



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

AGENDA ITEM 8

General debate (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil. On behalf of the Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations Mr. José Sarney and to invite him to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. SARNEY (Brazil):* It is with a feeling of history that I once again address the United Nations, the one Organization that symbolizes the universal ideal of understanding among countries—a distant ideal embodying the longings of statesmen, heroes, martyrs, romantics and thinkers who, from romanticism to ruthlessness, have faced a permanent contradiction between reality and hope and the paradox of the crude difference that exists between expectations and facts.

3. Throughout my political life I have always dedicated a special attention to international issues. As a congressman I dealt with them often in the House of Representatives and Senate of my country. As President, one of my constant concerns has been foreign policy.

4. This is the fourth time I have appeared in this forum, continuing to follow world changes. The first was in 1961 at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, when I was a representative in the Special Political Committee. The United Nations then had 104 Members; now there are 159. The halls of the United Nations were then embellished by the varied colours of the attire of different customs and races, by legendary heroes of wars of liberation, by nostalgic heirs to thrones. It was the time of decolonization, of a world freeing itself from the political geography that had been imposed upon it by the exploitation and domination of empires. The sun of freedom was rising again for many peoples. But unfortunately this was the beginning of turmoil and the forbidding era of nuclear experiments that burst forth as a peril to mankind. One walked through New York as if at any instant the fall-out from clouds filled with the residues of nuclear death might cover the streets. Shelters were planned and the awareness of the entire population was mobilized.

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

5. The questions discussed then would later emerge in all their dramatic weight. On the agenda at that time, the Middle East question was that of Arab refugees in Palestine. There was the Congo, Alto Adige and the effervescence of the Trust Territories. Africa was breaking its shackles. On behalf of my country I was one of the first speakers to protest against a blemish on the history of humanity, *apartheid*, which was then beginning to show the entire world its tragic and cruel face. Africa finally began to enter into its own, with blacks playing a role in the centre of decisions, protesting, fighting and affirming themselves.

6. As head of Government, I was here in 1985 to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Organization and to set forth my Government's foreign policy guidelines. Today, at the invitation of the Secretary-General, I have come to participate, along with a great number of heads of State and Government, in this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the first to be attended by a President of Brazil.

7. The question I now ask myself concerns the timing of our meeting, when the focus is on the Moscow summit, where the two super-Powers have discussed disarmament with the authority of those who possess the weapons and refer to them with the simplicity, as Clausewitz said, of the great commanders who speak with ennui of the problems of the life and death of millions. From them, from their own lips, the act of war is personalized as if it were a mere duel.

8. Far be it from me to discourage those pacts and efforts. On the contrary, my country has encouraged and praised humanity's debt to those statesmen—President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. They had the courage to surmount barriers and to initiate an effective programme of disarmament, one that cannot come to a halt, disproving the satanic theory that peace resides in a balance of terror, or, as Bismarck once said, "Gratitude and trust will not bring men together; only fear will do so."

9. What concerns me, however, is the fact that if war and peace are today problems that affect the very survival of the Earth, which can be destroyed many times over, our attitude, the attitude of the poor and unarmed countries that are powerless in the formidable race towards destruction through technology, cannot merely rest on the ancient words, *Ave, Caesar, morituri te salutamus*.

10. The task of salvation belongs to all of us, with no exclusions. The weakening of multilateralism damages the cause of peace. Disarmament, however

powerful the arsenals of the super-Powers, cannot be a discussion between the two. With the advent of nuclear technology, the question of disarmament has a transcendental connotation.

11. Nature and every living thing have become the crux of the question. The art of war is not the issue, but the transcendental question of life—not as an individual possession but in a philosophical, collective sense—that is threatened, from the poor Indian of the Amazon to the smallest flower, cultivated with great care by a poor child in Harlem, as well as all the wealth accumulated by man in countries and continents. Total destruction does not distinguish between rich and poor; it cuts down the human species. Death spreads among all beings and things. There is eternal silence, like the one described by the Brazilian poet Ferreira Gullar when he said:

“Death was all over the street
it struck the trees in the grove
it invaded our kitchen
the smell of our roasted meat
and shone on our silverware.”

12. The matter cannot be discussed only among the super-Powers. It is much too crucial to be dealt with by two men, although theirs is the greatest responsibility.

13. Peace will never be the result of force but will be the result of a widespread civilized opinion, universal enough to pervade many international centres, imbued with respect for the rights of man and respect for life, the human being and nature as well.

14. Eternal peace—according to Kant, world peace as opposed to truce—is a political end which stems from the very origins of the modern era. Ancient times and the Middle Ages provided no contribution of the sort, but the Enlightenment did so with the intellectual emancipation it brought about. It embodies the idea of humanity as a moral community: as one, though not necessarily uniform. Modern philosophical thought reinforced the Christian notion of the unity of mankind.

15. However, this acknowledgement of moral strength would not be realistic if we neglected the strategic role of States in maintaining and improving the international order. Without a doubt the State may be a source of oppression and aggression, but the State is as well an indispensable condition for the moral advancement of mankind, through international co-operation and the restraint of anarchic tendencies and predatory practices.

16. In the colonial era the great Powers exercised direct domination over the weak. The present times have witnessed a shifting of this domination to multiple forms of hegemony, that is, indirect and acknowledged domination.

17. The medium-sized countries have an important role to play at this time. I am convinced that the resolute efforts towards disarmament made by countries such as Brazil, combined with their determination to reduce inequalities and asymmetries in the international system, constitute a primary factor in the enhancement of international relations under the

egis of peace, democracy and development. For these countries, disarmament is humanism—the most practical humanism of our times

18. I bring a message from a country which has always participated actively in all efforts at attaining disarmament in the multilateral forums dedicated to that cause. I am the President of a country that takes pride in not having any disputes to settle in the field of international peace and security. We enjoy rewarding and friendly relations with each of our neighbours, relations which are reaffirmed each day through multiple forms of understanding, co-operation and integration. We border on ten countries, with no problems whatsoever; our borders have become a vanguard for friendship and integration.

19. The Amazon Co-operation Treaty and the River Plate Basin Treaty make up an institutional framework through which an equal and mutually beneficial partnership is developing among sister countries in one of the most peaceful and least armed regions of the globe. Together with its South Atlantic neighbours, Brazil is dedicated to contributing to a collective effort to achieve fully the objectives of the zone of peace and co-operation of the South Atlantic, as proposed by my Government and adopted by the United Nations in General Assembly resolution 41/11.

20. The comprehensive integration of Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay is emerging as a milestone of diplomacy in our part of the world. We have also been intensifying new areas of co-operation with Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Peru. Our aim is a common market, open to all of Latin America, in order that it be fully integrated into the economy of large markets.

21. As a member of the Contadora Support Group, Brazil has taken an active part in the search for genuine, just and lasting solutions to Central American problems. Within the Group of Eight and within the Organization of American States, my country has unceasingly sought a broader dialogue, greater mutual knowledge and co-ordination of positions as ways of promoting understanding and harmony in all of Latin America.

22. From a sovereign and democratic perspective, I wish to reaffirm the commitment we have already undertaken to use nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes. As I stated on 4 September 1987, when I announced that Brazil had mastered the technology for the enrichment of uranium, one cannot forgo having broad and unimpeded access to the entire range of scientific knowledge and its peaceful applications. It must also be recognized that the degree of industrial, scientific and technological development of some States cannot confer privileges *vis-à-vis* the general obligation to carry out internationally agreed disarmament measures on equal terms.

23. It is gratifying to note the benefits that co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy has brought about in strengthening mutual respect and confidence among Latin American countries. On this occasion I should like to highlight a historical fact, of utmost importance in South Ameri-

ca, with clear implications for the Assembly's agenda. By my own decision and that of President Alfonsín, Brazil and Argentina signed agreements on nuclear co-operation which dismissed any speculation regarding a possible nuclear race on the continent. We disarmed any nuclear threat in Latin America.

24. With the aim of enhancing the importance of these decisions, in a historic gesture the President of Argentina invited me to the slopes of the Andes along with Brazilian scientists—an unprecedented moment in the history of nations—to visit the sensitive installations for the enrichment of uranium and nuclear research at Picaneyeu. Likewise, I invited Mr. Alfonsín to inaugurate, in Iperó, the new Brazilian installations for uranium enrichment and reactor development, the Aramar Centre. In Picaneyeu and Iperó we demonstrated to our peoples, to Latin America and to the world community our confidence and determination to grow together, developing nuclear resources for peaceful purposes.

25. We have overcome historical disputes, we have established a unique atmosphere of trust, and we have joined our efforts in order to bring together expertise to master advanced technology for peaceful purposes and the well-being of our peoples. Future generations will be able to evaluate the importance of those measures.

26. The current state of international affairs in the field of disarmament is marked by two important elements. First, on the level of the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, there has been a new climate of relaxation of tension and the beginning of negotiations on the reduction of strategic nuclear missiles. In the area of verification, conceptual and technical advances are promising. I hope that the progress made will contribute before long to new, concrete and even greater successes in the real reduction of nuclear arsenals and that during the negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons now under way between the United States and the Soviet Union due attention will be paid to the need to halt and reverse the process of geographic proliferation of nuclear forces. Secondly, on the level of multilateral negotiations, one should stress the expectation of a speedy conclusion of the convention on chemical weapons, the use of which has been proscribed by the international community since 1925.

27. This third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is being held in the wake of a long series of efforts undertaken by the United Nations in the field of disarmament, beginning with the first session of the General Assembly in January 1946.

28. The Final Document approved 10 years ago by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament [*resolution S-10/2*] remains the foundation on the basis of which the conceptual legacy and practical disarmament measures should be developed. It contains a body of ideas and a concrete and objective Programme of Action. In the name of an alleged realism, however, some voices rise up against the broader goals of general and complete disarmament which are seen as Utopian. They claim that the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests is incompatible with the military security of certain

States; that the extension of the nuclear arms race to increasingly broader areas is indispensable to strategic balance; and that many other disarmament measures are not feasible.

29. It is a strange logic that pretends to impose as realistic and acceptable the kind of thinking which admits the destruction of mankind but considers unacceptable running the risk of peace. More than 40 years have elapsed since the Second World War, and not one day passes without our remembering the horrors of that conflict.

30. The doctrine of the security of some through the insecurity of all is inconceivable. More than a paradox, the balance of terror is a form of aggression against mankind. This realism is the most abstract and fallacious of all realisms.

31. Realism cannot be a pretext or an excuse to justify inaction. Realism means confronting the great problems that threaten us and setting about resolving them to the benefit of mankind. It is pressing the clay for our work.

32. It is also incoherent and paradoxical for the super-Powers to preach to other countries measures aimed at restricting proliferation of nuclear arms where they do not exist but not to accept the contention of the vertical proliferation, both quantitatively and qualitatively, regarding themselves, the possessors of fantastic arsenals.

33. Neither do we minimize the importance of the intention to limit and reduce conventional forces in the context of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It is only natural that Brazil, a part of one of the least armed regions of the globe and with one of the lowest levels of military expenditures, should voice within this process what logic and common sense have been claiming: that the initiative, the audacity and the responsibility of the States and regions which maintain the highest concentration of military contingents and power are the principal protagonists.

34. Brazil will soon serve as host to the first meeting of the South Atlantic countries, which should lead to a constructive and fruitful discussion on the means to implement the objectives set out in the declaration adopted by the General Assembly to establish peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic.

35. Aside from the special responsibility of South American and African countries with regard to the achievement of those objectives, we rely on the co-operation and good faith of all other countries, in particular those which are militarily more significant, in such a way that foreign military presence in the region will be reduced and eliminated and the introduction of nuclear arms prevented, so that the region will be free from tensions and rivalries to which they are not a part.

36. Once more I recall with great concern the grave tension caused by the persistence of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa through the continued illegal occupation of Namibia and the South African acts of

aggression. Equally serious is the lack of a solution for the question of the Malvinas Islands.

37. The growing risks of the militarization of outer space, including with nuclear devices, are indeed cause for restlessness. The effort undertaken for years by the international community within the United Nations in order to preserve outer space as a common heritage to be utilized to enhance the fate of the Earth is being jeopardized. I also underline the importance of the non-militarization of outer space as a condition for the adoption of substantial measures within regional disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament can and must complete and improve upon the existing legal structure so as to avoid one more environment from being contaminated by the destructive effects of the arms race.

38. Equality, trust, solidarity—those are the three elements on which we should base our future success in the areas of disarmament and peace.

39. In brief, Brazil asserts that no State should demand from any other disarmament measures that it itself is not prepared to take, and no one should require of another that which he himself will not do. Secondly, concerns regarding the security of one State are just as valid, just as important and just as relevant as those of any other State—that is the principle of equality. Thirdly, industrial and technological development do not free any country from the obligation to observe and respect disarmament measures which have been internationally agreed upon. Fourthly, the non-militarization of outer space constitutes an essential pre-condition for the adoption of significant measures for regional disarmament. Fifthly, the geographic proliferation of nuclear weapons compromises the position adopted by many States in renouncing the nuclear option.

40. I cannot leave this rostrum without emphasizing the link between the problems of peace and those of social injustice, with those of development and man's pursuit of happiness. It is indeed tragic for us to see just how huge is the amount of resources put at the disposal of the arms industry in comparison with the ever-decreasing resources directed to our struggle against absolute poverty.

41. In a world of fantastic achievements in science and technology, covering the broadest domains of knowledge, what fate is reserved for that part of mankind which has nothing before it but day and night? It also awaits another disarmament. Those men and women hope for the disarmament of the arsenals of hunger, the lack of work opportunities, inequalities, State intervention, the international economic order, foreign debt, the depressed prices of raw materials, protectionism, intervention, terrorism, violence and the moral crises which destroy the transcendental bases of man. They desire the disarmament of the arsenals of the distance which increasingly separates the poor world from the era of the scientific and technological discoveries which open the roads to the twenty-first century, not to a world in process of transformation but to a transformed world.

42. I reaffirm that the road to peace is democracy: freedom, through its creative and competitive power.

Democracies cannot be judged by the imperfect attainment of their ideals. Despotism, on the contrary, is that which is immobilized in its unquestionable values. Democracies do not wage war on each other. They are not dogmatic; they must always search for solutions through dialogue. Stability stems from understanding. The serious problem that we have to face is the militarization of ideologies, for ideologies pose unanswerable questions. We do not desire a world in which thoughts must be imposed by means of arms; such a world would be prematurely condemned to destruction. Empires are not eternal. History is stronger and more dynamic than hegemonies. As an intellectual, I believe that the struggle for peace begins with ideas. Pacifist prophets will always exist. An example is Tolstoy, with his long gray beard—mystical, reborn, dreaming of a world of peace after having written his masterly and eternal pages on war.

43. The world cannot exist without prophets and poets, historians to examine the lessons of the past, politicians to harmonize the conflicts of the present and poets to dream about the future. Disarmament is not only arms control, the balance of power, the theory of deterrence, or even treaties. Ultimately, this task must also include the sacred wrath of the pacifists, the idealists, the preachers—and the pure idealism of youth.

44. We are meeting here today to join our wills in an attempt to change the present state of affairs, and we can do that. There is nothing in the world that cannot be changed by the will of man.

45. A nuclear holocaust must not occur. Even when all our hopes are dying, other forces will revive us.

46. Let us not forget Mother Theresa of Calcutta, with her small, sore feet, walking through alleys, among beggars in the villages of India. And in Brazil we have Sister Dulce, carrying mountains of charity and love, fighting and praying for peace of body and soul and for the salvation of the spirit.

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

48. Mr. LONDOÑO PAREDES (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Permit me, Sir, to join those who have spoken before me in congratulating you on your election to guide the proceedings of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Your thorough familiarity with the subject and your vast experience guarantee the success of the session. I share your philosophy, stated before the Assembly, that joint responsibility for disarmament is vital for mankind.

49. I also wish to greet the Secretary-General, whose work in the field of disarmament is well known, as are his achievements on such sensitive issues of concern as peace in Afghanistan. The situation there is beginning to improve, thanks to his effective work and to the spirit of conciliation and peace which seems to be gaining strength in international relations.

50. On the special instructions of the Colombian head of State, I have the honour to come to this forum to talk about peace, the security of mankind, the preservation of the Earth and the life of future generations.

51. I welcome the opportunity to address the General Assembly at this third special session devoted to disarmament. We meet in the aftermath of the Moscow summit meeting, which focused world attention on the need to save mankind at all costs from the nuclear holocaust. The survival of all the nations of the world depends upon that.

52. However, the problems of disarmament extend far beyond potential conflicts between the major Powers. For many States the threat of nuclear weapons, with their capacity to destroy the whole planet several times over, is significantly less than that of terrorism, of crime and of the drug traffic. In the world today millions of men, women and children are threatened by forces which spread death, chaos and violence with impunity. Groups which have as their aim to replace democratic order with anarchy and which are carrying out a campaign of intimidation and violence have ready access to arms markets. They have been able in some cases to provide themselves with weapons that are rarely available to a State with scarce economic resources which is committed to an ambitious programme to eradicate poverty.

53. To my friends in the United States and other industrialized States, may I say that the single greatest threat to democracy in this hemisphere today is posed by those who have made fortunes out of the insatiable demand for drugs in the United States and in other industrialized countries. The American drug habit is dragging democratic nations into new depths of violence and corruption.

54. Colombia, together with many other countries, is currently contending with a complex situation characterized by an increase in violence. The roots of this problem are various and its manifestations are complicated, but in every case the purpose of instigators is to hamper a country's efforts to consolidate democracy and to ensure the accomplishment of human rights.

55. Analysts who have studied Colombia closely have recognized our adherence to the principles of human rights. As said by Mr. Kooijmans, the Special Rapporteur to examine questions relevant to torture appointed by the Commission on Human Rights:

"The Government of Colombia is to be congratulated for the interest it has shown in reinforcing the protection of human rights at a time when the stability of the nation is gravely threatened. That effort to attain the goals it has set deserves the support of other States."

56. The international community cannot remain indifferent to the escalating illegal trade in arms. In many cases the identity and whereabouts of the arms brokers are well known. Indeed, it appears that only the Governments of countries where these activities are generated remain uninformed about how the instruments of war are exchanged.

57. Even as countless public officials and private citizens in Colombia have been martyred for their gallant effort to stop the drug traffickers, organized crime continues to obtain every type of weapon desired without any difficulty, in the quantities and according to the specifications requested, in various places, including those industrialized countries that are aware of the links between terrorism and the clandestine arms traffic.

58. We are convinced that Member States are capable of strengthening their systems of internal control if they wish to reduce the illegal trade which inflames conflicts around the world, with no respect for geographical or ideological boundaries.

59. Another factor must also be borne in mind. At the same time as nuclear arms are reduced, efforts must also be made to promote conventional disarmament. In the third world, particularly in Latin America, such measures are especially urgent.

60. At a 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 ministers issued a communiqué condemning the trafficking in illegal arms. They acknowledged the "negative implications for international peace of arms supplies in the areas of tension, particularly illegal arms trafficking." They further cited the illegal transfer of arms as a "phenomenon that further aggravates tensions, undermines internal security in some States and regional security and strengthens forces opposed to the disarmament process" [see A/S-15/27, para. 56].

61. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has pointed out repeatedly that the buildup in conventional weaponry represents a tragic misuse of resources in a world which is afflicted with mass poverty and hunger. At a time of interdependence and instantaneous communications, the contrast between the well-being of a few and the terrible poverty of the great majority is a constant source of instability. Even in the midst of the alarming gap between economic prosperity and starvation, the conventional arms race has continued to accelerate. The production of a massive volume of conventional arms not only distorts the priorities of industrialized nations but contributes to prolonging the conflicts in the developing world. Since the Second World War the biggest conflicts have occurred between nations of the third world.

62. We shall not be able to guarantee peace as long as we limit the concept of disarmament to the super-Powers. International stability can be affected by frequent conflicts between backward countries tempted to use conventional weapons which for some are always and mistakenly more attractive than peaceful means of settling disputes.

63. World peace will not be guaranteed so long as nations persist in arming themselves without restraint, on the pretext of defending themselves against hypothetical conflicts.

64. Within this framework of multilateral dialogue, Colombia supports the Six-Nation Initiative and advocates the creation in the United Nations of a

system of control, supervision and verification, as proposed by those countries at Stockholm last January.

65. Colombia confirms today, in this disarmament forum, its commitment to the principles of international law that the Organization has sustained from its very beginning. That is the best mechanism for achieving the coexistence of peoples.

66. Colombia is determined to pursue peace, not only through an international framework but through regional efforts as well. Together with the other seven nations of the Contadora Group and the Support Group, we have undertaken mediation efforts on behalf of the peace process in Central America. We reaffirm our commitment to the negotiated solution for which we have been struggling.

67. Let me conclude by affirming that we are fully aware of the historical significance of the agreements signed by the two super-Powers. Any progress we witness in nuclear disarmament is a cause for celebration in every nation of the world. But we cannot let the dazzling spectacle of summitry blind us to the brutal providing of weapons to terrorists or to the many other ways in which conventional armaments have become an impediment to economic development and peace.

68. All of us fervently hope to avoid the nuclear nightmare. Yet our dreams of a better world will depend on progress in reducing armaments, conventional as well as nuclear.

69. Sir Geoffrey HOWE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Allow me first to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this special session. I assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation as you carry out your important responsibilities.

70. The Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany addressed the special session yesterday [8th meeting] on behalf of the 12 members of the European Community, including my own country. His comments reflected well the importance attached by European Community partners to a successful outcome of this special session.

71. It is in fact 10 years since the first special session on disarmament took place here in New York. So many speeches and so many millions of words later, where have we got to? What have we actually contributed to the cause of world peace? Is there anybody out there listening? Even the most determined optimist could not say that progress has been as great as the world has a right to expect. And yet disarmament does remain high on the international agenda, and rightly so. Security and economics both dictate that it should be there.

72. In theory East and West could build twice as many tanks and three times as many planes, put four times as many men in uniform, and all the while go on investing in increasingly sophisticated technology.

73. I can remember as a boy during the Second World War watching my mother take part in commu-

nity fund-raising to buy a Spitfire aircraft for the Royal Air Force. In 1940 it cost £5,000 to build a Spitfire. In 1988 it costs £18 million to buy the modern equivalent. That is not quite any longer within the small-town budget that my mother was trying to cope with. How long can costs go on rising at that kind of pace? The rising cost of military technology is eating like a cancer deeper and deeper into the flesh of national resources. Sooner or later even the God of War has to bow to the God of Mammon.

74. As that realization grows, military and civilian leaders alike are increasingly asking themselves whether more really is better, whether the surplus of weaponry in Europe and worldwide really adds anything to our safety, whether anyone benefits from remorselessly raising the ante in an endless game of military poker.

75. And not only East and West: the arsenals of war have been growing apace at least as much in the third world, where they absorb scarce resources and contribute to keeping the poor poorer. In the past 25 years the average percentage of gross national product [GNP] devoted to military spending in developed countries has actually fallen from 7 per cent to 5.7 per cent, while in developing countries it has risen from 3.1 per cent to 5.4 per cent. In some developing countries spending is running at well over 20 per cent of GNP.

76. Almost all the tragic casualties of war in the past 40 years have been outside the areas of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and the Warsaw Pact. A large proportion has been among the peoples of countries of the third world. The Iran-Iraq war is the latest and most devastating example. At least half a million people have died in that conflict since 1980, and the number of wounded will be far greater. Stranger and sadder still: countless men, women and children, soldiers and civilians alike, have been dying in those conflicts which are the hardest of all to end—bitter civil wars, often stoked from outside, such as those in Lebanon, Angola, Ethiopia and Mozambique.

77. So disarmament is not just for NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Disarmament is for all of us. The practical tools of arms control are available to all of us. We all know how to use them. So why is there so much unwillingness to get to work?

78. The reason is that disarmament cannot proceed in a vacuum. It is simply no good talking about it as an abstract end in itself. Disarmament is inextricably tied up with security. Nobody is going to discuss disarmament seriously if he already feels insecure. That is why it is crucial to tackle the root cause of military confrontation: the tensions that foster insecurity. Disarmament by itself cannot bear the weight of resolving these tensions.

79. President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev have just given us all an object lesson in the importance of dialogue in reducing tension, tackling insecurity, building confidence. They have shown that we can hope for a more productive and sustainable relationship between the super-Powers.

80. Who could have confidently predicted, in the aftermath of the shooting down of the Korean airliner in 1983, that less than five years later we should see a President of the United States and a Soviet General Secretary walking arm in arm together out of the Kremlin? Of course important differences remain. Of course there is a long agenda to discuss. But they are discussing it face to face.

81. I hope that that lesson will not be lost on those in other parts of the world who are at present locked in conflict. When will the leaders of Iran and Iraq be prepared to sit down and discuss the differences between them, rather than simply fighting a futile war which neither side can win? And when shall we see Arab and Israeli leaders getting together in an international conference, as one day they must, to discuss the vital bargain of territory for peace? Every one of the conflicts raging in today's world cries out for that kind of treatment.

82. Nor, I hope, will the lesson be lost here in the United Nations. Are we in the United Nations doing all we should to bring an end to the Iran-Iraq conflict, to ensure lasting peace in the Middle East?

83. Of course there are some hopeful signs, such as Soviet plans to withdraw from Afghanistan. The Afghans' resistance deserves the highest credit for their brave struggle against foreign occupation, and the United Nations for its role in mediating the Geneva accord. But the Soviet Union as well must be given credit for finally coming to terms with reality.

84. Yet another hopeful sign, at the super-Power level, is the historic Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty. It is a major advance and the best possible curtain-raiser for this special session. It is the latest achievement in a process for which the West has worked patiently for many years but which only started to move with the rise to power of Mr. Gorbachev and the emergence of a new thinking in Moscow. It has already led to an increase in understanding and confidence.

85. I am happy to say that my own country has played a full part in the more constructive East-West relationship which has recently begun to develop. Mr. Gorbachev came to the United Kingdom for the first time at the end of 1984, and Mrs. Thatcher paid a highly successful visit to Moscow a year ago. They met again in Britain last December. Britain was the first Western country to give public support to Mr. Gorbachev's efforts to reform his country's stagnating economy.

86. Confidence between East and West has increased. That greater confidence has been the catalyst of the INF Treaty and of the progress made in strategic arms reduction talks [*START*]. They in turn should further increase confidence. We do not live in a world where all circles have to be vicious; there can be benevolent spirals as well.

87. But the slow pace of progress underlines how far there is still to go. The arms race certainly has not come to a halt. Soviet military programmes grind on remorselessly year by year. The entire Soviet strategic

nuclear force in place in the mid-1980s will have been replaced by new or modernized systems by the mid-1990s. A new Soviet submarine is deployed every six weeks. More accurate SS-21s are increasing the huge advantage they enjoy in shorter-range missiles. Last year alone, the Soviet Union made over 90 space launches for military purposes.

88. So we are bound to ask why the Soviet military posture in Europe is so dominated by offensive weapons. Why do the forces of the Soviet Union go so far beyond the needs of a purely defensive strategy? The charitable answer is that *perestroika* and *glasnost* have not yet reached the Soviet military. We are waiting for signs that the Soviet military machine has begun to come to terms with economic pressures.

89. The key to peace through arms control is realism. We need hard-headed, sharply focused, carefully defined, verifiable proposals which accord with the real security interests of all the parties concerned. We need to avoid a declaratory, purely idealistic approach. We need to focus on the possible, not the speculative; on the gradual, not the Utopian; on INF and START, not the wildly unrealistic calls for a nuclear-free world by the year 2000. It may be that one day we shall find a better way to prevent war than through nuclear deterrence, but to suggest that between East and West such an alternative is within reach is to deny reality. As Winston Churchill put it to the United States Congress in 1951: "Be careful above all things not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure, and more than sure, that other means of preserving peace are in your hands."

90. Our arms control principles are clear and simple. In the hope that new thinking will prevail we look for further progress on START. A 50 per cent reduction in super-Power strategic offensive nuclear systems is an ambitious but a realistic goal.

91. We must also tackle the Warsaw Pact conventional superiority in Europe. The mutual and balanced force reductions negotiations have failed to redress this imbalance over the last 15 years. The lack of any Soviet data on force levels has blocked all progress. We remain committed to stability and security at lower levels of forces. We are working with our alliance partners to launch a new round of conventional negotiations in Vienna.

92. The United Kingdom is committed to a comprehensive, verifiable and world-wide ban on chemical weapons. We are working with determination to turn that commitment into reality. This is the most ambitious item on the multilateral arms control agenda. We can all welcome the progress in the negotiations in Geneva over the past two years.

93. Yet as we strive for a global and verifiable ban, so at the same time we all have a responsibility to uphold the 1925 Geneva Protocol against the use of poison gas.¹ This is being increasingly disregarded. Some 60 years ago the Geneva Protocol symbolized mankind's repudiation of this particularly repulsive barbarism. Yet today that barbarism is once again stalking the planet. The long-standing taboos which survived the Second World War intact have been breaking down. Successive reports by the Secretary-

General have drawn attention to this. Chemical weapons have been used repeatedly in the Iran-Iraq conflict.

94. We have to act before it is too late. The United Nations must demonstrate with all the clarity and conviction at its command that those who use chemical weapons are the outcasts of the civilized world. I cannot believe that the international community is powerless to prevent the creeping proliferation of chemical weapons. So let us take three steps now to make it plain that we mean business.

95. First, all those Members of the United Nations, some 50 in all, which have not yet acceded to the Geneva Protocol should immediately do so. Universal subscription to the Protocol would go a long way to reinforcing the moral and political sanction against the use of chemical weapons.

96. Secondly, procedures should be agreed without delay for investigating automatically allegations of the use of chemical weapons. Successive General Assembly resolutions have already empowered the Secretary-General to draw up these procedures. What is now needed is rapidly to complete this work. In that way, investigations can be undertaken as a matter of routine and without getting entangled by political considerations.

97. Thirdly, wherever the use of chemical weapons is clearly established the international community must take effective and speedy action to cut off the supply of key precursors. This is what the United Kingdom and many other countries did as far back as 1984, when chemical-weapons use in the Gulf conflict was first proved. We strongly support Security Council resolution 612 (1988), which calls on all countries to impose such controls.

98. At the same time we need to press ahead with the negotiations in Geneva. One of the principal obstacles to more fundamental progress there is secrecy. The success of any arms control negotiation depends on the provision of reliable, accurate data. Some countries which possess chemical weapons have not yet acknowledged that fact; others have made very limited disclosures. The negotiations face the problems of a tailor making clothes for customers who refuse to provide their vital statistics, even denying that they have any measurements at all. Making clothes for invisible men is not easy.

99. In arms control, vital statistics are just that: vital. This is particularly true of chemical weapons. The presence of other weapons—tanks and aircraft—may be gauged by a single photograph. Chemical weapons are intangible, insidious, an unknown quantity, and all the more threatening for that.

100. Britain has taken a lead in the search for greater openness. We abandoned our offensive chemical weapon capability 30 years ago. The international community witnessed the destruction of our pilot nerve agent plant. Last month a delegation of Soviet experts visited our defensive research establishment at Porton Down. We took a deliberate decision to show them unprecedented openness. We hope they will do the same for our own team when they visit the

Soviet military chemical warfare establishment at Shikhany in July.

101. We want a convention as soon as practicable. But the plain fact is that we cannot skate over the real technical problems which arise from the sophisticated nature of the civil chemical industry. A great deal more work is needed to fashion a convention which can deal with these problems satisfactorily. Even then it will almost certainly not be 100 per cent watertight. Meanwhile, we all have a responsibility to help in solving the practical problems.

102. I hope it will be clear from everything that I have said that I am not one of those who believe that disarmament activity in the United Nations is futile. On the contrary, this is the most comprehensive forum we have. This is where the world community can speak with a single voice, and set the tone for arms control negotiations around the world.

103. The second special session on disarmament frankly contributed to the difficult climate of 1982. Today, the climate is much more hopeful. The third special session can add to that hope by sending out a clear message. The message is this: while we recognize our differences—and there are many—we can all identify our common interest in disarmament. Each State can and must make its own distinctive contribution to the common goal of peace, peace with justice and with security.

104. We know through our own experience that disarmament by declaration does not work. If it did, the speeches from our special sessions would have put the world to rights long ago.

105. Disarmament is not an easy option. It takes hard work. It demands rigorous thinking, tough negotiating, clarity and steadfastness of purpose. But the fact is that, with those conditions, it can be brought about. That is why each of us can take heart. There is a way forward.

106. Today I have offered some signposts along that way. Let us make this special session into the milestone it should be.

107. Mr. EL-ERYANI (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Sir, at the outset it is my pleasure to express to you our sincere congratulations upon your election to the presidency of this special session. Your long political experience in the international arena and your well-known skill will surely contribute to the session's success.

108. It is a great honour for me to deliver this statement on behalf of my country, the Yemen Arab Republic, in this forum on disarmament. Disarmament has been and remains one of the most important issues, if not the most important, facing our contemporary world. The international community has made many significant achievements in this field, such as the two special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to the subject, held in 1978 and 1982; the promoting of multilateral agreements on disarmament; international disarmament campaigns; the many Assembly resolutions, adopted at regular sessions, supporting comprehensive disarmament, including conventional, chemical, biological and nu-

clear weapons; the many Assembly resolutions aimed at settling regional disputes; the appointment of special representatives of the Secretary-General; the sending of fact-finding missions and international peace-keeping forces; and Assembly endorsement of agreements to reduce the number of nuclear weapons of the two super-Powers, particularly the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—signed in December 1987.

109. Despite all these achievements, many tasks remain. The international community continues to witness many regional wars, mainly because of cultural differences and political, economic and social beliefs. The abundance of weapons has led to grave losses of human and material resources that could have been used to help the world in the progress of civilization.

110. There continues a serious drain of the world's resources, particularly financial resources, which are devoted to the purchase of weapons at a time when there is dire need of those resources elsewhere, given the critical economic situation caused by the inequity of the current world economic system, the problem of the foreign debt of the developing countries, the faltering dialogue between North and South, the deterioration of the commodities markets, the fluctuations in exchange rates, the lack of serious commitment in transferring technology from the developed to the developing countries and the lack of sincerity in providing assistance promised to the least developed countries.

111. The world today is also witnessing the use of arms against peoples and organizations struggling for freedom, independence, self-determination and equality, which is the case in Namibia and in Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories. In the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories the Israeli occupation forces are using their arsenals to kill defenceless citizens: they detain, beat and humiliate people; they expel and destroy the homes of those who are participating in the current uprising—men, women, children, the elderly and the youth who have only their faith in the victory of their just cause in achieving their right to independence and self-determination and to establish their independent Palestinian State under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization in accordance with international law and the resolutions of the international community. Furthermore, Israel is building illegal settlements and is changing the historic and cultural character of the occupied Arab territories, particularly in Al-Quds Al-Sharif.

112. There is no doubt that Israel's activities, like Pretoria's, are in violation of international law, as set out in the Charter of the United Nations and other relevant humanitarian legal instruments such as the Geneva Conventions of 1949. In Namibia, the racist régime uses live ammunition to kill citizens demonstrating against its racist policies and domination. In addition, the two racist régimes insist on introducing nuclear weapons into Africa and to the Middle East.

113. Israel for its part has not agreed to allow IAEA to inspect its nuclear installations. Furthermore, it has not committed itself to the proposal for the

establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It refuses to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], under which it would accept IAEA safeguards. Furthermore, it co-operates and collaborates comprehensively—particularly in the military and nuclear fields—with the South African racist régime despite the many General Assembly resolutions calling for an end to such co-operation.

114. At a time when the Arab States are seeking to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to the Middle East, at a time when such action is stressed in the declarations of Arab summit conferences, Israel persists in introducing these weapons into our region, thus challenging the will of the international community. That clearly shows the aggressive tendency of the Zionist entity not only towards the States of the region but also towards the whole world, since the destructive effects of nuclear weapons are not limited to a particular region but indeed spread to much wider areas, with the possibility of dragging the international community into a nuclear war.

115. The problem of disarmament of every kind is one of the most stubborn issues for the international community, particularly since the only choice before us, given the existence of nuclear weapons, is to get rid of such weapons or run the risk of total annihilation of all forms of life on our planet. This issue cannot be the exclusive concern or preserve of the States producing or possessing nuclear weapons because the threat is not limited to those States; it is a comprehensive, world-wide threat. Hence, action to eliminate this threat is the concern of all States of the world, small or large, rich or poor, and nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike.

116. The convening of this special session allows States to express their positions on rejecting the continuing arms race; to call not only for an end to the arms race but also for the comprehensive elimination of nuclear weapons for all time; and to call for an end to the race in the production of conventional weapons and for the use of the resources thus released for humanitarian purposes and for assistance to the developing countries aimed at eliminating their economic and social problems and combating the conditions of poverty and hunger under which many peoples in the world still live.

117. To seek the elimination of the nuclear threat is a humanitarian responsibility, a responsibility reaffirmed by all peoples of the world. However, in order to achieve that high humanitarian objective the international community, represented in this Organization, must provide guarantees to prevent the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons through international conventions prohibiting the resort to their use and nuclear-weapon testing and preventing nuclear blackmail by the nuclear-weapon States against the non-nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is one way to diminish the threat posed by the escalating spread of these dangerous weapons.

118. The world looks to this special session with special interest. High hopes are pinned on it, as it is expected that it will adopt positive resolutions aimed at lessening the nuclear threat and eliminating the

spectre of destruction hanging over us. Therefore such resolutions must meet the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world, especially since this session is being held in the more appropriate and optimistic international atmosphere following upon the important meetings between the two super-Powers and the signing of the INF Treaty.

119. Hence my delegation would now put forward the following proposals. First, IAEA should be made more effective and enabled to carry out inspections if there is concern that a non-nuclear-weapon State may be on its way to producing such weapons. Secondly, an international convention should be drafted prohibiting the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons against either nuclear-weapon or non-nuclear-weapon States. Thirdly, nuclear technology for peaceful purposes should be extended and made available to all States instead of preserving the monopoly of the few. Fourthly, disarmament negotiations between the two super-Powers should be supported, and they should be urged to speed up the total and final elimination of nuclear weapons. Fifthly, some of the resources freed by disarmament should be transferred to developing countries in order to assist them in eliminating their problems. Sixthly, a committee should be established to follow up on the implementation of the results of this session and the next Assembly session in this respect.

120. Such proposals are fully in line with my country's National Charter, which provides that

“Peace is the ultimate objective of mankind. With peace, justice and prosperity can prevail in all parts of the world. Therefore, we believe that peace based on justice can only be achieved by placing checks on the major Powers to prevent them from continuing to exploit smaller States and by preventing aggression by any State against any other.”

121. In keeping with the above, and proceeding from the foreign policy principles of the Yemen Arab Republic based on commitment to the Charter of the United Nations, to international peace and security, to the policy of peaceful coexistence between different political, economic and social systems and to the policy of non-alignment, and proceeding also from its belief that the United Nations, with its activities such as this special session, is the best possible forum to save mankind, both today and in generations to come, from the spectre of global nuclear annihilation, my country participated in the two previous special sessions on disarmament and supported all United Nations resolutions on nuclear disarmament, banning nuclear-weapon testing, non-use of nuclear weapons, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons and new types of weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons, reducing military spending, the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace [*resolution 2832 (XXVI)*], and the call on all nuclear-weapon States to agree to a freeze on nuclear weapons. We ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty on 14 May 1986, and we have participated in all United Nations efforts aimed at putting an end to the arms race and at the use of nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes and other efforts to maintain international peace and security, solve international disputes by peaceful

means and divert resources allocated to the production and purchase of weapons to economic and social development.

122. The convening of this special session reflects not only the international community's concern for checking the spread of nuclear weapons and for nuclear disarmament and the final elimination of such weapons, but also its deep awareness of the threat hanging over mankind as a result of the huge stockpiles of those weapons, which we must seek to destroy in order to guarantee the security and future of mankind. We have every hope that this session will lead to effective results guaranteeing that mankind will succeed in ridding itself of the spectre that threatens to annihilate it and every other living creature on this beautiful planet.

123. Mr. CHNOUPEK (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish first of all, Mr. President, to express our satisfaction that the work of this special session is being guided by the representative of the friendly German Democratic Republic, a country which has contributed actively and consistently to the world's disarmament efforts. Your experience and the authority with which the General Assembly has rightly entrusted you guarantee the success of our work. I wish also to state our appreciation of the role played in the disarmament process by the United Nations and its Secretary-General.

124. For centuries armed force was the decisive argument of policy, and war the main arbiter of disputes. It was the tradition in ages past for guns to bear the inscription “The last argument of kings”.

125. Today, however, we have had the tragic experience of the nuclear argument. Let us not forget that the power of deadly atomic explosions is many times that of history's great decisive battles, the destruction of Pompeii or any other apocalyptic event our civilization has experienced. Their horrendous echo has undermined confidence and split the world into hostile camps, launching the arms race with its incalculable consequences.

126. No one among us is likely to disagree that the argument of weapons must yield to the weapon of argument. In today's world attempts to gain military superiority are senseless and, moreover, can never be successful. They are a *carte blanche* for continuing the arms race, which is just as senseless as nuclear war.

127. The time has come, therefore, for the world community to make an effective attempt to safeguard and develop all that nations have already achieved and that sound politicians have agreed upon in the interest of mankind. The time has come especially for the atmosphere and results generated by the high-level Soviet-American dialogue to give rise as soon as possible to innovative international disarmament negotiations, leading to new agreements.

128. In today's nuclear and space age, no dispute, including rivalry between different systems, can be resolved by force. Indeed, in the words of Einstein, who served as professor at the Prague Technical University, “the human race became mortal with the birth of the nuclear bomb”. It is thus crystal-clear

that nuclear conflict, being a suicidal act, cannot serve to achieve political, economic, ideological or other goals. Indeed, in the event of a nuclear war it would be impossible to distinguish between the ashes of capitalism and the ashes of socialism. We face a choice between coexistence or no existence.

129. That very Hamletesque dilemma is very much of our times, which are permeated with the dynamism of events of historic relevance. We have arrived at the watershed of the nuclear age. We realize more fully the urgency of the challenges facing us today. We have a better understanding of the unitary nature of the world and of our mutual interdependence. We are acting more boldly to find new areas of constructive co-operation in all spheres, especially in the most important of all: the sphere of disarmament.

130. Much has happened, much has changed in the world since the General Assembly, 10 years ago in this Hall, adopted the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament [*resolution S-10/2*]. We have gathered new experiences, fully confirming the vital nature and universal validity of that Document. We all remember those years and the depressing atmosphere of the days when intermediate-range missiles were deployed in Europe. We recall the disappointment over the second special session devoted to disarmament, the complications caused by the "Star Wars" programme, and the alarming fact that world-wide spending on arms has more than doubled over the past 10 years.

131. Then came 15 January 1986. We all remember vividly the auspicious effects of the announcement of the programme to eliminate nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century.² We recall the relief at the Geneva declaration of November 1985 that a nuclear war could not be won and must never be fought.³ We recall the hope of a real breakthrough in efforts to halt the arms race flying high in the dramatic days of the Soviet-American summit at Reykjavik in October 1986, and the triumphant victory of common sense upon the conclusion last December in Washington of the historic Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles.

132. The exchange of instruments of ratification just a few days ago in Moscow was warmly welcomed by the whole world; it was a milestone on the path to the elimination of nuclear weapons and violence. It was a turning-point. Previously mankind had only added to its arsenals; now it has entered the era of nuclear disarmament and is learning to reduce them.

Mr. Dugersuren (Mongolia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

133. For its part, Czechoslovakia has done its utmost on behalf of the successful conclusion and speedy implementation of the treaty. We have undertaken to accept verification measures in our territory. Well before the treaty's ratification the Soviet longer-range operational-tactical missiles stationed there from late 1983 were withdrawn. We will continue to contribute to an acceleration of the process of disarmament.

134. Today, we are all still impressed by the momentous conclusions of the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. Those conclusions advance the cause of disarmament by yet another step and create for it a favourable psychological climate that must be used in an all-round, complete manner. This applies primarily to the prospect of concluding a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons. We regard the consolidation of the results achieved in the talks held so far as a firm guarantee that work on that treaty will be carried forward vigorously and purposefully.

135. The concept of security through disarmament is acquiring new content and new dimensions. It responds to present-day demands. Only its consistent implementation can guarantee the survival of our common civilization. Today's option is not arms for peace, but arms or peace.

136. It is imperative that we break out of the nuclear encirclement once and for all. Indeed, life lived in fear of nuclear armaments generates mistrust. It breeds violence, evokes fatalism and undermines the will. Today there is a much more urgent need to free mankind from nuclear weapons than there was to abolish slavery in the old days. It is the *sine qua non* of an era in which full use will be made of the creative potential of the human race, free from the fetters of the arms race.

137. This is what we should now be dealing with at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament: the future above all. We would like to see the 1990s become a decade of building a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. We want to give a strong impetus to that through development of a world-wide dialogue on the military parameters of security. That dialogue must be conducted more actively and with confidence. Let us create new opportunities for that to happen. Not to do so would be to show indifference to the future.

138. Common sense tells us that the survival of mankind cannot be forced. Seneca understood this long ago, when he wrote: "Wisdom is incompatible with weaponry, fortifications or war machines. It favours peace and calls the human race to concord."

139. The new thinking requires all of us to look at present-day realities from the universal, human perspective and boldly to break new ground in an overall restructuring of international relations, to work for the complete elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and to bring about substantial reductions in conventional armaments, to set up reliable guarantees that there will be no place in the world for pockets of power-oriented thinking and to ensure that war will never again become an instrument of politics.

140. Let us bend all our energies to ensuring a safe world by political means, not by striving for military and strategic balance. Let us make use of every mechanism. Let us be guided by the priority of universal human interests, by the primacy of international law. We know that energetic efforts are required to maintain détente when tension arises all too easily.

141. Man's sacred right to life requires a global solution. The cardinal tasks of the present day must be dealt with as a whole, jointly, as a single complex. It is both dangerous and unpromising to approach them from selfish positions.

142. We should, on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations, set in motion a comprehensive system of international peace and security, one that will forestall any use of force in international relations and guarantee that tension will never again recur. It should implement means of political and legal containment instead of means of military intimidation. In so doing it would fully ensure for all States a much greater and more realistic security than weapons of any kind ever could. A higher-quality security would emerge, one that would truly provide for more than a mere balance of military forces. It would be a security based on a new dimension of the structures designed to prevent war and on the new forms of co-operation that are needed to make universal human values the centrepiece of politics.

143. Such an arrangement of international relations in the military, political, economic, ecological and humanitarian fields is the objective of the initiative taken by the socialist countries and submitted to the General Assembly. In that context I would point out that our country is also paying increased attention to the ecological dimension of security and emphasize that the arms race poses a far greater threat to the environment than does the brutal damage caused by industrialization.

144. With its allies and friends, Czechoslovakia is determined to do its best to bring about the speediest possible development of a world-wide disarmament process while maintaining strategic stability. Our proposals and the joint initiatives of the Warsaw Treaty countries encompass the whole range of current disarmament issues. We submit them in a constructive spirit and in an effort to take into account as much as possible the views of our partners at the negotiating table.

145. We are guided by the proposition that the confrontation, and particularly the military confrontation, between the two military-political blocs in Europe has become too great and too dangerous. As a country every part of which has been affected by the ravings of many European wars, including the last world war, we attach extraordinary importance to the safeguarding of lasting security on our continent. We want to overcome consistently hostile images. We are striving for greater openness and confidence in all fields of relations, accompanied by mutual respect for points of divergence.

146. Openness, of course, is impossible without a balance. The same is true of confidence. Confidence starts with a unity of words and deeds and reaches as far as the capacity for critical self-assessment. Otherwise, the absence of confidence leads to a vicious circle—new armament, a further escalation of tension. The way of escape is more than obvious. We must jointly abide by the requirement of strict compliance with a balance of interests in any sphere of mutual relations, and we must develop a dialogue at the level of the creation of a peace policy—the basis of constructive, long-term co-operation.

147. Our active contribution to a further intensification of the all-European process in this very spirit is the proposal for the establishment of a zone of confidence, co-operation and good-neighbourly relations along the line of contact between the Warsaw Treaty States and those of NATO put forward by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Milos Jakes, on 24 February 1988.⁴ It reflects the key importance we attach to the European dimension of security in its weakest spot. It proceeds from the exposed location of my country in the heart of Europe, along the frontier between the two systems and their military-political groupings. It is an expression of the rich progressive traditions of our peoples and of the lessons they have drawn from history, *inter alia*, from the Munich diktat, of which this year will mark the 50th anniversary. Then too—although in a different era and under different circumstances—the survival or death of civilization was at stake.

148. In our proposal, which is open to all interested parties, we fully respect the specific position of the States that have found themselves on the line of contact between the two different social systems as a result of historical developments. We are particularly responsible for the maintenance of peace in an area oversaturated with weapons. It is exactly here that confrontation must be restrained, stability strengthened and confidence enhanced as much as possible. It is here that another pillar of the common European home should be erected. Otherwise, it is exactly here that the weakest point in this home might appear. Let us not build our home on differences but rather on what brings us closer together.

149. Our initiative is rooted in the principles of Helsinki. It is aimed at a dynamic and comprehensive development of the all-European process. It integrates the many years of experience gathered from the implementation of the Final Act of Helsinki on the line of contact between the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO States. It follows naturally from our earlier proposals for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free corridor and a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe as presented, jointly with the German Democratic Republic, to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. It is linked organically with other initiatives of the socialist countries aimed at a military relaxation on our continent, such as the proposal made by the Polish People's Republic to limit armaments and strengthen confidence in Central Europe or with the idea of the German Democratic Republic to convene an international meeting to support the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

150. The proposal of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is many-sided. It proceeds from the realities and absorbs all spheres of mutual relations. Besides the military sphere, we have focused it primarily on setting up a mechanism of effective political dialogue, on reinforcing the contractual character of relations and on expanding the spectrum of mutually advantageous co-operation in the economic and ecological fields and in the humanitarian, cultural, scientific, educational and health care sectors. To this end, we should jointly adopt measures that would help to remove the mistrust and bias that have arisen between us over whole decades. We should do so in

such a way as to be able to learn from each other better and to build our relations on stable and lasting foundations. As for the geographic parameters, the proposed zone would cover northern, central and southern Europe.

151. We have noted a series of positive reactions which indicate a genuine interest in our proposal. Very soon we shall present a draft proposal containing specific ideas for the individual spheres embraced by our initiative. These ideas could subsequently become the subject of mutual consideration. As far as the military sphere is concerned, we believe that such a subject might involve, *inter alia*, the creation of a zone from which the most dangerous types of offensive weapons would be excluded.

152. As was unequivocally stated also at the last session of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, at Sofia in March 1987, the States of our alliance seek the conclusion of new agreements leading to reductions in arsenals and to the simultaneous elimination of such military potentials as might make possible a surprise attack. It is also our concern that the historically created asymmetries be consistently redressed in the process of such reductions. In other words, we strive to establish a military balance at an ever-decreasing level, one sufficient for defence and threatening no one. We are considering ways of effectively achieving that goal.

153. For that reason, the task of opening meaningful talks on substantial reductions in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals is at the centre of our attention. We feel that it is now quite realistic to make a final clarification, within the framework of the Vienna Follow-Up Meeting, of the subject of those negotiations, to take advantage of the chance at hand and at last agree upon their mandate as well. We have proposed to carry out as soon as possible a mutual exchange of data on the armed forces and conventional armaments of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and members of NATO, to make a comparison of the military doctrines so that they may acquire a purely defensive character, and, furthermore, to open separate negotiations on the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons on the European continent, including the nuclear components of the dual-capable systems. We are also making every effort to have the Vienna Follow-Up Meeting decide as soon as possible on the elaboration and expansion of the arrangements of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

154. The current session should impel us to increased efforts to achieve mutually acceptable, non-confrontational solutions over the entire range of the disarmament agenda.

155. Of special urgency among the questions on the agenda is the requirement for speeding up work towards the goal of a complete and universal ban on nuclear-weapon testing. Let us do all we can to achieve progress along all paths leading to it in the fields of multilateral efforts and bilateral negotiations. Let us not forget the unilateral example of the one-and-a-half-year-long Soviet moratorium, an ac-

tion which undoubtedly could and should have been reciprocated.

156. We welcome the significant understandings reached at Moscow which indisputably constitute a platform for lasting progress in questions concerning nuclear-weapon tests. We believe that they will lead as early as possible to a considerable limitation of the power and quantity of nuclear explosions. However, it is necessary to come to an agreement and start simultaneous negotiations in a multilateral framework as well—at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva—and to work purposefully for the adoption of a mandate at those negotiations right up to the comprehensive preparation of a draft treaty.

157. The prospects for significant progress in disarmament are rightly linked to the very crucial task of concluding a convention on the prohibition and limitation of chemical weapons. In this case also we are in favour of accelerating the ongoing talks. We voice strong disappointment at the delays which recently started to emerge in the Conference on Disarmament owing to the clearly unfounded demands concerning the so-called security stocks of chemical warfare agents and to the surprising lack of readiness of some countries to resolve at long last the questions of verification. Progress is certainly not facilitated by the start of the production of binary weapons in the United States. All that is happening at a time when in the Soviet Union a visit to the Shikhany facility had just been organized and the amount of stockpiles of chemical weapons announced and when far-reaching proposals are on the table concerning a general exchange of data and the carrying out of inspections.

158. We want to confirm unequivocally our full and active support for the speedy completion of the convention and its verification system, including a systematic monitoring of the civilian chemical industry. We are convinced of the need for all countries with advanced chemical production to become parties to the convention from the very outset. We understand that a number of political and technical problems are still to be resolved. It might be useful to consider them both in Geneva in the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons and at a higher political level. We welcome all steps to bring about greater transparency in the question of chemical armaments and to enhance confidence. They must be continued.

159. In this connection I should like to inform the Assembly that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is among the countries which do not possess or produce chemical weapons. Our scientific and research activities in respect of chemical weapons are focused exclusively on protection from their effects.

160. Ever more topical is the problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Only refraining from stationing weapons in space can ensure strategic stability and the indispensable predictability in the military and political fields. We advocate the implementation of a whole set of proposed measures to sustain the peaceful régime in space, including the setting up of an international space inspectorate.

161. In modern times, the naval arms race and maintaining a military presence and a network of military bases with forward-based strike systems in foreign territories are ever-more dangerous phenomena. We consider it necessary to open negotiations to eradicate those anachronisms whose origin goes back to times long past.

162. We attach fundamental importance to the questions of verification and compliance with agreements on the limitation of armaments and disarmament. Inadequacy of verification and ambiguity in the practical binding force of international instruments considerably weaken the effectiveness of such treaties. That is doubly so in the field of disarmament. Only if there was absolute confidence that contractual obligations were being strictly observed could disarmament agreements be an alternative to weapons as a means of security and ensure trust. Therefore, we consider that it would be most useful to establish within the United Nations an effective system of monitoring compliance with agreements on disarmament and settlement in conflict areas.

163. We call on the present session also to confirm unequivocally the close relationship between disarmament and development. Let us not confine this issue to the level of mere theoretical discussions. Indeed, the relationship is beyond any dispute, so much so that the arms race is synonymous with the wasting of resources and funds. For this reason we stand for the practical consideration of the question of conversion of military production to peaceful ends and for the creation of a mechanism for transferring to development needs the funds to be released through disarmament.

164. We support as highly topical also the proposal that modern technology not be misused for the production of ever-more destructive weapons. Let us bear in mind the experience, confirmed many times by history, that it is much easier to build a new weapon than to destroy it later.

165. With regard to an improvement of the international mechanism for negotiations on these questions, at the meeting of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held in October 1987 at Prague, we proposed a whole set of measures to increase the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament. We are convinced that in augmenting its activities the Conference could assume the responsibility not only of a sole but of a prospectively truly universal body for working out specific disarmament agreements. To that end, it is necessary to elaborate further the procedure ensuring the full participation of all interested countries and to intensify the Conference's schedule. We have recommended that this special session should discuss all aspects of the Conference's work and determine the ways and means of improving it. In so doing the session would also be confirming the increasing role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, and significantly contributing to a further internationalization of the efforts for peace.

166. We are also convinced that the negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament must be continued energetically with the aim of ensuring

the systematic character of the disarmament process in its widest meaning. The positive elements in the standpoints of all groups of States must be integrated in a world-wide strategy for progress in the field of disarmament—those of the East and of the West, those of the Six-Nation Initiative and the whole of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

167. I should like to conclude by expressing my conviction that at this special session we shall make practical progress in the worldwide dialogue on disarmament and the military dimension of comprehensive security. It should be supported by a short yet substantial and truly action-oriented document to be worked out and adopted here, an outline of which already exists. I believe that we shall be able to apply sufficient constructive realism to overcome the stagnation of the past.

168. Czechoslovakia, for its part, will do its utmost for the work of this session to make progress in this very desirable direction and to make possible even now the creation of an atmosphere worthy of the new millennium.

169. Mr. ANDREOTTI (Italy) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to congratulate Mr. Peter Florin on his election to the presidency of the General Assembly at this special session. I believe that under his wise guidance this third special session devoted to disarmament will achieve the positive results so much anticipated. I should like also to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General, whose activity in the cause of peace and security has never been as essential as it is today.

170. Since the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Genscher, has already stated [*8th meeting*] the position of the European Community—which is also the position of my country—on the subject of this third special session, I shall confine myself to some points which I consider to be particularly worthy of attention.

171. This special session is taking place in the wake of the summit meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union in Moscow. Apart from the results achieved on that occasion, and those which immediately preceded it, the summit meeting confirms that the two super-Powers are committed to a permanent process of negotiation, the objective of which, in the field of armaments as in all other sectors, justifies the most ambitious expectations.

172. I do not believe that the results achieved to date, which would have been unthinkable even a couple of years ago, can be considered as having been gained for all time. On the contrary, I think that an appropriate psychological climate between the parties must be encouraged to consolidate and improve those results and that diffidence must be gradually replaced by a mutual trust built up through concrete events and specific initiatives, supported by consistent behaviour and constructive political will.

173. The overwhelming majority by which the United States Senate ratified the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—shows the extent

to which the American nation is committed to the peace effort.

174. In the Soviet Union also, fundamental choices have been made in the plans for transforming its society and for a substantial revision of its approach to international relations. That is an important and encouraging development which must be given strong external support in order to prevent domestic resistance from obstructing the movement for renewal.

175. The results also recompense those countries which, like Italy, working within the framework of the Atlantic alliance and together with its European Community partners, throughout the years have insisted that Europe should exercise all its influence and prestige to keep the dialogue open, even during times of sharp confrontation between East and West. I believe that neither of the preceding special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament could avail themselves of more favourable or more lasting international circumstances.

176. It is certain that not all the results of such intensive negotiations will bear fruit at the desired time. We hoped that the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on a 50 per cent reduction of offensive strategic weapons would be concluded at the Moscow summit meeting. That was not to be, and we regret it. However, we consider as a positive element the reaffirmation of the determination of the two countries to make a deep cut in the most dangerous of their weapons.

177. Violence and war are even today arbiters of politics in many parts of the world, but increasingly, negotiation is seen to be the only means of putting an end to conflicts that have lasted for years. This is taking place in Afghanistan, thanks to the tenacious efforts of the United Nations. In other areas also, from Angola to Cambodia, where open conflicts involving the interference of foreign forces are taking place, possible solutions are finally emerging. The two super-Powers are no longer viewing regional crises in terms of confrontation but rather as a possible ground for co-operation. By decreasing the areas where force is used, that policy is working, however hesitantly, in a concrete way in favour of a reduction of arsenals.

178. There is another factor that contributes to the favourable climate in which this special session is taking place, and that is the fully successful review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

179. Italy accepted the limitations inherent in that treaty, considering it to be a starting point not only for halting the spread of nuclear weapons but also for reducing existing arsenals of such weapons. Such an objective involved primarily the two super-Powers, but it also involved the other countries which participate in military balances. For the first time, the agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range weapons, and above all the agreements being negotiated for a major reduction in strategic weapons, mark a reversal of tendencies, which strengthens the case for adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We therefore hope that this trend will bring about an increase in the

number of countries which voluntarily renounce having their own nuclear deterrent. The recent decisions of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and of Spain are particularly significant in this respect.

180. This special session, which is taking place in such a positive context, provides a good opportunity to give a vigorous new impetus to the objectives of disarmament, peace and security.

181. Since the dialogue between the two super-Powers—supported, as in the case of the INF Treaty, by all their respective allies—has produced remarkable results, it is now time, in the interest of equilibrium, to adopt a more dynamic approach to multilateral talks. This should be emphasized as we begin our work, to prevent stagnation in multilateral disarmament, which would contrast with the current dynamism of international relations.

182. However, in our quest for the increasing rationalization and effectiveness of the role of the Organization, we must retain the appropriate distinctions between areas of competence and the different parts played, such as the universal scope of the action of the General Assembly and its deliberative bodies, and the more specific negotiating power of the Conference on Disarmament.

183. It is more difficult to envisage a role for the Security Council in the field of arms control. Nevertheless, the Council must continue to work to prevent the use of force and to promote a more stable political climate conducive to arms reduction. I am thinking of the importance of the Security Council's role, especially through the good offices of the Secretary-General, in resolving regional tensions, which fuel the arms race and stimulate the drain of military expenditures. In this connection all the experience of the United Nations, especially that of recent years, confirms how essential it is to maintain the unity of the Council and its permanent members.

184. The Conference on Disarmament has for perhaps too many years been the site of negotiations on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. However, despite universal revulsion against that type of weapon, the desired objective is still far off. We think that the banning of chemical weapons must involve the rapid destruction of all arsenals, particularly the larger ones, and an immediate halt in production under a strict verification system.

185. Since we are aware of the complexity of verification measures, we sponsored an international seminar of scientists on the subject in Rome on 19 and 20 May. Following the participants' recommendations on direct experimentation to develop the most rigorous and innovative inspection methods, we intend to invite a group of international specialists to visit a chemical facility in Italy to study the problems of verification of non-production.

186. We are also prepared to support in the near future regular exchanges of detailed data, following ways and means to be agreed upon. We are ready to establish stricter measures of control over the export of chemical substances which could be used for military purposes, measures similar to those already adopted to prevent nuclear proliferation.

187. Our objective is to have an international convention with the adherence of all States. We hope that political and economic considerations will not stand in the way of the rapid banning of these weapons, which, we are obliged to point out, are still used in current conflicts and which might be used again in the future, despite their devastating effects.

188. The special session should also contribute to encouraging a decrease in the levels of conventional weapons. The approximately 140 conventional conflicts of the post-war period have taken a toll of more than 20 million casualties.

189. In Europe, the imbalances in conventional weapons cause malaise and mutual suspicion and absorb huge amounts of resources. Here too there are signs of change which we hope will be confirmed in the next few months. We intend seriously to test the intentions of the countries concerned to eliminate the asymmetries which exist in their favour, by means of adequate negotiated reductions which can obviate a growth in the military potential of Western countries.

190. In the negotiations which have just begun in Vienna between the members of the two alliances we shall be able to tackle this problem at its roots, bearing in mind also the positive impact that could result from a solution in this area, which is currently the main sphere of disagreement in the region. This could be an example or model for situations of open or latent tension in other parts of the world.

191. Furthermore, we would hope that the transparency promised, and already in part put into effect by the Soviet Union in the social sphere, will be extended to military budgets, allowing an open comparison which would eliminate fears that sometimes derive only from ignorance of the intentions of others.

192. For the last 10 years the Italian Government has acted in support of the control and limitation of trade in conventional weapons. I realize that this is a difficult issue and that it is not the first time it has been raised in this framework. Nevertheless, we intend to pursue it and are encouraged by the growing expectations of international public opinion as regards complete transparency even in these fields. We have advocated the establishment of rules to this effect within the European Community, and we should also like this issue to be discussed at the United Nations.

193. No aspect of arms control today seems as delicate or as promising as verification. Verification is a problem which is both political and technical. It is political because it cannot be separated from a certain measure of trust and, therefore, depends on the overall climate of international relations. It is also a technical problem that presents considerable difficulties because of the complexity of the verification structures as we progress towards the co-ordinated destruction of weapons.

194. We are convinced that verification can become the ground for ever-broader agreement. A procedure for joint verification of nuclear tests was formulated in Moscow, which could lead to a progressive reduction in their number and power, so that

even this aspect of security would not be exempt from quantitative limitations.

195. In my opinion, the principle of joint verification of the process of creation of nuclear devices from its origins has many implications for possible future developments. With the scientific knowledge of both sides, it increases the transparency of the two systems. Nothing is more dangerous in the nuclear era than a condition of permanent uncertainty.

196. In so far as verification is concerned, we would like greater United Nations involvement. What is needed is a more flexible and realistic approach which, while avoiding all interferences in the present negotiations, would allow for greater involvement by States in the verification phase.

197. Consistent with its previous positions, Italy is in favour of the elaboration of principles of verification under United Nations auspices. It is also in favour of studying—in the same framework and always on the basis of past experience and the thorough work of certain States—the modalities that would allow the United Nations to provide specific support and to facilitate research on techniques—including the most advanced—and on appropriate machinery for multilateral disarmament. Our objective should be to provide a technical base which would be available to all for the purpose of promoting greater certitude.

198. Furthermore, we have accumulated useful experiences for multilateral control, for example in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy through IAEA. It seems to me we could draw inspiration from that experience and establish, for example, a body of experts to investigate the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

199. Among the items of great importance before this special session is the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The Government of Italy believes that, in the context of general and complete disarmament, space must be an area reserved for peaceful activities and that its use and exploration can contribute to the well-being of all and enhance the spirit of community among States.

200. The two super-Powers are fully aware that unregulated competition in the deployment of weapons in outer space would be extremely costly, without increasing security. The United States and the Soviet Union are negotiating on this point also in Geneva, in the belief that an agreement can be reached which would reconcile the freedom of research of one side with the mistrust of the other. We hope that every type of research and activity can be freely pursued in respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as extended to outer space. A recent proposal along these lines concerns a joint peaceful expedition by the United States and the Soviet Union to the planet which bears the name of the Roman god of war. That proposal deserves our full attention.

201. The work of the Conference on Disarmament has not advanced beyond a preliminary stage on the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Here too we hope that the Conference will

make more incisive progress, despite undeniable problems of politics, strategy and technology. But it is precisely technology that can provide better security conditions at lower levels of armament.

202. I think that, everything considered, all the developments that are taking place—from the joint control of nuclear tests to outer-space expeditions and the improvement of verification systems—point to greater scientific co-operation.

203. It is not science that has created the means of destruction, but politics which has directed scientific resources towards the wrong objectives. It is this starting point that must be changed. Scientists can and must work together, and if this international co-operation is achieved, politicians throughout the world will be helped in building structures of peace at the service of all. Science is making our world a smaller one. We must strengthen this phase of renewed international détente by supporting freedom of movement of men and ideas. That not only will help to ensure stability in East-West relations, but will also lead to development projects for the least-favoured countries. And that brings me to my last point.

204. Our security is tied not only to arms reduction but also to the more widespread observance of the principles and norms of the United Nations, including respect for human rights and a broader and more significant recognition of the role they should play. It is precisely in the United Nations that we have been able to discuss the links between disarmament and development, and the negative effects of economic inequalities on international stability.

205. The United Nations has devoted particular attention to the reallocation of resources to peaceful objectives. That is not a short-term process, and in fact it involves a change in the international climate, both in East-West relations and in regional balances.

However, we believe it of great political significance that the problem has been confronted and common consideration of it encouraged in terms which apply to general and complete disarmament.

206. General and complete disarmament remains the ultimate objective, in a framework of stability, transparency and respect for the principles of the United Nations. It is an objective to be reached gradually, but one which must guide and co-ordinate the actions of countries with different economic and social systems and belonging to different international structures. We shall serve our cause not by adopting general principles but, rather, as events of recent years have proved, with tenacious negotiations to reduce gradually the level of forces and to dismantle the psychological and material structures which led to this situation.

207. That is not a goal for the future, but one of the main thrusts of our policy. Our conduct is consistent with it. In history, opportunities do not arrive on schedule, like railway trains, but unexpectedly. It is our task as politicians to seize these opportunities. Maybe no other generation could do better in similar circumstances, but I think that none should venture any less.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

NOTES

¹Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva on 17 June 1925 (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138).

²See A/41/97, annex.

³See A/40/1070, annex.

⁴A/43/214, annex.