

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SPECIAL SESSION

Official Records



**5th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 2 June 1988,  
at 3.20 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

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

*Scale of Assessments for the apportionment of  
the expenses of the United Nations (continued)\**

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to document A/S-15/18/Add.1, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing me that, since the issuance of his communication dated 31 May 1988, the Gambia has made the necessary payment to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter. May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of this information?

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (*continued*)**

2. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Iceland. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Thorsteinn Palsson and inviting him to address the Assembly.

3. Mr. PALSSON (Iceland): I should like, before turning to the important subjects which have brought us here, to join those who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Sir, on your election as President of the General Assembly at this third special session devoted to disarmament.

4. This special session on disarmament is convened as the summit meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union is drawing to a close in Moscow. That fact symbolically illustrates the great changes we have witnessed in the area of arms control since the last special session on disarmament. But even though much has been accomplished, more challenges remain ahead.

5. The Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—has given arms control negotiations a new momentum, which the people of my country strongly feel must be maintained. We should all try to contribute to that process.

\*Resumed from the 1st meeting.

6. But while pursuing the paramount task of disarmament, we both can and should also strive to strengthen other fundamental elements of a truly civilized world community, such as individual freedoms, democracy and respect for human rights. The pursuit of economic and social development must also continue unimpeded.

7. Reducing arsenals and eliminating weapons systems are vital, but the weapons themselves are not the cause of war or friction between nations. The true causes are distrust and lack of confidence in relations between nations as well as a lack of understanding and tolerance of different ideologies, economic systems, religions or cultures. These causes we must also deal with and insist that States not act provocatively or in a manner that sows the seeds of distrust.

8. Disarmament and the elimination of weapons is a symbol of reduced tensions and increased trust between nations. No nation should endanger that process.

9. This third special session on disarmament has been prepared with great care, as were the first two. In these three largest-ever meetings on disarmament, representatives from nearly all States in the world, large and small, have taken part. The hopes and aspirations of mankind for a safer world where significant resources are diverted from armaments to the pursuit of development are felt here at this gathering as they were in 1978 and 1982.

10. In 1978 an important Final Document detailing a plan for disarmament according to certain principles and priorities was adopted by consensus [*resolution S-10/2*]. Four years later, however, the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament noted that hardly any progress had been made and that the arms race had unfortunately continued at an accelerated rate. The second session was unable to recreate the positive atmosphere that had prevailed at the first.

11. We now welcome the historic Treaty signed by the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union in Washington last December. The Treaty stipulates the elimination of all land-based intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. Although small in the context of global nuclear arsenals, these reductions represent an important step forward, a first step that shows that agreement on real nuclear weapons reductions, with the required verification provisions, can be reached.

12. I am particularly gratified that the meeting in my capital, Reykjavik, in October 1986 between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev not only paved the way for the INF Treaty but also

laid important foundations for further progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. The most important goal that the two leaders agreed upon at Reykjavik was that of a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive nuclear forces. This issue and others of great implications elaborated at the Reykjavik meeting have been among the subjects discussed at Moscow between the two leaders.

13. My Government, upon its formation in July last year, declared *inter alia* that Iceland supports all realistic endeavours towards a strictly verifiable mutual reduction of nuclear arms. In the course of the past 25 years Iceland has become a party to international agreements for partial disarmament negotiated within the United Nations framework. We feel that these agreements should be strengthened and the test ban made all-comprehensive.

14. We believe that all States should accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*]. In this connection I should like to mention the memorandum on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons submitted at this session by the five Nordic countries [*A/S-15/14, annex*]. The Nordic countries have jointly appealed to those countries that have not yet acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to do so at their earliest convenience. We should like to see reflected in the final document of this special session an appropriate reference to the importance of preserving and strengthening that treaty.

15. My Government is particularly pleased that the international development towards a generally accepted view that effective verification measures are fundamental to any disarmament agreements and that verification provisions, along with full compliance with such agreements, form an important basis for confidence between States. The Document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, adopted in September 1986, was a milestone in this respect. A number of measures were agreed upon in it which were aimed at reducing the risk of war as a result of misunderstanding, miscalculation or surprise attack.

16. Apart from nuclear weapons, chemical weapons have the greatest potential for mass destruction. Icelandic representatives have therefore time and again voiced their concern and hope for a global ban and the elimination of all existing stocks of chemical weapons. We welcome the progress made at the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva.

17. At the opening of the Stockholm Conference in 1984, former Prime Minister and then Foreign Minister of Iceland, Mr. Geir Hallgrímsson, said:

“The Icelandic people—an island nation—make their living to a great extent on the living resources of the sea. It is consequently obvious that we are very much concerned about the development of the naval arms race. Accidents at sea involving nuclear-arms systems may bring disaster to our and other nations’ means of livelihood, not to mention the irreparable damage that naval confrontation would cause, no less than armed conflicts on land.”

18. A valuable study on naval forces and naval armaments which Iceland co-sponsored was issued in 1985 by the United Nations, and that document<sup>1</sup> is an important input in this vital field.

19. It is the firm view of all Icelanders that the withdrawal of missiles from continental Europe under the INF Treaty must not be allowed to lead to the deployment of additional nuclear forces in the North Atlantic. We hope that a treaty on reducing strategic nuclear forces will actually lead to decreased nuclear activity at sea and fewer sea-based missiles. For Iceland, as for other fishing nations, reducing the nuclear threat at sea is clearly of the utmost importance. We feel that a strategic arms-reduction treaty would be an important contribution towards reducing that risk.

20. As we move towards decreasing nuclear arsenals in Europe, the question of conventional forces in Europe has come to the forefront. In Vienna since February 1987, we, as members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [*NATO*], have taken part in talks among the 23 States members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact on a mandate for new talks on a conventional balance on land from the Atlantic to the Urals. The mandate will, it is hoped, be adopted soon so that these important negotiations can start this year as envisaged. They will take place within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe but will be autonomous with regard to subject-matter, participation and procedures, as proposed by the Foreign Ministers of the NATO member States at their Reykjavik meeting in June 1987.

21. I have touched upon some of the vital subjects before this third special session on disarmament. However, the military side of security is only one of at least two prerequisites for peace. As I outlined earlier, the elimination of distrust among nations is even more important. Weapons are a symptom of that distrust, not its cause. Peace and freedom cannot be separated. It is no coincidence that the nations of Western Europe and North America have lived in peace for over 40 years. Respect for freedom and human rights as well as NATO’s defence policy are the main reasons for this.

22. In order to enhance international stability by creating confidence between nations, we must increase co-operation in such spheres as trade, science and culture; but most of all we must open up frontiers and let free and unhindered relations among peoples and individuals flourish.

23. I have stated that there is now scope for optimism as to the results of this third special session on disarmament because of recent developments in this field. I should like to mention another positive development. Iceland and Afghanistan both joined the United Nations on 19 November 1946. We have witnessed with particular concern the suffering of the Afghan people since the Soviet invasion of December 1979. We are heartened now to witness the withdrawal of the foreign forces and hope that a lasting peace will be found in Afghanistan so that the millions of Afghan refugees can resettle, confident that in the future their country’s sovereignty will be respected by all.

24. Let us also hope that another symbol of distrust and human rights violations, the Berlin Wall, will soon be torn down. That would remove one more obstacle on our road to a world of more trust and fewer arms. The removal of the Berlin Wall would truly exemplify a new era in international relations.

25. We all hope that this special session will be a successful one, although we know that the most important decisions in this area are not made in this forum. Speaking for the Icelandic delegation, I should like to see the following as the ultimate result of this session and other disarmament endeavours: continued realistic reductions in the nuclear-force levels of the super-Powers; a total ban on the production and use of chemical weapons, as well as the destruction of existing arsenals; substantial, mutual and balanced reductions in conventional forces; and, finally, unquestionable respect by all nations for freedom, pluralistic democracy and human rights, leading to enhanced mutual trust, peace and international security.

26. The Icelandic delegation will do its best to help in the making of a meaningful and constructive final document in that spirit at this special session.

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

28. The Assembly will now hear an address by the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Arthur N. R. Robinson and inviting him to address the Assembly.

29. Mr. ROBINSON (Trinidad and Tobago): I join with leaders of other delegations who have preceded me in expressing the heartiest congratulations to you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The road before us will be long and difficult. I have no doubt, however, that your proven wisdom and diplomatic skills will facilitate our work and promote a successful outcome of this session.

30. Ten years ago the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament laid the foundations for, and set out the broad principles of, an international disarmament strategy. The Document proposed a wide range of disarmament measures intended to enhance the security of all nations at progressively lower levels of armaments. It also reaffirmed the primary role and responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

31. Results achieved to date have far from matched the high expectations engendered by that first special session. Though the second special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1982, reaffirmed the validity of the 1978 Final Document and launched the World Disarmament Campaign, it achieved little by way of specific disarmament measures. The international political situation was, until recently, clearly not favourable for the negotiating process.

32. This third special session on disarmament is of profound significance. First, the prevention of a

nuclear holocaust is the single, most critical challenge facing our global community. Secondly, the timing of the session is propitious, coming as it does at a moment when the two major nuclear-weapon Powers have made small but real and historic progress in the area of nuclear-arms reduction.

33. It is fitting that the United Nations should be the forum for this discussion on disarmament. Despite the greater responsibility of the two major nuclear-weapon Powers, disarmament is an issue which touches all of us.

34. No State, no matter how small, no matter how remote, no matter how weak nor how powerful, would be immune from the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear conflagration. It is for this reason that Trinidad and Tobago, as part of the Caribbean region, has consistently added its voice to those which have expressed concern over the spiralling arms race and escalating arms expenditures and the threat they pose to international peace and security.

35. Security is indeed one of the most profound aspirations of humanity, and the temptation to employ ever-rising levels of armaments to ensure security is the most fatal attraction facing mankind. The accumulation of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from ensuring greater security now threatens the very existence of all of us. One tenth of the existing nuclear arsenals could cause the death of thousands of millions and bring about catastrophic environmental, atmospheric, biological and genetic changes. Civilization as we know it could cease to exist.

36. Moreover, there is an increasing awareness that challenges to security are not only military but also encompass the political, social, economic, environmental and other domains. Thus a purely military approach to the problems of security is no longer regarded as realistic.

37. However, so long as the recourse to force or the threat of the use of force continues to be an instrument of foreign policy, the disarmament process will remain an essential means of strengthening international peace and security. The disarmament process promotes a climate of confidence and trust, fosters better relations between States and narrows the technical and material base for waging war.

38. It was in this context that Trinidad and Tobago heartily welcomed the December 1987 agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles. The agreement between President Reagan of the United States and General Secretary Gorbachev of the Soviet Union was rightly acclaimed as historic. For the first time a measure was taken that would reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world, a small but significant step in the process of nuclear-arms reduction.

39. Subsequent negotiations to decrease strategic arsenals by 50 per cent have made some progress at the recently concluded meeting in Moscow. My Government sincerely hopes that in the years to come we shall be able to look back on this period of

time as a watershed in the long and difficult process of arms limitation and reduction.

40. This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the partial nuclear-test-ban Treaty.<sup>2</sup> The complete cessation of all nuclear testing would impede nuclear experimentation and innovation and thus curb the qualitative spiral of the nuclear arms race. On the political plane, it would give a tremendous boost to disarmament negotiations at both bilateral and multilateral forums. It would also ease the increasing environmental concerns of those of us who are not reassured by the environmental safety guarantees which are said to surround some of this nuclear testing. My Government hopes that the resumption of negotiations between the two major nuclear Powers on the issue of nuclear testing will facilitate the work of the Conference on Disarmament and hasten the attainment of what remains a major but elusive disarmament objective.

41. Recent progress in the area of arms reduction negotiations has brought the issue of verification to the forefront of the disarmament debate, with special emphasis being laid on the technical obstacles that remain to be overcome. It is right that States parties to a disarmament agreement should make every effort to prevent and to detect violations of international commitments. Progress in seismic monitoring should go a long way in increasing confidence in the accuracy and reliability of verification procedures. In this context, my Government wishes to underscore the importance of scrupulous compliance with existing and newly agreed arms accords as a means of establishing mutual trust between the parties involved.

42. The best guarantee, however, of non-use of nuclear arms is non-possession of these weapons. It is for this reason that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones constitutes one of the most effective means for non-nuclear States to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to achieve disarmament. Trinidad and Tobago is party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco<sup>3</sup> establishing such a zone in Latin America and the Caribbean. These nuclear-free zones are all the more important at a time when the availability of fissionable material and widespread technological progress have made the technical barriers to the acquisition of nuclear capability more surmountable for an increasing number of States.

43. In these circumstances greater responsibility to prevent nuclear proliferation is placed on those States which are most advanced in nuclear technology. My Government therefore views with considerable dismay and alarm the increasing nuclear capability of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa as a result of technical expertise and facilities accorded it over the years in the nuclear field. It would seem self-evident that a régime as grossly oppressive and insensitive as exists in South Africa, which repeatedly displays its bellicose attitude to its neighbours, should not be trusted with nuclear technology.

44. Alongside nuclear proliferation, the growing militarization of outer space is a cause of global concern. Research and development programmes aimed at establishing strategic defence systems have accelerated the pace of this militarization. Such

programmes are well on the way to propelling the arms race into outer space and to altering the traditional perceptions of security based on deterrence. Outer space must be regarded as the common heritage of mankind, and no effort should be spared to ensure its use solely for peaceful purposes and for the welfare of all humanity.

45. While nuclear disarmament must remain the overriding priority, the increasing recourse to weapons of mass destruction and to conventional weapons also underscores the vital importance of non-nuclear disarmament. The increasing number of States which today possess the capacity to produce chemical weapons is cause for alarm, as is the use of those weapons in the current Iran-Iraq conflict. The need for the Conference on Disarmament to overcome the remaining obstacles and to conclude a convention on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons has become all the more urgent.

46. Trinidad and Tobago believes that increased emphasis must be placed on regional approaches to conventional disarmament as well as on confidence-building measures, such as the reduction of military budgets and greater openness in military matters. The recent establishment of regional centres for peace and disarmament in Latin America and the Caribbean and in Africa is to be commended. Every effort should be made to help these centres to make a meaningful contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.

47. In a world in which the basic needs of hundreds of millions of people are not being met, in which hunger, malnutrition, disease and poverty are the daily lot of the majority, the economic cost of the arms race is extravagant and scandalous. Between 1960 and 1982 the military expenditures of developed countries rose by more than \$400 billion and their foreign economic aid increased by a mere \$25 billion. In 1982 their military expenditures were 17 times larger than their assistance to developing countries. The cost of a single nuclear submarine equals the annual education budget of 23 developing countries, with 160 million children of school age. Every minute of a day witnesses \$1.3 million being used for military purposes, while 30 children in developing countries die of hunger, malnutrition and disease.

48. The stark reality is that the arms race and development compete for the allocation of financial, human and physical resources. As these resources are finite, both processes cannot be pursued successfully at the same time. Until there is a greater awareness of the interdependence of the world in which we live and the consequent need for structural changes in international economic relations, balanced and equitable global socio-economic development will continue to be superseded by the accumulation of arms and military power.

49. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, underlined the multidimensional links between these two processes and emphasized that socio-economic tensions stemming from a lack of development constitute non-military threats to international peace

and security. If the resources made available by arms reduction are reallocated to developmental purposes, disarmament could make a significant contribution to the development process and thereby enhance the possibilities for a more stable international system.

50. As we discuss the issues of disarmament and arms control, we have to take account of the fact that, in many situations, human suffering in staggering proportions is occurring as a result of the use of weapons of mass destruction or weapons which cause unnecessary human suffering. I do not need to remind the Assembly that the decision to use those weapons is made by individuals. I therefore think that it is high time for us to focus, in our discussions on disarmament and arms control, on the responsibility of individuals, such as mercenaries and their ilk. They arise as well in the illegal traffic in drugs across national frontiers, which is a growing threat to peace and security and is often interrelated with traffic in destructive weapons.

51. It is, therefore, the view of the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago that the United Nations should commence discussion of the criminal responsibility of individuals—including mercenary scientists—who act in breach of the relevant norms of international law, with particular reference to the provisions of treaties banning the use of certain types of weapons. As part of such a discussion we would need eventually to examine the existing international criminal codes and the possibilities of using international commissions of inquiry and, in the long term, of instituting an international criminal court.

52. In concrete terms, it is the proposal of my delegation that this special session request the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the criminal responsibility of persons who use or authorize the use of prohibited weapons and weapons which cause unnecessary human suffering, or who engage in illegal drug trafficking across national frontiers, and submit that report to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session, in 1989, so as to enable the General Assembly to begin discussion of an aspect of our work which I think has been delayed for too long. In the preparation of that report, the Secretary-General would, as is customary, solicit and present to the General Assembly in an analytical form, information, views and observations of Governments, relevant United Nations organs, regional intergovernmental organizations, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

53. My delegation makes this as a formal proposal, and we will be undertaking contacts with other delegations with a view to the insertion of this proposal in the final act of the session.

54. I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate my Government's wholehearted support for the primary role and responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. As a small State, Trinidad and Tobago has always relied on the United Nations as the guarantor of its territorial integrity, its sovereignty and its security, and not on the use or threat of use of force of arms.

55. As a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Trinidad and Tobago will continue to join its voice with those of other small, developing States in emphasizing the dangers of the arms race, in advocating a reallocation of resources which can be put to so much more beneficial use and in expressing the aspirations of those who profoundly believe that the end of the arms race and a future free from the scourge of war are necessary and realizable goals. My delegation is convinced that our global community is on the threshold of one of those privileged moments of history when perseverance, common sense and compromise can combine to alter the course of events.

56. There are no barriers to the reach of the human spirit.

57. We hope that this perception is shared by other delegations. Together we must make a success of this third special session devoted to disarmament. Together we can also achieve, at this period of time, a significant step forward in the laborious process of arms limitation and disarmament and in the quest for a more just, a more humane and a safer world.

58. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago for the important statement he has just made.

59. The Assembly will next hear a statement by the Prime Minister of Ireland. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Charles Haughey and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

60. Mr. HAUGHEY (Ireland): Sir, I should like to congratulate you on your election to the office of President of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I am sure that our work will benefit from the skill and experience you have demonstrated during your presidency.

61. The second special session on disarmament, in 1982, took place at a time of sharp tension between East and West. The atmosphere then was one of deep concern that political and military competition between the two great alliances had brought the world perceptibly closer to a general conflict: a conflict which a combination of skill, common sense and good fortune had successfully prevented for nearly 40 years. At the same time, there was universal hope that the special session would lead nations to turn to disarmament as the path towards a secure future, free from the danger of war. In the event that hope was not fulfilled.

62. Today, at this third special session on disarmament, we have a new opportunity to respond to the hopes of the people of the world for justice, order and collective security. Fortunately, a dramatic improvement in East-West relations has taken place in the intervening years. We have already witnessed the first concrete result in the signing last December in Washington of a historic agreement on eliminating intermediate-range nuclear weapons. We warmly welcome this development. This is the first agreement that goes further than limiting a projected increase in nuclear arms and provides, rather, for the total elimination of a category of these weapons.



Militarily, the agreement reduces the level of armed confrontation. Politically, it demonstrates an awareness of the great need to reduce tension and begin again the process of building trust, the indispensable foundation for progress towards a world where the threat of nuclear annihilation no longer hangs over mankind. Perhaps most significantly, the INF Treaty is the first sign of a renewed willingness to move away from the unending accumulation of ever greater and more destructive arsenals.

63. That willingness is apparent also in the agreed objective of the United States and the Soviet Union to reduce their offensive nuclear arms by half. The world is encouraged by the statements made yesterday after their meetings by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in which they stressed their commitment to this objective and their determination to work towards its early achievement. The summit meeting in Moscow marked the completion by both sides of the ratification procedures for the INF Treaty, and agreement was announced on other important, if less dramatic, areas on the arms control agenda of the super-Powers, including aspects of nuclear testing. The continued intensive exploration by the two super-Powers at the highest level of all areas of arms control and disarmament in pursuit of broadening the areas of agreement is watched with increasing hope and enthusiasm by people everywhere.

64. The series of meetings between the leaders of the two super-Powers and the resulting improvement in the relations between their countries have created a far more positive international climate. Furthermore, the negotiations currently taking place at Vienna and Geneva hold out the hope of progress towards reducing conventional armaments and eliminating chemical weapons.

65. It is still too early, however, to say whether these are the dominant trends which will determine the future course of East-West relations. Recent developments have certainly brought encouragement and hope, but they should not cause us to lose sight of the broader and deeply troubling currents in a world which is still far from abandoning the age-old reliance on military strength. The INF Treaty will eliminate only a tiny fraction of the nuclear stockpiles. The eventual success of the current negotiations on reducing strategic nuclear weapons will still leave arsenals capable of destroying human civilization a hundred times over.

66. Furthermore, despite the progress that has been made and is envisaged, the arms race continues, as it always has. Indeed, it seems at times that this relentless rivalry has become a permanent underlying reality, almost regardless of the state of East-West relations. Albert Einstein said:

“Every step appears as the apparently compulsory and unavoidable consequence of the preceding one. In the end, there beckons more and more clearly general annihilation.”

67. As long as it continues the arms race will have two principal consequences. First, the very increase in volume of armaments is a powerful source of tension: the more weapons there are, the more likely

that some of them, and perhaps the most lethal, will one day be used. Secondly, as was made clear at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held here only last year, expenditure on armaments squanders real resources which could and should be used to meet the crying need to combat world hunger and malnutrition and promote the economic and social development of the third world.

68. Even though the nuclear arms race is by far the most threatening and most destabilizing, we should not forget that a dangerous and expensive competition is also being conducted in conventional arms in several regions of the world. Global military spending today is \$1,000 billion annually. It has increased between four and five times in real terms since the end of the Second World War, and the growth rate is accelerating.

69. Notwithstanding the hopes raised by recent agreements between the major Powers, we must always remember that current plans for the modernization of nuclear forces still call for the deployment of thousands of new nuclear weapons before the end of this century. In the past two or three years hundreds of new missiles, bombers and warheads have been deployed. The quantity is still growing, and the qualitative arms race is even more appalling. The accuracy and deadliness of the various missiles have been greatly increased. Many of the new weapon systems already being introduced are highly destabilizing. Whatever their designers' intention, each side is likely to see in these innovations, whether of increased throw-weight or more sophisticated technology, a threat to its own ability to deter attack. Objectively, these weapons confer an advantage on the side that strikes first and intensify the argument in favour of pre-emptive strikes.

70. The total number of American and Soviet strategic nuclear warheads at the time of the second special session was estimated at over 18,000. Today it is in the region of 24,000—at the lowest estimate. So the number of such warheads has actually increased by one third. This extraordinary increase in the numbers of nuclear weapons clearly shows that the arms race has been an ongoing feature of international life.

71. All of this is presumably being done in search of greater security. Every country wishes to assure its own safety, but the actions that each takes in order to do this can add greatly to the insecurity of all.

72. There are two fundamentally different approaches to security. The adversarial approach relies on the strength of armed forces and weapons, either to deter aggression or to defeat an opponent. The other approach is a co-operative one and seeks to build confidence among nations and to remove the fear of attack by getting rid of the means of waging war.

73. The adversarial approach, the attempt to achieve security by relying on one's own military strength, is often described as hard-headed and realistic. By contrast, the effort to find security through disarmament is often dismissed as naïve or treated as a high-minded aspiration which can be

realized only in the remote future, if at all. In the present, we are told, nations must look to their defences, and while certain limitations on weapons may serve a useful purpose, the maintenance and, indeed, the multiplication and refinement of those weapons remain the real basis for national security and the preservation of peace. The proof we are offered is that world war has been avoided for over forty years.

74. But can it be said that the world has been a truly peaceful one and that the people of the world have felt safe and secure for the last forty years? There have been dozens of regional conflicts since 1945, many of which, if not caused, have been exacerbated and prolonged by rivalry between the major power blocs. There have been a number of occasions when such conflicts have dangerously threatened to escalate into global conflict.

75. An international order which is built upon mutual fear and military rivalry is inherently unstable, even if the ultimate disaster has so far been avoided. Is it not clear that one of the major causes of the persisting tension and threat of war is the arms race itself? Peace is not built on a firm and reliable foundation where States are engaged in a permanent competitive struggle to attain superiority in arms. As one generation of weapons succeeds another, each side is determined to match and outstrip the other. Any advantage that is gained is only fleeting. The nuclear arms race has been pursued vigorously for over forty years. The result has been the building of arsenals containing over 50,000 nuclear weapons. This unreasoning acquisition of new and improved weapons has led to a world of diminished security at higher levels of armaments. We cannot see in this realism or logic or sense.

76. I am aware that it is regarded as realistic to consider that nuclear weapons have been invented, that they cannot be disinvented, and that they must therefore be factored into all our equations and their possible use sanctioned as a way of deterring their use by an adversary. The time is ripe, however, for new thinking in this area. The increasing sophistication of technology and the sheer weight of the economic cost is forcing a radical new approach to thinking at a global level.

77. In the nuclear area itself, we are confronted with the problem of disposal of civil and military nuclear waste, a problem which has not yet found a satisfactory solution. The dumping of much irradiated material in the seas cannot be regarded as a solution, and it can never be accepted by countries like mine which are surrounded by those seas. In this connection, the growth in nuclear submarine traffic in busy coastal shipping and fishing zones, such as the Irish Sea, is a matter of considerable concern to my country. Such submarines are in effect submerged and mobile nuclear power-stations. They are as subject to accident as fixed land-based stations, with the additional dangers of possible collision. New thinking is called for so as to banish the prospect of the almost everlasting contamination of the environment for everyone, whether or not we have adopted the nuclear option in military or civilian form.

78. In other ways too we have been forced to take a global view of our environment and to think in terms of enlightened management of our planet on a world basis to contain the threats posed to it from so many directions—in such ways, for instance, as the threat to the ozone layer, which is vital to life on Earth, arising from the use of chlorofluorocarbons. But the greatest conceivable environmental catastrophe would be the one caused by a nuclear exchange between the two super-Powers. Such an exchange would threaten the very future of mankind. In these circumstances, it should never have been considered unrealistic to give serious consideration to the possibility of completely eliminating such weapons, and now at last the super-Powers themselves envisage such a possibility.

79. But the responsibility for disarmament cannot just be left to the super-Powers. All of us have a vital interest in a safer world. We all have a responsibility to work for disarmament and to strengthen the international order and the rule of law among nations. Nearly thirty years have passed since the General Assembly set itself the goal of general and complete disarmament. That resolution [*resolution 1378 (XIV)*] was not voted through by any automatic majority; it was adopted unanimously. The resolution called for measures leading towards this goal to be “worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time”. Ireland has always supported this objective and continues to do so. Every step in this direction would bring enormous benefits.

80. The problem, of course, is how to reach this destination. We can find little encouragement in the record to date. The first special session on disarmament 10 years ago set out a Programme of Action [*resolution S-10/2, sect. III*] in its Final Document. This Document, too, was adopted unanimously and is still fully valid today, but the recommendations agreed in it are nowhere near being fully implemented. Although many partial measures have been agreed, they have not served to halt, let alone reverse, the arms race. These measures have been conceived too narrowly. For the most part, they have concentrated on limiting increases in certain categories of weapons while allowing other weapons to multiply. The general trend has been overwhelmingly in the direction of increased armaments, rather than reductions. The policy of States is still based on the mistaken belief that security can best be achieved through military strength.

81. The call for general and complete disarmament will no doubt be renewed by the General Assembly on the occasion of this special session, as it has been so many times in the past. This time, however, it will take place against the background of the hopes and objectives being voiced at the Moscow summit meeting, which give new hope that it can represent an attainable commitment which can be and will be translated into concrete measures.

82. We look forward to further sets of negotiations both to develop the work on confidence- and security-building measures begun at the Stockholm Conference from 1984 to 1986 and to negotiate actual reductions in arms. The 1986 Stockholm Document, a timely and significant achievement, includes a range of measures providing for openness in the

conduct of military activities, constraining provisions that impose conditions on the conduct of such activities, and far-reaching verification arrangements. This graduated confidence-building approach involving all States, great and small, has an important role to play in the pursuit of the disarmament goal. It is progress towards a better future in which the security environment in Europe will be stable and predictable, marked by mutual confidence and by a spirit of co-operation.

83. The first and obvious step in halting the arms race is to stop developing new weapons of mass destruction. This requires an end to nuclear testing. In 1963, the parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water<sup>2</sup>—the partial test ban Treaty—stated their aim of achieving the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time. Prior to the signing of that treaty some 500 tests had been carried out. Since then well over a thousand further test explosions have taken place, twice as many since the treaty as before it was signed.

84. A further agreement, the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests<sup>4</sup>—the threshold test-ban treaty of 1974—limited the size of nuclear tests. Neither of those agreements placed any effective curb on the arms race. Instead, the number of nuclear warheads has risen from the hundreds to the tens of thousands. Much of that increase could not have taken place if all nuclear testing had been prohibited. In our view there is no more convincing demonstration of the futility of attempting to achieve security through building weapons and no more graphic illustration of the kind of thinking which insists on pursuing the arms race even while accepting partial measures of arms control.

85. Today, a quarter of a century later, we still do not have a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Ireland believes that the immediate conclusion of such a treaty should be the first priority. We can see no grounds for further delay. In particular, we believe that a total prohibition on nuclear testing should be seen as the first step towards disarmament, and not as the final stage to be agreed only after disarmament has been achieved. Rapid conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would be the single, clearest proof which the nuclear Powers could offer of their willingness to discharge the obligations they have accepted and of their determination to bring the arms race under control.

86. The next step is to halt the deployment of nuclear weapons. Ireland strongly supports the aim of a 50 per cent reduction. The elimination of thousands of nuclear weapons would be most welcome, even though this would still leave arsenals as great as, or larger than, they were in 1972, the year in which the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty<sup>5</sup> was signed. The greatest benefit of this measure will be realized only if it is a stage in an irreversible movement towards general nuclear disarmament. A 50 per cent reduction will have little meaning if the remaining warheads are refined and transformed into even more lethal engines of destruction. There should be an end to the development of new weapons and their delivery systems. Speaking from this rostrum in 1982 at the 8th meeting of the second special session,

I advocated a freeze or moratorium on the introduction of new strategic warheads and delivery vehicles for a trial period. Had that suggestion been accepted then, the nuclear arsenals of the world would today contain at least 6,000 fewer warheads.

87. It seems inconceivable that half a million scientists and engineers are engaged in weapons research. A quarter of world spending on all research and development is devoted to military research and development—about \$100 billion every year—of which about half is accounted for by the two largest Powers. This is an essential element of the arms race as we know it, constantly working for ever more deadly, sophisticated weaponry.

88. The third step will be to make further deep reductions in the remaining nuclear weapons. This should cover all categories. This means that there will also be a need for a satisfactory solution to the issue of sea-based nuclear missiles, whether on submarines or on surface vessels, which must be included in any meaningful scheme of reduction aimed at eventual elimination. Again, a 50 per cent reduction will accomplish little if mankind continues to face the threat of 12,000 remaining warheads. Even if we were to accept the logic of deterrence, that number of warheads, or even half that number, is far greater than what is needed to deter attack. There can be no genuine basis for confidence and trust among nations while such arsenals exist. The only acceptable level of nuclear weapons is zero.

89. A measure of particular importance is the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime. The non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has become the accepted norm of international life, and it is both the responsibility and the interest of every country, large or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, to do all in its power to ensure that the menace of nuclear weapons will spread no further. It is unfortunate that to this day a sizeable number of States are not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*].

90. Most disturbingly, there are today several States which are actively seeking or may already have obtained a nuclear-weapons capability. We find it difficult to understand how certain countries can imagine that acquiring nuclear weapons will somehow strengthen their security. The truth is the very opposite. Any country which acquires nuclear weapons will provoke a similar response from its rivals and expose itself to an increased risk of involvement in the horror of nuclear war. There are genuine security problems between countries, but those problems will only be deepened by the acquisition of nuclear weapons. They can never be resolved by military threat.

91. I should like also to draw attention to the scope given for proliferation by incomplete implementation or non-implementation of internationally agreed safeguards in respect of certain civil nuclear installations. The barriers between civil and military nuclear power, on which public confidence in the whole non-proliferation régime rests, are not being fully respected, so that it is impossible for IAEA to determine in all instances whether or not illegal diversion of substantial quantities of fissile material to military



programmes is taking place. All countries should give complete co-operation to IAEA by permitting and facilitating full inspection at all civil nuclear installations.

92. Other weapons of mass destruction should be eliminated. In particular there should be no further delay in reaching agreement on the total elimination of all chemical weapons and the destruction of stockpiles. The use of chemical weapons has been outlawed for over 60 years and must be regarded with universal revulsion. It is not enough, however, to ban the use of a particular weapon. As long as weapons exist, the readiness to resort to their use will remain.

93. Ireland believes that nuclear arms pose the greatest threat to mankind. However, we do not underestimate the threat posed by conventional weapons. The greatest concentration of conventionally armed forces is to be found on the continent of Europe. Even if nuclear weapons were to be abolished, the conventional forces could still wage a devastating war. Furthermore, the very existence of those forces is intimidating and prejudices the building of the confidence necessary to achieve nuclear disarmament. We certainly do not wish to suggest that progress in nuclear disarmament should be conditional upon reductions of conventional forces, yet it is an undeniable fact that the prospects for nuclear disarmament would be immeasurably increased if the threats posed by conventional forces were removed. The concept of general and complete disarmament was never intended to apply only to nuclear weapons.

94. The present level of conventional forces in Europe far exceeds the legitimate requirements of self-defence. That is now widely recognized, and the current meeting of the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will, we expect, mandate new negotiations on the reduction of such forces. It is of the greatest importance that those new negotiations, when they begin, make rapid progress.

95. However, the problem of excessively large conventional forces is not confined to Europe alone. It is to be found in almost every region of the world. Everywhere it occurs it leads to sharpened tensions and increases the likelihood of conflict. More than 25 million people, a great number of them civilians, have been killed in the scores of conflicts waged with conventional weapons since the Second World War.

96. Furthermore, the diversion of resources away from pressing humanitarian, economic and social needs imposes a heavy burden on populations and especially on the poorest sectors. The problems created by underdevelopment are both an affront to human values and a threat to peace and security. The world cannot devote enormous human and financial resources to armaments and at the same time meet its urgently necessary development goals. In a world where hundreds of millions live in desperate poverty and endure famine, malnutrition and disease it is tragic to witness the vast sums dissipated on arms and military establishments. The world needs development of its agricultural, marine and industrial resources, better health and education, improved

infrastructures and protection of the environment. It does not need, and it cannot afford, yet more weapons.

97. A further essential step is to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space. This is an area where a new arms race could be averted by agreement. A repetition in that environment of what has already taken place on Earth can only lead to greater insecurity for all. One of the driving forces impelling the arms race has been the belief that the introduction of some new weapon system would at last usher in an era of complete and assured security. Experience, however, has shown that every advance in military technology has merely added a new dimension to the threat facing us all, increased the destructive power of existing arsenals and squandered vast resources.

98. There is, at the same time, a need to accompany these disarmament measures with other efforts to strengthen international security. We have in the United Nations an instrument specifically created for that purpose. The Charter of the United Nations provides structures and procedures and a legal framework for governing relations between States. These institutions must be strengthened and made more effective. This depends, in the first place, on the willingness of countries to make full use of the machinery and procedures of the United Nations to resolve conflicts and to settle disputes peacefully.

99. Unfortunately, recent years have all too often witnessed the illegal use of force and defiance of the United Nations in several conflicts in different parts of the world. Whenever Member States ignore the United Nations and its procedures and seek to assert themselves by military means, they weaken the Organization's effectiveness and relevance. Conversely, every time Members turn to the United Nations in an effort to overcome their differences, they strengthen confidence in the concept of collective action for peace and security.

100. However, just as there is a need for individual Members to respect the Charter, there is also a need for the Organization in general to respond effectively. Most important, the Security Council—the core of the United Nations system—must improve co-operation among its members, in particular its permanent Members, if it is to discharge its obligations as the organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

101. In addition to strengthening the broad authority of the United Nations, the Organization's ability to carry out its specific functions in the field of disarmament should be developed. The United Nations, in accordance with the Charter, has a central role in disarmament. It is not sufficient that the General Assembly should remain a forum where resolutions are voted upon but not acted upon and the Conference on Disarmament a body where negotiations are pursued for years but seldom lead to worthwhile results. The reason for this lack of agreement and action does not lie with the machinery of deliberation and negotiation. Instead, it is to be found once again in the failure of Member States to commit themselves whole-heartedly to work for multilateral solutions.

102. Just as the consequences of a general conflict would extend to all nations, so must the tasks of strengthening international security and achieving disarmament involve the participation of all our Governments and command their consensus.

103. In a world where force and anarchy challenge the rule of law, many nations feel compelled to base their security on their own resources of armed strength. The alternative of building an international order where reason and justice prevail is generally recognized as a task urged upon us by respect for human values and a concern for survival. All too often, however, that goal is regarded as a worthy aspiration the realization of which is consigned to a distant future and which bears little relevance to the imperatives of national defence. That reliance on a predominantly military means of warding off aggression is understandable; in some senses it may even be unavoidable, but it offers no assurance that the relative peace we have enjoyed can endure.

104. The technology of nuclear destruction threatens to overwhelm the capacity of our political institutions to cope with the crisis of confidence, which is still the salient feature of international relations. We are all fully conscious of the dangers of our present course, but that awareness has not led to any fundamental change in the security policies of governments. The reality is that competition for superiority in nuclear and conventional arsenals has caused them to multiply beyond any reasonable considerations of national security, while the measures of arms control undertaken so far have failed to bring about a decisive change of direction.

105. We look to this special session to chart a new and more constructive course. The urgency, in the interest of humanity, of general and complete disarmament needs to be reaffirmed. However, this reaffirmation will have effect only if it leads to a multilateral, comprehensive programme for reducing reliance on military power. A new concept of security is required which sees disarmament as a realistic policy objective with practical implications for present and future defence planning.

106. This session should pursue three major goals: first, there should be a commitment to make disarmament a real factor in the security policy of every country; secondly, a series of concrete measures should be adopted which will transform that commitment into reality by setting definite limits to the military dimension of security; and thirdly, there should be a new commitment to the collective institutions of the United Nations and its central role in the preservation of international peace and security.

107. It is not enough at this special session to proclaim our dedication to desirable ends alone. There must be a corresponding emphasis on their accomplishment. We should grasp the opportunity which the session offers to help build up a comprehensive world-wide demand for real progress, for concrete measures and for universal commitment to a world order based on the rule of law instead of the terror of deadly armaments.

108. Mine is a small country. It is not a member of any military alliance; it has no nuclear weapons or installations, and its conventional forces are small. Its only strength is the moral right to speak out truthfully uninhibited by any vested interest or involvement. In 1932, shortly before he assumed the presidency of the League of Nations, the President of Ireland, Éamon de Valera, declared the following:

“Wherever the opportunity presents itself, we intend to uphold the principle of the equality of States and to advocate the reduction and eventual abolition of armaments and the establishment of a system of inter-State relationships in which the rule of law shall hold between nations as between individuals.”

Those principles have consistently remained at the centre of Ireland's foreign policy for over 50 years, despite the enormous political changes in the world since then.

109. It is sometimes suggested that small countries like mine depend for their security on the weapons of those nations which, in the last resort, are prepared to use what they call the deterrent. It is my firm view, however, that, in a real sense, much of the feeling of insecurity in the contemporary world springs from the very existence of nuclear weapons. We do not feel that they provide us with any protection but rather than they are a constant threat, dangerous to all the people of the globe, including their possessors.

110. Nuclear weapons are a cloud over the future of mankind. Their very existence constitutes a denial of the hope that has been inherent in human history for many centuries: the hope that humanity could and would learn to manage its affairs in peace and friendship, that it could and would make a rational use of the great scientific opportunities that were opening up to it and that the enlightened side of its nature would inevitably prevail over the dark.

111. In saying all this I am not naïve enough to be unaware of the reasons for suspicion and distrust that exist among nations and that some correspondingly wish for the security that these awful weapons seem to provide. But we have now, I feel, reached a point where many of the advocates of the nuclear deterrent are beginning to reconsider, and it is notable that the major Powers themselves have begun to think of a different kind of security. Indeed, both President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev have stated that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. We must work to see that the hopes of the vast majority of the people of the world are fulfilled, and we must fully support and encourage those statesmen who are working for peace based on disarmament.

112. Ultimately, let us remember, the choice between armament and disarmament is a choice between death and life. The history of mankind is one of fortitude, nobility, discovery and achievement. It is also one of destruction, aggression and rejection even of the gift of life itself. In the case of nuclear weapons, science has wrested from nature a secret so awful in its possibilities as to strike terror into our minds. That terror should compel us to consider new ways of meeting our felt need for security. For that,

as for all other worthwhile purposes, there must be patience, hard work, the breaking down of barriers and the strengthening of understanding. But the end will be worth it: nothing less than the victory of life and of all life's glorious possibilities over war with all its dark tragedies. It must be the firm purpose of this session to make a major contribution to its achievement.

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

114. Mr. GONZALES-POSADA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): By the time my statement is over 800 children will have died around the world from malnutrition, poor health, hunger and poverty. During that same lapse of time \$45 million will have been spent on weapons, a sum more than sufficient to save the lives of those human beings who were irretrievably condemned to die. In other words, if by some miracle at this moment we were to manage to invest in development the \$54,500 million that will be spent on weapons during the duration of this special session on disarmament, we would have substantially relieved the tragic living conditions endured by millions of human beings and have saved at least 800,000 children from death. The choice is stark: either those children will be saved, or we will continue arming ourselves.

115. Given that situation, which jeopardizes our historic responsibility, we have a mandate from our peoples to seek out ways to resolve the ancient riddle of war and peace, of injustice and inequality.

116. I fear, however, that in the course of numerous conferences on disarmament, more progress will have been made in the exercise of rhetoric than in the application of real solutions to eliminating the arms race and promoting development. All this exercise and all these well-known and predictable rituals based on fleeting words and good and righteous intentions, far from contributing to our credibility have eroded it, thus undermining at the same time the hopes of millions of people who are demanding of us not just promises but concrete achievements.

117. And here we are again, talking about disarmament, but without coming up with any significant achievement. Keeping pace with the flow of our words and the multiplication of the forums in which we utter them, the facts and the irrefutable proof of comparative statistics on the arms buildup, development and poverty continue to belie our intentions. Thus the promise of a better world that all the peoples of these United Nations made to themselves at the end of the holocaust of the Second World War is one that is being lost little by little, day by day, hour by hour before the inexorable advance of the rule of death and despair. We are losing that promise because we continue living in a world where nearly \$2 million per minute is being spent on weapons while hunger is producing 50 million deaths a year, among them 30 million children under the age of five, a world where the arms race is consuming more than a \$1,000 billion dollars a year—that is, a million million dollars—when only one fifth of that sum would be sufficient to eradicate hunger by the year 2000. All this is the product of political irrationality

that has eclipsed the humanistic vision of man, paying fetishistic worship to the unequal accumulation of wealth and the technology of war and mass destruction.

118. Our peoples cannot tolerate 1,500 million human beings suffering hunger, 1,000 million people lacking access to health services and drinking water or more than 800 million remaining in the darkness of illiteracy with 300 million of them unemployed.

119. In this context how can we possibly explain to our peoples that military expenditures have increased 25 times since the beginning of the century and that this waste corresponds to the gross national product of the countries of Africa and Latin America as a whole? It is paradoxical, for example, that a new nuclear missile should use up the same amount that WHO was able to obtain over 10 long years and through enormous efforts for the purpose of eradicating smallpox from the face of the Earth.

120. It is simply not ethically acceptable to the conscience of our peoples to know that the price of only 27 intercontinental ballistic missiles would be sufficient to acquire the agricultural equipment to ensure that the poorest countries could attain food self-sufficiency and that, with the price of 100 strategic bombers, we could provide food, education and health for 500 million children.

121. The alternative, then, is clear and conclusive: peace or war, life or death, weapons or development. To put it in more concrete terms, we point out that it would be enough to suspend military expenditure for only six days to wipe out completely Peru's external debt. It would be necessary to do so for only five months to cancel the entire external debt of Latin America. And the trillion dollars invested in weapons during the past nine months would be more than sufficient to cancel completely the third world's total external debt.

122. I place special emphasis on the debt problem, because its present dimensions have gone beyond all logic and because the historic and global solution so urgently needed must be compatible with our Governments' overriding commitment to pay first of all the debt we owe to our own peoples, which consists in attending to their most urgent needs for development, well-being and justice. Hence our resolve to adjust the payment of the external debt to the requirements of the common good, but also not to fall into the vicious circle of the arms traffickers and on the contrary, to proceed to reduce military expenses and acquisitions and devote the maximum of resources to the urgent task of development.

123. The task becomes even more urgent when we observe with anxiety that since 1978 Latin America has tripled its military expenditure, thus accumulating a pseudo power that is useless when we face the true enemies of our peoples' security: poverty, hunger, the vulnerability of democratic institutions, terrorist crimes, drug trafficking and the asymmetry of relations with the centres of world power.

124. This situation was described by the President of Peru, Alan García, at the fortieth session of the General Assembly, when he decried the fact that

these expenditures correspond to a compulsive mechanism that is exhausting us and pointed out that we believe the best defence is to uphold our nation as a people and that social requirements necessitate our limiting our military expenditure, because:

“We are a peace-loving nation, respectful of international treaties, and we are not part of the arms race. We do not represent the strategy of any Power, nor have we been infected by the egocentric view of security”<sup>6</sup>

125. This is my first appearance at the United Nations as Peru's Minister for Foreign Affairs and this gratifies me, because disarmament is a problem to which my country and Government attach the greatest importance.

126. Peru upholds a conception of international relations which views the human person as the supreme aim of society and the State. Accordingly, we uphold peace and reject war; we affirm and place our hopes in life; and we oppose a strategy which falsely seeks to find the security of the few in threats to all of mankind. Thus we categorically reject the diplomacy of death.

127. This situation of precarious armed peace responds to a discriminatory and obsolete concept of security. Paradoxically, this militaristic concept of security generates the insecurity of the majority and nurtures the seeds of conflict, bringing us into a vicious circle in which the escalation of war production generates suspicion and conflict, which in turn fuel the demand for the supplies with which to inflict massive death.

128. As an alternative, Peru upholds a concept of security for all States, irrespective of their territorial dimensions, power and socio-economic and political systems. An oligarchic perception of security is a grave and tragic error; it merely creates greater inequality and thus, sooner or later, the international system finds itself in violent upheaval.

129. On the contrary, security implies peace and development for all—the North, South, East and West. For that, it is necessary to go beyond mere military or strategic considerations and to build a pattern of security that reflects, principally, economic, political and social variables.

130. The super-Powers cannot continue to bear the burden of spending billions on arms competition and must negotiate an East-West agreement that restores rationality. Similarly, the developing countries cannot continue any longer to bear the unfair burden imposed upon us by the international financial system. Hence it has become essential to arrive at a North-South agreement that restores justice in the world economy.

131. As an immediate measure, we propose that the Powers agree to include in all future disarmament or arms-limitation agreements a clause on co-operation for development, allocating a percentage of the military expenditures thus released to the establishment of a fund against poverty and hunger. This is a realistic initiative, because to be implemented it requires only genuine political will. Consequently, we

invite the Powers to declare here and now their willingness to establish and execute such a fund.

132. For our part, we are committed to halting the arms spiral which has such a grave impact on development problems. In this spirit, we reiterate to our Latin American brothers the appeal addressed by the President of Peru from this rostrum to initiate genuine and effective negotiation to limit military expenditure.

133. Latin America must build its own regional security system, which we view as an integrated and ongoing struggle against inequality and poverty, and the capacity peacefully to solve our own problems, which is incompatible with intervention and extraregional interference which only increase conflicts and tensions, using our lands to expand and engage in rivalries.

134. We welcome with optimism and hope the initiation of a process of détente. We welcome with hope the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—although we warn that that agreement, in its initial phase, cuts by only 4 per cent the total existing nuclear arsenals.

135. Accordingly, additional agreements are necessary, not only on strategic nuclear weapons but also to reduce conventional forces.

136. Consequently, it is imperative to eliminate the policy of blocs and spheres of influence, because we cannot grant the super-Powers the prerogative of resolving regional conflicts by themselves. We cannot do so because that would undermine our sovereignty and the right to self-determination and convert us into simple spectators in a problem in which our own destiny, not to say our survival, is at stake.

137. My delegation is happy to see you, Sir, presiding over the work of this special session. We wish also to greet my compatriot, the Secretary-General, whose skills in international diplomacy augur well for the success of our work.

138. Let us resolutely accept the challenge presented by this session, viewing this as a time for deeds, not words; for substance, not form; for decisions, not transitory rhetoric. Let us respond with true conscience to mankind's expectations of us as we carry out our task.

139. Let us be inspired by the teachings of universal ethical and religious thinking, which, heeding the message of the hopeful multitudes, tells us that peace awaits its builders. That is what we must be: builders of peace, guardians of life, not destroyers of the present or architects of an uncertain future. We must stand for life itself and for a new dawn. Let us strive to fulfil the dreams and desires of those who have little or nothing, and who hope only for justice and sound judgement on the part of those with the extraordinary power to change the course of history.

140. I recall with deep feeling a Latin American visionary who, by interpreting the will of our peoples, lives on in their hopes, because he delved deeply into

their conscience with a message of peace and brotherhood, a lesson of love and non-violence and affirmation of the identity, solidarity and independence of Latin America. The teacher to whom I refer was Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre, who, at the headquarters of my party, the Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana—APRA—would tell the younger generations that the weapons we need to build a better world are not rockets or missiles but education, culture and a dedication to struggling on behalf of the poorest, the humble and all the oppressed peoples of the world. Foreseeing in 1956, more than 30 years ago, the danger of a holocaust, Haya de la Torre said, “Nuclear weapons are the terrible and sophisticated manifestation of a universal mutation”, and he warned: “Atomic war would be the tomb of civilization and, worse, of the human race.”

141. Today the super-Power summit and reality itself in a world seeking peace on the brink of the nuclear abyss have dramatically borne him out.

142. I also wish to recall Cesar Vallejo, the eternal, universal poet, who, moved by the havoc of war, raised up in the following poem the creative capacity of man and his common love of life against the instinct for death and destruction represented by war and symbolized by weapons. He wrote:

“When the battle was over  
And the fighter was dead, a man came towards him  
And said ‘Don’t die. I love you so much.’  
But the corpse, alas, went on dying,  
Two men approached him and said again  
‘Don’t leave us. Courage! Come back to life!’  
But the corpse, alas, went on dying.  
There came up to him 20, 100, 1,000, 500,000,  
Crying ‘So much love and yet it can do nothing  
against death!’  
Millions of individuals surrounded him  
With a common request: ‘Brother, stay’;  
But the corpse, alas, went on dying.  
Then all the men of the Earth  
Surrounded him; deeply moved, the sad corpse  
saw them;  
He got up slowly, embraced the first man  
And started to walk . . . ”

143. Let us also raise up our dreams and let them walk. Let us make a reality of our hopes of peace. The peoples of the world demand it of us. Our own human sense of life demands it of us.

144. Long live life!

145. Mr. MOCK (Austria): May I extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your election to preside over the General Assembly at its fifteenth special session, which is the third special session devoted to disarmament. We highly appreciated the competence and authority you displayed in the course of your presidency during the forty-second session of the General Assembly, and we are confident that the special session will be brought to a successful conclusion during the coming weeks. I assure you that it will be the endeavour of the Austrian delegation to co-operate with you in your important task.

146. May I also convey my appreciation to the Secretary-General for his assessment of the issues and challenges of disarmament which he made at the opening of the session.

147. This special session is yet another opportunity to reflect on the chances of, and obstacles to, disarmament; it could even trigger concrete action in the field of disarmament if a strong political will to that end were to prevail. Although participating actively in this endeavour, we should not forget two important lessons: disarmament is not an end in itself, and disarmament will improve international security only to the extent that one major condition is met.

148. Let me consider briefly this condition. To my mind, international security depends primarily on the general attitude of States towards one another. If Governments were ready to apply in their mutual relations those moral standards they expect their citizens to abide by, one could assume that international society had taken a major step forward. Ethical principles common to all peoples, such as the non-use of force or the peaceful settlement of disputes, are already enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. However, these principles continue to be violated by a number of States. As long as those States persist in their negative behaviour, we have to admit that disarmament is just one among many steps towards a more peaceful world. With this reservation in mind, I turn to the disarmament issues proper.

149. We regret to admit that our hopes and programmes formulated 10 years ago at the first special session devoted to disarmament have in many respects not been translated into action. Repeatedly the rules of international law have not been respected, and the sovereignty and integrity of members of the international community have been violated. Bilateral conflicts have been started or have continued, and the arms race, in both the nuclear and the conventional fields, has not been halted but has even accelerated.

*Mr. Peters (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

150. For these reasons, the late 1970s and early 1980s have been described as “the lost decade”. Even if one finds this view too negative, one has to admit that progress during this period was slow or non-existent in the various fields of arms control and disarmament.

151. This period, however, seems to have come to a close. We have entered a new phase of international relations. Let me give the Assembly three examples that testify to this new spirit.

152. First, the signing by the United States and the Soviet Union of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—constitutes, primarily in the political field, an important step towards nuclear disarmament, and by its detailed verification mechanisms it creates new prospects for disarmament agreements on additional types of weapons.



153. Secondly, the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan open the door to a settlement of one of the most serious regional conflicts involving not only the immediate participants but the super-Powers themselves, thereby promoting the improvement of the international climate necessary for far-reaching agreements on disarmament and arms control.

154. Thirdly, the rapprochement between the European Economic Community and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance will strengthen the economic ties between Western and Eastern Europe and facilitate endeavours to enhance the areas of co-operation and understanding between States of different political, economic and social systems.

155. These examples show that we have entered a period of new flexibility in East-West relations. In such a political climate, neutral and non-aligned nations may find new reasons to make important contributions to the solution of international problems for the benefit of the international community as a whole.

156. If we accept such a procedure, we can face the future with an optimism that is rooted in realism and has its basis in the belief that man, though threatened by his propensity to commit irrational acts, is by definition a rational being. In such a spirit it should be possible to include in the calendar of political events of the coming years the signing of disarmament and arms-control agreements as regular events. Some agreements will be major events, like the INF Treaty, the strategic arms reduction talks [START] or the chemical weapons convention; others will mark more modest achievements on the way to a greater goal.

157. The most recent manifestation of this new spirit was the atmosphere prevailing at the Moscow summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. Both sides were obviously inspired by the desire and determination to make progress in areas of disarmament and human rights.

158. The ability to engage in a continued dialogue and the willingness to extend co-operation beyond the requirements of coexistence may serve as an appropriate basis for the conclusion of additional disarmament agreements. I therefore look with optimism at the prospects of START and of a chemical weapons convention. May I also express my hope that the final phase of the Vienna Follow-Up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will benefit from this new atmosphere.

159. May I turn now to some specific items on the disarmament agenda. An area of highest priority is that of nuclear arms. Austria, situated in the heart of Europe, a continent with enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons, approaches all questions related to this issue with deep concern.

160. Mindful of the possible consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, the Austrian Federal Government on 3 February 1987 launched an appeal to the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to renounce further nuclear testing until the conclusion of a nuclear-test-ban treaty. The Austrian Govern-

ment stated that it considered the prompt opening of negotiations on, and the early conclusion of, a comprehensive test-ban treaty as an essential step towards curbing the nuclear-arms race. Furthermore, Austria called for the strict observance of existing arms-control agreements, pointing out that only in this way could the upward spiral of armament be halted and reversed.

161. The problem of adequate verification of a comprehensive test-ban treaty plays an important part in the deliberations on that question. We understand—and the majority of the international community shares that view—that the question of verification of compliance within reasonable margins can be considered as technically solved.

162. As a member of the *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, Austria actively participates in the search for solutions of those technical questions. The results achieved so far are highly encouraging. We are convinced that further progress will be made in the forthcoming sessions of that Group. The future functioning of a global seismological network is at the core of the entire verification machinery. We are confident that the utilization of the most recent technology will facilitate the achievement of the objectives envisaged.

163. Technological considerations, important as they may be, cannot, however, in themselves produce a solution to a political problem. They can only ensure that the conclusion of an agreement will not be jeopardized by mutual distrust. What is needed is the political will to conclude an agreement.

164. Ultimately we should strive towards a nuclear-weapon-free world, a world which would be substantially less dangerous than the one we live in now and less dangerous than a world we are likely to have if the arms race goes on.

165. The frightening dangers emanating from the enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons must not blind us to the great concentration of conventional weapons in Europe and the risks arising from them. Conventional disarmament should, therefore, be an integral part of the disarmament process. We have always taken the view that disarmament is a step-by-step process through which a global balance of armaments should be established on as low a level as possible.

166. The costs of conventional weapons and forces are enormous. They amount to about 80 per cent of global military expenditure. During the past four decades some 17 million persons have been killed by weapons of this type. Disregarding conventional disarmament would, therefore, result in an unrealistic assessment of the disarmament picture, because an essential part of the requirements for international security would be neglected.

167. Attention should be directed not only towards the quantitative aspect of armaments but also to the refinement of arms in the light of recent technological advances. To overlook this qualitative aspect

would result in the erosion of any progress achieved in the field of quantitative arms limitation.

168. Let me now turn to efforts undertaken in the framework of the ongoing Vienna Follow-Up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The whole spectrum of questions concerning security and co-operation in Europe is under review at that Meeting. The approach to security that the 35 participating States have been following since the signing of the Final Act of Helsinki in 1975 is of a comprehensive character. Military aspects are but one, though an essential one, element of these multilateral efforts.

169. The length of these negotiations, which began in November 1986, might be surprising. Not least among the reasons for the slow pace are the comprehensiveness and complexity of that approach, covering humanitarian and economic as well as military aspects. The negotiations in Vienna have, however, evolved lately in a positive sense; possibilities of agreement have been gradually taking shape. Austria and the other neutral and non-aligned countries have in these circumstances been able to play their traditional role of mediating and proposing compromise solutions.

170. As the chairman of a meeting of foreign ministers of the neutral and non-aligned countries, I introduced to the plenary meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe a comprehensive draft proposal of the nine States for a concluding document. The foreign ministers, who met at Vienna on 12 and 13 May, emphasized the importance they attach to the Helsinki process and thus to a timely and positive conclusion of the Vienna Meeting. With this initiative the neutral and non-aligned States have proved once again the useful role they can play in promoting compromises in the Conference. The first reactions are encouraging. An agreement on a final document should be possible in the months to come.

171. Consideration of military security matters played a much more important part at the Follow-Up Meeting at Madrid and led to the convening of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. At its initial stage at Stockholm remarkable results were achieved in the field of military confidence-building. You may recall that it was at Stockholm where for the first time in the history of disarmament an agreement on on-site inspections was concluded. The inspections which have taken place since then, as well as the implementation of the other measures agreed upon, confirm the viability of this step-by-step approach towards greater security. Greater transparency in military matters is increasingly recognized as a vital prerequisite for further efforts towards disarmament.

172. Important work remains to be done in the field of confidence-building, be it by increasing transparency through the exchange of structural military information or by the introduction of measures constraining military activities. General agreement does exist at the Vienna Meeting to continue the efforts in this field among the 35 participating States.

173. Simultaneously, the Vienna Meeting will in all likelihood initiate negotiations on conventional armaments within the framework of the conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Stability in the conventional sphere is, in our view, of increasing importance, considering the background of progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. This evolution is of particular significance. Consultations at the periphery of the Vienna Meeting between the 23 member States of the military alliances are proceeding very constructively.

174. Austria welcomes the desire of those 23 States to take a new approach towards conventional disarmament. We recognize that in a first phase only the States members of the military alliances will participate in these negotiations. The military potential of the neutral and non-aligned countries, being of a purely defensive character, should not be subject to initial reduction measures. In the longer run, however, all aspects of military security having a bearing on the security of the whole continent should be dealt with by all 35 States participating in the Conference.

175. We do believe that the current positive tendencies in East-West relations need complementary efforts in the military field. The general readiness to hold negotiations among the 35 participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe on military confidence-building, and between the States members of the military alliances on conventional arms control, is an encouraging sign of this improved international climate.

176. Important decisions in the sphere of military security are about to be taken at the Vienna Meeting. Europe, as the most heavily armed continent in the world, is in great need of courageous and imaginative steps. The instruments being currently worked out in Vienna should offer an adequate framework for translating this need into concrete results.

177. As I had the opportunity on 14 April to state in an address to the 457th meeting of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, a subject of urgent interest to my country is the global elimination of chemical weapons. These weapons also belong to the category of arms of mass destruction. The tragic condition of victims of such weapons who are being treated in Austrian hospitals has sharpened public awareness in Austria of the effects and dangers of chemical weapons. We consider it important that the international community reaffirm its common conviction that chemical warfare must be abolished as abhorrent to humanity. We consider that the production of such weapons is a cruel and inhuman application of scientific knowledge and a case of scientific progress violating the standards of human dignity.

178. In our view, the adoption of a convention on chemical weapons is a matter of the greatest urgency. Existing stocks should be eliminated, production halted, on-site inspections on challenge institutionalized, verification procedures introduced and data on present arsenals made available in an exchange of information.

179. In order to study the requirements of the verification machinery of a future monitoring organi-

zation and its consequences for the chemical industry, some Austrian chemical enterprises have indicated their readiness to consider co-operation with the Conference on Disarmament with a view to serving as model facilities. Such an exercise would allow testing of the specific verification machinery envisaged regarding the non-production of chemical substances listed in the draft convention.

180. In the context of verification procedures, I wish to recall that the Vienna-based IAEA has highly qualified and experienced experts working in the field of monitoring and verification. Although every disarmament agreement has its own verification problems and needs specific solutions, the new control organization to be established under the convention on chemical weapons might benefit from the experience of those experts. The sharing of knowledge may prove useful and even lead to financial savings.

181. I wish to take this opportunity to reiterate that Austria would be willing and pleased to act as host for this new organization, should the international community consider such a choice to be in the interest of the most effective implementation of the chemical weapons convention.

182. In concluding my remarks on chemical weapons, I should like to express my firm conviction that the historic chance to agree upon a multilateral convention on the global ban of these weapons in the near future must not be missed. The international community must not fail in the last stage of this important disarmament endeavour.

183. Another field of arms control in which some encouraging progress can be reported since our last special session on disarmament is that of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction [*resolution 2826 (XXVI), annex*].

184. Austria, which had the privilege of presiding over the Second Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention in September 1986, supported the strengthening of the Convention both at the Conference and at the *Ad Hoc* Meeting of Scientific and Technical Experts in April 1987. The exchange of information on laboratories with very high safety standards decided upon by that Meeting and put into practice on 15 October 1987 is an important contribution to the establishment of the climate of mutual confidence that is so necessary in disarmament matters. This first step, however, must not deflect our attention from the need to undertake additional efforts with a view to implementing the goals set by the Review Conference and the Meeting of Experts. At this special session the General Assembly may wish to encourage such action so that, in the spirit of the conclusions of the Second Review Conference, progress may continue and additional steps be made on the basis of a general consensus of the international community.

185. Austria is looking forward to the second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques

[*resolution 31/72, annex*]. My country is in the process of ratifying that Convention, which it has supported from the very beginning. We hope to make an active contribution during the Review Conference, at which some modifications of the Convention may be considered with a view to improving its ability to meet its object and purpose.

186. Since the advent of powerful firearms causing disproportionate human suffering, man has succeeded, if not in preventing States from resorting to war, at least in declaring illegal the use of weapons causing unnecessary pain and suffering.

187. From the Declaration of St. Petersburg in 1868 outlawing the use of certain arms to the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects,<sup>7</sup> the progress and the development of weapons technology have prompted the adoption of new rules in the field of humanitarian law. It is a cause for great concern to Austria that technological progress seems once again to be going in the direction of the development of weapons that cause inhumane effects disproportionate to the achievement of military objectives. One such example, according to the latest reports, is the development of battlefield laser weapons designed permanently to blind enemy personnel on a large scale. We believe that such an application of technology, which at present is not illegal under international law, should be banned in view of the unnecessary suffering it causes to human beings. My Government will lend its full and strong support to the recent initiative taken by the Government of Sweden.

188. May I now turn to a subject of long-standing interest to my country and recall that Austria is among those States which have been candidates for full membership in the Conference on Disarmament for several years. I wish to express our expectation that at this special session the General Assembly will not fail to direct its attention to the fact that no progress has been achieved on this question since, at its second special session on disarmament, the Assembly adopted its decisions on enlarging the membership of the Conference. As there are a number of States particularly interested in more active participation in the work of that Conference, I trust that this question will be thoroughly examined under item 13 of the agenda, "Consideration of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and of the effectiveness of the disarmament machinery".

189. We think it necessary that at this session the Assembly should also consider the question of participation facilities in the Conference on Disarmament for non-members interested in an enhanced observer status. All States wishing to contribute to the work of the Conference on Disarmament should be allowed to do so on the basis of appropriate arrangements.

190. The relationship between disarmament and development is an item that was dealt with extensively last year during a special international conference. As I stated last September, at the 18th meeting of the forty-second session of the General Assembly, the assessment of the results of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and

Development may vary from State to State. It should, however, be generally recognized that both disarmament and development are among the priority concerns of the international community. They are pillars on which enduring international peace and security are to be built.

191. Science and technology are advancing at an unprecedented speed. They have helped to solve many problems mankind had faced in the past, but they have created new challenges. Mankind has been given the key to its own destruction. Peace has become a prerequisite for life. In the search of nations for a more stable peace and greater security, disarmament is an essential element.

192. Let us replace declarations on disarmament by specific disarmament measures. Let us meet the expectations of our peoples, who are not reassured by official communiqués and statements but demand that their security be assured at a lower level of armaments and that more resources be devoted to their welfare.

193. To work for peace must be our supreme responsibility. Peace among nations requires a basic change of mind. Genuine peace must be based on ethical principles shared by all peoples. As long as nations feel threatened, and as long as they rely on the use of force as their ultimate means of survival, the arms race will not come to a halt. It is only by attacking the root causes of war and international violence that we shall be able to meet the aspirations of our peoples longing for peace, freedom and justice.

194. Mr. NGUZ a KARL i BOND (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): Since this is the first time I have spoken before the Assembly I should like, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, to express our satisfaction to the President at seeing him again presiding over our debates and to congratulate him on the outstanding manner in which he has discharged his mandate.

195. My country, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Conference on Disarmament, and holding the chairmanship of the First Committee of the General Assembly, is aware of its geo-political and strategic position in the heart of the African continent, a position to which it attaches the greatest importance. From that position it has very actively and consistently participated in the negotiations and activities within the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the sole multilateral forum for negotiations in the disarmament field, in the Disarmament Commission, the First Committee and all the special sessions of the General Assembly, as well as in all international meetings on disarmament.

196. It is now 10 years since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament met here in New York, from 23 May to 1 July 1978. For the first time in the history of negotiations on this subject the international community laid down a global strategy for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

197. From 7 June to 10 July 1982, during a politically difficult period, the second special session on disarmament was held. While reaffirming the

provisions of the Final Document adopted by the first session, the second session was not able to meet the expectations of the international community in the field of general and complete disarmament.

198. During that time the nuclear threat has remained; the frenzied arms race goes on; nuclear tests continue; and regional conflicts abound, sometimes with the use of weapons of mass destruction.

199. In contrast, the present session is benefiting from most favourable circumstances, from a political climate very different from that which prevailed during the two previous sessions, because of the signing last December in Washington of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles between the two great nuclear Powers, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We believe that that Treaty marks a first stage in negotiations which could lead to negotiations on space weapons, on an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic weapons and—why not?—on conventional weapons.

200. Moreover, we wish to appeal to all the other nuclear Powers to associate themselves with the effort of nuclear disarmament undertaken by the United States and the Soviet Union.

201. The question of the banning of nuclear tests is of the greatest concern to Zaire. It will be recalled that the General Assembly has adopted numerous resolutions on this subject. It has most energetically condemned the continuation of such tests.

202. One of the obstacles encountered in the past in the banning of such tests was, of course, the question of verification; but today, thanks to the progress made by the *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, the General Assembly declares that it is convinced that the present means of verification are sufficient to ensure the implementation of an agreement on the banning of nuclear tests.

203. The Powers which have adhered to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water<sup>2</sup> and to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] should strictly comply with their commitments under those treaties. Here we have an opportunity to invite the other nuclear Powers to adhere to those two treaties.

204. Zaire would like to reaffirm that general and complete disarmament must lead to global security for all States of our planet. Unfortunately we are obliged to note that the implementation of the concept of collective security, guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations, has not prevented the outbreak of regional conflicts. In those conditions, appropriate measures must be laid down which could ensure global security for all.

*Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic) resumed the Chair.*

205. The 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests<sup>4</sup> and the 1976 Treaty

on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes<sup>8</sup> have still not been ratified, although we can welcome the official exchange of visits to nuclear-test sites by American and Soviet teams.

206. The abusive use of chemical weapons in certain regional conflicts is, in humanity's eyes, a crime that must be condemned and deplored by the entire international community at a time when the elaboration of a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction has made real progress within the Conference on Disarmament. The adoption of that convention on chemical weapons by the Conference would mark an important step towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control and would supplement the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925 concerning the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.<sup>9</sup>

207. In this area of chemical weapons it is encouraging to note the co-operation that seems to be evolving between the two great Powers through the authorization of visits to their respective sites producing chemical weapons, in particular Shikhany in the Soviet Union, and in the United States.

208. My delegation would also like to associate itself with all member States of the Conference on Disarmament who are engaged in working out a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the objective of which is, as is well known, that of eliminating the risk of war, in particular nuclear war, the prevention of which remains the most urgent and pressing task of our time. The progressive reduction and ultimate elimination of arms and of armed forces is also an integral part of the comprehensive programme of disarmament which, in essence, aims at strengthening international peace and security and the security of individual States.

209. In the area of the prevention of the arms race in outer space, it is in the interest of mankind that the exploration and use of space should be carried out for economic, social and scientific development purposes and not for military ends, for outer space, the shared legacy of mankind, must serve solely peaceful purposes for the benefit of all nations of the world.

210. The Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa adopted in 1964 by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity remains uncomplished because the minority and racist régime of South Africa is trying by all possible means to consolidate *apartheid* in order to perpetuate its domination over the black people who are in the majority in South Africa, and to do so by acquiring powerful military means, even including nuclear weapons. We appeal, therefore, to the nuclear-weapon States which are assisting South Africa in this way to put an end to such aid.

211. In the view of my delegation the present special session devoted to disarmament should emphasize the concept of "security for all" or "disarmament for collective security".

212. As it is currently understood, the concept of "national security" justifies unilateral measures of armed defence. Others go even further and use the Latin maxim *si vis pacem para bellum*, forgetting that concepts of collective security, of peaceful coexistence, of non-alignment and of shared security imply rigorous interdependence. In our time the security of a country is no longer solely a function of its military force and of its economic power, but rather derives from parameters that transcend its geopolitical position.

213. In the light of the above, my delegation believes that the concept of security must take on a much broader meaning covering the military, economic and social aspects as well as the political aspects.

214. While for the developed countries security seems to be assured by the arms race, that is not true for the developing countries whose security must be ensured by adequate arms, to be sure, but also, and above all, by a food supply sufficient to halt the famine and hunger that are constantly threatening the lives of the people.

215. The critical situation now being experienced by the world in general and by Africa in particular is, as members are aware, primarily due to the international economic environment, characterized by general stagnation. We are seeing in fact a collapse of primary commodity prices and of our revenues, generalized inflation, a continued deterioration of terms of trade, the rise of protectionism in the developed countries and a reduction in the flow of capital to our countries.

216. The aggravation of the debt burden, which has today become the number one problem of Africa and of many countries of the third world, is one of the inevitable and adverse consequences of the present world crisis.

217. Even after the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development held last summer, the arms race continues. More than \$1,000 billion is being spent annually on the arms race, amounting to nearly 30 times the global total of official development assistance, and some 50,000 existing nuclear warheads can destroy the planet several times over. Zaire therefore believes that the international community should deal with the relationship between disarmament and development in order to promote the adoption of measures that would release resources for development. In this context Zaire very much hopes to see the establishment of a fund for disarmament and development.

218. The Final Document of the first special session on disarmament [*resolution S-10/2*] will remain the main reference document in the area of disarmament. We should therefore attempt to strengthen the principles that it embodies.

219. All States, regardless of their socio-political system are urged to participate actively in a joint effort on disarmament. The United Nations should continue to play its vital and central role in that process.



220. A policy of transparency between East and West, North and South, and mutually advantageous international co-operation among all nations, large and small, will promote the advent of a climate of trust among peoples and step up the process of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

221. Zaire would here like to reaffirm its unshakeable dedication to and faith in the ideals of peace and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In this context it remains faithful to its foreign policy, whose pillars are non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and a policy of good-neighbourliness and openness to the entire outside world in order to preserve international peace and security.

222. I wish all success to the meetings of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

223. The PRESIDENT: Under a decision taken at our 1st plenary meeting I now call on the Secretary of State of the Holy See to deliver a message which His Holiness Pope John Paul II has addressed to the General Assembly. I have great pleasure in welcoming His Eminence Agostino Cardinal Casaroli, and I invite him to address the General Assembly.

224. Cardinal CASAROLI (Holy See) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, with your permission I shall read out the message which His Holiness Pope John Paul II has addressed to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in order to stress in a personal manner his interest in your work and his confidence in the work of the United Nations.

225. I should like to take this opportunity to associate myself, Sir, with the wishes expressed to you by the representatives of Member States who elected you to the presidency of this important special session, to which I wish every success.

226. This is the pontifical message:

“Mr. President, the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to which I have the privilege of addressing this message, is taking place at a time when several signs in international life lead us to believe that efforts to make progress towards co-operation and peace will have a successful outcome, thanks to effective disarmament measures.

“At present the international community rightly seems to fluctuate between concern over local conflicts which are mired down, and hope, due in particular to the determination of the two major Powers of the Northern Hemisphere to reach new disarmament agreements.

“But disarmament would not be able to achieve its purpose if the longing for peace were not shared by all nations and if they did not all want to enter into a common process aimed at reducing tension and threats of war. Indeed, peace by its very nature demands a deepening of those ethical values which give coherence to relations between peoples as well

as between States. In order for peace to become a reality humanity must draw upon its very deepest and most universal spiritual resources.

“The invitation from your distinguished Secretary-General to address your Assembly, which renews similar invitations to my predecessor, Paul VI, in 1978, and to myself in 1982 is an indication moreover of the importance that you attach to these aspects, an area in which it is universally recognized that the Holy See is entitled to make its voice heard.

“It is normal that a subject that is as intimately linked to the cause of peace as disarmament has always been of concern to the Holy See. The moral principles which the Church draws from the Gospel and which have their root in the conscience of all are valid, in its eyes, for every human community and in all circumstances. Peace is a good to which all human beings aspire, whatever their cultural roots or the social systems to which they belong.

“Disarmament is not an end in itself. The end is peace, and security is one of its essential elements. The evolution of international relations today reveals that disarmament is a necessary condition, if not the primary condition, for security since, by a synergetic phenomenon, it allows the other elements of stability and peace to develop. All are well aware that the type of security on which our planet has depended for the last several decades—a balance of terror based on nuclear deterrence—is a security with a far too high risk level. This awareness should encourage nations to enter into a new phase in their relations with all due urgency. This is precisely what you are now devoting your attention to in order to eliminate once and for all the spectre of a nuclear war and of all armed conflict.

“The progressive, balanced and controlled elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the stabilization at the lowest possible level of the defensive weapon systems of countries is an objective that should garner the necessary consensus as a first step towards increased security.

“The second special session devoted to disarmament could not achieve the results desired, largely, it seems, because of the tensions which then prevailed in East-West relations. The improvement in these very relations which we are now witnessing cannot but have a positive effect on the efforts of the entire international community. The signing of the treaty in Washington last December is to be hailed as an important new step, above all because the parties themselves declared—as their present summit meeting in Moscow confirms—that it is only a beginning, not an end, on the path to effective disarmament.

“If negotiations between the two super-Powers give rise to the hope that new disarmament agreements will soon be reached, these successes should not let us forget the importance of a complementary multilateral approach to the disarmament question. On the contrary, they only underscore its importance. The multilateral ap-

proach has the merit of intensifying disarmament efforts in three ways, in that it allows all nations: to examine all the interdependent aspects of disarmament, not only nuclear, but also chemical and conventional disarmament; to commit themselves to assume their responsibilities for the elaboration and implementation of disarmament measures; and to reinforce consensus concerning the ethical principles to be observed and the priorities to be established for concrete international action.

"Although a multilateral, global dialogue is no easier to conduct than bilateral negotiations, it alone reveals the full complexity of what is at stake in disarmament. It soon becomes evident that, if the aim of the disarmament process is security and peace, it cannot ignore the root causes which condition that peace.

"Disarmament efforts cannot therefore concern only some countries or be centered on only one type of weapon. These efforts should focus on the elimination of all threats to security and peace, be they on a regional or world-wide level.

"A comprehensive disarmament plan must be adopted, without any restrictions, with the determination to move at the very minimum from a dangerous situation of offensive over-armament to a situation of balance of defensive armament at the lowest level compatible with common security.

"The first decision to be taken obviously is to halt the arms race. This imperative concerns the producers, as well as the purchasers, of arms. Of course, as long as countries are obliged to have adequate means of self-defence in order to repel possible aggression, they will inevitably be obliged to modernize or replace their weapons. But beyond this limit, any increase in or improvement of armaments would mortgage the very possibility of reaching the desired aim and must, therefore, be resolutely avoided.

"But more has to be done in terms of the balanced reduction or elimination of existing arms. This is what the two super-Powers declared that they wanted to do when they indicated their intention to cut their strategic arsenals in half. It is highly desirable that the process now begun be strengthened and extended to all countries and that it take into account quickly the threat that tactical, conventional and other imbalances represent.

"The discussions going on in the Conference on Disarmament about the elimination of chemical weapons are making decided progress which, we firmly hope, will result in a new international convention. If there is one area where a multilateral agreement is necessary, it is in regard to this type of weapon, which is unworthy of humanity. The fact that recently these weapons could once again be used points to the urgent need for further efforts to improve international verification methods which will guarantee not only that chemical weapons are no longer produced but also that existing stocks are destroyed. It is important that all States without exception adhere honestly to such a convention. For all of them, forgoing chemical weapons, as well as bacteriological and any other

weapons of mass destruction, is above all a moral question.

"In this same context I cannot remain silent about the threat that the arms trade represent. Their negative consequences are obvious in wars which are being waged between developing countries. If law cannot defend the weaker countries, then it is up to the international community to make a strong commitment, in accordance with the Charter of your Organization, to ensure that appropriate measures capable of deterring potential aggression be taken.

"Any international disarmament effort must find its efficacy in the fundamental principles of peaceful relations. That is why when I welcomed with satisfaction on 1 January 1985 the reopening of disarmament negotiations between the super-Powers I suggested that substance be given to a 'new philosophy of international relations' which would channel action in two directions: the first is an invitation to States to question their own national selfishness and their expansionist ideologies, which lead them to exalt themselves, to reject what is different, and to fear others; the second is assuming responsibility, in solidarity, for those basic conditions for peace—respect for human rights and development.

"The reduction and elimination of arms are in fact nothing more than the visible manifestation of another process of deeper disarmament. I mean the disarmament of spirits and hearts, according to an expression already used by my predecessors.

"Nobody doubts any longer that disarmament must be accompanied by an intensification of development efforts. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in 1987 at the Headquarters of the Organization, noted, among other things, that effective disarmament could create a new climate favourable to the transfer of resources and technology to developing countries. To transfer capital and knowledge which create employment and improve the living conditions of people contributes more effectively to security than do arms sales.

"Disarmament for development is a question of ethical choice and concerted political will. I heartily hope that the international community will make this choice, because disarmament for development, by reducing disparities between North and South, could at the same time lessen one of the causes of world instability which most seriously threatens peace.

"Consequently, what the cause of peace requires today is not more strategic or technological knowledge but, first and foremost, more conscience and moral strength. The highest religious and philosophical traditions to which the peoples you represent refer contain in themselves sufficient spiritual resources to give impetus and courage to those who never tire of building and rebuilding peaceful relations among nations. The 'new philosophy of international relations' which I mentioned is not synonymous with utopia, but finds its inspiration in the supreme realism of solidarity and hope.

"May God bless your endeavours to assure peace for the world."

*The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.*

227. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Secretary of State of the Holy See for the important message he has just delivered.

*[The speaker continued in Russian.]*

228. At its second special session devoted to disarmament the Assembly agreed, in the general debate in plenary meeting, to hear three organizations having observer status with the General Assembly—namely, the League of Arab States, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Palestine Liberation Organization.

229. I should like to inform members that the same organizations having observer status with the General Assembly have requested, in accordance with the relevant resolutions, to speak in the general debate at this special session devoted to disarmament. Accordingly, taking into account the practice of the General Assembly at its previous special session devoted to disarmament, may I take it that the Assembly agrees to these requests?

*It was so decided.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>*The Naval Arms Race* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.86.IX.3).

<sup>2</sup>Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964).

<sup>3</sup>Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068).

<sup>4</sup>*Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 27, annex II, sect. 13, document CCD/431.*

<sup>5</sup>"Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms" (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 944, No. 13445).

<sup>6</sup>See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 5th meeting, paragraph 57.

<sup>7</sup>See *The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, vol. 5: 1980 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.IX.4), appendix VII.

<sup>8</sup>*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 27, vol. II, annex III, document CCD/496.*

<sup>9</sup>League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2138.