



*Thursday, 2 June 1988,  
at 10.20 a.m.*

**NEW YORK**

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

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

**General debate (*continued*)**

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

2. Mr. VASSILIOU: Allow me, on the occasion of my first address to the General Assembly since my election as President of the Republic of Cyprus, to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the United Nations for its significant achievements. I also wish to emphasize our commitment to work within the context of the world Organization and offer our contribution for the translation into reality of its lofty goals.

3. I should like to express our appreciation and thanks to the Secretary-General for his outstanding services to the world community and in particular for his long-standing services to Cyprus. We shall continue to assist him in an open and constructive way in all his endeavours and in the fulfilment of his good-offices mandate for a solution to the Cyprus problem.

4. In congratulating you, Sir, on your election to preside over the special session, we commend your capable leadership during the deliberations at the forty-second session of the General Assembly. Our two countries have for many years had warm and friendly relations, which we value most highly.

5. The Charter of the United Nations represents the ideal instrument for the preservation and strengthening of international peace and security, to which we must devote our energies and efforts. The Charter embodies the principles that should govern international relations, while the Organization itself has been entrusted with the task of ensuring compliance with those principles.

6. The Charter provides for a security system resting on the effective implementation of the decisions of the Security Council, through enforcement action where necessary. It is time for this system, which has practically been abandoned, to be put into operation, and fresh consideration should be given to

the need to conclude the agreements for a permanent United Nations force.

7. Cyprus has consistently advocated greater rapprochement, détente and co-operation between the two great Powers and the military alliances. Undeniably, the breaking away from the tensions that prevailed in the first half of the present decade is a source of satisfaction, since we believe that, apart from its global significance, the interests of all nations can be better pursued and secured in a peaceful international climate.

8. We welcome the wise statesmanship exhibited by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. The political realism and determination which they have demonstrated have had a positive effect on the international situation. In this respect, 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, coupled with the continuing efforts of the two super-Powers to reach an agreement to reduce by 50 per cent their strategic nuclear arsenals at an early stage, is of great historic significance.

9. In Cyprus we note with satisfaction the progress achieved in finding solutions to long-standing conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, southern Africa, Kampuchea, Central America and Chad. We earnestly hope that this new climate will have its positive effect for the solution of the Cyprus problem as well.

10. The contribution of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in promoting a new climate in international relations has been substantial. The Movement has been instrumental in promoting the discussion of disarmament within the framework of the United Nations. The special ministerial meeting devoted to disarmament of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement, held at Havana from 26 to 30 May 1988, demonstrates the importance that the non-aligned countries attach to multilateral disarmament efforts.

11. The non-aligned countries take advantage of all opportunities afforded them to make their contribution. In this regard particular mention should be made of the contribution of the neutral and non-aligned countries, among them Cyprus, in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. The group of neutral and non-aligned countries has for long been the major vehicle for preparing and proposing balanced and forward-looking documents taking into account the interests of all participating States.

12. The reaffirmation of the central role of the United Nations and adherence to the provisions of

the Charter were central in achieving consensus on the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [*resolution S-10/2*], the first special session devoted to disarmament, for which we reaffirm our support. During the present third special session devoted to disarmament we should resolve to broaden its achievements. Our primary task should be to decide on concerted action to achieve real progress in disarmament.

13. It is gratifying that the international community takes a uniform stand in expressing concern about the present-day armaments situation. The on-going arms buildup has got out of hand, and the vicious circle of fear feeding on fear has to be broken. The arms race is draining much-needed resources, both human and material, that should be employed for the progress and prosperity of humanity. It is sad that in an era of increased economic opportunities, more people are starving and millions still have no access to education and medical care.

14. It is now generally recognized that security cannot be guaranteed through increasing armaments, and the notion of the "balance of terror" is becoming slowly but steadily outdated. The world is becoming linked by a web of interdependence that is woven even more tightly through the advances of science and technology. These advances make also for increased contacts, exchanges of information, more openness and greater transparency in international relations. These developments facilitate more accurate observation and verification of military activities, and that allows the conclusion of agreements on control and reduction of armaments. In this connection, I should like to express our support for the Six-Nation Initiative launched by Greece, Argentina, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania concerning nuclear disarmament in general and the establishment of an integrated multilateral verification system.

15. Highest priority in the field of disarmament should be given to the reduction of nuclear weapons, the creation of nuclear-free zones, the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, the conclusion of the international convention on the complete prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the cessation of nuclear tests.

16. Ultimately we must emphasize the obligations deriving from our common humanity. It is a source of pride for the people of Cyprus that Stoicism, which was expounded by the Cypriot philosopher Zeno more than 2,000 years ago, was the first philosophic system in Europe that stressed the unity of mankind.

17. We do not underrate the complexities of the problem of disarmament. We know that we live in an imperfect world. Our immediate task, until that happy moment when our vision of a world free from the tyranny of armaments is realized, should be to encourage practical and feasible measures for partial disarmament and for strengthening security at a reduced level of armaments. The prevalence of the idea of general and complete disarmament presupposes a new way of thinking and strict respect for the Charter and international law.

18. We recall President Woodrow Wilson's belief, expressed at the beginning of the century, that:

"No injustice furnishes a basis for permanent peace. If you leave a rankling sense of injustice anywhere, it will . . . produce a running sore presently which will result in trouble and probably war."

19. We live in a world where, as in the case of my own country, principles are violated and illegal recourse to force and military occupation are a reality. Since 1974 a large part of the territory of Cyprus has been under Turkish occupation. One third of the population are refugees in their own country while thousands of settlers from Turkey have been implanted in the occupied areas. The problem of Cyprus being one of foreign occupation, no lasting solution is attainable unless the Turkish occupation forces and the settlers are withdrawn from the island, unless the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus are safeguarded, and unless the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all Cypriots are respected.

20. In view of the fact that the withdrawal of Turkish troops and settlers is a matter that necessitates action by the Turkish Government, I proposed, as soon as I assumed my duties, a meeting with the Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Turgut Özal. I firmly believe that a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem is not only in the interest of the whole population of Cyprus but will also contribute to peace and stability in the Mediterranean. It will also promote good-neighbourly relations among the countries of the region, and in particular between Greece and Turkey.

21. In the context of the intensified efforts of the international community in promoting disarmament, and in our fervent desire for a solution of the Cyprus problem, I take this opportunity to reaffirm our proposal for the demilitarization of the Republic of Cyprus. We propose to dismantle the military forces of the Republic of Cyprus if all Turkish troops and settlers withdraw from the island and the armed elements they have fostered are disbanded. Part of our proposal concerns the establishment of an international peace force, under the auspices of the United Nations, the composition and terms of reference of which would be agreed upon and endorsed by the Security Council.

22. The acceptance and implementation of this proposal would be the greatest single contribution towards the unity, prosperity and security of Cyprus and would have wider positive repercussions in the region. I strongly believe that such a course would also serve Turkey's own best interests.

23. Though Cyprus is a small, relatively developed country, with a stable economy and with no foreign exchange problems, the financing of defence expenditure has constantly put pressure on both our fiscal and our real economic resources. Faced with the occupation of a large area of our country, we have no choice but to spend sums we can hardly afford for our defence. We are therefore well aware of the high cost of these military expenditures in terms of the

diversion of resources from projects aimed at furthering the development and welfare of our people.

24. If we bear in mind that the Turkish occupation forces on the island are several times larger than the forces of the Republic of Cyprus, in terms both of manpower and of equipment, the total savings from the demilitarization of Cyprus would run to hundreds of millions of dollars per year. The resource savings that would ensue from demilitarization in Cyprus would be substantial.

25. Demilitarization would not only create the conditions for resolving the Cyprus problem but also offer a further opportunity. One of the negative consequences of the continuing occupation of part of Cyprus has been the lagging behind of the Turkish Cypriots in economic development, despite the fact that they have been concentrated by the Turkish occupation forces in the part of Cyprus which before 1974 had the greatest resources and production potential.

26. We therefore undertake now to use the funds to be saved through the demilitarization of Cyprus for the development of areas of Cyprus which have fallen behind economically, and primarily for projects the benefits of which will be derived mainly by the Turkish Cypriots. Part of the savings could also be used for financing the international peace force to be established.

27. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987, established a basis for the further consideration of the complex interrelationship between the arms race and people's welfare. We fully associate ourselves with the assessments and proposals contained in the Final Document of that Conference.<sup>1</sup>

28. World military expenditures have reached the heights of \$1,000 billion, moneys sorely needed for economic development and for critical non-military purposes, such as food, housing, health and education. Military expenditures, besides placing a great burden on the world's economic resources, frustrate social and economic development and rob mankind of a life free from hunger, fear and despair. We are squandering the talents and resources of mankind by concentrating on means of mass destruction, while thousands of children die every day of malnutrition, disease and want.

29. The interdependence between disarmament and economic development, although repeatedly acknowledged by pertinent forums, has not as yet been met with concrete steps marking progress towards achievement of the goal of diverting military expenditure to economic and social needs. In spite of the lack of substantial progress we must not be disheartened. Quite the contrary; encouraged by the growing awareness and support of public opinion, we must, I believe, give full consideration to this important matter.

30. We are all greatly concerned, both in the developing and the developed countries, about the vast expansion of third-world external debts and the resulting strangling burden of debt servicing. Accord-

ing to recent estimates, the outstanding debt of developing nations is some \$1,200 billion, and the debt-service ratio represents approximately 25 per cent of export earnings. The situation has been aggravated by the fact that, even though the volume of exports of these countries has increased, their export earnings have declined because of the general fall in commodity prices. Total financial flows to developing countries have declined, largely because of the drastically lower level of new private-sector loans, while loan repayments last year turned IMF into a net recipient of funds from developing countries. Under these circumstances, it has become evident that the debt problem is a major impediment to the further development of the third world.

31. Serious and interesting proposals were advanced by many countries for finding a solution to this problem, which has tremendous political, economic and social consequences. Without wishing to detract from other constructive practical proposals dealing with the debt problem, we suggest that it is also worth while to consider the problem from the point of view of disarmament and development.

32. Several systems have been proposed for the release of funds saved through disarmament for the development of the third world. Here I refer to the past proposals for a disarmament dividend, an armaments levy, a tax on arms exports and voluntary contributions. All these proposals are welcome. However, I believe it would probably be easier to make progress if each country were to examine how it could reduce its own military expenditures and use the resulting savings for development purposes in line with its national priorities.

33. A common feature of previous proposals, and the object of considerable discussion, was the suggestion that all savings be channelled through existing international institutions or through a disarmament and development fund. Though we fully agree that such proposals should constitute the eventual objective, we suggest that at this point in time any incremental transfer of funds through disarmament for the benefit of developing countries should be welcome.

34. On the basis of these realities, that is, the acute debt problem and the possibility and desirability of achieving savings in military expenditures, I should like to propose the following. A considerable proportion of savings arising from reductions in military expenditures by countries whose banks are owed substantial debts by developing countries should be paid into a fund specially established by each country. This fund would be used to buy, at a specially agreed discounted value, part of the debt owed to their banks by developing countries. Developing countries would thus be greatly relieved by the reduction of their foreign debt to banks. This will also allow them greater accessibility to new loan finance which would be used for development projects. Simultaneously, the developed countries would be alleviating a source of serious problems for their own banking sector, would keep the funds in their own country and would help to release resources for their own development and welfare needs.

35. In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the third special session on disarmament will make a substantial contribution to the achievement of lasting peace through the implementation of effective disarmament measures. We can build on the present positive international climate in order to combat the twin scourges of war and want.

36. Our efforts should not cease with the end of this session. I suggest, therefore, for the Assembly's consideration, that the proposals put forward in the course of this session be examined by a special committee to be established. That committee would be mandated to identify, elaborate and assess the practical means for the implementation of these proposals and report to the General Assembly.

37. If our approach is characterized by short-term realism and long-term idealism, we shall be able to make progress in these vital fields that affect the present and the future of mankind.

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

39. The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Finland. I have great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Harri Holkeri and inviting him to address the Assembly.

40. Mr. HOLKERI (Finland): Mr. President, my delegation is delighted to see you presiding over the fifteenth special session of the General Assembly, the third special session devoted to disarmament. Your commitment to peace and international co-operation has become known to all of us here. We are confident that you will direct our work successfully. I assure you that the delegation of Finland will co-operate in every possible way to help you in carrying out your important duties.

41. The third special session on disarmament is taking place at an opportune time. Seldom have disarmament negotiations prompted so many expectations as they do today. New hope has been kindled. Reducing nuclear arsenals rather than limiting their growth is now recognized by nuclear-weapon States to be the right approach towards increased security. This is demonstrated by the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the INF Treaty—signed by the leaders of the two major military Powers in Washington last December. Reduced reliance on nuclear weapons is a prospect which Finland, a neutral European country, particularly welcomes.

42. We are encouraged by the Moscow summit meeting. It made progress towards nuclear disarmament through building confidence. It reaffirmed the value of continued dialogue at the highest level.

43. The INF Treaty proves that where there is a will there is a way. It demonstrates that concepts such as on-site inspection for verification of compliance can be translated into binding treaty commitments. Such conceptual breakthroughs are relevant to other disarmament negotiations, whether they concern strategic, conventional or chemical weapons. May this will

guide efforts not only in the area of arms control but also in regional conflicts and in their peaceful settlement.

44. Finland sees in disarmament an instrument for safeguarding security—that of its own people and of all peoples. As a small nation, we are in the same position as the vast majority of States represented in this Hall. Disarmament is in the particular interest of small States, which cannot afford the illusion of maintaining their security by military means alone.

45. Disarmament, nuclear and conventional, is a recognized necessity. It cannot be achieved without a realistic appreciation of the security concerns of States, as defined by the States themselves. General and complete disarmament under effective international control remains the ultimate goal. Yet it cannot be achieved at one go or by any prescribed deadline. There is no practical alternative to a step-by-step approach to disarmament. To obtain results, disarmament efforts must be geared to realistically defined objectives and pursued relentlessly. Finland, for its part, is ready to support any realistic and realizable disarmament proposal.

46. It has been our hope that the breakthroughs made in the negotiations between the two major Powers would be reflected in multilateral talks as well. This special session is an opportunity to ask why that does not seem to be happening.

47. Multilateral disarmament on a global scale appears to be undergoing a dual crisis: one of confidence and one of credibility. The two are not unrelated. There seems to be less confidence in multilateral disarmament negotiations as a means of addressing important security issues through disarmament. The two latest multilateral disarmament agreements, one on banning environmental modification techniques<sup>2</sup> and the other on certain prohibitions and restrictions on the use of so-called dirty weapons,<sup>3</sup> date from 1977 and 1980, respectively.

48. It is a powerful fact that no multilateral disarmament agreement has been concluded in the past eight years. One may, of course, refer to the unfavourable international situation of the early 1980s by way of explanation. It is true that disarmament is part and parcel of international politics. Difficulties in bilateral relations between the two major Powers tend to be reflected in multilateral disarmament efforts. But the fact that the opposite does not seem to hold true is even more worrying.

49. The present progress in bilateral United States-Soviet arms negotiations attracts public attention everywhere. Multilateral disarmament, on the other hand, is fast disappearing from the popular consciousness. Unable to show any concrete results, multilateral disarmament is losing credibility. There are no ready answers to the awkward question: if they can succeed, why can't we?

50. Maybe an answer can be found by challenging the notion that bilateralism and multilateralism are somehow competing approaches. Bilateral disarmament cannot displace multilateral disarmament. Both are needed. This may be stating the obvious, but it is still worth stating. There are a number of

areas—even a growing number—in which a multilateral approach is necessary. Chemical weapons is one, conventional arms and arms transfers is another. So are naval armaments, a ban on nuclear testing and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

51. This special session provides a welcome opportunity to strengthen peace and security. It derives its authority from its universal nature and from the level of representation. This session should renew our collective commitment to the multilateral disarmament efforts within the United Nations across a broad range of issues. It should assess past accomplishments and set the course for future work. We will have helped set the stage for the comeback of multilateralism if we are able to achieve concrete progress.

52. A universal convention banning all chemical weapons everywhere for all time is the most promising prospect in this regard. A chemical weapons convention would do away with a dreadful means of mass destruction and banish the spectre of its re-emergence and proliferation. We are reminded of the urgency of such a ban by reports of repeated and increasingly indiscriminate use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq conflict. There is no justification for the use of chemical weapons by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

53. The Final Document unanimously adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament remains the most authoritative global statement on disarmament. At this session, we should build on it and work for a substantive and forward-looking new document. It should concentrate on the most urgent issues before us, and it should be adopted by consensus. But we should not be unduly constrained from also debating controversial issues where at least some progress is a possibility.

54. Nuclear disarmament and other measures to prevent nuclear war must remain an issue of the highest priority on our agenda.

55. Nuclear disarmament is the primary responsibility of nuclear Powers, but nuclear war is a threat to everybody. All States have the right and the obligation to work for nuclear disarmament. Encouraged by the declaration that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, the international community must continue to work to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] and enhancing the IAEA safeguards régime remain crucial tasks. The importance that all the Nordic Governments attach to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will be reiterated at this special session.

56. The international non-proliferation régime would, in our view, be markedly strengthened by the complete prohibition of nuclear tests. A comprehensive test ban would also do much to constrain the qualitative development of nuclear weapons, thus slowing down the nuclear arms race. Other important collateral measures to diminish the risk of nuclear war and to foster nuclear disarmament include the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and

binding, comprehensive security assurance for non-nuclear-weapon States.

57. This special session should also pay particular attention to conventional disarmament, to confidence-building measures and to the role of the United Nations in disarmament.

58. The accumulation of conventional arms and forces constitutes a real danger to international peace. Unlike nuclear weapons, conventional weapons are actually being used in conflicts in different parts of the world. The technological arms race is accelerating in conventional weaponry. The growth in destructive capacity has been exceptionally fast in this area. Conventional weapons account for the major part of global military expenditures, thus hampering economic and social development.

59. The conventional arms race must be addressed both globally and regionally. The regional approach gives the States concerned a tangible basis for negotiations. In my own region, within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, there are now promising signs of a new opening on the issue of conventional forces.

60. In Finland's view, confidence-building measures have improved the possibilities for negotiating real reductions in conventional forces. Building confidence is a dynamic process. Past experience influences future possibilities. The implementation of confidence-building measures is of major political importance. Militarily less significant measures can be followed by more far-reaching ones.

61. In our view, confidence-building is also a viable approach to naval arms control. The importance of naval forces and sea-based weapons systems has been growing. A significant proportion of the strategic capabilities of major military Powers is at sea.

62. Finland's concern for naval stability is dictated by its own security interests. The growth in naval capabilities and activities in the vicinity of the Nordic region has given rise to apprehension. That prompted the President of Finland, Mr. Mauno Koivisto, to suggest in October 1986 that confidence-building measures should be considered as a means of improving stability and predictability in the naval area as well.

63. Efforts towards reversing the naval arms build-up must be considered in the general context of the balance of forces. Both the principle of freedom of navigation and the particular security requirements of coastal States must be honoured. Confidence-building in the naval area should start with greater openness. Access to reliable and relevant information should be improved.

64. The United Nations could enhance its disarmament role by assisting Member States in their efforts. In our view, the United Nations is uniquely equipped to assist Member States in verifying compliance with disarmament agreements to which they are parties. We have therefore proposed that a study be carried out on the possibilities of establishing a verification data base compiled and managed by the Organization. The United Nations could also be



called upon by the parties to disarmament agreements to perform specific technical verification functions.

65. The present international machinery dealing with disarmament under United Nations auspices is a decade old. Reviewing it is on our agenda. Opinions may vary as to the performance of its three major components, the First Committee of the General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. We believe that each of them performs a distinct role: the First Committee recommends, the Disarmament Commission deliberates and the Conference on Disarmament negotiates. While the roles need to be kept distinct, that should not preclude a periodic review of their agendas and procedures. In the case of the Conference on Disarmament, its composition should also be reviewed in the light of experience and needs.

66. It has been the consistent policy of Finland to strengthen the United Nations as the irreplaceable instrument of collective security. We continue to believe that collective security can be effectively enhanced through multilateral disarmament. The United Nations has a central role and a primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament. It is time to honour in deeds what we all agree to in words.

67. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly I thank the Prime Minister of the Republic of Finland for the important statement he has just made.

68. Mr. QIAN (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): First of all, Sir, please allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I am confident that with your rich experience and outstanding abilities you are sure to make important contributions to the success of this session.

69. As we gather in the Headquarters of the United Nations for the third time to devote ourselves especially to the issue of disarmament, we find ourselves in a world where the arms race is still going on, the international situation remains turbulent, peace is jeopardized and security is not ensured. The danger of war is still there; but, on the other hand, we see that over the years there have been increasingly strong calls from people everywhere for a halt to the arms race and for the preservation of world peace. The developing countries want development and peace. The developed countries want no war. The United States and the Soviet Union, too, have declared that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and numerous world and regional organizations and conferences have been engaged in a search for proper solutions to the major issues confronting various regions and the world as a whole. The people of the world and all peace-loving nations, with their aspirations and actions to maintain peace, are playing a role of growing importance in containing war; therefore we believe that while the danger of war still exists, the forces for peace are outgrowing the factors making for war, and that peace can be maintained.

70. Recently there has been some positive new development in the international situation. The conclusion of 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 last December has led to a certain degree of relaxation in East-West relations. The signing of the Geneva agreements on the Afghan question last April has shown that progress has been made in the endeavour to seek political settlements to regional conflicts.

71. Ten years have elapsed since the convening of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978. We are pleased to note that this has been by no means a fruitless decade.

72. First, the campaign to halt the arms race and promote disarmament constitutes an ever-stronger force for maintaining peace and containing war. Numerous countries have joined in the struggle for disarmament. Various social forces working for peace have converged in a surging and irresistible historical trend.

73. Secondly, an effective approach has been adopted for disarmament. Since the first special session on disarmament, the international community has realized more and more clearly that the armaments possessed by either of the two super-Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, far exceed those of any other country and that the nuclear weapons they possess account for more than 95 per cent of the world's nuclear arsenals. In view of this fact, the two super-Powers bear a special responsibility for disarmament and should take the lead in drastically reducing their armaments, especially their nuclear weapons. Now this view is shared by all countries in the world, including the United States and the Soviet Union. Disarmament has been turned from a noble desire of the people of all countries into an action that has a clear starting point and a practical goal.

74. Thirdly, some concrete progress has been made in disarmament. The INF Treaty is the first treaty ever signed between them for cutting down existing nuclear weapons. It is our hope that this Treaty will be observed and implemented in earnest and that the United States and the Soviet Union will continue to move forward on the way to reducing strategic nuclear weapons and other types of nuclear weapons.

75. Members will, I believe, agree that the achievements made in the disarmament field have been hard won. These achievements, though only a start, have been encouraging to the people striving for disarmament, bringing them some hope for further disarmament.

76. Now I should like to take up the other aspect of the question. The current situation remains grave, the task of disarmament is still most arduous and we have a long way to go, so we should never slacken our efforts.

77. First, as we all know, the nuclear weapons covered by the INF Treaty constitute a very small portion, only 3 to 4 per cent of the nuclear arsenals of the two countries. If they can reach agreement on the

50 per cent reduction of their strategic nuclear weapons and implement it, they would be taking another step forward. The results of the recent US-USSR summit show that it will take an arduous process of negotiation to reach such an agreement. The problem is that even if they do cut by half the number of their nuclear weapons, their nuclear arsenals will still account for approximately 90 per cent of the world's total and, moreover, will hold absolute superiority in quality, sufficient to destroy all life on Earth many times over, thus keeping humanity under the shadow of nuclear threat.

78. In their negotiations on disarmament, the two super-Powers have paid great attention to "balance" and "equal security" between themselves. The question, however, is whether with "balance" and "equal security" between them, there will be peace and tranquillity in the world. Things are by no means as simple as that. The egregious imbalance in military forces between the two super-Powers and the rest of the world makes the vast majority of countries feel extremely insecure. That state of affairs cannot be changed unless the two super-Powers take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear weapons of all types.

79. Secondly, chemical weapons pose a threat to and are abhorred by mankind. Yet from time to time there have occurred instances involving the use of such weapons between belligerents. Therefore, besides nuclear disarmament, the issue of the complete prohibition of chemical weapons requires the efforts of countries around the world for an early solution.

80. Thirdly, while nuclear disarmament is in progress, conventional arms reduction should not be neglected. One should not forget that conventional weapons were invariably used in frequent post-war military invasions and armed occupations of sovereign States. In Europe, where disarmament is of profound concern to all countries, and where sharp confrontation exists between the two major military blocs, the weapons possessed are mainly conventional ones. The bulk of the \$1,000 billion worth of world military expenditure every year is spent on conventional weapons. At present, conventional armaments are developing rapidly. The number of naval vessels is growing, and weapons are being upgraded at a faster pace. Advances in science and technology are being increasingly applied to conventional weapons, resulting in greater accuracy, destructiveness and deadliness. Particularly disturbing is the fact that there is no impassable chasm between conventional war and nuclear war. Once a large-scale conventional war breaks out, no one can guarantee that it will not escalate into a nuclear war. Therefore, it is our consistent view that drastic conventional arms reduction is also of great importance.

81. I should also like to stress that since all have expressed support for disarmament, it is self-evident that first and foremost the arms race should be halted. It would go against the wish of the people of the world for disarmament if, after some cuts in armaments have been achieved through years of painstaking and complicated negotiations, all-out efforts are made to push the arms race forward. It is regrettable that the arms race is still going on. The two major nuclear Powers are stepping up their

efforts to upgrade their nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. Long-range cruise missiles have emerged as a new strategic nuclear force and are in the process of further development. Strategic nuclear weapons are being improved in respect of accuracy, mobility and stealth; so are tactical nuclear weapons. With the development of space weapons, a new type of strategic weapon which serves defensive and offensive purposes concurrently, outer space, which is a common heritage of humanity and ought to be developed and utilized for peaceful purposes, will become an area for the arms race between the two super-Powers.

82. At present, people should be on guard against an important change which is taking place in the super-Powers arms race, i.e., quantitative reduction but qualitative improvement. Their nuclear weapons have been piled up to such a magnitude that, as is aptly pointed out, it makes no real difference whether one can destroy one's opponent 60 times or 40 times. Therefore, application of the latest scientific and technological research findings to the development and manufacture of new types of weapons is becoming a new trend in their arms race. That is very dangerous. Numerical reductions in armaments are of course a good thing, but will qualitative development of more and newer types of armaments make the world safer and peace more secure?

83. What should be done when we face so many complex problems in the field of disarmament? In our view, the experience of success in disarmament gained so far can serve as an important guide to the solution of these problems.

84. First, experience tells us that a realistic objective must be set and an effective approach followed if there is to be success in disarmament. The present situation of world armaments determines that the two super-Powers bear a special responsibility for disarmament and that they should take the lead in drastically reducing their respective armaments. Their signing of the INF Treaty is a first step in line with this effective approach. Only by persisting in this approach can we achieve further concrete results in the cause of disarmament.

85. Secondly, experience tells us that disarmament is a major issue involving world peace and the security of States. All countries, big or small, strong or weak, should have a say and the right to take part in discussions and to raise demands and put forward suggestions. In fact, progress made in the disarmament field so far is not separable from the joint efforts of all countries.

86. Thirdly, experience tells us that the role of the people of the world should not be ignored. The World Disarmament Campaign initiated by the United Nations, the voice of non-governmental organizations and the discussions by academic societies have produced a tremendous impact, morally and psychologically, on public opinion, giving a strong impetus to the cause of disarmament.

87. Here I wish briefly to sum up the consistent position and propositions of the Chinese Government on disarmament as follows. First, as the nuclear arms race poses a general, grave threat to world peace

and security, nuclear disarmament should be given top priority in the reduction of all types of armaments. Secondly, the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament is the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons. Thirdly, the two super-Powers that bear a special responsibility should take the lead in putting an end to the testing, manufacturing and deploying of all types of nuclear weapons and in drastically reducing and eliminating all types of nuclear weapons each of them has deployed in any region at home and abroad. Then a broadly represented international conference on nuclear disarmament can be convened with the participation of all nuclear States to discuss the steps and measures to be taken for a thorough destruction of nuclear armaments. Fourthly, pending the realization of the goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons, we hope to see all nuclear States undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use such weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones. Fifthly, there is also an urgent need drastically to reduce conventional armaments. The conventional armaments of all States should be used only for defence and not for aggression against other States or to threaten their security. Sixthly, an international convention on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons should be concluded at an early date. Seventhly, an international agreement on the complete prohibition of space weapons should be concluded at an early date. Eighthly, all States have the right to take part in the discussions and solution of disarmament issues on an equal footing. The legitimate interest and just demands of the small and medium-sized countries should be respected.

88. Disarmament is no doubt important for the maintenance of world peace. But it is apparently not enough to pin our hopes only on disarmament for the maintenance of world peace. While we are meeting here, the world we live in is still far from tranquil. A series of prolonged regional conflicts continue to undermine the security of the countries concerned and threaten world peace. Year after year we have been discussing these issues here at the United Nations. The recently signed Geneva Accords on the Afghan question represent a victory for international justice. The United Nations has made praiseworthy contributions to this end.

89. Naturally people may ask: why does Viet Nam not make up its mind to withdraw all its troops from Kampuchea since the Soviet Union is already resolved to pull out its troops from Afghanistan? The Vietnamese people, having survived the scourge of war in Viet Nam, urgently need a period of rehabilitation and economic development. The Vietnamese authorities, however, motivated by their wild ambition for expansion, have dragged their country into the quagmire of a war of aggression against Kampuchea, indulging themselves in military expansion. This has brought enormous suffering to both the Kampuchean and Vietnamese peoples. Any attempt on the part of the Vietnamese authorities to keep their troops in Kampuchea on whatever pretext would be doomed to failure. Now it is high time they made up their minds to withdraw all their forces as soon as possible.

90. The Chinese Government regards peace and development as the two major issues of the present-day world. It is for the purpose of both peace and development that we strive for disarmament. The United Nations has held a special conference and conducted in-depth discussions on the relationship between disarmament and development. It is widely agreed that, without a proper solution to the development issue, international peace and stability would be adversely affected.

91. At present, the gap between North and South is still widening. As a result of falling prices of oil, raw materials and primary products and the irrational international economic order, the third world is sustaining great losses. The accumulative total of a \$1,200 billion foreign debt, a crushing burden, has weighed heavily on some developing countries. The trade protectionism of some developed countries has added to the economic difficulties of debtor nations. Now the developing countries are already adopting measures to readjust their economies, including measures for cutting down expenses, painful as they are.

92. It is clear, however, that such a huge international economic problem cannot be solved only on the strength of the measures taken by the developing countries alone. We therefore call on the developed countries to pursue far-sighted policies and provide necessary and reasonable conditions for the developing countries in terms of finance, trade and so on in order to facilitate the latter's development and enhance their debt-servicing ability. As the world has developed to what it is today, the economic interdependence of countries has reached a high degree. So it is very difficult for the developed countries to maintain their prosperity on the basis of the prolonged poverty of developing countries. This problem is so serious that all countries in the world have reason to feel worried. Some people have compared the debt crisis to an atom bomb dangling over the heads of mankind. I do not think this is alarmist talk.

93. Of the five permanent members of the Security Council, China is the only developing country. China is whole-heartedly dedicated to its modernization programme. Only in an international environment of enduring peace will it be possible for China to accomplish this historic task. China is committed to the maintenance of world peace and interested in the attainment of disarmament. It is opposed to the arms race and never takes part in it. The small number of nuclear weapons in China's possession is entirely for self-defence. From the very day when we tested the first atom bomb, we have declared time and again that at no time and in no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons. China has long stopped nuclear testing in the atmosphere. It has undertaken not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones, as it understands the desire of non-nuclear-weapon States for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and respects such zones already established. Following its signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco),<sup>4</sup> China last year signed Protocol 2 and Protocol 3 of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Rarotonga).



94. In its dedication to the promotion of world peace and disarmament, China has not only actively put forward proposals but has put them into practice. As soon as the international situation permitted, China voluntarily decided to reduce its troops by 1 million, and that troop reduction was already completed last year. Many of our military airports and seaports have been converted to civilian or military-civilian use. A considerable number of our military industrial enterprises have been shifted to the production of civilian goods. The proportion of China's national defence expenditure in the State budget has dropped from 17.5 per cent in 1979 to 8 per cent this year. Our current military expenditure totals approximately \$5.5 billion, that is, about \$5 per person. I think that this simple figure is a most telling argument.

95. Although what has been achieved in the field of disarmament over the past decade since the first special session on disarmament is not satisfactory, one must say that there has been some progress compared with the first three decades of the post-war period. These achievements have been gained through the unremitting efforts of the countries of the world and all peace-loving people. They have enhanced our confidence and strength. Experience is showing us the way to new achievements. We sincerely hope that, in keeping with the fundamental principles contained in the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament and taking into account developments in recent years, all delegations will make concerted efforts to set realistic objectives and adopt practical measures for future disarmament endeavours, thus ensuring full success for this special session. It is our belief that peace can be maintained and the goal of disarmament achieved. Science and technology, which are created by mankind, should be used to benefit mankind, not destroy it. Mankind will eventually be able to take its destiny into its own hands.

96. Mr. DUMAS (France) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great honour for me to speak in the Assembly at the third special session on disarmament. I am pleased to offer you, Mr. President, France's congratulations on your election, which is testimony once again of the confidence all delegations have in you. I wish you every success in discharging your responsibilities and assure you of the French delegation's complete co-operation. May I also express my country's high esteem for the Secretary-General and his work in the service of peace throughout the world.

97. This third special session on disarmament opens in a new climate of hope. At our first such meeting, in 1978, we tried to analyse the causes of our lack of success and to revise our methods and sometimes even our goals. We also laid down certain guiding principles, noting that disarmament could not be confined to a few nations only; that it must of necessity be combined with the legitimate right of each State to security and that it cannot be allowed to overlook regional situations. It was possible to agree on a document whose importance is worth recalling here.

98. While only recently disarmament was still regarded as Utopian, it is today perceived to be a genuine prospect, giving rise to hope among nations.

99. The President of the French Republic, Mr. François Mitterrand, has time and again called for real progress towards genuine disarmament, stating, "France can but applaud all that may lead, by means of balanced, realistic and verifiable agreements, to a lowering of arms levels." That is why we have welcomed progress accomplished in the dialogue between the two great Powers, or at the regional level.

100. Yet is it right that disarmament should witness the crystallization of a kind of division of labour between actors and spectators? Is it normal that the map of violence be so far from coinciding with that of successes already achieved or impending in the field of disarmament?

101. The international community represented here cannot be satisfied with the role of a more or less passive observer. It cannot allow security to be organized along the same lines as confrontation, namely, around the assumed pre-eminence of certain Powers. Europeans know this better than anyone, their security being often at issue in negotiations between the two great Powers.

102. Consequently, the objective of this session should be to enable the international community as a whole to play its role to the full in the task of disarmament. To do so, what is required is first of all realism. The international community will never make progress towards disarmament unless it is first convinced of the absolute need to give due weight to the way in which each State perceives its own security.

103. This session is intended to approve a final document by consensus. Let us therefore steer clear of those themes which we well know will never secure the assent of all. This applies to the disappearance of nuclear weapons. Some people have predicted their obsolescence; others see in their preservation a sign of outmoded ways of thinking which must be overcome. Naturally, nobody would claim to be hostile to the disappearance of nuclear weapons—as indeed of all weapons—in a world in which general and complete disarmament had finally prevailed.

104. But what would be the logic in holding nuclear weapons solely responsible for the risks that the arms race entails for humanity? Some people have claimed that "nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought". Is conventional war, whose sufferings and slaughter are daily in evidence, worth fighting? No; all war must be prevented.

105. And the best way to prevent all war, nuclear and conventional, is deterrence. As the President of the French Republic has stated, deterrence is the complement of disarmament: "The purpose of deterrence is to prevent war; disarmament is intended to reduce the risks of war. The two are convergent."

106. Some people today condemn this concept, praising the merits of a world without nuclear weapons. Any such general and complete denucleari-

zation would have to go hand in hand with general and complete disarmament which, unfortunately, is not for tomorrow.

107. Would regional denuclearization be any more realistic? Let us take the case of Europe. Would anyone wish to abolish in one blow the stability that has been achieved since the war, despite political divisions, geographical disparities and the imbalances in other areas of weaponry, conventional and chemical? A nuclear-free Europe would not thereby cease to be the target for atomic weapons. I note in passing that the various architects who speak of a "common house" for Europe, from which all nuclear weapons have been removed, leave us to understand that the two great Powers would retain their own nuclear arsenals. That is not my country's perception of a Europe that has overcome the divisions inherited from the war.

108. The new political order to which we aspire for the old continent entails not only freedom of movement for people and ideas and respect for the rights of the individual, but also control over security. In no circumstances can it be built at the price of consenting to a new and profoundly inegalitarian vulnerability.

109. That leaves the question of what we customarily refer to as denuclearized zones. My country has always favoured the establishment of such zones. Naturally, any such undertaking must flow from the unanimous decision of all the States concerned and must be subject to satisfactory control. Moreover, their creation must be militarily and geographically relevant. Clearly, therefore, where nuclear deterrence operates directly, it would be artificial and would add nothing to security to designate regions and declare them denuclearized.

110. It is in the name of these same principles that France has refused to ratify the Protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga instituting a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. The unanimous consent of States? How could one credit that, when plainly the treaty in question is aimed at one of the States in the region which conducts its nuclear tests there? Geographically relevant? This condition is unfulfilled also, given the ambiguities of the treaty terms concerning navigation and ports of call. If it jeopardizes freedom of navigation, denuclearization can never be legitimate. Militarily relevant? This, too, is dubious, in view of the total absence of any risk of nuclear proliferation in the zone concerned.

111. As one of the region's Powers, we are naturally engaged in permanent dialogue with the South Pacific countries. We hope to pursue that dialogue in a spirit of respect for the decisions of all the States concerned in matters of security, including, of course, our own.

112. The banning of nuclear tests plays an important part in the thinking of those who aspire to denuclearization. But the reduction and subsequent banning of tests can only be the consequence, not the cause, of a cut in arms.

113. We note that in the bilateral talks on tests between the United States and the Soviet Union—

which naturally cannot be binding on France—the principle has been established of a linkage between reductions in arsenals and the limitations on tests which might be accepted.

114. It is obviously not for me to express an opinion on this discussion between two States. But I should like to make one remark here. While it is understandable, in the case of redundant arsenals, to think of reducing tests as and when the number of weapons is reduced, the same arithmetic does not apply to the situation of France, whose nuclear arsenal is already at its strictly essential level. I say this to make it clear that France cannot feel itself bound by any limitations to which the two biggest Powers may eventually agree.

115. On the other hand, mindful of our concern for transparency, of which we have given evidence in the past in welcoming the Atkinson mission to Mururoa in 1983, I am happy to announce that France has decided to make a yearly statement of the number of tests performed in the preceding 12 months. This will allow people to assess more accurately what is actually going on than would be possible from the information that certain third States have felt authorized to circulate. People will thus be better able to discern in concrete terms the logic that links our tests to our concern to maintain the effectiveness of our deterrence at all times.

116. Disarmament, in our view, goes hand in hand with security.

117. In 1978, to begin with, then with greater precision on the occasion of the special session in 1982, and lastly through the President of the Republic addressing the General Assembly in 1983, at the 9th meeting of the thirty-eighth session, France specified the three conditions upon which it would be prepared to take part in nuclear talks.

118. Those conditions still stand. They have not yet been met. We hope that they will be, because, as the President of the Republic has said, "nuclear deterrence does not signify redundancy or accumulation of weapons without end".

119. The first of those three conditions concerns a reduction in the arsenals of the two super-Powers to the point where the resulting change in the nature of those arsenals would bring them closer, quantitatively and qualitatively, to the other nuclear arsenals. I would remind the Assembly that my country has always given very high priority to strategic talks on the intercontinental weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States. We would like to believe that, notwithstanding present difficulties, the prospects of an agreement remain open.

120. However praiseworthy and ambitious it may be, the goal set by the Soviet Union and the United States of a 50 per cent cut in their strategic arsenals would, if effectively achieved, merely bring those levels down to where they were some years ago, and would not modify the difference in scale between them and France. That is an indication of how much remains to be done in order to reach a reasonable level.

121. Nor have the other two conditions been met. One concerns the limitation of defensive systems designed to neutralize deterrence. We have all noted the considerable difficulties that remain between the two great Powers in this respect. It is the stability of their long-term strategic relationship that is at stake. The other calls for significant progress in the reduction of conventional imbalances in Europe, and for the disappearance of all chemical threats.

122. Considerable efforts are currently being made in these spheres, in which, as the Assembly knows, my country is actively involved, in the one case to get talks started, in the other to carry them through to their conclusion. Although here, too, the difficulties are considerable, we intend to do everything in our power to overcome them.

123. How, then, is the realism to which I have just referred applicable to our debate? Everyone here could, I am convinced, agree on two notions: stability and sufficiency. These should dictate what is desirable and what is possible in all negotiating forums.

124. In the nuclear sphere, we should be grateful that the most heavily-armed Powers, fearing to exhaust themselves in a race without end, are gradually shifting in the direction of sufficiency.

125. First, let me make it clear that this notion obviously does not mean that anyone should have to acquiesce in obsolescence for his forces. The preservation of credibility does not mean over-armament. It is the prerequisite for stability. To be sure, technological development requires self-discipline. The Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems<sup>5</sup> is an example of this. But certain types of technological progress may contribute to stability. Thus, sufficiency and modernization are compatible, provided the use we make of technologies is intended exclusively to maintain the credibility at all times of an arsenal designed solely to prevent war.

126. In the talks on chemical weapons it is now universally recognized—and this is a vital point—that the possession of such weapons is not vital to anyone's defence; the best application of the principle of sufficiency in this case is zero. That is why my country attaches the highest priority to a global ban on chemical weapons and has always firmly condemned their use.

127. Of course, all States would have to be denied such weapons, if one wanted to avoid undermining stability. That is why we cannot accept a convention unless it is universal, comprehensive and verifiable. That is also why we cannot afford to leave unresolved the very difficult questions still left unsettled at the Conference on Disarmament. That is also why we cannot afford to neglect the issues raised by the transition from the present situation, which is characterized by the disparity between the different arsenals, to the general ban for which we have called. Indeed, it was those last concerns which led us to present in Geneva our proposal for security stocks.

128. In the talks on conventional weapons, which we hope will open shortly within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in

Europe, the watchwords, again, are stability and sufficiency.

129. First, political stability is vital, since the need in Europe is to rectify an imbalance in conventional forces the effect of which has been to prolong, in spite of the wishes of the peoples, a situation of division and, for some, dependence, which is not in keeping with our political vision of the future of the continent of Europe.

130. Military stability, too, is essential, since there is a need to correct imbalances between arsenals and to bring the number and siting of weapons into line with the requirements of defence alone.

131. I hope I am making myself clear. The future conventional talks in Europe, which are intended to follow up the effort initiated here by France in 1978, with its proposal for a conference on disarmament in Europe, are not the only key to our security.

132. Even assuming we did achieve a conventional balance in Europe—in my view a goal of the utmost importance—we would still not be free of the need to maintain a nuclear deterrent. Such a deterrent is not intended only to deter those who currently enjoy superiority in conventional armaments from the temptation to make use of them: history also teaches us that conventional parity, or even inferiority, is not always a safeguard against the senseless desire for military adventure. Further, even if the conventional imbalance were reduced, Europe would still continue to be the target for nuclear weapons of various ranges.

133. Still more important than the military consequences of rectification of the existing conventional imbalances would be its political consequences. It would abolish one of the obstacles still preventing Europe from progressing towards a just and democratic order, thereby enabling all States to maintain the same relations of confidence among themselves that they ought to maintain with their own citizens.

134. It is this political vision which has led to our insistence that the two parts of the future negotiation—that between the 35 members of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, on confidence-building measures, and that between the 23 members of the two alliances, on stability—be made a part of the great process originating from the Helsinki accords. In our view, human rights, contacts between people, and economic and cultural co-operation cannot be dissociated from the military aspects of security.

135. The demand for realism and the key themes of stability and sufficiency are the underlying principles that should now enable us to identify the broad spheres in which the international community, represented by the United Nations, ought to be able to play a part with regard to disarmament.

136. The following five approaches are open to us: to prepare for and assist disarmament; to engage in negotiations which are by their essence universal in scope; to harmonize regional efforts; to foster research; and to promote solidarity among States.

137. In order to prepare for and assist the process of disarmament, we need to promote verification and control, ensure transparency and avoid proliferation. As regards verification and control, many have proposed that this session should launch a discussion on the role of the United Nations with regard to the verification of disarmament. This idea is not entirely new. As early as 1978, France, in proposing that an international satellite monitoring agency be established, sought to show that in its view disarmament should be the task of all, under the control of all. Since then, thinking on the subject has made progress. While the notion of individual verification régimes, each relating to a specific agreement or negotiation, has gained acceptance, it does not necessarily flow from this that the United Nations, as such, should not play a part in this verification.

*Mr. Jacobovits de Szeged (Netherlands), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

138. The observance of disarmament agreements obviously concerns all countries, whether they are party to them or not. While a State cannot expect to be allowed to engage in direct verification of respect for agreements to which it is not a signatory, it is legitimate for all members of the international community to have access to information. Moreover, it is desirable that all States should be in a position to understand fully the situation with regard to a disarmament agreement. Similarly, they ought to be able to assess the military and non-military threats to their security. I am thinking here of problems such as crisis management and the prevention and handling of major catastrophes and accidents. However, not all the countries in the world currently possess the individual means of obtaining the precise information available to several of them at this time, particularly from outer space.

139. In view of the technological possibilities now offered to us, could we not envisage initially the establishment, within the United Nations, of an agency for the processing and interpreting of images obtained from space? This agency would be responsible for gathering the data obtained from civilian satellites and investigating the possible contribution that space technology could make to the implementation of multilateral programmes relating to security or of a civilian nature. But that alone would not suffice. I suggest that a meeting of experts on verification be convened, and my delegation stands ready to discuss its tasks.

140. Among the conditions necessary for any progress in disarmament is complete transparency of military information, especially with regard to budgets. I should like to make three proposals in this regard: that our final document include a solemn appeal to all countries to communicate to the Secretary-General quantified data relating to their military budgets; that each State supply an evaluation of the impact of its military expenditures on its economy; that a United Nations facility be set up for the evaluation of the military expenditures, to review the data gathered in this way. France put forward ideas along these lines at the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in New York from 24 August to 11 September 1987. At a time when States are showing a

new willingness with regard to transparency, we hope that these proposals will receive a more favourable response.

141. The third buttress of disarmament is non-proliferation. In the chemical sphere, proliferation has today become a major problem. Over and above export controls, the true solution lies in a convention to ban such weapons, coupled with the measures mentioned earlier for encouraging the greatest possible number of States to adhere to it.

142. That leaves an area of which we have recently become far more acutely aware, namely ballistic proliferation, that is to say, the technologies and means whereby States can acquire missile capability. The question is obviously not unrelated to the fight against nuclear proliferation, since the missiles in question could always be fitted with an atomic warhead. As we know, a certain number of industrialized countries have already endeavoured to design a régime to prevent such proliferation. But this régime suffers from being too narrow in scope and binds only a small number of industrialized States at this time. We believe that this important problem calls for serious consideration. We intend to put forward proposals on this point at the appropriate time.

143. Another major responsibility of the international community in regard to disarmament concerns the negotiations, which must by their nature concern all. I would mention three areas in this connection.

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

144. First, outer space. I have already spoken of the importance that we attach to the current negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on space-based defence systems. We know how difficult they are, and we are well aware of the issues at stake. The 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems bound only the Soviet Union and the United States, but it has gradually heightened the awareness of the international community as a whole of the close relationship that exists between the means to ensure security on Earth and the development of space defences.

145. The States as a group cannot remain indifferent to any legal régime that might apply to future military activities in space. For that reason, it must not be negotiated by only two of them.

146. In the short run, where space is concerned the international community could play a greater role in three directions: the reaffirmation and development of the principle of non-interference with non-aggressive space activities; the framing of a code of good conduct in space designed to prevent accidents and allay fears that might arise out of certain manoeuvres by objects in space; and the strengthening of the system of notification laid down by the 1975 Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space [*resolution 3235 (XXIX), annex*], with a view to achieving greater transparency. I believe that it would be desirable for the Conference on Disarmament to undertake a serious review of these questions straight away.

147. The talks on chemical weapons should also be mentioned here. We would be willing, in order to make the future convention as universal as possible, to embark right away on a discussion of procedures for assistance with respect both to protection against the use of chemical weapons and to the destruction of munitions and installations. This assistance could, for example, be provided by the permanent members of the Security Council.

148. Similarly, the prohibition of biological weapons should also be an item for new discussions on the part of the international community. As a preliminary, I would suggest that a group of experts meet to devise a procedure to be followed in the event of an alleged use of biological substances.

149. The Conference on Disarmament is the multi-lateral forum for talks on disarmament. It is naturally up to the Conference itself to improve its organization, as it is important to preserve its autonomy *vis-à-vis* the United Nations. I do not mean that it should modify the decalogue of its agenda. On the other hand, we are open both to an intensification of its work and to a concerted broadening of the Conference.

150. But, beyond the Conference itself, we need to examine the role of the United Nations as a whole with regard to disarmament: respect for the Charter is the *sine qua non* for progress towards disarmament, inasmuch as it cannot be treated in isolation from the evolving relationships between States.

151. There is a third role that the United Nations can play in the field of negotiations, namely, the harmonization of regional efforts. I firmly believe that if the document of this third special session is to be both realistic and innovative, it ought to stress the crucial importance of regional limitations on conventional arms, the contribution that confidence-building measures can make in the conventional arena, and demonstrate here, too, that disarmament is not for the powerful alone.

152. Disarmament research is another area in which the United Nations has a major role to play. We have been the instigators of important initiatives in the past, but we must now move forward. The French delegation will have occasion to spell out our views, *inter alia*, on the rationalization of certain institutions such as the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and UNIDIR.

153. The last area in which the international community could assert itself would be solidarity among the States with regard to disarmament, by following through efforts undertaken with regard to the relationship between disarmament and development. France, through the voice of its President, has made clear the importance it attaches to this undertaking. Further progress is desirable. Apart from my earlier proposal to oversee military budgets, I propose to examine in greater depth three ideas which we believe important: the evaluation of savings that could be made over the next 10 years as a result of possible agreements in the chemical, conventional or nuclear spheres; the inclusion in disarmament agreements of clauses providing for an indication of how hoped-for dividends might be reallocated; and the

utilization of the human and technological skills of the armed forces of different countries for development purposes and humanitarian undertakings.

154. I agree that these proposals may look rather modest. But we have seen the difficulties that are raised by attempts to define the triangular relationship between disarmament, security and development. It is to the credit of last summer's conference on disarmament and development that it contributed, for the first time, to the removal of some doubts and to the definition of certain guidelines.

155. Is it not something of a paradox to lavish so much effort on disarmament talks while displaying only resignation and sometimes even indifference when the tragic problems of poverty, hunger and debt are broached in international forums?

156. Such are France's thinking and proposals for achieving progress towards disarmament within the framework of the United Nations, in other words, to make progress towards greater unity among nations.

157. Peace, which is the *raison d'être* of the Organization, cannot proceed from the cold rule of empires and condominiums, or be confused with the silent desolation that flows from hunger and poverty.

158. Peace, for which we all yearn, rests upon two pillars: respect for all the provisions of the Charter and recognition of the right of each nation to sovereignty and to security. These goals deserve the mobilization of our energies and our dedication; they are both fertile and accessible.

159. Disarmament is one of the ways to facilitate their achievement. For that, however, it must be conceived neither as a virtuous excuse for remaining passive in the face of the inevitable violence of the world, nor as a seal of honourable intentions, exempting those who display zeal for it in words from genuinely working for the emergence of a more just and more fraternal international society.

160. We must never forget that weapons, be they nuclear or conventional, are the fruit, not the source, of violence, which is itself born of political, economic and social disorder. Despair in the face of injustice will always find the weapons of revolt, if only a stone is gathered by the roadside.

161. The only worthwhile disarmament is one which, here and now, with the means at hand, and mindful of today's constraints, serves the cause of justice. It is not a disarmament which, preferring to neglect the realities of the world, chooses to abdicate in the name of promises that are only meant to be kept in some distant future.

162. Mr. FISCHER (German Democratic Republic):\* Mr. President, it gives me satisfaction to see you presiding over the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Allow me to wish the Secretary-General much success in his continued efforts to strengthen the United Nations and also to convey to him our personal best wishes. My appreciation goes to Mr. Ahmed for the initiative

\*Mr. Fischer spoke in German. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.



and dedication he has shown in the preparation of this session.

163. The third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament is taking place in a period that is crucial for further international developments.

164. The meeting in Moscow between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan has given a strong impetus to the world-wide strivings for a radical shift from competitive armament to an enduring and dynamic disarmament process. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Erich Honecker, declared, immediately after the conclusion of the summit meeting:

“Everything that was agreed in Moscow with the mandate of the allies of the Soviet Union or has been initiated for future accords on disarmament and détente and for improving the international situation makes peace more secure”.

As the highest representative of the citizens and policy of the socialist German State said:

“These are results that benefit not only the USSR and the United States but all peoples. They are eloquent proof of what can be achieved through political dialogue, despite all differences of views. The results of Moscow encourage us in the German Democratic Republic in our efforts to do everything possible to dismantle confrontation and mistrust, to develop mutually beneficial co-operation and not to allow new tragedies of war.”

165. Above all, the process of nuclear disarmament must be continued without hiatus. The need for the worldwide elimination of nuclear weaponry by the end of this millennium has become the maxim of the outgoing century.

166. In view of the fact that States are becoming more and more dependent on one another, that scientific and technological progress is going on and that there are weapons which, if used, would threaten all life on Earth, there is an increasing awareness that lasting security can no longer be achieved by means other than political and that it is the common security of all States that has to be achieved. Political solutions are taking shape for regional conflicts that have been going on for years. Thus the military factor keeps losing ground in international politics. Millions of people, non-governmental organizations and political, scientific, cultural and religious figures speak out in favour of ridding the world once and for all of the all-threatening scourge of the arms race.

167. Now that the Soviet Union and the United States have concluded the Treaty on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, for the first time in human history the vision of a world without nuclear weapons and violence is beginning to become a reality. This Treaty meets with strong support all over the world. The German Democratic Republic has contributed its share to making the Treaty become a reality and is now doing all in its power for its implementation. Thus, even

before the Treaty's entry into force, the withdrawal took place from its territory of those missiles that had to be deployed there in response to the appearance of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western European countries. The demolition of those missiles began weeks ago. One of the sites used for those weapons in the German Democratic Republic has already been converted into a holiday centre. This shows how disarmament can be of immediate and tangible benefit to the people.

168. It should be a concern of this special session to help give substance to the concept of “security through disarmament”. The Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament has already charted the course to be followed. The third special session on disarmament will live up to what people expect of it if it leads to a wide-ranging dialogue on the basic aspects of disarmament and to a programme of action setting out the path to be pursued.

169. Bilateral, regional or multilateral disarmament negotiations can be successful only if all participants really have the desire to reach substantive results. It is only in this way that generally acceptable solutions can be found even for difficult problems. This was illustrated by the Declaration on the Enhancement of the Effectiveness of the Principle of Refraining from the Threat or Use of Force in International Relations [*resolution 42/22, annex*], as well as by the results of last year's International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. This is also borne out by the 25-year record of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water<sup>6</sup> and by the twentieth anniversary of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*].

170. The international situation still continues to be contradictory as humanity remains threatened by the destructive potential already accumulated. A nuclear war would spell the doom of all civilization. Wars waged with other weapons of mass destruction or with conventional weapons would also have catastrophic consequences.

171. Science and technology keep bringing forth new means of destruction at a faster pace than disarmament accords can be achieved. Even at this stage huge resources and a great deal of creative thinking are required to eliminate the accumulated arsenals without doing harm to mankind. Still worse, adherence to so-called doctrines of deterrence makes the search for practicable and immediately workable disarmament accords far more difficult. Consequently, endeavours to compensate for the first nuclear disarmament accord by an intensified arms buildup in other directions or under cover of “modernization” must cause concern. The peoples do not want a mere shifting of the threat from an area where it is clearly felt to areas where it is less obvious. What the peoples want rather is the verifiable elimination, once and for all, of everything that menaces their continued existence.

172. With good reason attention is increasingly being drawn to the fact that the foundations of human existence are under deliberate or accidental

threat not only from the potential use of military power. Directly related to this is the continuous worsening of the economic situation, notably in the developing countries, as well as energy and ecological problems, all of which jeopardize the peaceful coexistence of peoples. While the arms race swallows up the gigantic sum of \$2.5 billion every day, one quarter of mankind lives in poverty, with one in ten people suffering from malnutrition.

173. There is a growing awareness that for global problems to be solved, all States have to work together in a constructive spirit and that resources have to be released on a substantial scale through genuine disarmament. Therefore, the efforts to overcome underdevelopment, achieve just solutions to acute international economic problems and democratize international economic relations become increasingly intertwined with the struggle for peace and disarmament. There is an insistent call for co-operation on the basis of equality with a view to ensuring the economic security and steady development of all countries.

174. That goal would also be served by a comprehensive system of international peace and security established on the basis of the principles of equality, equal security, balanced interests and mutual advantage. This presupposes changes in the thinking and action of nations. It calls for bold ideas and actions in the spirit of what Albert Einstein viewed as a necessary consequence of the nuclear age.

175. The Warsaw Treaty States, when they met at Berlin in May 1987, made a major contribution to that goal by revealing the principles underlying their military doctrine, which is strictly defensive in nature in that it is solely geared to repelling armed aggression. The Warsaw Treaty States also called upon all nuclear Powers to pledge that they will refrain from the first use of nuclear weapons and eventually completely renounce any use of such weapons. The military forces of all States should comply with the standards of incapacity for attack. That would considerably improve conditions for disarmament.

176. When the German Democratic Republic time and again presses for dialogue and co-operation in Europe, it does so not least because of its exposed situation at the dividing-line between the two most powerful military coalitions. There can be no doubt that the use of even a fraction of the thousands of nuclear and chemical weapons in existence, indeed the use of only the conventional arms concentrated there, would turn the European continent into a wasteland. And, unlike the consequences of the First and Second World Wars, the worldwide aftermath would be incalculable. Every country would be affected, no matter whether it had been directly involved in a nuclear conflict or not, no matter whether it had been in the midst of it or on the margin. Moreover, is it not obvious from current political and military conflicts how hard it is to keep them in check or settle them peacefully once they have erupted?

177. Therefore, the Warsaw Treaty States suggested at Sofia that all States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe enter into

negotiations this year on drastic cuts in armed forces and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals in the framework of the Conference process and publish data on their armaments.

178. I reiterate from this rostrum that never again must war, but only peace, emanate from German soil. That is the supreme maxim of the socialist German State; it is inherent in the nature of socialism and is based on the lessons of history.

179. That is why the German Democratic Republic has, over the years, launched one initiative after another in order to promote disarmament and security at the global and regional level. Later this month, to emphasize, as it were, the purpose of this special session, an international meeting for nuclear-weapon-free zones will be held in the capital of the German Democratic Republic. Its purpose will be to advance the dialogue and foster common action between all forces which favour a nuclear-weapon-free world. The fact that representatives from more than 100 States have already promised to attend is evidence of the need for intensive exchanges of views and experience on practical ways that will lead to a world free of nuclear arms.

180. Increasing efforts by many other peoples and countries to create nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace in the Indian Ocean, in Africa, the South Atlantic and elsewhere encourage us to take regional initiatives in Europe. The treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga show that such projects are practicable and effective.

181. Together with the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic has proposed to the Federal Republic of Germany the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in Central Europe. With the double-zero solution in regard to intermediate-range missiles in place, such an undertaking would acquire even more importance. In a letter dated 16 December 1987 to Helmut Kohl, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Erich Honecker stated, in this connection:

“Let me once more reaffirm the German Democratic Republic’s abiding interest in seeing nuclear disarmament in Europe spread without delay to additional categories. The nuclear weapons systems with ranges under 500 kilometres do indeed affect the two German States in a particular measure. This circumstance was one that guided the German Democratic Republic in submitting its proposal on denuclearization in Central Europe.”

182. The German Democratic Republic is ready, as a matter of principle, to proceed from one zero solution to the other on the basis of equality and equal security. I repeat, there must be no hiatus in the arms limitation and disarmament process.

183. That is also our approach in seeking a chemical-weapon-free zone in Central Europe. The German Democratic Republic possesses no chemical weapons and has no such weapons from other States stationed on its territory. It is neither engaged in the development of chemical weapons nor has it facilities to produce them.

184. The establishment of such a zone would be an important stimulus to achieve a global ban of such weapons. Only recently the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia renewed their proposal to enter, without delay, into result-oriented negotiations with the Federal Republic of Germany on removing chemical weapons from the territories of the three countries or keeping their territories free of these weapons. In that context, provisions of the chemical weapons convention already agreed upon at Geneva, including those on verification, could be helpful or tried out in practice. What is needed now is to begin negotiations on those proposals as soon as possible.

185. The prohibition of chemical weapons is overdue. We share the widespread concern over the start of the production of binary chemical weapons and over concepts envisaging the setting-up of security stocks. Such concepts run directly counter to the efforts to conclude a convention banning all chemical weapons, a convention to which the German Democratic Republic would accede immediately.

186. This special session should be an occasion for speeding up the relevant negotiations which have lately slowed down. It could, for example, recommend to the Conference on Disarmament that it hold a session at the foreign minister level and discuss specific measures with a view to finalizing the convention without delay. To prevent the further spread of chemical weapons, the German Democratic Republic in 1987 adopted regulations governing the export of specific chemicals.

187. A multilateral exchange of data and trial inspections would not only improve the negotiating climate but would provide important experience in regard to the practical implementation of such a convention. A contribution to that end was made by the German Democratic Republic last year when it was host to an international seminar of experts which included a visit to a chemical plant. At present arrangements are being made in the German Democratic Republic to ensure that data on the chemicals covered by the convention may be presented at the summer session of the Conference on Disarmament and that a trial inspection may be held in the Republic.

188. The prospects for a cessation of nuclear-weapon tests have improved. We expect the Soviet-American negotiations to lead soon to a reduction in the number and yield of tests. Parallel with those negotiations, the Conference on Disarmament should prepare the ground for a comprehensive solution by working out, as a first step, a comprehensive international verification system for a nuclear-test ban.

189. Outer space must not become an arena for an arms race in the twenty-first century. That is the desire of almost all States and peoples. That aim must also be served by the Soviet-American negotiations in conformity with their mandate of 8 January 1985.<sup>7</sup> At the same time negotiations on the subject should be taken up within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. The prohibition of anti-satellite weapons, proposed by the German Democratic Republic and the Mongolian People's

Republic last year, could be a first step in that direction.

190. In our view, greater openness in military matters is needed in order to reduce mistrust in international relations and replace it with an atmosphere of predictability. The process of confidence-building is, for instance, being advanced by the fact that in the course of realizing the 1986 Stockholm Document a number of businesslike contacts have developed between military representatives of the Warsaw Treaty States and those of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as well as of neutral and non-aligned countries. It is now high time to agree on further confidence- and security-building measures within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which should also cover naval and air forces.

191. Any disarmament measure requires verification, and it is not only the experts who are agreed about that. We see the main purpose of verification as strengthening confidence in the fulfilment of the respective agreements and providing a major guarantee for international security. The German Democratic Republic is therefore ready for all measures of verification that serve disarmament.

192. The United Nations is called upon to become the guarantor of comprehensive international security in all phases of an effective disarmament process and of world peace. The German Democratic Republic therefore welcomes the proposal of the Six-Nation Initiative to establish an international verification system within the United Nations. The elaboration of a relevant United Nations study could be a useful step to that end.

193. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development adopted useful recommendations which are of direct relevance to the creation of comprehensive security. In this context we support the setting up of a disarmament for development fund and the holding of a Security Council meeting at the highest level.

194. The German Democratic Republic deems it necessary to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and advocates greater effectiveness of the international disarmament bodies, especially the Conference on Disarmament.

195. The activities of the United Nations in educating and informing the international public about all aspects of the arms race and of disarmament promote disarmament and strengthen the forces working for it. Declaring the 1990s a decade for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world would greatly contribute towards that goal.

196. To sum up, the German Democratic Republic favours a substantive and concrete final document that will set out speedy solutions, as well as longer-term tasks. Priority steps are, in our view, the following: first, to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, eliminate all nuclear weapons and prevent an arms race in outer space; secondly, to reduce armed forces and conventional armaments, including the banning of chemical and other means of mass destruction and

of weapons with a high destructive potential; thirdly, to halt the naval arms race and remove foreign military bases; fourthly, to renounce destabilizing arms technologies; fifthly, to create confidence-building, openness and predictability in military matters, as well as a constant and comprehensive verification of all disarmament measures and of the remaining military potentials; and sixthly, to release funds through disarmament and use them for the economic and social development of peoples, especially in the developing countries.

197. This special session commits the United Nations Member States, large and small, to engaging in a broad-based dialogue on the military aspects of the establishment of comprehensive security and related questions. Let us seize this chance and together search for solutions to ensure the survival of mankind. The German Democratic Republic is ready to contribute its share to that endeavour.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>United Nations publication, Sales No. E.87.IX.8.

<sup>2</sup>Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (resolution 31/72, annex).

<sup>3</sup>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 (see *The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, vol. 5: 1980 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.81.IX.4), appendix VII).

<sup>4</sup>United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, vol. 944, No. 13446.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, vol. 480, No. 6964.

<sup>7</sup>See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Supplement No. 27 (A/40/27 and Corr. 1)*, appendix II (CD/642/Appendix II/Vol. II), documents CD/570 and CD/571.