.

2. This special session of the General Assembly is taking place at a time when definite hopes are beginning to emerge for the survival of mankind. In fact, just when we were beginning this session the leaders of the Soviet Union and of the United States were meeting in Moscow, at their fourth summit meeting, to continue the steps undertaken for reduction of the nuclear arsenals of both countries. This fact is in itself of major significance for the international community. The idea that military supremacy as an instrument of international relations has to be permanently condemned is becoming firmer and firmer. It is up to us, then, to recognize the steps taken thus far in these bilateral efforts, steps that mark the beginning of a new era for a better and safer world, for the present and future generations.

3. In support of this spirit of negotiation, leading to the elimination of nuclear and other weapons, the Organization of African Unity [OAU] and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which the People's Republic of Angola is a member State, produced statements that reflect our points of view as countries struggling for a just and lasting peace. We can thus say that no country rejoices more than does Angola in the achievement of an international agreement that will eliminate the possibility of a nuclear conflict and direct us irreversibly towards a process of total and complete disarmament, so that international peace and security will be strengthened.

4. More than one billion dollars are being spent each year in the arms race, while in the countries of

the so-called third world or developing countries nearly one billion people live in poverty and squalor; over 700 million human beings suffer from under-nourishment; almost 900 million people are illiterate in the third world, with the aggravating factor that nearly one and a half billion people are suffering from diseases that would be curable if they had access to medical services and medicaments. Thus, the arms race doubly affects the developing countries, because of the accumulation of ever-more-sophisticated weapons and because of the fact that the financial resources for the manufacture of those weapons come from the same national sources, rendering insignificant the funds channeled to the economic and social development of our countries. That is why some of our countries repeatedly reaffirm the close relationship that exists between disarmament and development. That is also why we support the recommendation for the adoption of drastic measures for disarmament, with the ultimate goal not only of guaranteeing peaceful coexistence among peoples but also of releasing resources for development.

5. At this third session the utmost effort must then be made to consider the two aspects of peace. Application of the action programme¹ approved by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, must be encouraged. We are convinced that without resources for development there can be no peace. That is a fact that the United Nations cannot underestimate.

6. This special session must also reaffirm the validity of the Final Document that we approved at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament [resolution S-10/2], as well as the objectives, principles and priorities established there. The need to adopt practical measures to avoid the outbreak of a nuclear war, the urgency of ending nuclear-weapon tests and the importance of stopping the arms race continue to be priority tasks that we cannot shirk. Nuclear weapons, by their very nature, are instruments for the annihilation of the human species. It is recognized that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. It is thus necessary for the producers and possessors of those weapons to commit themselves here and to proclaim universally that they will not use these weapons and that the funds for their manufacture will henceforth be invested in social, economic and scientific projects for the benefit of those in the world who have directly or indirectly suffered from the negative effects of every type of weapon of mass destruction.

7. It is necessary to add to these priorities, in the light of recent events, the need to take concrete steps

*Mr. De Moura spoke in Portuguese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space. The dangers of the militarization of space are obvious; it is necessary for us to strive to stop a new scenario of spiralling armaments into the cosmos, the common heritage of mankind, whose use must be exclusively reserved for peaceful purposes.

8. Another area that also concerns us in Angola is that of chemical weapons. We suspect, and we now charge, that chemical gases have been used in southern Angola by the racist invaders of the Pretoria régime. We favour the efforts now under way for the conclusion of an international convention to prohibit the use of chemical weapons.

9. We believe that the establishment of fair and equitable international relations, based on peaceful coexistence and on confidence between States and the development of co-operation founded on mutual interests, does not have to be subordinated to ideological contradictions nor to the level of technical or scientific development that divides countries into developed or underdeveloped categories. This has also been recognized, furthermore, by the international community and is reflected in the Final Document approved in 1978 at the first special session on disarmament.

10. The arms race is incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and is against the sovereignty of peoples. The use of force in relations between States, the permanence of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in the southern part of the African continent and the existence of various centres of tension that we in the third world know can be attributed only to the military strength that some Western countries accord the racist régime of Pretoria and the Zionist régime of Israel.

11. In fact, the aggressive policy of the *apartheid* régime and the proven acquisition by that régime of the technological capacity for the production of its own nuclear weapons constitute a threat to the countries of southern Africa and to international peace and security. In view of that reality, it is logical that we should not stand idly by. The Assembly will therefore have to declare itself in favour of concrete measures to put an end to the real danger that the *apartheid* régime represents and to condemn the countries that afford it that technological capacity.

12. The Final Document adopted in 1978 states in paragraph 12:

“the massive accumulation of armaments and the acquisition of armaments technology by racist régimes, as well as their possible acquisition of nuclear weapons, present a challenging and increasingly dangerous obstacle to a world community faced with the urgent need to disarm.”

It is therefore imperative that practical measures be implemented for an embargo on arms and technologies destined for the racists and that mandatory sanctions be applied against that régime, which continues to occupy Namibia, to oppress more than 25 million of its black citizens and to attack and destabilize the front-line States in general, and Mozambique and Angola in particular.

13. In the meetings of the Council of Ministers and the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 19 to 28 May 1988, as well as in the special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 26 to 30 May, the hope was expressed that this session would mark the beginning of tangible results for disarmament and international peace. The clear position of African and non-aligned countries, consolidated in the final documents of Addis Ababa and Havana, is a valuable contribution to the work of this third special session.

14. We are not direct participants in the arms race, nor do we possess offensive weapons. But we are not mere spectators to the controversy between the so-called developed countries that possess nuclear weapons. We share in the search for decisions and agreements on general and complete disarmament to guarantee world peace. Thus, Angola, in spite of the hostility of the *apartheid* régime, expressed in direct or indirect aggression or in the occupation to this day of various parts of Angolan territory, has taken a flexible position in the search for fair, negotiated solutions which will bring general peace to southern Africa, guarantee the security and respect for the sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola and facilitate the independence of Namibia on the basis of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), without extraneous considerations.

15. Four years after the adoption of Security Council resolution 435 (1978), in a declaration of 4 February 1982 signed by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Cuba and Angola, Angola published the conditions that would contribute to a negotiated solution of the conflict in southern Africa.

16. On 19 March and 17 November 1984 a declaration, signed by Presidents José Eduardo dos Santos and Fidel Castro, and a platform for general negotiations for peace in Angola and the independence of Namibia were produced. In the first quarter of 1988 Angola and Cuba sent to South Africa, through the United States of America, in its capacity as intermediary, a proposed agreement and timetable for the gradual withdrawal of Cuban military personnel from Angola after the South Africans withdraw from the portions of Angola they still occupy and after they implement resolution 435 (1978) for the independence of Namibia, when South Africa and the United States cease interference in the internal affairs of Angola through the manifold support they give to UNITA² and, finally, after there are international guarantees for the security of Angola.

17. As is evident, Angola has always presented constructive proposals which, if accepted, would have greatly contributed to the elimination of the so-called conflict in southern Africa, the cause of which is the existence of *apartheid*, considered a crime against mankind and Public Enemy No. 1 of Africa. The continuation of regional tension and the aggressiveness of Pretoria is also the responsibility of certain Western allies which transfer military technological capacity to it instead of abiding by the relevant resolutions of the international community.

preferring the policy of aggression against the sovereign States of the region.

18. Zambia, Zimbabwe, Botswana, Mozambique, Lesotho and various other countries of southern Africa are subject to threats, attacks and destabilization by Pretoria—trained bandits who betray their own people. We must choose, once and for all, either co-operation for peace and development on the basis of the rules of international law, or unprecedented confrontation with over 100 million people in southern Africa.

19. Angola, in spite of being militarily stronger than ever, does not pursue war as a goal. Angola is defending itself within its own borders from external aggression, and in spite of the fact that, in a war of aggression like the one from which we are suffering, we cannot give assurances of conduct, we have never invoked the right of pursuit beyond borders. The Cuban presence is not a threat to the countries of the region. The struggle for peaceful coexistence is a permanent objective of the foreign policy of the People's Republic of Angola. We are part of the international community that demands peace and aspires to development.

20. We are included in the membership of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. We are Africans; we are in southern Africa. Our people desire peace. Our children, women and the elderly who overcame five centuries of colonialism and who defeated the racist militarist venture at Cangambe and at Cuito Canavale say "No" to the nuclear or other destructive threats to the human species. It is within this context that we are negotiating and are placing on the table in London proposals which, if honestly considered in the next round of talks, will contribute to the climate of moderation and understanding reaffirmed at the recent Moscow summit. The place and time of these talks are now under consideration. As far as we are concerned, we shall always be in accord with those who contribute to a new order in international relations.

21. Until then, the struggle continues; victory is sure.

22. Mr. FADZIL CHE WAN (Malaysia): I should like at the outset to congratulate Mr. Florin on his election as President of the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly. His statesmanship and even-handed conduct of the Assembly's deliberations last fall contributed to a very successful session, and we are confident that with him presiding this special session will also conclude successfully. May I also convey our felicitations to the other officers upon their election.

23. Our meeting here is the third in a series of special sessions devoted exclusively to the all-important issue of disarmament. But despite the recognition of the wastefulness, the drain and the potential obliteration of the world that the arms race and the runaway military expenditures represent, and despite the realization of the urgent need to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the world is no nearer to an agreement. On the contrary, global military expenditures in 1987 recorded an estimated all-time high of \$1.8 million a minute.

24. It is incomprehensible that the international community has still been unable to galvanize the necessary political will to take collective action in the face of its own potential annihilation. The whole world is replete with the instruments of war—an oversupply of the power to kill in both conventional and nuclear weapons. While it is true that the two super-Powers expend huge sums to build up their weapons of mass destruction, developing countries also are guilty of excessive military expenditures.

25. It has been estimated that the global arms race has absorbed more than \$15,000 billion of the world's wealth since 1960. In contrast, the world's most outstanding showpiece of reconstruction and development—that is, the rehabilitation of Europe after the Second World War, otherwise known as the Marshall Plan—utilized a minuscule \$23 billion at that time.

26. Even more startling are the following statistics. The United States and the Soviet Union together spend about \$1.5 billion a day on military defence. Yet the United States ranks eighteenth among all nations in infant mortality, and the Soviet Union forty-sixth. Developing countries spend about four times as much on arms as on health care. Yet, hundreds of millions of people in those countries are hungry, and 20 per cent of their young die before their fifth birthday.

27. I have chosen these figures as a basis for comparison, to underline the critical choice before us between the imperatives of development and the spiraling costs of armament.

28. It is undeniable that the super-Powers have a key and crucial role to play in bringing about arms control and disarmament. The important agreement concluded on 8 December 1987 to eliminate an entire category of nuclear forces, 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—should provide a strong impetus for further success in their continuing efforts to effect a 50 per cent reduction in their strategic nuclear weapons. The ratification of the INF Treaty at the recently concluded summit meeting in Moscow between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev is indeed a welcome event. It is our hope that the momentum generated at the summit meeting will make it possible for the two super-Powers to achieve an early conclusion of their negotiations on a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing, for therein lies the key to the cessation of the nuclear arms race. It is therefore important that the present climate be sustained and that confidence-building efforts be more vigorously pursued to ensure progress in their bilateral talks.

29. While recognizing the important contribution and responsibility of the two super-Powers as well as that of the other nuclear Powers, we must also emphasize the need for a multilateral approach to disarmament within the framework of the United Nations. As members of the international community we must support and encourage this development by getting involved in the urgent task of disarmament.

30. The existing United Nations disarmament machinery has made valuable contributions in multilateral deliberations on various aspects of disarmament. The Department for Disarmament Affairs has an important role in lending support to all components of the Organization's disarmament machinery in the pursuit of their aims. In this regard, Malaysia expresses its appreciation and support for the positive contribution of the Disarmament Commission. The Commission's recommendations continue to serve as the central basis of international endeavours for multilateral consensus on many vital disarmament questions. The work of UNIDIR is also appreciated as it seeks to promote the cause of disarmament through research and the provision of useful data and information.

31. The Conference on Disarmament, entrusted with the task of negotiation on agreements aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control, has been seized of very serious disarmament issues. It is my delegation's hope that the Conference will be able to achieve progress in its negotiations on many of the issues before it. We therefore urge that support be given by the highest level of Government to the Conference on Disarmament so that it can become the focus of a continuing multilateral effort in the disarmament process.

32. Malaysia views the holding of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as a timely occasion to underline further the necessity of bringing about a multilateral approach to the question of disarmament. The Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which affirmed the importance and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the disarmament process, is as valid today as when it was adopted in 1978 and should therefore be upheld. It is my delegation's hope that this special session will be able to agree on practical and concrete measures as a follow-up to the principles and priorities established in the Final Document.

33. Consistent with its stand on disarmament, Malaysia has always given and will continue to give its full support to international efforts for ending the nuclear arms race, reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons and concluding a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. With equal fervour Malaysia joins the international community in working for the elimination of all other weapons of mass destruction, be they on land, in the sea or in outer space.

34. Indeed, the arms race and military competition in outer space must be prevented. Outer space belongs to all mankind, and the international community has a vital stake in ensuring that it is used only for peaceful purposes.

35. Chemical weapons have emerged as an increasingly threatening aspect of the arms race. The need for the speedy conclusion of a convention on the universal, comprehensive and verifiable ban on the research, development, production, use, stockpiling and elimination of all chemical weapons takes on a grim urgency in the light of recent reports on their increased use. Malaysia for its part has no chemical

weapons and no intention of acquiring or developing them.

36. The reduction of and disarmament in conventional weapons must also continue to receive priority so as to complement the progress made thus far in the realm of nuclear disarmament. The *Study on Conventional Disarmament*³ has clearly drawn attention to the need to focus efforts on finding effective measures of conventional disarmament in order to enable nations to divert expenditure from armaments to development. Threats and the perception of war must be reduced through confidence-building measures and economic development.

37. The growing level and sophistication of conventional weapons make it imperative that bilateral, regional and multilateral efforts be vigorously pursued to achieve real and meaningful reductions world-wide. Indeed, it has been calculated that more than four fifths of the world's expenditure for military purposes is spent on conventional arms and armed forces. Real and effective cuts in those spheres would no doubt contribute substantially to global peace and security.

38. Effective verification is critical in ensuring compliance with any agreement on disarmament. Malaysia continues to support, and is willing to participate in, efforts to formulate international mechanisms to facilitate the effective verification of disarmament agreements. In this connection, Malaysia would welcome the establishment of an integrated multilateral verification system within the United Nations.

39. My country has also given support to major action to secure disarmament through such modalities as declarations of zones of peace, denuclearization, non-use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war. The proposed convening of the international Conference on the Indian Ocean is consistent with disarmament goals at the regional level. We therefore reiterate our firm support for the early convening of the Conference at Colombo to implement the 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*].

40. In the regional context, Malaysia and its partners in the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN] have also taken action to bring about regional disarmament in South-East Asia. The 1971 Kuala Lumpur Declaration, which seeks to establish the South-East Asian region as a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality [ZOPFAN], stands as a symbol and testimony to the commitment of Malaysia and its ASEAN partners to nurturing regional peace and security through regional co-operation. The ZOPFAN concept aims at building mutual confidence amongst regional States and reducing their level of armaments by providing for mechanisms which rule out military solutions in favour of negotiated settlement of regional issues. It also seeks to free the region from involvement in big-Power rivalries by proposing a code of conduct in the interrelationship between regional and non-regional States. The ASEAN States recently reaffirmed their steadfast belief in and commitment to the early realization of the proposed zone of peace at the third ASEAN summit, held at Manila in December 1987.

We also pledged to intensify all efforts for the early creation in South-East Asia of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, which is an integral component of ZOPFAN. The establishment of such a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia would be a significant contribution to nuclear disarmament and complementary to the efforts already made by the South Pacific countries through their historic South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Rarotonga).

41. Malaysia and its ASEAN partners are also signatories to an international agreement in South-East Asia which advocates co-operation and which constitutes yet another important aspect of confidence-building measures in the region. I am referring to the 1976 Treaty of Amity and Co-operation in South-East Asia.⁴ That treaty also incorporates mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts and is open to all regional States to subscribe to.

42. In Malaysia's view there is no doubt that there exists a close and multidimensional relationship between disarmament and development. Demands for development provide compelling reasons for reduced military expenditures for both conventional and non-conventional weapons. Development expenditures are productive and contribute to the growth and prosperity of nations, whilst armaments are destructive and are either expended or destroyed and do not contribute to national growth. The Final Document and the action programme of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development¹ provide a ready basis for constructive endeavours by the international community to secure peace and security through development. While it is recognized that the question of channelling resources freed by disarmament measures impinges on the sovereignty of States and nations, it is worth our while to consider the merit of utilizing such resources in the pursuit of solutions to common problems confronting mankind today.

43. The investment of vast resources for the study of ecological and environmental changes, such as the warming up of the world and the depletion of the ozone layer, is an example which comes to mind. These are world-wide phenomena affecting the whole of mankind and should ideally be tackled in a comprehensive manner under the auspices of the United Nations.

44. Another problem that is emerging as a grave threat to our societies is that of illicit drug trafficking and drug abuse. In many countries the traffic in illicit drugs and drug addiction have reached alarming proportions. There is growing agreement that the problem has become an urgent security threat. The International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking, held at Vienna from 17 to 26 June 1987, underscored the need for concerted international action to combat this problem in all its aspects. Whether it is to provide for anti-abuse programmes for rehabilitation, supply-reduction or strengthening national and international anti-drug agencies, the prerequisite for success is international co-operation. As a common problem faced by the international community, the channelling of resources from disarmament to anti-drug programmes can surely serve none but the best interests of all humanity.

45. Let me conclude by urging the international community to consider the more productive and inexpensive alternatives to an excessive military capability that has trapped the super-Powers as well as other major Powers and many of the developing countries. I have raised the possibility that perhaps insufficient efforts have been expended on confidence-building. Frequent dialogue and frank exchanges not only between the political leadership but also between peoples can contribute to better understanding.

46. Like many developing countries, Malaysia believes in the alternative of dialogue and building understanding, which is the only firm basis for progress in the field of disarmament. The resources that would be released for development and economic prosperity, a prosperity that is more balanced and evenly spread, would provide the only solid basis for securing peace and stability for all mankind, and not just for nations.

47. Mr. KINANA (United Republic of Tanzania): Allow me to begin by congratulating Mr. Florin on his election as President of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. He has brought to the presidency vast diplomatic experience and negotiating skills, qualities which, as during the forty-second regular session, will prove useful in the expeditious conduct of our work. Allow me also to congratulate the Secretary-General and his staff for shouldering his responsibilities so ably.

48. A decade ago, taking up the challenge embodied in the Charter of the United Nations "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", nations convened here at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to chart a course towards that objective. It had taken over three decades since the founding of the United Nations to give its very *raison d'être* the special attention it deserves, for the United Nations was born out of war, and the elimination of armaments was, and must continue to be, one of its first priorities.

49. That first such special session took fundamental decisions. It adopted a Final Document [*resolution S-10/2*] embodying a programme and mechanism for negotiating away the arms race. That Document remains valid. Despite the passage of time, it retains its intrinsic validity. It constitutes a "charter of disarmament" and should continue to guide us in our deliberations.

50. In the past decade the international community has witnessed sustained efforts, at both bilateral and multilateral levels, to achieve the noble goal of disarmament. No such effort has brought us any closer to the termination of the arms race, let alone its reversal. While political and economic problems continue to cast a gloomy shadow over the future of the world, none puts its survival in jeopardy as much as does the spiralling arms race. In the current debate, speaker after speaker has reiterated the yearning for durable peace which pervades mankind and the abhorrence of war, the escalating arms race and the stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

51. The recent developments have renewed a sense of optimism, not because we are any closer to the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, but because the two major nuclear Powers possessing the world's largest and deadliest weapons are now talking to each other and not at each other. The new spirit and the steadily growing willingness of the two Powers to enter into dialogue on issues which in the past appeared insurmountable offers grounds for optimism and for promising prospects in the field of disarmament.

52. We are gathered here for the third time in the series of General Assembly special sessions on disarmament, with the strong belief that it is the responsibility of all of us to contribute to the global security system. The agenda before us provides a sufficiently broad and viable framework for deliberation on issues which are crucial in the strengthening of multilateralism. The Final Document adopted at the first special session embodies the spirit of multilateralism. We should all resolve to maintain its integrity as representing the high-water mark of agreement on the principles and priorities of global disarmament.

53. We are meeting in the aftermath of the super-Power summit meeting in Moscow. We are encouraged that the new spirit of realism that was ushered in by the signing and subsequent ratification of the INF Treaty has been sustained. Indeed, we did welcome that treaty as a landmark in the efforts to curb the arms race, since it provided for the elimination of an entire category of nuclear weapons. We did, however, note that, much as the treaty should be lauded as a concrete step in the right direction, it will have marginal effect on the actual number of missiles. The two or three percentage points it will take off the overall count of missiles can hardly provide a respite from the perpetual menace of nuclear weapons. But the treaty was of significant psychological and political value. It showed that with political determination it is possible to take concrete measures. Against this background, the world looked to Moscow with much anticipation. While we note that some progress was made in Moscow, the international community was entitled to expect more concrete agreement on strategic weapons. Therefore we urge both parties to summon their political courage and expedite negotiations for an early agreement on the 50 per cent reduction in their strategic weapons.

54. However, even after a 50 per cent reduction, there will still remain in the arsenals of the nuclear Powers enough weapons to kill every child, man and woman on earth many times over. It becomes necessary, therefore, to insist that, while we welcome these bilateral measures, we should not succumb to euphoria and lose sight of our ultimate objective, namely, general and complete disarmament.

55. Like all problems, social or economic, the question of elaborating arrangements for credible and lasting peace through disarmament can be effectively tackled only on a multilateral basis. As the world has shrunk into a so-called global village, we need more and more to reach out to each other in the spirit of co-operation. To have meaning, the co-operation should underscore the indispensability of multilateralism. The United Nations, being the ulti-

mate expression of that spirit, must be the point of convergence in the overall process of co-operation. In the field of disarmament we should underline the central role of the United Nations. Consistent with that position, we believe that, while we welcome and, indeed, encourage the bilateral negotiations now in progress between the two super-Powers, they should not be allowed to replace or supplant the multilateral negotiations. Disarmament and matters of peace and life in general are simply too important to be left to the super-Powers alone. We all have a stake in our future. It is a right we should demand and exercise within the collective machinery of the United Nations.

56. In the past years we have witnessed systematic attempts to undermine the United Nations machinery in general. The regression of the spirit of multilateralism on the part of a few Members of the Organization has been at the centre of these attempts. Under the guise of restructuring, these Members have sought to distort the agenda of the United Nations and to redefine its mandate. In the field of disarmament, the organs established by the General Assembly have had their work stalled by those Members that have, in effect, put their narrow self-interests above those of mankind. Despite its many years of existence and continuous efforts, the Conference on Disarmament has to date been prevented from reaching agreement. The priority areas agreed upon in 1978, namely, the cessation of the nuclear-arms race, the prevention of nuclear war and a comprehensive test ban, have not been addressed in a meaningful way.

57. In particular, we regret that even in the single area where progress could possibly be made the Conference on Disarmament has been hamstrung by those selfish interests. The conclusion of a convention on the elimination of chemical weapons has effectively been vetoed on some flimsy excuses. That apart, some of those who oppose the convention have now begun the production and stockpiling of binary weapons, and in the process they have completely undermined the prospects for the early finalization of the convention. It is our hope, therefore, that this session will renew its call for the conclusion of the convention and stimulate multilateral negotiations on all aspects of the arms race, building upon the spirit embodied in the Final Document of the first special session.

58. Few issues in the field of arms control have been the subject of so much international deliberation and negotiation as that of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. Since the late 1950s the General Assembly has passed dozens of resolutions calling for a nuclear-test ban, several of which contain outright condemnation of tests. The question has been on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament ever since its establishment. Thirty years of international diplomatic efforts against nuclear tests have, however, resulted in agreements only on partial measures.

59. The pressing need to negotiate and conclude a comprehensive multilateral nuclear test-ban treaty arises from the undisputed fact that nuclear weapon testing fuels the nuclear arms race and increases the danger of nuclear war. A ban on all nuclear weapon

tests would de-escalate the nuclear arms race and greatly reduce the risk of nuclear war.

60. The extension of the arms race to outer space is worrisome. The technology involved in reaching outer space is still in the hands of a few, who have now embarked on a process to militarize an area which has been designated by the international community as a common heritage of mankind. Space belongs to us all. Outer space should be used for the benefit of all people and not for the destruction of humanity. One of the dividends of disarmament would be, among other things, the opportunity to apply the science and technology now engaged in military research and development of outer space more directly and systematically to the solution of economic and social problems, in both developing and developed countries.

61. We all inhabit one planet, and a sure way of surviving a nuclear war is to prevent it. This is what is at the heart of the super-Power declaration that nuclear war cannot be won and should therefore never be fought. The advocates of the concept of nuclear deterrence are no doubt aware that the establishment of secure peace requires the display of new political thinking and a new approach to the issues of war and peace. That new direction must entail a commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the renunciation of the nuclear deterrence concept. Permanent peace cannot be sustained on the basis of mutual fear and terror. The unleashing of a nuclear war, either by accident or by miscalculation, would lead to the total extinction of mankind, for there would be no survivors.

62. Peace, security and economic and social development are indivisible. We can ensure the safety of mankind if we heed that truth. Trying to seek peace at the expense of justice or of the security of others can only create global instability and problems. Thus, the notion that the more a nation arms itself the more secure it is is a fallacy which has to be rejected as dangerous. So is the concept of nuclear deterrence.

63. My delegation does not share the view that peace has been maintained in the past 40 years because of the nuclear bomb. Peace has been maintained because of the sheer interest of all nations in survival.

64. If I have devoted considerable time to the danger posed by nuclear weapons, it is because nuclear weapons pose the most immediate threat to the very survival of mankind. The argument that since 1945 all regional and internal conflicts have been fought by conventional weapons, though valid, does not make nuclear weapons any safer. This arises from the simple fact that if those wars were fought using nuclear weapons, we would not be here to count their numbers. Negotiations for nuclear disarmament remain, therefore, a priority and should not in any way be held hostage to the reduction of or balance in conventional weapons.

65. Two thirds of the world's population live in degrading poverty and their lives are perpetually threatened by starvation, yet they continue to witness, with dismay, the hundreds of billions of dollars squandered annually on weapons. The International

Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, among other things, has awakened these people to that relationship. The Final Document adopted unanimously by the Conference provides a workable framework which we could build upon in terms of offering hope for the long-term development needs of the majority of the people in the developing countries who are currently engaged in economic survival.

66. In the efforts to achieve peace, we have demanded the denuclearization of Africa. The security situation in Africa is compounded by the acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability by a racist South African régime, a nuclear status it has acquired through collusion with certain countries represented here. We condemn that collusion. The danger facing the international community is quite real. The possibility that, in its desperation, South Africa may unleash a major regional war which could precipitate a global nuclear confrontation is disquieting. The *apartheid* régime is engaged not only in the systematic suppression of the black population, but also in intensified acts of aggression and hostility against the peaceful neighbouring countries. This special session should call upon the world community to elaborate measures to prevent further co-operation with the racist régime and to compel it to submit its nuclear programme to international control under IAEA.

67. Closely related to the denuclearization of Africa is the question of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. The littoral and hinterland States have tried hard to make the Indian Ocean such a zone. It is a matter of great regret that certain big Powers not only continue to threaten peace and security in the Ocean but have also totally frustrated all efforts to convene an international conference which would pave the way for the implementation of the 1971 Declaration. We deplore the refusal even to hold a preparatory session at Colombo. It is in the interest of the regional States, as well as all others that use the Indian Ocean, to reduce tension in the region. This underscores the need for joint and collective action by all Member States in the interest of peace there. This session must reiterate the necessity of such a conference. In doing so, it should call upon these obstructionist countries to agree to its convening as soon as possible.

68. In asserting its central role in matters of disarmament, the Assembly has endorsed the principle of United Nations involvement in verification. We note that extensive discussion on the question of verification took place in the Disarmament Commission. While different views exist as to the nature of the United Nations involvement, there is general acceptance of its role in verification. Therefore the principle is no longer in dispute. Consistent with this position of principle, Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania have grouped in the Six Nation Initiative and have submitted a formal proposal that the special session establish an integrated multilateral system within the United Nations. We are gratified that this proposal has received overwhelming support and endorsement by the non-aligned countries. We believe that a sufficient body of information exists and in consequence no further study would be needed. Therefore the Secretary-General should be mandated to proceed with the

actual elaboration of the modalities of its establishment.

69. The first special session on disarmament adopted a significant Final Document, which contains everything required for meaningful disarmament. The Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*] contains priorities and measures in the field of disarmament which States were to undertake, as a matter of urgency, with a view to halting and reversing the arms race. Unfortunately, no real progress has been made since the adoption of that Programme. The success of the current session depends, therefore, on our collective action and responsible approach in finding ways and means of translating the principles and priorities enunciated in the Final Document.

70. As we proceed with our deliberations, let us summon courage. We should not allow our detractors to derail the session by either making impossible demands or seeking to circumscribe its agenda. We should be firm and seek a consensus which reflects the majority view. We accept the view that the session should be forward-looking. But we cannot accept that it should be so at the expense of fundamental problems which need to and must be discussed. We should seek inspiration from our previous achievements and build upon them to further our objectives. The 1978 Final Document remains the reference point. We cannot go back on any of the undertakings to which we have committed ourselves; neither can we accept a redefinition of the political principles we have accepted. We should, indeed, look forward.

71. Mr. GOEBBELS (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): The assumption of great responsibility is at the same time a source of great satisfaction. Hence I should like to convey to Mr. Peter Florin my congratulations on his election to the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly and assure him of our full co-operation.

72. In the course of its long history my country, Luxembourg, has on numerous occasions suffered from conflicts that pitted powerful neighbours against each other. But for more than 40 years now my country has been experiencing peace. This experience is all the more valuable since it was achieved during a period which was marked by serious tension in international life.

73. Quite obviously, Luxembourg's concerns in security matters and in questions of armaments and disarmament coincide with those of its partners in the Atlantic alliance and the European Community. My colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Hans Dietrich Genscher, spoke on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community in this forum only a few days ago [*8th meeting*]. The views he set forth are shared by Luxembourg, and I shall therefore not go into details on all the points he made in that statement.

74. The third special session on disarmament is being held 10 years after our first such session, in 1978. The Final Document that was then drawn up is a valuable achievement. Our assessment of certain

aspects today has necessarily evolved under the impact of intervening events.

75. What strikes us when reviewing the 1978 Final Document is the absolute terms in which it is couched. At that time it was undoubtedly a question of profession of faith. Today we realize that that profession of faith, however necessary it may have been, was one which regarded disarmament as a principle which was seen above all from an idealistic angle. Proof of that is that the text particularly emphasizes everything which deals with nuclear weapons, but in the space of 10 years we have seen no casualties from any nuclear military action, while we have learnt of hundreds of thousands of victims, dead or wounded as a result of military actions in which conventional or chemical weapons have been used. In the Final Document the dangers inherent in conflicts other than nuclear should undoubtedly have been given much more emphasis, in order to prevent such conflicts.

76. I refer to these facts not in any way to underrate the dangers which face mankind now as a result of the accumulation of nuclear arsenals which, according to a recent WHO report, is in excess of an explosive capacity of 15,000 megatons—in other words, approximately a million times the destructive force of the Hiroshima bomb.

77. In 1978 the General Assembly stated: "Existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth." [*See resolution S-10/2, para. 11.*] Unfortunately, that finding still holds good.

78. Consequently, nuclear disarmament should remain a matter of priority, because nuclear weapons possess the greatest destructive potential and their accumulation is necessarily fraught with a growing threat of a conflict which would be injurious to all. But the lack of restraint which has too frequently been shown in the use of conventional weapons, and even chemical weapons, underlines the value of a credible deterrent, since we cannot base ourselves on the premise of an authentically and globally stable situation. As long as the security of all States, great or small, powerful or weak, cannot be guaranteed collectively and universally, my country considers that the needs of Europe can be met by a defensive strategy based on a combination of nuclear and conventional weapons, even while we believe that the present levels of nuclear stockpiles are far in excess of the necessary minimum.

79. Luxembourg is among those countries which have for many years spoken resolutely in favour of reduction measures and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world. That is why we welcome the ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles as an event of prime importance in the history of modern international relations. It is the first treaty which has done away with an entire category of nuclear weapons and is indeed a point of departure for an authentic disarmament policy throughout the world.

80. Ten years after the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, we are therefore

in a position to see that concrete results have been achieved which have brought about an improvement in the international climate, as well as the fact that a growing number of States are clearly determined to go ahead and achieve tangible results in other categories of armaments.

81. Before reaching that promising stage we have seen failures between 1978 and today. The second special session on disarmament was not a success. New wars have broken out and caused suffering to hundreds of thousands of men, women and children throughout the world. While it is heartening that one of those conflicts, namely, the war in Afghanistan, seems to be on the way to termination, it is none the less true that others continue, and among them I would particularly single out the bloody and pointless struggle which has for too long now been going on between Iran and Iraq. The fact that chemical weapons have been used in that frightful confrontation only makes it all the more unacceptable that such a death struggle should continue in modern times.

82. If it is therefore unfortunately a fact that the general consensus on the principles defined in 1978 has been unable to prevent these bloody conflicts, it is nevertheless true that the efforts begun at the first special session have yielded some results, more specifically in that part of the world where Luxembourg is situated.

83. This progress is due to the fact that our desire for disarmament has been placed in its overall context as an important component in a policy of global security. Our work during this session will be devoted to only one of the aspects of security, namely, disarmament, but we should not overlook the fact that general disarmament will be possible only if the security of all countries can be guaranteed and safeguarded. However, a proper security policy would necessarily include, apart from a dynamic policy as far as arms control and disarmament are concerned, a credible defence policy. Above all, it would mean that there should be, both domestically and internationally, behaviour which would inspire confidence and stimulate co-operation. Without security there will be no disarmament, and without trust there will be no security.

84. As an example of how this global action has succeeded, may I recall the experience gained from the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The gradual effort undertaken there in a spirit of realism finally prevailed and led to the results of which we are all aware. The progress recently achieved in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva proves that this approach can be applied in a world forum.

85. The main hope of mankind at the dawn of a new century is that the positive experiences of recent years and recent months will prove to be the first steps in a sober international policy aimed at specific improvements in the condition of humanity. By developing the means afforded by such a policy we can hope that trust will be created. Common sense, reason and the respect which is due to life demand that we make a further effort to eliminate those antagonisms which tangibly jeopardize the physical

and moral integrity of a number of our fellow citizens throughout the world. To succeed in any task we must be totally committed to it. The task to which I have referred justifies more than any other a coherent and sustained commitment on the part of all those who take important decisions. May I express the hope that this will prove to be possible at this time.

86. The considerable progress achieved in the field of verification and the recognition given to the principle of asymmetrical reductions have set very significant precedents while they emphasize the readiness of everyone to adhere closely to reality.

87. The results of the recent summit meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States are encouraging because the fact that they have thus confirmed the normalization of their relations affords prospects for considerable progress. That is true in respect of disarmament and of certain regional conflicts. The influence of these positive results should also extend to a number of other fields where the super-Powers are not directly involved.

88. This third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should therefore provide us with an opportunity to welcome the progress made, to encourage the present process of dialogue and negotiation and to work towards broadening the peace process by initiating other negotiations in all parts of the world where the repercussions of East-West, North-South or South-South antagonisms can be felt.

89. A little under a year ago we had occasion to ponder together the relationship between disarmament and development. When at that time I set forth Luxembourg's point of view, I said from this rostrum that the most effective way to reduce the arms race, in both the developed and developing countries, would be to create conditions making for domestic stability based on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and international stability based on détente and mutual security guarantees.

90. I added at that time that security is not dependent on disarmament alone. What proves irrefutably that disarmament and development are linked is that they are both essential to re-establishing a lasting global security. By providing conditions for better domestic and external stability we shall make it possible for disarmament to proceed smoothly; we shall be liberating an important potential consisting of attention, efforts and funds which can be invested in the development of our respective societies.

91. The way in which these various instruments interact in the service of a single peace policy is in itself a very encouraging factor. It is true that we should avoid confusing disarmament with saving money. It is to be expected that, initially at least, confidence-building and verification measures will in their turn give rise to considerable expenditure. It has been estimated, for example, that the cost of destroying chemical weapons will be at least three times the cost of manufacturing them. Furthermore, the reduction of armaments, even on the significant scale now envisaged in the field of strategic weapons, will not overnight make it impossible for the remaining

weapons to be updated. A hard look at the facts must convince us that the zero option is more often than not something which reflects the profound aspirations of peoples, and sometimes also of their Governments, but that the pursuit of such an ambitious objective involves, albeit unwittingly, the possible risk of going too quickly and thus compromising the credibility of this approach.

92. As Mr. Mario Soares said this morning from this podium [*12th meeting*], we prefer to go step by step, gradually looking for progress in various fields so that we can slowly and surely draw closer to the objectives we keep constantly in mind: a guaranteed stability at the lowest possible level of armaments, reinforced by fidelity to the essential values of humanity, which are freedom, security and solidarity.

93. The Luxembourg Government is convinced that it is possible today to move in this direction in a determined way. It is our hope that the present session will provide an opportunity to stimulate this process by having all the members of this Assembly adhere to a series of specific targets drawn up in common and summarized in a final document.

94. We have to move towards a process which will make it possible to ensure stability in all parts of the world. Military competition should give way to peaceful competition which will enable societies to develop in accordance with the views expressed by their peoples.

95. There is no lack of means to bring that about. A few moments ago I was referring to our permanent desire to work towards a reduction of nuclear weapons, since the levels of the stockpiles in the two major nuclear Powers have for a long time borne no relation to real security needs. Any progress which brings us closer to the target of a 50 per cent reduction of strategic weapons is to be welcomed, even if it is desirable that this objective be regarded only as a temporary floor which we should subsequently strive to go well below.

96. Furthermore, the INF Treaty, quite apart from its symbolic value, is a specific measure to reduce nuclear arms. We hope that it can be successfully concluded according to the timetable and procedures decided upon by common consent. Further progress is possible and indeed necessary in the nuclear field, particularly with regard to verification of tests and possibly one day even in a total test ban, as well as the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is our earnest hope that all these efforts will be continued.

97. But—and this bears repeating—the casualties in military conflicts over the last 10 years have been caused not by nuclear weapons but by conventional or chemical weapons. Approximately four fifths of total world military expenditure is devoted to conventional weapons and to armed forces. Since the Second World War they have played a part in more than 20 regional wars and the loss of approximately 20 million human lives. Therefore I have no hesitation in proclaiming today that the top priority is to limit the number of casualties in the current wars through the efforts of the international community, since we cannot expect any efforts from the belliger-

ents. In this connection the responsibility of arms-exporting countries is enormous, and they should voluntarily refrain from supplying the belligerents.

98. But if we wish to put an end to conventional wars we also have to give some thought as to how they can be avoided. The technological sophistication of conventional weapons is making them increasingly formidable, but it must be admitted that unfortunately they do not inspire the same deterring terror as nuclear weapons. Their combined efficiency and frequent use make them particularly dangerous. For that reason it is all the more urgently necessary to restrict these arms everywhere in the world.

99. There is a real hope that in the near future negotiations will be initiated in Europe to establish stable and secure relations at the lowest possible levels of armaments. This should lead to the elimination of the conventional disequilibria which seriously compromise stability and security in Europe.

100. We look upon these negotiations with hope and confidence, because we know that they can be based on experience gained through the confidence-building and security measures which were agreed upon in Stockholm in 1986 and more generally in the context of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The Follow-Up Meeting which is being held at Vienna will shortly close and should result in a substantial and balanced final document.

101. The significance of the Conference process, as well as the virtues of an improved climate of confidence and greater respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, cannot be confined to the European context. All those who have had the opportunity to participate in this great experiment can assure you that this is a positive development which other States and other parts of the world might well profit from by initiating similar efforts.

102. As far as chemical weapons are concerned, we must welcome the fact that the Geneva negotiations are continuing after having quite recently achieved important results. It is true that all the question marks have by no means been removed. In flagrant violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol,⁵ recent war reports have provided proof of the use of such arms. Quite apart from severely condemning such acts, it is very important that we take immediate action to ensure that the temptation to resort to these inhuman means of destruction is banished once and for all from the thinking of general staffs. In this context I should also like to refer to the need to supplement the Bacteriological Weapons Convention⁶ by a verification procedure.

103. Quite obviously, other efforts are required in order to stem the arms race.

104. The desire to reduce existing stocks of weapons necessarily implies a readiness to work towards channelling the development of new arms. This commitment could take an explicit form if it were concretely embodied in mutual commitments to avoid the side-stepping of treaties by taking advantage of unforeseeable technological progress.

105. In this context, the clarifications recently provided by Messrs. Schultz and Shevardnadze in connection with the INF Treaty are particularly welcome, but this confirmation of the spirit of trust and co-operation which now prevails between the United States and the Soviet Union should not remain an isolated instance. It could be further extended in the context of the use of outer space.

106. Since it adds more complexity to an already highly technical subject by absorbing considerable financial funds, the continued manufacture of new arms outside any negotiating context will inevitably detract from whatever success has been achieved and might even reopen the arms race. Therefore, it is advisable to make the modernization of arms an element in any policy which combines both defence and dialogue.

107. Other components of a realistic disarmament policy are undoubtedly the efforts made or to be made to increase the transparency of military budgets by having the international community define a uniform, clear and verifiable procedure in this context. The fact that the United Nations must be involved in this matter is incontrovertible, and an impulse in this direction could be provided by the present special session. Luxembourg is in favour of agreements being concluded on the reduction of military budgets by all States on the basis of transparency, starting with agreements of those States which have the largest stockpiles. This is a very good example of a global confidence-building measure, the proliferation of which would undoubtedly prove to be a very significant factor for peace.

108. The maintenance of international peace and security is the prime goal inscribed in the Charter of the United Nations, which means that the Organization will have a primary role to play in the future. In fact, it does represent a unique forum in the world where the problems involved in the arms race can be stated and examined on a world-wide scale. The United Nations can give voice to the concerns of Governments and provide effective stimulation for bilateral and multilateral negotiations under way. It also has an important part to play in research and information-gathering in connection with security and disarmament matters. By streamlining its structures to a certain extent, the Organization would be even better placed to perform these various functions.

109. We are going through a period in history which is exciting in many respects. There are countless challenges which have immense dimensions. This state of affairs might lead us to yield to defeatism. Nevertheless, at present throughout the world there is a will to move forward. It is very heartening that many men and women have a passionate desire to do better, and this passionate desire is fed by the hope that it will be possible to progress not by acting against each other, but by acting together and by helping each other. This hope has never disappeared, even if there are times when it lies hidden in the hearts of men of good will because it cannot be expressed openly.

110. We have just gone through undoubtedly a rather gloomy period, but thanks to the spirit of

détente and co-operation which at present is a striking feature of international relations, the hope that the world can act in a more effective way has today thrown open the doors to further expressions of a desire for openness and freedom. If this is an exciting era it is because we can, through our commitment, strengthen this trend and make ever more progress. We cannot, we should not fall short of this expectation.

111. But if what is at stake is indeed exciting, let us not at the same time give way to facile enthusiasm. The experience of the last 10 years demonstrates that we have to be constantly mindful of the fact that the better is the enemy of the good. We should be guided by reality; it should prevail over our desires or our speculations. It is through flexibility allied with tenacity and through moderation allied with determination that we can achieve clarity and thereby success. If the present special session of the General Assembly could demonstrate this fact, then it will indeed have been successful.

Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

112. Mr. SRITHIRATH (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): First, may I say how happy my delegation is to see Mr. Florin presiding over the work of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

113. This third special session on disarmament, unlike the first two, is being held in a much more favourable international climate because of the four Soviet-American summit conferences at Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington and Moscow, and especially because of the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles in December 1987. During the past few decades the international community has been constantly concerned over the acceleration of the arms race and the buildup of nuclear weapons, which constitute a threat to the future of mankind. Although the recent summit conference in Moscow did not yield the expected results, the treaty, which concerns two categories of first-strike nuclear weapons, is a first important step towards nuclear disarmament. Nuclear weapons, as was stressed by the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare in September 1986, are more than just weapons of war, they are weapons for mass annihilation.

114. To be sure, the path to disarmament in general, and nuclear disarmament in particular, is still strewn with many hurdles. However, the two major Powers, by agreeing to pursue negotiations on a 50 per cent reduction in their offensive strategic nuclear weapons and by reaffirming the idea that a nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought, have at least made a psychological breakthrough in their relations, thereby allowing greater mutual understanding and therefore a relaxation in international tension. That approach, we hope, will pave the way to a safer world, one without nuclear weapons, as was proposed by the Soviet Union on 15 January 1986 in its step-by-step programme for eliminating all nuclear weapons by the end of this century,⁷ and in the New Delhi Declaration on

Principles for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free and Non-Violent World, of November 1986.⁸

115. While it is true that the agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union are not insignificant contributions to the cessation of the nuclear arms race, for nuclear disarmament to be effective it is necessary to adopt further measures in addition to the implementation in good faith of those agreements by their signatories. First among these measures is the prevention of nuclear war and the non-use of nuclear weapons. In this respect, the nuclear-weapon States must conclude a treaty banning the use or the threat of the use of these weapons and must, following the example of the Soviet Union and China, pledge not to be the first to use those weapons. They must also pledge not to use those weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. If that could take place, the danger of a nuclear war would then be removed.

116. Next there is the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of agreements among the States in a given region. In this connection, some regional arrangements are already in place, such as the OAU Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Treaty of Raratonga and other proposals which have been made concerning the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, South-East Asia, the Far East, including the Korean peninsula, northern Europe, the Balkans and a denuclearized corridor in Central Europe. These proposals, all serious and positive, deserve to be taken into consideration by the international community, which must take concrete measures to establish favourable conditions for the creation of such zones, whose ultimate objective would be a completely denuclearized world. However, the main requirement should be strict respect for those zones by the nuclear-weapon States.

117. There is also the question of the prevention of the arms race in outer space, which is the common heritage of mankind and must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and in the interests of all countries, regardless of the stage of their development. In this connection, the Soviet Union has put forward a series of proposals, the most recent of which⁹ concerns international co-operation in the peaceful exploitation of outer space under conditions of its non-militarization, submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session in 1985. Regrettably, however, the Strategic Defense Initiative programme of the United States runs counter to this objective. If implemented, this programme would, in a chain reaction, bring with it an escalation of the arms race in outer space and thereby increase the chances of a nuclear conflict.

118. All States possessing a significant space potential must therefore strictly respect the agreements already in effect governing a legal régime applicable to outer space, particularly as regards the restrictions and legal limitations which apply to space weapons, including the 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems,¹⁰ and arrive at agreements to prevent the extension of the arms race in outer space.

119. Along the same lines, nuclear disarmament is inconceivable while nuclear tests continue, for these tests, whose purpose is to perfect and develop new types of nuclear weapons, will inevitably involve an intensification of the arms race. In this connection, the Soviet Union had set an example by decreeing a unilateral moratorium on its nuclear tests for almost two years. Unfortunately, however, this example has not been followed. To stop the arms race it is necessary for all nuclear Powers to show good will by concluding as speedily as possible an agreement on a general and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests.

120. Disarmament is a very complex process. While it is true that the greatest threat to mankind is the danger of a nuclear war, it is also true that other categories of weapons also represent a major threat to the security of peoples. The international community must therefore make sustained efforts to adopt without delay an agreement banning their use, development and production. Among these weapons which have catastrophic effects equal to those of nuclear weapons, I should mention chemical weapons, and in particular binary weapons, the production of which has already begun in the most important State member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO], as well as other weapons of mass destruction, such as bacteriological weapons, neutron weapons and radiological weapons.

121. With respect to chemical weapons, it would appear that substantial progress has been made by the Conference on Disarmament in the preparation of a draft convention banning their use and production. It is therefore necessary for all the States concerned to begin negotiations in good faith and to refrain from any action which might obstruct the conclusion of that convention. In this context, the proposals of the States members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization regarding the elimination of chemical weapons from the European continent could be a step towards their complete elimination.

122. With respect to other weapons of mass destruction, we hope that certain NATO countries which have thus far obstructed an agreement banning the development and production of such weapons will adopt a more positive attitude.

123. Similarly, conventional weapons play a preponderant role in the current balance of power, and their qualitative development adds a new dimension to the arms race. Thus, nuclear disarmament alone will not completely meet the security and stability needs of States; it must be followed by limitations on and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons. But these measures must be adopted in an equitable and balanced manner, so that the right to security of every State is guaranteed at each stage, with the objective of undiminished security with weapons and armed forces at the lowest possible level. In this connection, the Soviet proposal to reduce armed forces in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, as well as the proposal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding the gradual reduction of the armed forces of both parts of Korea between now and 1992, with their number to be kept at 100,000 each, could help to reduce tension in those two areas of the world.

124. The points that I have just mentioned represent just a few important aspects of the disarmament process. There are others equally important, such as a freeze or non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, reduction of military budgets and establishment of confidence-building measures, including the settlement of regional conflicts by political means—all matters that the present session should take into account in its deliberations.

125. With regard to confidence-building measures, proposals have been put forward by various regions of the world, including that of Mongolia on the establishment of machinery governing the non-use of force in relations between the States of Asia and the Pacific.

126. Within the context of the settlement of regional disputes, a solution was found recently for the question of Afghanistan by the signing in Geneva of an agreement between Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Soviet Union and the United States.

127. This matter brings us now to the question of the Indian Ocean. Indeed, even today certain Western Powers invoke the presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan to obstruct the international Conference on the Indian Ocean. However, now that the withdrawal of those troops has begun, those Powers will no longer have any valid reason to oppose the convening of that Conference.

128. With reference to the question of Kampuchea, positive steps have been taken. Last year the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea proclaimed its policy of national reconciliation, and two meetings have taken place between Mr. Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk. Recently, in agreement with the People's Republic of Kampuchea, Viet Nam declared that it will withdraw 50,000 of its troops from Kampuchea during coming months, and a complete withdrawal could take place by 1990 if a political settlement of the situation could be agreed on.

129. With regard to the border dispute between the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Thailand, the Lao Government, in keeping with the principle of the non-use of force in international relations, has been able to convince Thailand by force of reason to accept a cease-fire and come to the negotiating table to effect a peaceful settlement of the dispute. In addition, the high commands of the armies of the two countries have agreed that their troops would no longer take up arms against each other. However, the two rounds of negotiations have not yet yielded concrete results. We hope that the international community will help the parties find a definitive solution to the dispute as soon as possible.

130. If all those things were done they might help eliminate tension and thereby facilitate the disarmament process.

131. Furthermore, when speaking about the reduction of military budgets, one automatically thinks of the resources thus released which could be used for development purposes, and that helps us understand better the relationship between disarmament and development. Indeed, the International Conference

on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, emphasized that the allocation for weapons of an enormous amount of resources curbed development efforts and that the reduction of military expenditure on a world-wide scale could considerably facilitate development. That Conference also underlined that disarmament could contribute to development not only by releasing additional resources but also by exerting a beneficial influence on the world economy. It could create conditions propitious to economic and technical co-operation on an equitable basis and help achieve objectives having to do with a new international economic order.

132. To attain those objectives, developing countries have been fighting for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

133. In this difficult struggle the international community in general and Governments in particular have an obligation to take into account the claims of peace movements, especially anti-nuclear movements. Most of the latter are made up of either victims or relatives of victims of the two atomic bombs utilized. Better than anyone else they know the effects of nuclear weapons. We must heed their appeals to make sure that a second Hiroshima will never take place, for this time it is not just a city that will be affected but the entire world.

134. If nuclear disarmament depends largely on the will of the major Powers, the United Nations nevertheless has a central and paramount responsibility for disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security. In the course of statements made during the past few days there has been general agreement regarding the validity of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament and the priorities that have been set forth in the disarmament field. Now they must again be highlighted and adapted to current realities.

135. The peoples of the world hope that the present session will contribute to the establishment of lasting peace by adopting effective disarmament measures. To that end the United Nations role in this area must be strengthened, and so must that of the Conference on Disarmament in the area of negotiation, so that the activities of the two bodies will be complementary. But in the present state of affairs, strengthening the role of the United Nations requires the implementation of the Charter provisions on the collective security system, and those measures must be supplemented by other initiatives, the most important of which were submitted by the Soviet Union to the General Assembly at its forty-second session.

136. My delegation hopes that, on the basis of the views put forward at the present session and the elements contained in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, this special session will adopt concrete and effective measures that will lead us to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

137. Mr. CAPO-CHICHI (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to convey, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, warm congratulations to Mr. Florin on his election to the

presidency of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The fact that this was a unanimous choice is an expression of our common conviction that his outstanding qualities as a statesman and diplomat and his well-known skill will make it possible for these meetings to enjoy wise and effective leadership and thus to lead to very positive results. It is likewise a great pleasure for me to see the representative of a country with which my own, the People's Republic of Benin, enjoys excellent relations assuming the presidency of the present special session.

138. On this occasion I should like to repeat to the Secretary-General my feelings of great esteem and the gratitude of the Government of my country for the courageous and tireless efforts which he is constantly making to carry out his lofty functions in the service of international peace and security.

139. The cause of disarmament is, more than any other, one which was at the origin of the establishment of the United Nations 43 years ago, it being well understood by the founding fathers that there could be no peace or international security so long as States continued to go round in the vicious circle of the arms race.

140. After the painful appearance of the giant mushrooms of the holocaust over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, humanity, horror-stricken by the effects of that instrument of death, the atomic bomb, had not yet recovered when the major belligerent Powers of the Second World War once again embarked on an out-and-out arms race, although at San Francisco they had signed the Charter creating the United Nations. How much has happened since then! How many ups and downs, how many vicissitudes on the steep, tortuous and thorny path which was to lead the United Nations to the effective realization of its prime objective: the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security through disarmament.

141. But thanks to the concerted action and the persistent efforts of men of good will in all countries and of national and international peace organizations, and above all thanks to the determination and sustained efforts of the United Nations, the watchword of "general and complete disarmament under international control" has become a powerful force in world public opinion in this last quarter of the twentieth century. Today this goal is no longer perceived as Utopian, as a dream of idealists who have their feet in the twentieth century but their heads in the Stone Age.

142. It must be emphasized that for more than three decades various kinds of action have been undertaken to promote peace and disarmament, but it was in particular with the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978, that the international community took a decisive step on this road by setting up new machinery for multilateral deliberations and negotiations. The aims and prospects pursued by that first special session are not obsolete even today, 10 years later, and could provide a useful inspiration for our reflections during this third special session. Allow me therefore to recall

paragraph 1 of the Final Document of the first special session:

"The attainment of the objective of security, which is an inseparable element of peace, has always been one of the most profound aspirations of humanity. States have for a long time sought to maintain their security through the possession of arms. Admittedly, their survival has, in certain cases, effectively depended on whether they could count on appropriate means of defence. Yet the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes much more a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament, that is to say, through a gradual but effective process beginning with a reduction in the present level of armaments. The ending of the arms race and the achievement of real disarmament are tasks of primary importance and urgency. To meet this historic challenge is in the political and economic interests of all the nations and peoples of the world as well as in the interests of ensuring their genuine security and peaceful future." [*Resolution S-10/2, para. 1.*]

It could not have been put in clearer, more incisive, more eloquent terms.

143. But how did we come to the present situation in which we see the uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear arms and the exacerbation of the arms race?

144. Immediately after the Second World War, the first Powers to possess the nuclear weapon believed that they could avert the danger of its proliferation by grouping into what was commonly termed the "Atomic Club". Above all, they wanted to ensure that the secret of the manufacture of this formidable engine of death would not be spread abroad. But it was in vain. The Club quickly grew from two members to three members, to four members, until there was no longer any Club. The technology of atomic weapons was thereafter an open secret. It became: "Well, do you want it? Do you have the money? There you are." The tactic is quite simple: officially the two contracting parties—the buyer and the seller of technology—agree to set up a nuclear centre for peaceful purposes, such as the production of electric power. And then the rest of the equipment and the know-how come pouring in secretly.

145. Otherwise, how can we understand and explain the fact that a minority, fascist, and racist State contemptuous of human rights and of the norms of international morality, in rebellion against the international community—such as the South African régime—has been able so easily and with impunity to acquire atomic weapons, almost under the noses of the nuclear Powers responsible for their non-proliferation and of the Security Council? Who could tell us today with any certainty how many other States outside the famous Atomic Club have, like the Pretoria régime, been able thus to acquire atomic weapons or are in the process of doing so? The situation is particularly serious and disquieting since South Africa has so far rejected any monitoring by IAEA, and armed with this nuclear weapon, that

régime threatens, terrorizes and destabilizes every African State in the region and thus seriously imperils peace and security throughout Africa.

146. Generally speaking, throughout the world the arms race, both in the nuclear and conventional fields, is in full swing and takes varied forms as technical progress is made. Arms expenditures, which at the beginning of the Second Disarmament Decade were estimated at more than \$500 billion a year, have grown continually at an alarming rate, and this has been true despite the generalized state of economic and financial disorder which in recent years has exacerbated the hunger and poverty of more than two thirds of mankind.

147. The hotbeds of tension and armed conflicts, often fratricidal, ignited here and there throughout the world are continually tended and maintained by militarists and cannon merchants. It is for this reason that each small, wavering step taken by the international community along the rocky and twisting path of disarmament is immediately jeopardized by their frenzied race, to the four corners of the world, to make their sinister trade in death flourish endlessly.

148. Today, when more than 50,000 nuclear weapons of various sizes have been accumulated in our midst, with a combined explosive capacity of already a million times that of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima in 1945; today, when one missile can have 200 times the explosive power of the Hiroshima bomb and can deliver an explosive charge in less than 30 minutes within 100 metres of a target 9,000 kilometres from its launching point; today, when, using the pretexts of "dissuasion" or "mutually assured destruction", the nuclear Powers have already exceeded their capacity to kill off mankind 10 times over—to say today that the planet Earth is saturated with bombs is an understatement. We have transformed our one and only habitat into one great bomb, orbiting around the sun, ready to explode at any time. It must be defused immediately. The survival of mankind depends on it.

149. Between general disarmament and general death, everyone in this world which is dominated by selfishness, chauvinism, the desire for power and hegemony, intolerance and prejudice, must be aware that mankind does not have a choice. Rather, it is faced with a categorical imperative. Choice presupposes the freedom to take a decision that only commits oneself. Therefore no one has the right, much less the freedom, to decide on the collective suicide of mankind. No one has the right to assassinate the human race and its civilization. That is why it is incumbent above all on the international community, which bears the absolute duty and responsibility, to gird its loins and to take control of the destiny of mankind.

150. However, there are certain encouraging signs of the times. The leaders of the two nuclear super-Powers, who since the end of the Second World War had been indulging in an infernal arms race—a race without a finish line, unless it be the fatal Day of the Apocalypse—have finally recognized publicly and conjointly that a nuclear war can never be won and must never be fought. Nevertheless, unfortunately, it is true that the danger would arise not only from a

conscious and concerted decision taken by men, but that a simple technical or human failure might cause a catastrophe, if not a holocaust. Defeat, in effect, would know no allegiance. It would be the defeat of mankind, when our planet Earth, if it did not simply disintegrate in space and become lost in eternal oblivion, would undoubtedly be reduced to a great mass of embers and lifeless ashes.

151. The recognition by the two protagonists in the arms race, in November 1985 in Geneva, of the pointlessness and absurdity of any future nuclear war is, in our opinion, significant in more than one way and, at any rate, has revealed that a qualitative change has occurred in the relations among States. The world had, undoubtedly, gone beyond the era of "big stick" foreign policies and of relationships based on force and domination and has gone on to the stage of necessary dialogue and negotiation and a natural interrelationship of interdependence and complementarity of nations. Certain historic events in the past decade have indeed proved to the whole world the fragility and impotence of even the most powerful, as well as the fact that military force for the solution of certain international problems is both useless and negative.

152. We must welcome the fact that the blinking red signals on the road of contemporary history have not gone unnoticed and that the bend has been taken slowly, at least for the time being. This positive direction in international relations should be sustained and broadened in the interests of all. In fact, when dealing with disarmament problems, there is a temptation to take the effects for the causes, to take the apparent symptoms of the sickness for pathogenic viruses. This approach should be inverted. What we must do first, is, from the very outset, attack the viruses if we wish to save the patient, that is, our contemporary world. The world is sick because in international relations some use and understand only the language of force. It is sick from the flagrant injustices and from the policy of "two weights and two measures" characteristic of these relations. It is sick particularly from the disorders, the greed and the unreasonableness of the way in which the common riches of the planet are distributed and enjoyed. All these ills have finally become intolerable to peoples and nations and have prompted them, despite what they possess, to deny themselves the essentials in order to acquire weapons of various kinds which guarantee their territorial integrity and sovereignty, so that they can recover and enjoy in peace their property which has been plundered by force.

153. Today, when it is generally recognized that no human action is gratuitous and there is some explanation even for an act committed by an idiot, my delegation believes that, if a proper reply were given to the question of why States and peoples make tremendous sacrifices from their modest national budgets to buy, at great expense, more and more lethal weapons, we could undoubtedly define the minimum conditions necessary to allow them to feel they no longer had to arm themselves beyond what was necessary for simple police activities. It would then become clear that the great barrier to the proper solution of the fundamental problems related to the arms race is a moral, psychological, political and

economic one. It is not a legal barrier, still less a technological one.

154. My delegation believes that one of the primary factors in the deterioration of international relations and the escalation of the arms race is distrust among States, which is a serious handicap in any disarmament negotiation process. Only the creation of an authentic climate of confidence based on equality, mutual respect and transparency in military and economic information can facilitate negotiations on disarmament, the process of arms limitation, the questions of verification, the settlement of international disputes and conflicts and the strengthening of the security of States, great and small.

155. It appears that that is precisely what the leaders of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev, eloquently testified to when on 8 December 1987, at the Washington summit meeting, they signed the treaty on the global elimination of American and Soviet medium-range and shorter-range missiles, and when on 1 June 1988, at the Moscow summit meeting, they exchanged the instruments of ratification of that treaty. The Government and people of the People's Republic of Benin welcome that historic act, that first great step in the efforts made by the international community to achieve, if not general and complete disarmament, at least, initially, nuclear disarmament. My country, through me, speaking from this rostrum of the General Assembly, would like to address its warm congratulations to Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev for their great political courage, their far-sighted and just vision of the sense of history as we approach the end of the second millennium. We would encourage them not to stop at this first step, which would soon lose its value and its historic scope if it were not rapidly followed up with other giant steps towards nuclear disarmament.

156. Similarly, my country hopes that the START negotiations for a 50 per cent reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals will shortly lead to the signature and ratification of a treaty on the subject. A further step by the two super-Powers along these lines would undoubtedly be a serious token of security for the future of mankind and the safety of civilization.

157. Likewise, my country believes that there is a certain contradiction, which is very difficult to justify, in signing treaties and conventions for the progressive elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth while at the same time going on with nuclear tests and experiments designed to improve these same types of arms and make them more operational and more lethal, to say nothing of the harmful effects, the pollution and the disturbance of ecosystems caused by these tests. Therefore, my Government earnestly hopes that negotiations will be concluded as soon as possible on a convention calling for a total ban on all nuclear tests in all environments.

158. Turning now to the elimination of chemical, bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons, my Government would like to express the hope that the Conference on Disarmament will intensify the negotiations on a convention containing effective verifica-

tion measures, including *in situ* inspections, and at the same time condemning all activities that violate the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.⁵ This convention should, in clear terms, formally prohibit the manufacture, improvement, stockpiling and use of any chemical or biological weapons and should call for the destruction of existing stockpiles.

159. Furthermore, my Government has serious misgivings with regard to the tendency in military circles to replace existing weapons for whose destruction the international community has been fighting for decades now with new arms of mass destruction, which are even more lethal and more formidable. Therefore my country, sharing as it does the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, wishes once again to emphasize that the arms race should not be curbed for some categories of weapons only to be stepped up with new types of weapons; that disarmament should be global and complete, applying to nuclear weapons, conventional weapons and naval weapons, as well as chemical, bacteriological, radiation and other types of weapons of mass destruction which cause excessive injury or which have an indiscriminate effect.

160. The Government of the People's Republic of Benin recognizes the complexity of the problems of disarmament, where a number of factors come into play, not least of which are national policies, regional peculiarities and divergent interests in the field. Nevertheless, we believe that the question of disarmament is a question of life or death for mankind and therefore it is of equal concern to all nations. We must not deprive this debate of the century of its substance by focusing exclusively on certain regions where it is claimed the destiny of our planet is at stake. It is our conviction that the destiny of mankind can be imperilled in any part of the globe, inhabited or not. Examples of armed conflicts in desert areas are not lacking in history.

161. At all events, while encouraging bilateral or even regional negotiations for disarmament, we are still convinced that the international community needs to return to consistent respect for the Charter of the United Nations, with a view to a proper settlement of all the problems involved in the cessation of the arms race and in disarmament. In other words, my country believes that the world Organization provides a multilateral context well adapted to the negotiation of any agreement or convention on disarmament. It has the human, legal and technical capabilities, as well as the appropriate structures. At the present special session the General Assembly could, if necessary, confirm the mandate of the Conference on Disarmament and spell it out.

162. From 24 August to 11 September 1987 the Organization devoted a special conference to the subject of disarmament and development. Without wishing to return to that question, on which there does not seem to be unanimity in the Organization as yet, may I be permitted to make some comments on the subject?

163. When we realize that for more than three decades now 5 to 8 per cent of available resources in the world has gone every year to military budgets,

and that in 1980 world military expenditure amounted to the mind-boggling figure of \$500 billion, while in 10 years WHO has spent only \$100 million for the eradication of smallpox; when we realize that this sum of \$100 million would not be enough even to finance the manufacture of the latest type of strategic bomber; then I think we can draw the conclusions dictated by universal reason and morality. If we gauge the extent of the waste, the ravages and the inhumanity involved, we can grasp in its full dimensions the very clear relationship that exists between disarmament and development. In any case, military expenditure represents a consumption of resources and not an economic investment.

164. In this connection, my Government would like to propose that at this special session the Assembly should establish a special United Nations fund to reconvert and to reallocate for economic and social development purposes resources which, because of disarmament measures, would no longer be required for military purposes.

165. It is high time each and every one of us was convinced that the harmonious and equitable development of mankind can be a determining factor in détente and disarmament, for indeed, détente should not be regarded simply as something horizontal, East-West; it must necessarily also be vertical, North-South.

166. A major statesman and great soldier of our times, a man who in a military field undoubtedly knew what he was talking about, once spoke these meaningful words, with which I will conclude my statement:

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

This great man, this great personality of our century, was not a visionary; he was a realist. His name was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

167. May I, in closing, express the ardent hope that the work of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will, from one end to the other, be guided by that same kind of realism, and that it will lead to the necessary consensus on the most important items on our agenda. It should not be said that all we did was to hold another session on disarmament, but rather that, from 31 May to 25 June 1988, the international community took a giant step towards the achievement of its great ideal, which is to make the entire Earth an area free from war and nuclear weapons, a zone of peace and co-operation among all nations, in this vast and beautiful region of the universe that is our galaxy.

168. Mr. INGLES (Philippines): Allow me first, on behalf of the Philippine Government, to congratulate Mr. Peter Florin on his election to preside over the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Philippine delegation is confident that his proven wisdom, skill and experience will surely guide our deliberations to a successful conclusion.

169. Ten years ago we met in this very Hall for the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. That was acknowledged to be a significant step towards the ultimate achievement of the goal of peace and security laid down by the founding fathers at San Francisco in 1945. It set the track for multilateral disarmament negotiations on the first Disarmament Decade proclaimed by the General Assembly for the 1970s [resolution 2602 (XXIV)].

170. The second special session on disarmament was held four years later, in 1982. Although it was not regarded as being as successful as the first such session, it nevertheless launched the World Disarmament Campaign during the Second Disarmament Decade proclaimed by the General Assembly for the 1980s [resolution 35/46]. It also resulted in proposed plans for a comprehensive programme of disarmament. In addition that session witnessed, as an outpouring of public consciousness, one of the biggest mass demonstrations on disarmament here in New York City.

171. Today we are meeting in a greatly changed atmosphere. The landmarks are many and the catchwords are varied, among them being Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, Moscow, the strategic defence initiative, the double-zero option, deterrence, nuclear winter and *glasnost*.

172. The recently ratified Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, on reducing the nuclear arms arsenals by about 4 per cent, has been hailed as a breakthrough in the negotiations between the two super-Powers because it signalled not only a hope, but also an actual reversal of the nuclear arms race. The first and second special sessions of the General Assembly on disarmament had not halted the arms race. On the contrary, the nuclear weapons arsenals of the super-Powers had been progressively increased from the first special session through the second and to the threshold of the present third special session. It is in that context that we should view the ongoing negotiations for a 50 per cent reduction in the strategic nuclear weapons arsenals which was said to have been given a boost at the recently concluded Moscow summit meeting, although actually the remaining nuclear stockpiles still have the capacity to kill every man, woman and child on this planet five times over. The most heartening prospect, however, is the targeted elimination of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

173. Forty-three years after the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations we now seem close to agreeing universally that a new global balance is emerging in which security becomes a shared responsibility of all. Many of the problems which confront us in the Middle East, South Africa, Central America, South Asia, South-East Asia and other troubled areas of the world seem open to solution only through a common approach to security. The experience of nations tells us now that in many areas of this interdependent and rapidly shrinking world only a collective approach can solve certain problems, such as the conservation of natural resources, the depletion of the ozone layer, environmental pollution, the exploitation of the seas and the use of outer space.

174. That has, however, always been a core idea of the United Nations system. It had been envisioned that the attainment of the United Nations primary goal of peace and security could best be coursed through a common approach to those goals. That was the basic idea for the Security Council, where five permanent members, together with other—elective, non-permanent—members, would guarantee peace for the collectivity of nations in the era following the trauma of the Second World War. That was the motive for the establishment, in the Charter, of the General Assembly, which, according to Article 11, paragraph 1:

“may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.”

175. The principle of collective responsibility also lies at the heart of the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice and other United Nations bodies.

176. The failure of the United Nations system of collective security in many cases may be laid at the door of the Security Council, where the permanent members seem at times to be working at cross-purposes. It would seem that the super-Powers tend to equate their own interests with the interests of the international community.

177. That the United Nations is still far from achieving the goals of international peace and security is dramatized by the fact that 20 million people have been killed in conventional warfare since the Second World War—many times more than the total casualties which occurred during both World Wars. The occasions when nations have united for peace have turned out to be the exception rather than the rule; yet today we are increasingly returning to the formula of a common approach to security. We have as examples the International Conference on Kampuchea, held in New York in July 1981, the proposed multinational patrolling force in the Persian Gulf and the proposed International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

178. It is believed that by this time it has become abundantly clear that individual or unilateral approaches to common problems have been repudiated by the world community as a viable alternative to the collective security system established by the Charter. The days of gunboat diplomacy and the politics of the big stick are numbered.

179. That brings us to the task of the third special session on disarmament. Based on the experience of the two previous such special sessions, we can now attempt to consolidate the gains attained and flesh out and develop proposals made at the first special session, in particular to implement the Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*].

180. We could move forward by adopting a comprehensive test-ban treaty. With the development of sophisticated techniques of verification aside from

on-site inspections, satellite surveillance, listening posts and tamper-proof seismic stations, there can no longer be any valid objection to such a comprehensive treaty 25 years after the adoption of the partial test-ban Treaty.¹¹

181. Pending the attainment of nuclear disarmament, we could also urge the nuclear Powers to negotiate among themselves a treaty prohibiting the threat or use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States, and to pledge not to be the first to use them.

182. After 43 years discussing disarmament, we have learned the following wide-ranging and important lessons.

183. First, bilateral and multilateral approaches in the field of disarmament should complement and reinforce one another. While we would encourage the major Powers to negotiate and to conclude treaties with one another, multilateral negotiations in such bodies as the Conference on Disarmament should be pursued. Today, one of the most promising areas for a breakthrough is chemical weapons, as seen in the proposed convention on the use of chemical weapons being negotiated in Geneva. With the development of such lethal devices as binary chemical weapons and the proven use of chemical weapons in some regional conflicts, the danger of their spread could be checked through a multilateral treaty. Similarly, the discussion of issues of biological weapons and conventional weapons which are being negotiated in various multilateral forums should be accelerated.

184. Secondly, disarmament and international security are inextricably linked. International security in its present form consists of various bilateral and multilateral alliances linked to one or another of the economic systems prevalent in the world today. True non-alignment thus becomes difficult to pursue, since nations can be subjected to economic, military or political pressure. In any case, alliances, deterrence and balance of power cannot be the most desirable ways to approach international peace and security. They are still arrangements supporting readiness for war. On the other hand, disarmament and the scaling down of weapons to lower levels can better guarantee the survival of mankind and the Earth which is our home. The steps taken by the two super-Powers through the INF Treaty and the START talks are thus to be commended as steps in the right direction.

185. Thirdly, disarmament and development are indeed related. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held from 24 August to 11 September 1987 stressed the consensus of the international community that those two issues, while they may each be pursued independently, are interrelated and are goals worth aiming for in their own right. One powerful incentive for disarmament is the transfer to developing countries of resources and technology now being squandered in the arms race, which would arrest the widening of the economic gap between North and South.

186. Fourthly, education and information are essential to disarmament. The need for a better flow of information on various aspects of disarmament, to avoid dissemination of false and tendentious infor-

mation and to concentrate on the need for complete disarmament under effective international control, was stressed in the Final Document of the first special session. The roles of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and UNESCO in study, research and publications on disarmament were cited. In that connection, I should like to stress the particular competence of UNESCO in eradicating the roots of war from the minds of men.

187. Such neat formulas as have been described here and which have emanated from international conferences such as this have been supplemented by action in the rough-and-tumble arena of the real world. When ideas such as those proposed fail to be heeded or realized, then spontaneous regional initiatives may arise which reflect peoples' attempts to solve issues which confront them directly.

188. We welcome governmental initiatives such as the peace plan for Central America and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We look forward to the convening of an international meeting on nuclear-weapon-free zones at Berlin from 20 to 22 June this year under the patronage of Mr. Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic. We note that the meeting will be attended not only by government representatives but also by parliamentarians, trade unionists, students, youth groups and other mass organizations.

189. We also welcome innovative ideas by non-governmental organizations, such as the International Peace Run, Greenpeace, Operation Dismantle, Swedish Pro^c sionals Against Nuclear Arms, the Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, and the International Physicians for Social Responsibility.

190. In our own country, initiatives of the Catholic bishops and of cause-oriented groups like GABRIELA and TERESA and of specialized groups like the Group for a Nuclear-Free Philippines, the Anti-Bases Coalition, the Philippine Peace and Solidarity Council and the Campaign for Democracy and Independence in the Philippines have contributed to the continuing national debate on the issue of nuclear weapons.

191. The non-governmental initiatives bring to mind the Filipino people's experience of a parliament of the streets two years ago when, being deprived of legitimate venues in which to express their grievances, they took to the streets and peacefully challenged and changed the *status quo*.

192. A similar feeling of frustration prevails in the world today. Fifty thousand nuclear weapons are poised to be unleashed to exterminate life on this planet; yet we seem to be able to do little about it. Merely to say that there is lack of political will or of moral strength is not enough. Nonetheless, we the non-nuclear-weapon States do not consider ourselves to be a Greek chorus merely lamenting or bewailing the action of the main protagonists of a potential tragedy. We are also part of the action. Even at the level of being hostages to the nuclear threat, we are as

much involved in the dilemma as those possessing weapons of mass destruction.

193. Fortunately for the nations of the world, there are venues in which we may express our opinions, such as the General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament.

194. As an observer at the recently concluded special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Philippine delegation wholly subscribes to its recommendations. Since the recommendations were adopted by consensus and therefore represent the lowest common denominator of opinion, such recommendations should be viewed merely as the absolute minimum step possible. It behoves us at this present special session to build upon this modest progress in order to advance further on the road towards our final goal.

195. The multilateral machinery of the United Nations must occupy centre stage and not be relegated to the wings simply awaiting the cue from the major Powers. The United Nations should not forget that, as stated in the Preamble of the Charter, it is the peoples of the world which brought it into existence. The United Nations, therefore, is accountable to the peoples of the world, no less than to the Governments of Member States. The primary purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security so as to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. It is both the right and the duty of the United Nations to protect and promote the fundamental human right to peace.

196. In terms of disarmament, the United Nations has shown itself responsive to peoples' initiatives, such as through the World Disarmament Campaign. However, it could do more. For instance, we have studies conducted by the United Nations, from which we have indeed benefited greatly over the years and at this session particularly. These studies might have also richly profited from consultations with experts not directly recommended by Governments but drawn from the private sector.

197. There is a new study,¹² for instance, to update the report entitled *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures*.¹³ In this case, direct testimony from people who live on the periphery of military bases in the third world could provide more insight into actual case examples than simple statistics or experts' descriptions. A study on the effects of nuclear fall-out could include testimony from the victims of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Chernobyl and of South Pacific nuclear testing. The results of such studies must be made available in as many languages as possible and be comprehensible to a wide audience.

198. Studies such as these may help to propel us into the twenty-first century in a better state of preparation. The following century may see us closing in on the last frontiers on Earth, such as the high seas and Antarctica, as well as opening up on the new one of outer space.

199. The next century has also been described as being the century of the Pacific. The main avenues of

world trade and commerce have shifted from the Mediterranean and the Atlantic to the Pacific. On the shores of the Pacific are situated not only four major Powers—the United States, the Soviet Union, China and Japan—but also Australia and New Zealand, the newly industrializing countries of East Asia and South-East Asia and the States of Latin America. Through Pacific waters and straits pass precious cargoes to and from Europe, Africa and the Middle East.

200. It is noteworthy to mention here that two nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established in the Pacific region through the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga. In addition, the area also converges geographically with Antarctica, where another nuclear-weapon-free zone is in force. A third nuclear-weapon-free zone has been proposed in the Pacific region, in particular for South-East Asia; the matter was taken up at the 1987 ASEAN summit meeting at Manila. It was agreed that:

“ASEAN shall intensify its efforts towards the early establishment of a South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone . . . including the continuation of the consideration of all aspects relating to the establishment of the Zone and of an appropriate instrument to establish the Zone”.¹⁴

201. It should be observed that because they are legally binding, treaties may be more easily implemented. In contrast, General Assembly declarations creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean or establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia, and the OAU Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa are still awaiting implementation.

202. Our immediate concern is that, the two super-Powers having once determined that land-based shorter-range and medium-range nuclear weapons should be withdrawn from the European and Asian regions, their arms race might be intensified in the high seas, particularly in South-East Asia, and even extended to outer space.

203. We desire that nuclear testing in the Pacific region be ended now. The super-Powers have tacitly agreed to this, but other nuclear Powers are posing a problem, notwithstanding the Declaration on the Granting of Independence of Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514(XV)]. We wish to avoid a repetition of the NATO–Warsaw Pact scenario along the European border. After being separated by an iron curtain, the European countries are now attempting to build bridges through measures on security and confidence-building proposed at Helsinki, Madrid and Stockholm. We find this to be a healthy and positive sign which could perhaps be echoed in those areas of the world so much in need of détente.

204. We envision the Pacific century as a truly peaceful century.

205. My country has just hosted a meeting of the newly restored democracies of 14 countries that had returned to democracy after having experienced dictatorships. Among the problems we took up were those of transition, the role of the military and of

important institutions like the Church in some countries during the transition, human rights, external debt and further threats to democracy in terms of coups and insurgencies. Some very interesting lessons were learned from the conference. We believe that when people are able freely to choose their own Government and their own arrangement for their security, a stronger foundation is built for achieving security for the world in the long run.

206. My country also participated in the drafting of the 1976 Treaty of Amity and Co-operation in South-East Asia,⁴ under the auspices of ASEAN, and of the 1982 Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes [resolution 37/10, annex], under the aegis of the United Nations. By working together peacefully with our neighbours, we have worked out bilateral arrangements to smooth out, for instance, border problems and territorial disputes.

207. Disarmament should be the keystone of the coming century, if it is to be truly a century of peace. So let us turn our attention to an area which also directly concerns the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America—namely, conventional disarmament.

208. Ms. Ruth Leger Sivard, in *World Military and Social Expenditures 1987–1988*, has pointed out that three fourths of the 3 million deaths in the period 1987–1988 have occurred in Asia and Africa. Some four fifths of the deaths in these regions have been civilians. And such wars have been waged with conventional weapons.

209. While we consider the elimination of nuclear weapons a priority issue, we are equally concerned about the regulation and reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. It is interesting to note that in the 1984 *Study on Conventional Disarmament*,³ it is stated that the conventional arms race is closely related to the political tensions and differences between the East and West and also to tensions, conflicts and confrontations in other parts of the world. The study concludes that progress in the field of conventional disarmament would to a larger extent depend upon the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and States members of the two main alliances.

210. A recent *Economist* article confirmed that:

“in many of today’s wars participants receive outside help from Russia or America or a regional big Power. Intervention does not usually cause wars, but it intensifies them.”

It was also pointed out in the same article that it is not massive weapons like tanks and airplanes which cause the largest number of deaths but principally small arms and munitions which can easily be traded across borders. Developing countries have found it lucrative to trade in, if not actually manufacture, small-scale weapons.

211. A solution seems to lie in controlling the arms trade on a collective basis. A decision needs to be taken thereon at a high political level. It would, in effect, be possible only if nations agreed to form collective security arrangements on a subregional

basis which would be respected by outside Powers. In the past, collective security arrangements on a continental basis have been formed; yet we see that in those regions conflicts still persist. A further step could be taken by pruning down these security arrangements to a subregional basis, thereby ensuring more homogeneity and a closer, local approach to problems.

212. We recall that those neutral nations which have enjoyed peace for a long period up to the present time sought their security, on the one hand, by internal security arrangements and, on the other, by guarantees of non-intervention by external Powers. Such a formula has remained valid in the modern world.

213. In our own region, ASEAN has sought security not in military alliances but in economic co-operation and stability. Such military co-operation as has been established bilaterally does not bear the ASEAN label.

214. Having more than once experienced devastating wars in this region brought about by foreign intervention, ASEAN strives to establish a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality [*ZOPFAN*], as proclaimed in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration of 1971. In aid of that zone, the ASEAN Heads of Government signed a Treaty of Amity and Co-operation in South-East Asia at Bali in 1976. It is a non-aggression pact which establishes machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes and is open to accession by all States in South-East Asia. A nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty for the region is also under preparation.

215. These projects have not been opposed by the socialist countries of the region. Indeed, they have their own proposal of a zone of peace, independence and neutrality in South-East Asia. Two days ago [*9th meeting*] the Foreign Minister of Viet Nam expressed support for the ASEAN initiatives to establish *ZOPFAN* and a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia. At an opportune and propitious time, with the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea, we would hope that the six members of ASEAN could sit down with the three Indo-Chinese States to work out a common treaty or treaties on the matter. While we envision the conclusion of such agreements at the earliest possible time, we take comfort in the proposal made today [*12th meeting*] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, who proposed the elimination of the presence of foreign troops and military bases in foreign territories by the year 2000.

216. We now turn to the question of strengthening the United Nations machinery as a means of realizing disarmament under effective international control.

217. One of the main achievements of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development was its action programme. In the Final Document, the participating States emphasized:

“the need to strengthen the central role of the United Nations and its appropriate organs in the field of disarmament and development, in promot-

ing an interrelated perspective of these issues within the overall objective of promoting international peace and security”.¹⁵

218. We have noted that there have been various proposals in the First Committee of the General Assembly and in the Disarmament Commission to strengthen procedures of United Nations bodies as well as the machinery of the United Nations.

219. We note that the United Nations itself has taken measures to strengthen the effectiveness of its bodies. At the forty-second session, by resolution 42/39 I, the General Assembly expanded the programme of fellowships on disarmament to include training and advisory services on disarmament research. UNITAR and UNIDIR are also undergoing reorientation in the kinds of research pertaining to disarmament which they should undertake.

220. We should like to commend the Department for Disarmament Affairs for its work in the field of disarmament, specifically for the servicing of conferences and for the cogent studies it has produced. Considering that that Department has a relatively small staff, its output is all the more remarkable. Recently, it has even undergone internal restructuring to make it more responsive to the needs of the times. We are among those who feel that the Department for Disarmament Affairs should be given the necessary support and, perhaps, even expanded accordingly. We believe the United Nations should be flexible enough to study possibilities and give priority to disarmament projects in terms of budgeting and personnel.

221. One such project we have in mind is recommended in the action programme: “The United Nations should facilitate an international exchange of views and experience in the field of conversion”.¹⁶ We believe that for countries big or small, the problem of converting arms industries or of reducing military facilities or budgets in favour of development projects is a serious one which deserves special attention. Some studies on conversion have been conducted by developed countries. Yet, developing countries which have invested heavily in arms are often faced with the twin problems of how military expenditures can be reduced without undue loss of security and how savings from arms reduction might be channelled properly towards development projects. It is here where the United Nations can be tapped to serve as an advisory body or an exchange centre for ideas in the field of conversion.

222. There are well-known cases in the past where countries have disarmed or demobilized without seriously affecting—in fact, benefiting instead—their own development. It would be helpful to know how such experiences could be applied in other countries.

223. Since there are now three regions in which United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament have been established—Africa, Latin America, and the Centre for Asia which was inaugurated just this afternoon—dissemination of such ideas as well as exchanges of ideas on conversion could be better organized.

224. In 1987 the Disarmament Pavilion in the Palais Wilson at Geneva burned down. Tragically, that Pavilion was intended for an international conference on disarmament in the 1930s that never materialized. We all know the dreadful consequences of that non-event: when the Members of the League of Nations could not get together to disarm or to halt aggression, a world war took place.

225. Today, we are again faced with a historic choice. As the philosopher George Santayana said: "Those who do not learn the lesson of history are condemned to repeat it." Time is running out. We must act before it is too late.

226. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Representatives will recall that at the 5th plenary meeting on 2 June, the General Assembly, taking into account the practice followed at its twelfth special session, the last special session devoted to disarmament, agreed to requests by three organizations having observer status with the General Assembly to speak in the general debate at this special session. Subsequently, the South West Africa People's Organization, also an organization having observer status with the General Assembly, has requested to speak in the general debate at this session. May I take it that the Assembly agrees to that request?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

NOTES

¹*Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.IX.8), para. 35.

²União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola.

³United Nations publication, Sales No. E.85.IX.1.

⁴United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1025, No. 15063.

⁵Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925 (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

⁶Convention on the Prohibition of the Production, Development and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, signed in London, Moscow and Washington on 10 April 1972 (General Assembly resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex).

⁷A/41/97, annex.

⁸Signed by the Prime Minister of India and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at New Delhi on 27 November 1986 (A/41/929, annex).

⁹See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 48 to 69 and 145, document A/40/192.

¹⁰United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 944, No. 13446.

¹¹Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964).

¹²A/43/368, annex.

¹³United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.IX.2.

¹⁴See A/43/68, annex, p. 3.

¹⁵See United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.IX.8, para. 35 (c)(ix).

¹⁶*Ibid.*, para. 35 (c)(ix) f.