



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

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: This morning the General Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the Portuguese Republic. On behalf of the Assembly I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. Mario Soares and to invite him to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. SOARES (Portugal):* It is a pleasure for me, Sir, to join preceding speakers in complimenting you. Allow me to express my conviction that your well-known qualities as a diplomat will be an extremely useful asset for the success of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I should like also to take this opportunity to express again, publicly, my appreciation of the dedication and efficiency with which the Secretary-General has been devoting himself to the United Nations—that is to say, to the service of peace and international equity. I should like also to congratulate the officers of the Assembly. Their high qualifications assure us of the effective and fruitful conduct of the work of this session.

3. This special session has given rise to increased expectations, since it is taking place at a time when remarkable events are turning the attention of the world to the issue of disarmament. This is the third special session in a series that began precisely a decade ago. At that time there was an obvious lack of tangible developments in the efforts to reduce military arsenals to levels that might be compatible with the legitimate expectations of the peoples of the world for the preservation of peace and security. Given the overall dissatisfaction, and thanks to a praiseworthy initiative on the part of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the General Assembly held a special session in 1978 with the specific purpose of discussing exclusively problems of disarmament. Even though the results achieved at that time might not have been entirely satisfactory, that special session, at the end of which a Final Document [resolution S-10/2] was adopted by consensus, became a noteworthy international event, which acted as a catalyst for our hopes for the strengthening of international peace and security. Nevertheless, the way international relations developed subsequently

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

failed to confirm the results achieved during that session.

4. Looking back to that period, one might even conclude that the process of negotiations on disarmament then reached its lowest level, both multilaterally and bilaterally. The unsatisfactory closing of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1982, and, a year later, the fact that the Soviet Union left the negotiating table in Geneva, reflected that situation. It might also be noted, for the sake of truth, that the impatience and excessive ambition with which some countries addressed disarmament issues during the work of the second special session on disarmament also contributed to the lack of agreement on a final document.

5. That reference to the past is not made in a negative spirit. On the contrary, I intend simply to stress that impatience and excessive ambition are not compatible with the need to give disarmament a direction and a pace capable of satisfying the legitimate demands for the security of all States.

6. Fortunately, in the last few years, particularly since the return of the Soviet Union to the negotiating table in Geneva in 1985, remarkable progress has been achieved in the field of disarmament at the bilateral level between the United States and the Soviet Union. I should like to take the opportunity, in this prestigious forum, to pay a tribute to the tireless efforts of President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in the pursuit of disarmament, consistent efforts directed towards a crucial objective, so clearly summarized in the joint statement of their first meeting, in Geneva in November 1985,¹ in the paragraph which states that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

7. The Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—signed in Washington in December last year, has become a historic landmark. Its recent ratification by the United States Senate and the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union is most commendable. Indeed, for the first time the two States have agreed not only upon the control and reduction but also upon the global elimination of their intermediate-range missiles. I have often, on various public occasions, praised the INF Treaty as an important and positive step forward in the development of East-West relations, since it enshrines the principle of asymmetric reductions and furthermore introduces an unprecedented verification process, remarkable in that it allows for the world-wide establishment of an atmosphere of open confidence.

8. The recent summit meeting which brought together in Moscow the Soviet and United States leaders is yet another extremely important step in the process of disarmament and arms control.

9. We must now proceed to intensify the dialogue between the two Powers possessing the largest arsenals and consequently bearing the greatest responsibilities in the field of disarmament. We must encourage their discussions on the issue of nuclear testing with a view to the ratification of the 1974² and 1976³ treaties, and also their endeavours in the no-less-crucial area of chemical weapons. We believe that this is the most appropriate attitude to take at this time inasmuch as the present atmosphere of confidence favours the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts, as is shown by the agreement on Afghanistan and the Lisbon discussions on Angola. My country is firmly convinced, along with our partners in the European Economic Community, that it is necessary to take advantage of the present favourable international environment. We must thus channel the momentum engendered by the bilateral dialogue process towards the area of multilateral disarmament and at the same time promote an overall international atmosphere of détente and open confidence that will allow for the gradual settlement of regional conflicts.

10. As stated in the first paragraph of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, constitutes a threat for the future of mankind. Even though we agree with that statement, we should also bear in mind that threats to international peace and security do not stem from one specific type of weapon. They are rather the result of a complex interconnection of several factors, among which should be mentioned the important role played by ideological pressures which lead to different types of violence, by attempts against human rights wherever they are committed, by international terrorism and by use of existing arsenals.

11. On the other hand, a growing number of countries have chosen nuclear power as a solution to their energy problems. The risks of proliferation are consequently higher and there is an enhanced threat of possible accidents or even of widespread regional conflicts where nuclear weapons could be used. I thus firmly believe in the vital importance of intensifying our efforts to reinforce the international system of nuclear non-proliferation. Indeed, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII) annex*], in spite of its well-known limitations, is enjoying increasing international support. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the Non-Proliferation Treaty's full political and moral potential will be utilized only when all States, namely those with advanced nuclear technology, adhere to it, thus undertaking not to use fissionable materials except for controllable uses. Meanwhile, the search should continue for the essential common formula that will allow the safeguarding of legitimate needs for security of all parties and, at the same time, the establishment of guarantees whereby nuclear-weapon States would commit themselves to refraining from using this type of weapon against non-nuclear-weapon States.

12. The understandable concern aroused by nuclear arsenals should not be used as a pretext for legitimizing an underestimation of the devastating capacity of conventional armaments. On the contrary, it is more necessary than ever to draw the international community's attention to the urgent need for adequate limitation and control of this type of weapon, taking into account especially the indescribable human suffering and the tremendous material losses caused by conventional weapons in conflicts which have broken out since the Second World War. Ravaging wars of unprecedented violence have proliferated today in many parts of the world, wars in which the most destructive weapons are used and nobody seems to be concerned by their devastating consequences for the people who suffer from them. Often, either because of the geographical conditions of the region where these wars occur or because of the imposition of measures that deny free access to outside observers, there is not even enough news, or pictures and reports of these regional conflicts to alert the international community and make it aware of the tragic existence of these circumstances.

13. That is what has been happening in East Timor since the invasion of the territory in 1975. Once again, Portugal reiterates the right of the Maubere people to express itself and to defend its own cultural and religious identity. We stress once again the need for negotiations that might help us reach an internationally acceptable solution for that territory, and at the same time we express our support of the progress report of the Secretary-General on the subject,⁴ issued last September.

14. The need to highlight the issues related to conventional weapons stems also, particularly in the case of developing countries, from the economic burden of the military expenditures incurred to satisfy their security needs. Such a burden is becoming increasingly and intolerably heavy. We are convinced that a better knowledge of matters of conventional weapons would have a positive influence on the overall disarmament negotiations and even on the strengthening of international peace and security.

15. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe process, initiated in 1975, is a good example of how a concerted effort for international peace and security can be undertaken through regional channels. The Helsinki, Madrid and Stockholm conferences have played an extremely important role in promoting human rights and in strengthening confidence and security in Europe and have led to the issuing of documents on those subjects. Portugal truly believes in the great significance of the current Vienna Follow-Up Meeting and hopes that it will achieve fruitful success in the near future. In order for this to happen, there should be developments in the implementation of existing provisions as well as in the adoption of new measures that would encompass the entire Conference process, namely, human rights questions. In this regard I should like to pay tribute here to the progress accomplished recently in the Soviet Union in the human rights field, thanks to the policy of openness pursued by General Secretary Gorbachev. I trust that some new and extremely necessary steps will now be taken which will be conducive to transparency and greater flexibility so

that the hopes reposed by the world in his important actions may be duly fulfilled.

16. In the field of security, the experience accumulated in the course of the Conference process over the last few years, particularly on the implementation of measures for greater confidence-building, leads us to believe that the overall observance by the 35 countries that signed the Document of the Stockholm Conference and all its provisions would be a major contribution to the strengthening of international security and stability.

17. Confidence is also generated by greater transparency and openness in military matters. Portugal, along with many other countries, participates in the United Nations standardized reporting system. It is of the utmost importance for all countries which are not yet participating in that system to do so soon.

18. Portugal, together with its allies, continues to make tireless efforts to meet in the near future the necessary conditions for embarking on negotiations with the Warsaw Pact countries, aimed at the stability of conventional forces of both alliances from the Atlantic to the Urals. We shall seek to create the necessary conditions for gradually overcoming the sharp differences that prevail in the European continent today.

19. The Assembly, during its first special session on disarmament, stated:

“The complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction represent one of the most urgent measures of disarmament.”
[See resolution S-10/2, para. 75.]

20. Permit me, first and foremost, to point out that Portugal does not possess chemical weapons and intends never to possess them.

21. Particular efforts should be promoted to reaching an effective global and verifiable agreement on the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, especially since this type of weapon has been repeatedly used in flagrant violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.⁵ This rather dark horizon has nevertheless been somewhat lightened by some recent developments within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament and in the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on chemical weapons.

22. I should like to take this opportunity to note with satisfaction the fact that the Soviet Union has finally admitted that it possesses chemical weapons and is now willing to accept mandatory challenge inspections in the future convention. Equally commendable are the announcements made by the Soviet Union about the construction of a facility near the city of Chapayevsk for the destruction of such weapons, and the Soviet initiative inviting foreign observers to be present at a demonstration of the destruction of chemical weapons carried out at the Shikhany Military Facility. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has agreed to send Soviet observers to a similar demonstration in the United States at the Tooele Army Depot. Nevertheless, I cannot but

express our conviction that a less realistic approach underlies both the quantification of chemical armament stocks claimed by the Soviet Union and the insistence of that country, along with that of other Warsaw Pact countries, on concluding the convention by the end of this year. Indeed, numerous and highly complex issues have yet to be successfully resolved in the Conference on Disarmament, particularly regarding adequate mechanisms and processes permitting the efficient verification of compliance with the obligations entered into.

23. As an observer in the Conference on Disarmament, my country, a signatory of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, has a deep interest in the rapid and appropriate implementation of the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction. In the mean time, until such time as there is implementation, the international community collectively should seek the adoption of measures that will prevent, or at least, hinder the proliferation of such weapons.

24. There are two proverbs in my country which are particularly appropriate: “Slowly one goes farther” and “Let’s slow down, I’m in a hurry”. The steps already taken are extremely important. Nevertheless, the truth is that international peace and security cannot rely on the arsenals of war. It is therefore urgent that we find the right solution that will permit us to rescue mankind from the nightmare of war and, at the same time, to release powerful material and spiritual forces with which to combat other scourges that have beset the world at this turn of the millennium.

25. Another means of strengthening international peace and security is the elimination of all violations of the fundamental rights enshrined in the Charter. Indeed, the total eradication of the scourge of war will be accomplished only through the concerted fulfilment of obligations laid down in the Charter. In other words, the Charter in itself constitutes a global security system.

26. We are at a turning-point in history where, at last, common sense seems to be prevailing over national selfishness. This special session must be considered our token of confidence in the potential of the United Nations and its Charter and should be used as a special opportunity for the international community to reiterate its willingness to rely on the peaceful settlement of conflicts and differences. We firmly believe that the success of this session will be crucial to the implementation of a multilateral, dynamic and constructive disarmament process in which the United Nations will have an important role to play. This success depends upon ourselves, upon our capacity to gear our efforts towards reaching broad areas of agreement and to avoid intransigence, particularly concerning issues on which it has proved impossible to achieve consensus.

27. Let us thus be confident. We would have no excuse to offer our successors if we were to waste such a perfect opportunity as history is now offering us. At this moment of renewed hope, I am positive that this will not be the case.

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

29. The Assembly will now hear an address by the President of the Republic of Costa Rica. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. Oscar Arias Sánchez and to invite him to address the Assembly.

30. Mr. ARIAS SÁNCHEZ (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first time I spoke before the General Assembly—at the forty-first session [9th meeting], in September of 1986—I said that I had come from an unarmed nation, from a Central America beset by violence. I spoke of the long decades of oppression and misery that had preceded the wakening of democracy in our small America. I spoke about betrayed revolutions and I declared that Sandino had been assassinated a second time in Nicaragua because the revolution he had hoped for and which all Latin America desired could flourish only in freedom and democracy. I reaffirmed my unwavering faith in peaceful and diplomatic solutions to the serious conflicts of the region.

31. The second time I spoke before the General Assembly—at the forty-second session [8th meeting], in September of 1987—I spoke about the peace plan that we Central Americans had signed in Guatemala.⁶ I asked members to support that plan, and I said that we did not want to go on walking in darkness through history, burdened with poverty and tormented by war. I declared that we wanted a different destiny, a lasting peace that could be guaranteed only by democracy and freedom.

32. In both of my earlier addresses I expressed my country's support for disarmament initiatives. I declared that the nuclear race had turned into a gigantic monument to the blindness of the powerful. I repeated that we favoured arms reduction as a necessity for peace and as a mandate for development. As a nation without weapons or soldiers, we know that security cannot be achieved by force, that it is not acquired by threats and that it cannot be maintained by violence.

33. I have come here for a third time. Today I shall speak about disarmament—that is, about peace, change and development. Many things have happened over these past two years, and some have happened very quickly. The first nuclear arms reduction accord has been signed. This is a road of hope whose construction we should all encourage. There is a Central American peace plan which, despite enormous obstacles and despite the fact that so much remains to be done, has silenced guns and freed the press. There are Soviet troops leaving Afghanistan. Cruel fighting still goes on in which brother kills brother, from the heights of Machu Picchu to the valleys of Ireland, from jungles to deserts and seas.

34. Above and beyond successes and failures, there are pockets of freedom won by men in every corner of the globe. There is a new world springing up everywhere, the result of the advances of freedom on all continents and within all political systems. We cannot betray the world of freedom that is beginning

to emerge. If we want to construct the future, we cannot go on staring at the past. If we fall into the game of a fanatical few who judge today's behaviour by that of yesterday, then no change is possible and everything will have to remain the same: war, hunger, oppression.

35. There are those who lament the withdrawal of Russian soldiers from Afghanistan, just as there are those who regret the fact that the contras have stopped fighting in Nicaragua. I know that there are those who are sorry that the world is becoming freer. I know very well the powerful forces that celebrate the temporary setbacks on the road of peace and who refuse to see its victories. It is difficult to know what wretched motives move those few who continue to wage endless wars, who favour the violence that aggravates conflicts and who block mutual understanding among men.

36. I come to add the commitment and strength of Costa Rica to those of all people of good will who seek to reduce arms and to foster dialogue, who work to share the benefits of development among nations and to abandon attempts to dominate other peoples. I come to join the crusade of men and women who do not fear liberty and who work for that new world, of all those who can help us end the threat of war in Central America. I come to ask that all arms shipments to our region be stopped, because only weapons can hurt the peace plan and slow down the advance of democracy.

37. With each day that passes, there are more weapons in the world and fewer trees. With each day that passes, there is more hunger and less clean air, more drugs and less pure water. In my Central America, with each day that passes there are more soldiers and fewer students. Are we losing the battle for a new world?

38. When we are winning the battle for freedom, we are winning all the battles. We must fight so that mankind's policies reflect the will of the majority. If freedom prevails, those who push drugs and weapons, destroy forests, dry up the water supply and seek to establish dictatorships in their countries will find that their days are numbered. The only battle we cannot lose is the battle for freedom, because if we do we will be forsaking once again that new world that desires and deserves peace, that new world that Christ predicted 20 centuries ago.

39. Once in Latin America's history, weapons and armies were linked to freedom and independence. Once in our history, arms and armies were linked to stability, respect for public institutions, national security and the forging of a new nation. Once in our history, weapons and armies were linked to discipline and opportunities for the development of our peoples. Once in our history, there was an army of liberation.

40. Times have changed. Today's history is one of oppression, tyranny, dependence, disrespect for human rights, corruption and misery, written by the boots of the military.

41. In today's world important changes are taking place in favour of freedom. Among the peoples of

America it is imperative that these changes take place so that democracy can be consolidated and that the hope of development can be reborn. We need a new army of liberation. The soldier must put down his rifle and take up the plough. The soldier must commit himself to the freedom of his people, not to threatening their rights. The soldier must understand that two democracies have never made war on each other in the entire history of our Latin America.

42. Free men understand each other without having to resort to violence. The new army of liberation of the Americas must be much smaller, be subordinate to civilian power and drop out of the arms race. Armies cannot go on hoping for and fomenting the destruction of democratic Governments in order to justify their existence and to seize power. They cannot go on being irresponsible witnesses to the misery of many nations in order to justify themselves by repressing those who rise up in arms. Every soldier who goes parading by, seeking applause, is costing the world 20 empty stomachs. Every tank, every warship and every war-plane is sad evidence of thousands and thousands of men and women without work or a place to live; sad evidence of the slow, painful death of malnourished children.

43. The armies of our nations must understand that the best strategy for facing a neighbour's threat is mutual understanding, mutual disarmament and a solid, permanent commitment to peace. It is the strategy that takes the fewest human lives and consumes the least of our natural resources. It is the strategy that will decorate the lieutenant and the general as true heroes of their nations.

44. The new army of liberation must be reborn if Latin America is to write its own history of peace and democracy. The new army of liberation must be reborn so that in the few pages left of the twentieth century we may once again walk the roads to the development that we so much desire.

45. The call to create a new army of liberation was given by José Figueres, an illustrious Costa Rican, 40 years ago. When he abolished my country's army, he said:

"The regular Army of Costa Rica, worthy successor of the Army of National Liberation, is handing over the keys of these barracks to the schools so that they can be converted into a cultural centre.

"The Founding Junta of the Second Republic declares the National Army officially dissolved, because we consider the existence of a good police force sufficient for the security of our country.

"We firmly support the ideal of a new world in the Americas. To that homeland of Washington, Lincoln, Bolívar and Martí, we wish to say: 'Oh, America! Other nations, your children too, offer you their glories. Small Costa Rica wants to offer you now and forever, along with her heart, her love for civic-mindedness and democracy.'"

46. That act and those words made Figueres the first Commander of the new army of liberation of the Americas. It is time that we pay tribute to those

commanders who disarm their people so that they can be free and work for development, instead of honouring those who accumulate weapons and are insensible to the hunger and submission of their fellow citizens.

47. In the 40 years that have gone by since that time, all the countries of our America have experienced military dictatorship, and some are still living through it today. Not Costa Rica. Our freedoms were never threatened, and we have never known the humiliation of a destiny controlled by force. In these 40 years, all our brother nations have seen the young student, the peasant and the worker dying in cruel and useless slaughter perpetrated by men under arms. In these 40 years, in our homeland not a single mother has had to weep over the death of a son murdered by the arrogance of a soldier or the blindness of a tyrant.

48. In these 40 years, millions of Latin Americans have known exile and have suffered torture, imprisonment and death at the hands of dictators. No Costa Rican has ever left his country and not been able to return to it freely. No one amongst us has ever been imprisoned for expressing his ideas, no one has ever been tortured, and no one has ever been killed. In these 40 years, in which military barracks have been converted into schools, our symbol has been the teacher who extols intelligence, not the soldier who oppresses his people.

49. Latin America is demanding Commander Figueres' army of liberation, because we want peace, because we are going to live in democracy and, above all, because we have the right to development. Our young people have the right to new heroes, to commanders who silence weapons and practise dialogue. From the most powerful nuclear Power in the world to my small, unarmed Costa Rica, we are all called upon to work for progressive disarmament.

50. In Costa Rica I declared 1 December "Army Abolition Day", and now we celebrate that day with pride. I abolished the ranks and military uniforms in use in our police force. The new uniform was designed by students and schoolteachers. In this crusade each nation has its own responsibility: some will have to destroy nuclear warheads, others the uniforms of soldiers; but all of us must work untiringly for disarmament. The weapons that once symbolized freedom and independence have all too frequently become symbols of underdevelopment and oppression. For a long time now soldiers have ceased to be the guardians of freedom and have become its gaolers.

51. We have a serious problem with regard to the consumption of arms. There can be no doubt that the greatest addicts of the arms race are the military men themselves. You will find the most weapons where there is dictatorship, where there is the most misery, where there is the most intolerance, where there is the most dogmatism, be it political or religious. The tragic paradox is that arms almost never seem to help resolve these critical situations. History shows instead that violence tends to deepen hatred and to perpetuate misery.

52. We all know that the principal problem in the arms race lies with the consumers of arms and their most faithful allies, who are generally to be found at the political extremes. But there is also a very serious problem with those who produce and finance arms. Who does not know that it is much easier to obtain credit for weapons than for the development of our countries? Who in the third world does not know that when credit lines for producing or buying foodstuffs are closed, credit lines for arms purchases remain open?

53. In the history of international organizations that have tried to balance the budgets and correct the balance of payments of our nations, can anyone remember a single recommendation that would reduce the importation of arms or reduce military spending? The recommendations have always been to lower expenditures on social programmes, to close schools, to reduce subsidies to farmers, or to fire some public employees.

54. When we try to face up to the great evils that affect mankind, we often wonder what would be the best way to go about it, whether to fight the producer of those evils, the distributor or the consumer. Inevitably, in almost every instance, we have to conclude that we must fight on all fronts simultaneously.

55. With regard to drugs, it has been suggested that countries should be punished economically if they do not fight drug production rigorously enough. Why not do the same thing with the producers of weapons?

56. The same cause should produce the same effect, as an old proverb has it. We should form an international front against our common threats. To strengthen confidence in these common struggles, it will be necessary to seek the eradication of those evils with the same determination, no matter which countries are affected. The industrialized world cannot remain indifferent to the ills of the third world, nor can the third world remain indifferent to the threats to the developed world. We must help each other. Together we can build a new world.

57. Enormous technological advances, the respect that freedom inspires throughout the world day after day and instantaneous communications oblige us to break with the stereotypes of the past. The development of the poor countries can no longer be viewed as a threat to the developed world. Quite the contrary, development is part of the road to peace, which will benefit us all. The same thing is true of the gigantic struggles that we shall have to wage together in the international field. It is true of the arms buildup, the environment, drugs, illness and so many other problems.

58. To strengthen common international struggles we must make uniform the principles we apply and the morality by which we judge our own actions. The fear of nuclear war, the horrors of an atomic end to the world, have rendered us insensitive to conventional warfare.

59. The memory of Hiroshima is stronger than the memory of Viet Nam. How fervently we wish that

the same hesitation existed about using conventional arms as there is about using nuclear weapons. How fervently we wish that the killing of many people a few at a time would be as reprehensible as wiping out a multitude in a single day. Are we living in such an irrational world that, if the atomic bomb were in the hands of all nations and the fate of the world were to depend only on one madman, we would have more respect for the use of conventional weapons? Would peace in the world be more secure? Do we have the right to forget the 78 million human beings killed in the wars of this twentieth century?

60. Today the world is divided between those who live with the terror of being destroyed in a nuclear war and those who die day after day in wars fought with conventional weapons. That terror of the final war is so great that it has made us insensible to the arms buildup and the use of non-nuclear weapons. It is essential—our intelligence demands it and our sense of mercy demands it—that we fight on equal terms so that there will never be another Hiroshima, another Viet Nam, another Afghanistan.

61. The hour is ripe for freedom to make its way into the world, to reassert principles and to renew the morality of the international world. May our policies also reflect the opinion of the majority across all frontiers. We cannot go on allowing a few to benefit from harming many, whether it be with drugs or weapons.

62. Let human rights be defended only by those who have impeccable credentials for doing so; otherwise we will be advancing the cause of those who violate those same rights. Let us not export a medicine or a pesticide that we know to be harmful at home. If we know the value of dialogue and tolerance, let us not stimulate hatred; let us stop selling arms. It is a sad irony that the suspension of arms shipments is thought of by some as a punishment when it should be treated as a reward, as a sincere demonstration of friendship. Therefore, in all our struggles let us work to ensure that international democracy reflects the will of all peoples, reflects the power of the principles we share and draws strength from ethics that strengthen trust.

63. I would like to thank the Assembly and the Secretary-General for the free and unconditional support they have given to the peace efforts of Central Americans. I would like to thank them for their confidence in the face of our temporary failures and for the joy with which they have shared in our successes. I am pleased as well to take this opportunity to call attention to the efforts of the United Nations to show the world that disarmament and development are subjects that should be discussed together. This is a reality we cannot go on ignoring. My own country is the best example of the fact that without weapons there is a true opportunity for development. I would like also to express our thanks for their encouragement of the work of the University for Peace in Costa Rica.

64. There are reasons why the world is impatient; after all, the many injustices that separate the North and the South persist and grow worse. There are reasons for the world to shout in protest; tyrants survive in many countries and there are millions of

men and women demanding freedom. But there are more than enough reasons for not losing faith, for insisting on dialogue, for creating a world with more freedom and less injustice.

65. For many years we have lived in a world prepared for the worst: the overthrow of the democratic leader by the soldier, fratricidal revolution, nuclear war. It is time to overcome fear. It is time to make a commitment to a world prepared for the best: for peace and for development shared by all nations. Let us defeat those few who persist in looking only to the past. We must show ourselves to be capable of creating soldiers without weapons. Our task, and our responsibility, is to encourage the creation of that new world: the world of the commanders of peace.

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

67. The Assembly will now hear an address by the President of the United Mexican States. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado and to invite him to address the Assembly.

68. Mr. de la MADRID HURTADO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Sir, on behalf of the Government of Mexico and on my own behalf, I should like to express our pleasure at your election as President of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your experience and diplomatic skills will serve to guide our deliberations along the path of understanding. I should like also to state that the designation of the representative of the German Democratic Republic as President of the General Assembly is a recognition by the community of States of that country's committed role in international action. In the performance of your functions, you may rely on the invariable support of the Mexican delegation.

69. It is also fair to emphasize the outstanding work that the Secretary-General has done in heading the Organization. With his intelligence and political ability, he has contributed in an exceptional manner to the creation of conditions favourable to a new détente.

70. Never in history has coexistence among nations been easy. Nevertheless, today more than in other times the spirit of contradiction seems to govern our relations. Above and beyond the marvels that are the product of man's inventiveness, the fatal attraction of power, self-consuming and an end in itself, is imbued with the illusory aspiration of subordinating the nature of relations among States to its sway. The material expansion and security of the super-Powers prevail in a world that frequently bows to the dictates of force rather than to the rules of law and equity, preferring conflict to coexistence and tension to understanding.

71. Now some promising signs are appearing on the horizon. The world community is gratified, of course, not only by the dialogue between the great Powers but also because it has already produced undeniable and even spectacular results. The Treaty on the

Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—signed on 8 December 1987, in addition to doing away with a specific class of weapons, also represents real progress in the field of verification. And there is something new of the greatest importance: the decision of the two super-Powers to initiate a downward spiral in their nuclear arsenals, without affecting their security. We, the countries that have fought for disarmament for years, should not withhold our recognition of the major technical effort and the political decision of the negotiators.

72. Only a few days ago, in Moscow, the two super-Powers continued their dialogue and their efforts. Unquestionably, at that summit meeting the constructive will to consolidate a relationship that a short time ago seemed to have seriously deteriorated was once again apparent. The expectations raised by this new meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union were, perhaps, not entirely fulfilled. All of us would have liked to see more substantive progress made in the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive weapons and of nuclear testing. We cannot, however, ignore the fact that, from beginning to end of their joint statement [A/S-15/28, *annex*], both sides again express their intention to increase areas of agreement and to reduce areas of disagreement. As the document itself states, this will be done step by step, but without interruptions or upheavals. The exchange of strategic information and the notification of military actions by the two Powers, which is announced there, should foretoken international relations in which trust and openness will prevail over the confused attitude engendered by feelings of superiority and false predominance.

73. We are optimistic. But we are also aware of the difficult stretch that is still to be covered on the road to disarmament, peace and genuine world security. Ever since 1945, mankind has insisted on its right to a nuclear-weapon-free world—in other words, its right to life. That is why we have consistently repeated that the process of disarmament concerns not only a few major Powers, but, in truth, all human beings and all peoples, since their very survival is at stake. Nothing could be more obvious than that. It should likewise be recognized that the recent accords also result from the demand for a weapon-free world and that the moral and political force that mankind has exerted to prevent the holocaust has undeniably been a factor in creating the necessary constructive atmosphere for the progress of negotiations and agreement.

74. A conjunction of internal and international circumstances has favoured dialogue between the super-Powers. Among them is the squandering of human and natural resources required by an unending and purposeless arms race. Our peoples have always maintained that those enormous resources of knowledge and capital should be used to improve the nutrition, health, education, clothing and shelter of millions of human beings, not only in poor, but in wealthy, nations, where we also find shameful pockets of destitution. But these resources are needed above all in the former, in that world of ours where the majority of the world's people live, where even the barest necessities are often lacking and where

economic difficulties destroy the society's faith and hope for life.

75. The nuclear Powers are also talking and drawing nearer to one another because of economic factors and because they finally seem to realize that it is impossible, at one and the same time, to build ever-more-sophisticated weapons and to make the huge investments demanded by the ongoing technological revolution. This shows that we have had right and reason on our side in voicing our long-standing and persistent demands. Now, there is irrefutable evidence to support our demands. Now, in effect, the profound irrationality and sterile wastefulness implied by the construction of those instruments of death are being acknowledged.

76. Therefore, we shall not abandon our claim and our argument that disarmament and development are inseparably linked. We are well aware that some countries reject the association of those two terms, basing this refusal on the possibility of working out a specific figure that could also serve as a basis for concrete demands. Even if this were the case we would still be right, not only because of current testimony that they themselves have provided, by quantifying their own wasteful spending and investments needed for their prosperity, but also because the unequal exchanges and even exploitation that have marked our history legitimately entitle us to new resources that will allow us to overcome the innumerable deficiencies that still weigh so heavily upon our peoples.

77. No one would escape from a nuclear conflagration. There would be neither winners nor losers. As has rightly been said, a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. These assertions lead us to the inescapable conclusion that no person or nation is unaffected by negotiations and efforts to achieve a world free of these terrifying weapons. We are all involved, and that is why we are here at this world forum seeking to move ahead on the long road that will one day free us from the threat of annihilation. We have recognized the undeniable importance of the bilateral negotiations and agreements of the principal nuclear Powers, which not only bear the main responsibility in those negotiations but are also the ones most implicated in the fact that the face of the Earth is covered with these artifacts of death.

78. We welcome with optimism the recent rapprochement of nations that manufacture and possess these weapons, but we cannot and must not renounce our own right and responsibility. Consequently, we must continue to insist on the decisive importance of the multilateral scope of negotiations, as provided for by the Charter of the United Nations, which confers on the General Assembly and the Security Council the highest duties in respect of peace and security. It is also called for on logical grounds and by the requirement that no one should be left out in a matter of such vital importance. This commitment and collective responsibility are obvious for historical reasons: for many years, the international community made demands that were frequently disregarded and forgotten. Despite this, time has almost invariably borne out our arguments and given them greater weight.

79. Today, we must look beyond the horizon of passing circumstances and the opinions of the moment to insist on some goals of basic importance in the disarmament process: the cessation of all nuclear tests and the prevention of the extension of the arms race into outer space, the reduction and elimination of strategic weapons and of their delivery vehicles and the establishment of measures to prevent a nuclear conflagration, among other measures.

80. It cannot be forgotten that the spirit of this struggle, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and its authors, is to attain one day the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, without exception. It is also clearly a battle against conventional and chemical weapons and in general is firmly opposed to the idea of turning scientific and technological development to the construction of new military artifacts.

81. Disarmament is essential to international stability, peace and security. It is a decisive step within a broader process that includes other elements. True stability, lasting peace among nations and the guarantee that each nation can exercise its rights without detriment to the legitimate rights of others also depend on narrowing the abysmal gap between rich and poor countries and on finding political solutions and negotiated settlements to regional conflicts which are exhausting and destroying the peoples of the areas.

82. A new state of détente between the West and the East appears to be in the offing. Unfortunately, North-South relations have worsened, both qualitatively and quantitatively. In recent years the distance that separates a few advanced societies from the majority of the peoples of the world has widened. It is inadmissible that the most severe effects of this crisis should fall almost exclusively on the developing countries. The efforts made have been far from equivalent and symmetrical. The fact is that, owing to a perverse phenomenon in the international economy, our countries are being decapitalized and turned into net exporters of resources to the financial centres. That situation, which causes instability and legitimate social outcries, cannot continue. It is intolerable and it jeopardizes the capacity of the international community to attain fair and harmonious organization, without which peace will not last and coexistence among States cannot develop within a framework of true security and respect for the rights of man.

83. The same is true of regional conflicts, which also threaten peace and security among nations. Fortunately, initial solutions seem to have been found in some cases. The majority, unfortunately, still present obstacles which seem insurmountable. The military conflict in the Middle East continues to be a challenge to political understanding. *Apartheid* must be eradicated, as a disgrace to humanity. The Iran-Iraq war must not continue to inflict so much suffering. Argentine sovereignty over the Malvinas must be recognized. Central American conflicts, including that in Panama, must be settled rapidly, with the strictest respect for the self-determination of each nation and without inadmissible foreign intervention. The conditions for a negotiated peace, in the case of the confrontations in Latin America, have

already been clearly defined. Let us aid in the successful outcome of formulas for peace, without disrupting the political negotiations which are being called for by the peoples of the area.

84. Mexico is convinced that, just as the United Nations has made a great effort to move ahead on the road towards disarmament, it should also focus its energies in forthcoming years on solving the problem of poverty and finding a means of settling sanguinary regional confrontations. The international community could also, with good faith and decisiveness, achieve the fundamental goals for attaining true peace in relations among States.

85. It is well known that since the founding of the United Nations Mexico has taken an active part in discussions and negotiations on disarmament. Since 1984, together with heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Sweden and Tanzania, in the Initiative for Peace and Disarmament, we have made every effort to promote a favourable political climate for peace negotiations. The following points address the proposals which are of major importance to Mexico and which should be examined carefully by the General Assembly at this special session.

86. Nuclear tests should be prohibited, which would contribute to halting the perfecting of weapons and the arms race. We insist on the importance of approving and signing a multilateral treaty on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, which would be a significant step towards general and complete disarmament.

87. The establishment of a multilateral verification system within the framework of the United Nations should be studied, particularly with reference to nuclear tests.

88. The extension of the arms race into new spheres, such as outer space, should be prevented.

89. The proliferation of nuclear weapons should be prevented, not only out of present self-interest but also in the interest of future generations. That would naturally not imply the raising of barriers to the development of nuclear technology for exclusively peaceful purposes or taking advantage of non-proliferation to conceal the manufacture of more sophisticated weapons.

90. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones should be encouraged. Here I would mention the Treaty of Tlatelolco,⁷ which, along with similar and more recent agreements, constitutes valuable experience which originated in Latin America.

91. The final negotiation of an international agreement that would prohibit the manufacture, stockpiling, transport and use of chemical weapons should be encouraged.

92. The direct and indirect links between disarmament and development should be emphasized and explored.

93. Our call for disarmament is also a demand for the well-being of all peoples, and in the final analysis it is a renewed effort to promote reason, balance and

justice in international relations. The attainment of peace for society, in both its internal and external workings, is still one of the prime objectives of contemporary civilization.

94. Naturally, disarmament is an objective of primordial importance today to the survival of all men and women the world over who aspire to and fight in good faith for the right to live, build, think and create: in other words, those whose perspective is based not only on individual and immediate interests but also on the most abiding interests of the community of nations and of generations yet to come.

95. The special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which were held in 1978 and 1982 each achieved the objective proposed at the time. This third session should confirm that the nations gathered here, without exception, assume our corresponding responsibility with regard to the danger of annihilation. Let us honour human reason and a civilization which has taken thousands of years to build. Let us press tirelessly ahead in our struggle for the life and prosperity of all men and all nations.

96. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the United Mexican States for the important statement he has just made.

97. Mr. SHEVARDNADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In just a few days the first clusters of intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles will be destroyed. The treaty eliminating those missiles came into force at the Moscow summit meeting. As Mikhail Gorbachev said, the era of nuclear disarmament has begun. Destiny has so willed it that this coincides with this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

98. The Soviet Union invites the Secretary-General of the United Nations, representatives of the States members of the Security Council, the representative of Zimbabwe as the current Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and also delegates to the Conference on Disarmament to be present at one of the first missile-elimination procedures. This, of course, is not the Bolshoi Theatre but nonetheless a major première, a momentous historic event.

99. It has been made possible by the Moscow summit meeting. This alone lends the summit an extremely important political dimension, but it has also made possible many other things, and this even further enhances its significance in the context of disarmament. At the summit distinct progress was achieved towards agreement on 50 per cent reductions in strategic offensive arms, while observing the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems.⁸ It has brought us closer to a convention banning chemical weapons. A step has been taken towards limiting and subsequently ending nuclear explosions. Important additional confidence-building measures in the military field have been agreed upon. Principles of comprehensive control and verification have been reaffirmed and further developed. A contribution has been made towards putting on a practical plane the problem of reducing troops and conventional armaments in Europe.

100. The Moscow meeting between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States of America has marked a further advance in the conceptual view of the nature of disarmament itself. It has shown that despite their profound differences and disagreements the Soviet Union and the United States can co-operate in this extremely important sphere. We are in full agreement with speakers here who believe that dialogue between the leaders of the two major nuclear Powers is of fundamental importance for strengthening international security in the interests of all nations of our planet. And, of course, we share the opinion of Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar that this historic event confirms the timeliness and relevance of this forum.

101. At the risk of over-using the words "for the first time" and "new" I should like to focus the Assembly's attention on the first measure of real disarmament, which, precisely here and precisely now, must assume its true proportions in this forum.

102. A reality hitherto unknown to mankind has come into being; the world has entered a new state, one of significance equal to the overcoming of the earth's gravity. The anti-gravitational forces have now finally come into their own and, as they gain momentum, could eventually counteract the universal pull of weapons and put an end to the centuries-old dependence upon them. This is only a beginning, but it ushers in an era so qualitatively new as to require a collective effort to grasp its meaning.

103. It is our duty to learn the lessons of the first treaty on nuclear disarmament so that together we can ascend to a higher plane of civilization. In our view, these lessons show that disarmament as a universal human concept can become—and indeed has become—a universal human task, and one which can indeed be accomplished.

104. Here, without in any way digressing from our thoughts about the future, we owe a debt of gratitude to those whose idea of a world without weapons for too long seemed to be Utopian. Well, as a great man once said, Utopias often turn out to be truths uttered before their time.

105. There is nothing more powerful than a truth whose time has come. For us, Lenin's dictum, "Disarmament is the ideal of socialism", has always been such a truth. It could not become a reality immediately after our revolution. Even now it might be said that we are still far from that ideal. Indeed, the Soviet Union, like the United States and some other countries, does have a lot of weapons.

106. *Glasnost* is indivisible. It transcends national boundaries. I will give the Assembly figures: at the present time the Soviet Union's strategic offensive weapons comprise 2,494 delivery vehicles and about 10,000 warheads, including those on sea-launched cruise missiles.

107. But the world should know that in addition to vast arsenals, the Soviet Union possesses an even greater potential for political will for disarmament. It equals our ability to analyse in a self-critical way our own past and the mistakes which were made. In the

process of the renewal of our society new political thinking is displacing old thinking and establishing new and higher standards of *glasnost*, openness and democracy.

108. This tendency to totally honest self-assessment, which is inherent in *perestroika*, has found ample expression in the Theses of the Central Committee of our party for the nineteenth National Party Conference.

109. Speaking of dogmatic and subjectivist approaches which have left their imprint on our foreign policy, we are entitled to expect others to be equally self-critical. In this lies the courage of the new political thinking which challenges out-dated stereotypes and standards. In this lies a desire for an open dialogue with the world, a dialogue which has been initiated, stimulated and inspired by our *perestroika* and renewal. In this lies a policy of democratizing international relations, which presupposes not only dialogue on an equal footing but also equal responsibility.

110. For us the idea of a State founded on socialist legality is inseparable from the principle of the primacy of law in international relations. It is only on this basis that new political thinking can put into effect a set of major ideas, such as: a step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, a comprehensive system of security, a common European and a common planetary home, defensive sufficiency and a non-offensive strategy, national reconciliation and regional security, and the ending on a reciprocal basis of the presence of foreign troops and bases on foreign territories.

111. The Soviet Union is submitting to this forum a number of proposals which could constitute elements of a new disarmament platform in the years following the beginning of the physical elimination of nuclear weapons.

112. Earlier in this statement I used the word "destiny". It is hard to disagree with Immanuel Kant, who said that destiny is the cause compelling people to achieve concord through discord even against their will. Faced with the threats of this century, the world is one and it shares a single destiny. Redeeming concord among countries and peoples is forcing its way through a multitude of discords into the light of day. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is an embodiment of this concord.

113. Today the world community is witnessing a realistic prospect of the removal of 13,000 nuclear warheads from weapons arsenals. We are confident that an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms, while observing the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, will be concluded. The search for and the devising of other political methods, the purpose of which would be to build a nuclear-free world, is now the order of the day.

114. If the objective were merely to increase man's chances of survival, the current session could even now announce its total success, for today these chances are greater than 10 years ago. Indeed, they are greater by the number of missiles that the Soviet

Union and the United States will soon destroy. Yet today this can no longer satisfy us. For the goal of our quest and our efforts is not a situation in which mankind is threatened with 10 deaths instead of 20, but a world in which it is no longer threatened by death because of a conflict or a war.

115. We have before us two strategic missions. The first is to expand and intensify the disarmament process without losing momentum, and the second is to build security on a different qualitative level.

116. Having embarked on the process of disarmament, we are now confronted with the fundamental problem of how to disarm ourselves without diminishing either our own or global security, without dividing it into two mutually exclusive types—one for ourselves and the other for all the rest.

117. We are not saying that nuclear weapons can be eliminated easily or regardless of other elements of security. But the first and perhaps the hardest thing to do is to abandon the myth of nuclear weapons as the guarantor of peace, for if they were, then why eliminate them at all? Because this “guarantor” is capable of reducing all life on this planet to ashes; because so long as those weapons exist, mankind lives in constant fear.

118. Yet for all this, nuclear weapons do not end but rather stimulate the race in all other kinds of weapons. For if nuclear war is impossible—and it is indeed impossible—then elementary logic requires nations to acquire other, non-nuclear weapons, making them ever more sophisticated and powerful. In fact, “nuclear deterrence” cannot exist without constantly growing arsenals of conventional weapons. “Nuclear deterrence” does not rule out, but clearly implies, conventional war, which is always capable of escalating into a world war.

119. The nuclear component of strategy is the most aggressive catalyst of the arms race, which is why it must be done away with. The Soviet Union is convinced that ensuring security by non-nuclear means is possible. It is possible on the basis of sufficiency.

120. Sufficiency is not just a certain level of armaments but, above all, a certain frame of mind, a psychological and political disposition towards ever smaller arsenals, sufficient for defence but not for attack. Sufficiency is something that was unthinkable in the years of the cold war, which forced us and others to keep arming ourselves over and over again. Sufficiency is something that can and must be seen today as the only possible path towards a non-violent world for all nations. Sufficiency is a concept of security deriving from the collective actions of States. Peace and the rule of law can no longer be maintained by two or three of even the most powerful countries. It is the function of special institutions and mechanisms which are capable of combining the efforts of many into a single will.

121. We have such institutions. They are the United Nations, the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee, which was conceived as a special body to assist the Security Council in formulating plans for putting in place a system that would

regulate arms in the world. For a long time, conditions for that did not exist. But such conditions are now being created.

122. As we see it, one of the central tasks for the international community, and specifically for the disarmament forums within the United Nations system, is to devise a concept of disarmament which must be based on the idea of the integrity and interdependence of today's world. We want to see the same integrity in the process of disarmament and, accordingly, in the system of control. It would appear that common sense embodied in verification and inspection arrangements can be much more powerful than the awe-inspiring horror of the wide-open door of the nuclear arsenal.

123. Having provided the maximum opportunities for verification, the Soviet Union has contributed to the establishment of new forms of coexistence on our Earth, to a truly revolutionary change in the traditional views of the limits of openness in relations among States. This revolution, of which we are rightly proud, should be extended to other areas of disarmament, and also to regional conflicts. Here verification is the central question, for if there is no verification, then even the movement towards settlement would be threatened.

124. We make no secret of the address of our concern. It is Afghanistan. When one party observes its obligations under the Geneva agreements while the other party is violating them, this naturally causes us to have doubts about our partner and to withdraw our trust in him. I would go further and state that the violating partner undermines confidence in the possibility of settling other regional conflicts, for which Afghanistan offers a ray of hope and an example of a solution. We believe that the world community must not condone actions of this kind.

125. Dialogue on disarmament can and must be part of a wide-ranging multilateral process of ensuring comprehensive security on a genuinely international basis. This presupposes that all countries, and primarily all nuclear Powers, will define their attitude towards real disarmament and state how they intend to participate in that process. Indeed, we should participate in disarmament rather than avoid it, overzealously worshipping the idols of “nuclear deterrence”. We should contribute to disarmament rather than engage here in a statistical evaluation of Soviet military power while somehow forgetting to cite similar data on one's own country and its allies. I have in mind, of course, the statement made here yesterday by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, Sir Geoffrey Howe [*10th meeting*].

126. An in-depth exchange of views has started at the United Nations around the idea of a group of socialist countries concerning the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security based on the Charter of the United Nations. At the current session, they have submitted a memorandum entitled, “Security through Disarmament” [*A/S-15/26, annex*], which gives concrete expression to the central idea of that concept.

127. We believe that the way to implement that idea is to develop a new understanding of a reasonable combination and harmonization of national and global security interests. It should be based on the idea of a transition to non-military guarantees, with States adopting a defensive strategy and, accordingly, reorienting their military structures exclusively to the objectives of non-offensive defence.

128. The member States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization have made their position quite clear in a document on military doctrine.⁹ It codifies the strictly defensive nature of their politico-military alliance and contains an appeal to the member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*] to undertake a comparison and joint discussion of military doctrines. The goal is to bring military theory and practice into conformity with the requirements of defensive strategy and the principles of sufficiency for defence. Will this appeal be heeded? We very much hope so, because there are very serious issues involved here.

129. Defensive strategy and military sufficiency will require not only arms reductions but also a radical overhaul of their structures and distribution, changing the very nature of military activities and the development of armed forces.

130. In this context, talks on conventional armed forces and armaments, above all in Europe, are a matter of priority for the Soviet Union.

131. We propose that reductions in conventional armaments begin with the elimination of existing imbalances and asymmetries on the basis of a reciprocal exchange of data. It would appear that a great deal of such information is being bandied about all over the world. However, those figures are not produced by Governments, and that deprives them of the necessary legal force and credibility. That is why we are so insistent on a formal exchange of official data.

132. As proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Moscow summit, that could be done even before the start of negotiations. Once they get under way, it is proposed that on-site inspections be conducted to check baseline data, thus removing differences in assessments. At that stage ways of eliminating imbalances and asymmetries could be identified and the first practical steps taken to that effect, and methods of carrying out reductions of armed forces and armaments under the strictest control could also be devised.

133. The second stage of the negotiations would deal with cutbacks in the armed forces of both sides by approximately 500,000 men each.

134. At the third stage further reductions would be made in armed forces and conventional armaments; the armed forces of both sides would be given a defensive character and their offensive nucleus would be dismantled.

135. At all those stages of negotiations we are ready for reciprocal reductions in all types of offensive arms, including tactical nuclear weapons, attack aircraft, tanks and so on.

136. Parallel to that, discussions could be held on measures for the disengagement of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO forces and the establishment of corridors and zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons. In that regard, some extremely interesting suggestions have been made by socialist countries. I shall just mention the proposals of the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, the Jaruzelski Plan, the Jakes Plan and so on.

137. Another task is to place limits on the development of ever-more-destructive types and systems of conventional weapons. Worthy of consideration in this regard is the proposal of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for the cessation and prohibition of the use of scientific and technological achievements for developing and producing new generations and kinds of weapons of mass destruction and of new kinds and systems of conventional arms.

138. We regard as very interesting the idea of conducting a systematic assessment of scientific and technological achievements with a view to the timely elaboration of recommendations on preventing the use of new technologies for weapons development and on establishing to that end a committee of prominent scientists under the auspices of the United Nations. This should be done in the first place with respect to laser, genetic and electro-magnetic systems. We note the importance of Sweden's proposal to ban the use of battlefield laser weapons for blinding personnel.

139. One of the obstacles to a settlement of regional conflicts is the intensive importation of weapons into zones of increased confrontation. Therefore the Soviet Union favours restrictions on the sale and supply of conventional arms.

140. Arms supplies are not the root cause of conflicts. Sometimes they are so deeply rooted that they may appear to defy solution. But now that the idea of national reconciliation has crystallized, everyone can see that it opens up good prospects.

141. There is, of course, no single prescription, and there can be none; but solutions could be sought along those lines. Contributing to them are the initiatives of many countries, including Kampuchea, Viet Nam, Laos, Angola, Ethiopia, Cuba and Nicaragua, which in very difficult circumstances are working out a future-oriented policy of regional settlement.

142. Asian security is becoming an important area in its own right. Here, too, a number of countries are trying to make their small contribution to ensuring peace and stability in the region. Worthy of attention in particular are the proposals of India, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Mongolian People's Republic and, for other regions, the initiatives of countries of Latin America, Africa.

143. Following the concept of an integrated process of disarmament, it is inadmissible to leave naval forces outside the framework of negotiations. This is a major global problem, but its solution can and must be initiated at regional levels. Here, again, we draw attention to the initiatives set forth in statements of

Mikhail Gorbachev at Vladivostok, Murmansk and Belgrade, which contain detailed proposals for restricting naval activities in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, the northern seas and the Mediterranean.

144. From the disarmament standpoint naval forces still remain off limits. Some States which are ready to include even kitchen trailers in the military balance on the side of their opponents become nervous when they are invited just to talk about, for instance, aircraft-carriers. And here a question arises on the level of primary arithmetic: what is the number of, say, tanks that would equal the fire-power of this floating armada?

145. Let us try to begin with confidence-building measures in the naval sphere, such as advance notification of transfers and manoeuvres of naval and associated air forces; limitation of the number, scope and area of exercises; the inviting of observers there and exchanges of information. We have the unique experience of the Stockholm Conference; why do we not extend that to disarmament?

146. To strengthen confidence, it would be useful to compare data on naval potentials, to discuss principles of the use of naval forces and to compare the goals of exercises and manoeuvres at sea.

147. All have an equal stake in reliable security of sea communications, and that would be facilitated by establishing, in areas of major international ocean lanes, zones of lower density of armaments and enhanced confidence and by withdrawing offensive forces and systems from such zones. Here, again, we must be guided by the concept of non-offensive defence. At sea, too, we are in favour of finally precluding the possibility of launching a surprise attack or large-scale offensive operations.

148. Recent events have once again convinced us that it is desirable to create United Nations naval forces. The permanent members of the Security Council could announce in advance which elements they would be prepared to assign to such forces. In the near future a joint experimental exercise could be conducted in which the fleets of permanent members of the Security Council would practise maintaining freedom of navigation by United Nations forces.

149. An agreement on limiting the number of ships equipped with tactical nuclear weapons would also be consistent with present-day trends. On the basis of reciprocity with the United States and other nuclear Powers, the USSR is ready to announce the presence or absence of nuclear weapons on board its naval vessels calling at foreign ports. There is the attractive idea of collective efforts by countries concerned to develop technical means of verifying the absence of nuclear weapons on board naval vessels.

150. We propose that all these questions be discussed in the United Nations at a multilateral meeting of military experts.

151. The question of military bases in other countries and territories and of foreign military presence lies at the junction of the most urgent political and military problems. It is the political pole where the meridians of international security and sovereignty,

independence and the national dignity of peoples and countries converge.

152. The USSR proposes the goal of eliminating foreign military presence and military bases in foreign territories by the year 2000. This goal should be pursued gradually, with due regard for specific regional characteristics and for the real needs of security and defence. The United Nations could be invited to participate in verifying the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories. Where the presence of foreign troops is needed to maintain peace, they should be provided by the United Nations.

153. It would be a very good thing if States agreed to provide to the Secretary-General information on their military presence abroad and on foreign military presence on their own territories.

154. As the process of disarmament comes to encompass an increasing number of countries, international verification arrangements will probably be required. This is likely to put on the agenda the establishment of an international monitoring and verification agency under United Nations auspices. The multilateral verification body could co-ordinate and, where appropriate, monitor the fulfilment of obligations under multilateral arms limitation and reduction agreements, verify compliance with agreements on easing international tensions and monitor the military situation in areas of conflict.

155. Fully aware of the difficulties involved in putting this idea into effect, we proceed from the assumption that the process that will eventually lead to the establishment of an international monitoring and verification agency will be based on taking decisions by consensus. We do not exclude the possibility that control machinery could be set up on a case-by-case basis for specific situations.

156. It would also be desirable to establish under the Secretary-General a multilateral centre to assist in verification. It could, in our view, perform such functions as promptly dispatching, on instructions from the Secretary-General, missions to areas of international conflict and rendering assistance in verification matters to the parties to bilateral and regional agreements. On the basis of reports from these missions, the Secretary-General could hold consultations with States concerned and use his right of recourse to the Security Council.

157. Finally, may I once again draw the Assembly's attention to what we regard as the most important task in the area of disarmament, namely, preventing the introduction of weapons into outer space. One of the ways to achieve this goal is to make space a sphere of expanding peaceful inter-State co-operation, the benefits of which could be enjoyed by all peoples on Earth. We see a joint mission of Soviet cosmonauts and American astronauts to Mars as an example of such co-operation, and there is the possibility of participation by other States. This project would undoubtedly give a powerful impetus to developing new technologies and speeding up scientific and technological progress.

158. Speaking from this rostrum at the fortieth session, in 1985 [6th meeting], we advocated the

establishment of a world space organization. Today such an organization would be even more timely. We envisage it as a focal point for the practical development of a universal model of international space exploration. Even today there is an urgent need to explore the possibilities for co-operation among States on the basis of agreed rules and procedures to prevent pollution in outer space. Building on the idea put forward by France, a start could be made in establishing an international space monitoring agency.

159. The first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament called for a complete ban on all types of chemical weapons. Today that call has been translated into an extensive draft convention with detailed annexes and with most of the texts free from brackets. Finalizing the convention in the near future is a realistic possibility.

160. It is, however, jeopardized by the spread of chemical weapons. This exceedingly grave problem is of great concern to us. The Soviet Union strongly condemns any use of chemical weapons or any transfer of such weapons to others. We must all regard the danger of chemical weapons proliferation as yet another argument for an early agreement totally banning them, not as a pretext to avoid it. The sooner we conclude a comprehensive convention, the more effective will be measures to combat the spread of chemical weapons.

161. A few words now about nuclear testing. By now the two sides at the Soviet-United States talks are close to attaining the first-stage goal, namely, producing improved measures to verify compliance with the 1974² and 1976³ treaties, which will make it possible to move on to the next phase, at which limitations on the number and yield of test explosions will be discussed. As is known, an agreement on conducting a joint verification experiment was signed during the Moscow summit.

162. Soviet-United States negotiations are only part of our efforts to achieve a total ban on all nuclear testing. Serious work remains to be done at the Conference on Disarmament. Proposals by the Six Nation Initiative, by socialist countries and by several Western nations have laid a good beginning, a good foundation for that. If for some reason it is difficult to embark immediately on the drafting of a text of a total test-ban treaty, here, too, a step-by-step consideration of the verification system could begin. But failure to move is totally unacceptable, for without limiting and banning nuclear tests it is difficult, and even impossible, to prevent the global spread of nuclear weapons.

163. Action in this area could be reinforced by the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world. It is only serious work and complementary efforts on a multilateral and bilateral level that will lead to the attainment of the ultimate goal. All this said, our unswerving position of principle on a nuclear-testing moratorium is as valid as ever: on the basis of reciprocity with the United States we are ready to reintroduce and to observe it, only this time not for a year and a half but for all time.

164. In concluding my remarks on nuclear weapons, I consider it necessary to state that if the General Assembly adopts an appeal to the USSR and the United States not to use for military purposes the materials released as a result of nuclear disarmament agreements, we shall respond to that appeal positively.

165. I wish to return now to a subject whose tremendous importance has become particularly evident following the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. The subject is disarmament and development.

166. Even those measures of concrete disarmament that we have already taken have released significant resources for development in our country's social sphere. This experience gives us an incentive for our persistent efforts to promote the idea of disarmament in order to increase assistance to the developing countries. In this context, the proposal for the establishment of a disarmament for development fund appears to be particularly relevant. We reaffirm our willingness to participate in such a fund.

167. The Soviet Union also intends to undertake a thorough examination of the problem of converting military industry to civilian purposes and of preparing relevant plans on the national and local levels.

168. All those issues could be included in the agenda of a meeting of the top leaders of the States members of the Security Council proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

169. If there were no areas where the interests of all converged, no society whatsoever would be able to exist. This session and our dialogue are the best possible confirmation of that thought of a great philosopher. Disarmament is the point at which the interests of nations converge, and it is this fact that makes the world community more conscious of the fact that it is a single whole. In the words of Mr. Gorbachev, the Soviet Union regards itself as part of a single civilization, believes in the primacy of universal human values and views the preservation of peace as a matter of the highest priority.

170. This provides a reference point for our foreign policy activities. The three years of *perestroika* have increased its power for forging peace. In the view of the Soviet leadership, today the immediate threat of war involving the major Powers has receded. The world situation has become more stable and predictable. The prospect of curbing the arms race is now more real.

171. In a few days, when the first public execution of weapons in human history takes place, there will be no weeping or wailing. It will herald an end to a great deal of misfortune, grief and sorrow. The nightmare of violence and war will begin to be incinerated at the bottom of the pit where missiles are to be blown up.

172. However, having dug a grave for weapons of mass destruction, mankind must now build the foundation of a nuclear-free and non-violent world.

Let us hope that our forum will place its faith and resolve in that foundation.

173. Let us hope that the results of this session will reflect the will of the world community, which has numerous representatives here. From meeting and talking with them in recent days, it has become obvious that a genuine people's assembly on disarmament has gathered here, the best representative of people's diplomacy. Its proximity and its involvement lend our activities the human dimension which is the only measure for efforts to build a world without wars and without weapons.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

NOTES

¹A/40/1070, annex.

²Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests.

³Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes.

⁴A/42/539.

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).

⁶A/42/521-S/19085, annex. For the printed text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Forty-second Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1987*, document S/19085, annex.

⁷Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068).

⁸United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 944, No. 13446.

⁹See A/42/313, annex.