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The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 8 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): On behalf of the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic and on my own behalf I should like at the outset to express to you, Sir, our deep satisfaction on your election to preside over this important special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are confident that the wisdom and ability that you showed in guiding the deliberations of the forty-second session of the General Assembly and its resumed meeting are the best guarantee for the achievement of the success of this session, to which the peoples of the world are looking with great expectations because its conclusions will undoubtedly reflect the political will of Member States to achieve world peace for the prosperity of all mankind.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations, on his untiring efforts to strengthen the pioneering role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the realization of justice and respect for law in international relations.
I express my appreciation also to Mr. Yasushi Akashi, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament, for his efforts to promote United Nations activities and to increase world awareness of the importance of disarmament and its dimensions. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate him on the excellent preparations he has made for this special session.

The questions of disarmament are the most pressing questions of our present time since the world has been turned into a huge arsenal of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass-destruction. The world today, which is capable of providing a better standard of living for people everywhere through technological progress, at the same time possesses the horrible means to end all manifestations of life on earth. The achievement of real and essential progress in the matter of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, the neutralization and prohibition of the militarization of outer space, and the elimination of all forms and manifestations of aggression, racism, foreign domination and occupation are matters of urgent necessity.

The question of nuclear disarmament is closely linked with the cause of international peace and comprehensive security. The achievement of peace necessarily means the creation of a world free of nuclear weapons. The link between those two concepts should constitute a solid basis for contemporary political thinking.

International aspirations for peace and security in fact express man's desire to live a normal life free from all forms of nuclear threat and other forms of aggression such as racism, foreign domination and occupation. This desire has led to man's determination to survive, to preserve the achievements of his civilization, and to provide a better future for succeeding generations, since the antithesis of peace is nuclear armament and its continuation with all its threats...
of destruction. Therefore, real and durable peace cannot be established unless we
rid ourselves of nuclear weapons once and for all. The link between peace and
disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, proves that the doctrine of nuclear
deterrence is without foundation; it is a theory which, by its very nature,
produces the real terror in which mankind is living. It threatens his existence
and that of succeeding generations. The Heads of State or Government of
Non-Aligned Countries reaffirmed that fact in their summit conference held at
Harare, Zimbabwe, in September 1986. The Final Document stated:

"The idea that world peace can be maintained through nuclear deterrence,
a doctrine that lies at the root of the continuing escalation in the quantity
and quality of nuclear weapons and which has, in fact, led to greater
insecurity and instability in international relations than ever before, is the
most dangerous myth in existence." (A/41/697, annex, Political Declaration,
para. 33)

The ratification of the Washington 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 is of special importance since it is
the first treaty on the elimination of a given category of nuclear weapons. In
addition, it constitutes a crucial step, one which expresses the capability of the
parties concerned to strengthen confidence in the realization of more achievements
with a view to general and complete nuclear disarmament. Such confidence is an
indispensable element in eradicating all the vague notions and unrealistic thoughts
that are impeding the establishment of a world free from nuclear weapons. This
achievement is a good start towards the realization of other achievements. It also
represents a conscious choice for the benefit of mankind in a very sensitive and
dangerous field.
Undoubtedly, the realization of significant accomplishments in the field of disarmament provides the necessary climate for development, progress and prosperity for all peoples. Disarmament and development have become the major challenges facing the international community in our time. The international community will either continue wasting its resources in the production and stockpiling of means of destruction and death while millions of men, women and children are deprived of their fundamental right to satisfy the essential needs for food and life, or it must transfer its resources to construction and development.

The INF Treaty must open the way to more significant action to eliminate all nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and must contribute effectively to the protection of outer space from the arms race with a view to preserving it exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

The question of the prohibition of the militarization of outer space is a very serious and crucial one. The international community has repeatedly expressed its firm opposition to the "Star Wars" programme as well as to the extension of the arms race to outer space. This programme, which constitutes a direct threat to peace and to the interests of mankind, is aggravated by Israel's participation in it. Its participation has become a more and more active one in the schemes of that programme, which provides Israel with the facilities to acquire the most sophisticated technology in the use of nuclear arms, thus increasing its nuclear military capability and strengthening its aggressive, expansionist policies and practices in the occupied Arab territories.

Outer space, as the common heritage of all mankind, should be protected from the arms race and should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of all countries and all peoples.
The production and proliferation of nuclear weapons have become a matter of concern for the international community, and in particular a special concern for the non-nuclear-weapon countries.

The exacerbation of the phenomenon of the proliferation of nuclear weapons makes it incumbent upon the international community to take effective measures as quickly as possible to curb this phenomenon and to enhance the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States, including international, legal and political measures that provide guarantees to these countries to protect them against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. This question should be given the highest priority because such measures would greatly contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of international peace and security and reduce the risk of the use of nuclear weapons.

Needless to say, the way towards the establishment of an international order free from nuclear weapons requires effective and balanced action to realize the prerequisites of, inter alia, strict adherence by nuclear-weapon States to the principle of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. This principle has not been respected by some nuclear-weapon States, which have contributed to the proliferation of nuclear military technology and the fabrication of nuclear weapons. That is the case with Israel and South Africa, which benefited from the direct or indirect assistance of certain States which provided them with military nuclear technology and enabled them to produce nuclear weapons in spite of the General Assembly's repeated calls for all States to discontinue all forms of co-operation with and assistance to those two régimes in this field.

At this time I should like to draw attention to paragraph 12 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was reaffirmed
in the final document of the twelfth special session and in which the General Assembly stated:

"the massive accumulation of armaments and the acquisition of armaments technology by racist régimes, as well as their possible acquisition of nuclear weapons, present a challenging and increasingly dangerous obstacle to a world community faced with the urgent need to disarm. It is, therefore, essential for purposes of disarmament to prevent any further acquisition of arms or arms technology by such régimes, especially through strict adherence by all States to relevant decisions of the Security Council." (resolution S-10/2, para. 12)

The military nuclear capacity of the Tel Aviv régime and the close collaboration between it and the Pretoria régime in the field of military nuclear activities is a serious and grave threat not only to the African and Arab peoples but to international peace and security.

The Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their eighth summit conference, held at Harare, Zimbabwe, in September 1986, strongly condemned the increasing co-operation between South Africa and Israel. They noted the similarity of repressive measures such as the policies of the iron fist and hot pursuit practised by both régimes against the peoples of South Africa, Namibia, Palestine, southern Lebanon and the Arab territories occupied by Israel. The Heads of State or Government called upon all States to refrain from co-operation with the régimes of Pretoria and Tel Aviv in the nuclear field, since such co-operation constitutes a threat to international peace and security. They also recalled the resolutions adopted at the fortieth session of the General Assembly, which reaffirmed its condemnation of the continuing nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa and expressed its awareness of the grave consequences for international peace and security of Israel’s collaboration with South Africa in the development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.
Israel's refusal to comply with the international community's will, as embodied in the United Nations resolutions, in particular the final documents of the tenth and twelfth special sessions of the General Assembly and its resolution 42/44 of December 1987, and the decisions of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in particular the resolution adopted at its thirty-first Conference, held in Vienna, Austria, last year, in which that Agency called upon Israel to place its nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards, has contributed to increased tension in the region and impeded the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East.

A comprehensive nuclear-test ban is a matter of the highest priority for all mankind, and it has a special importance in curbing the nuclear-arms race and protecting mankind and its environment from its impact. A comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is one of the most urgent requirements for achieving nuclear disarmament.

The question of the prohibition of the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons is urgent, as these represent one of the greatest threats to mankind and its environment. Urgent sustained efforts should be made to accelerate the achievement of a complete ban on such lethal weapons. The Syrian Arab Republic vigorously condemns the production, stockpiling and use of these weapons.

In this regard, I should like to draw the attention of Members of the Assembly to a certain type of tear gas used by the Israeli occupation troops against the population of the occupied Arab territories which causes death and miscarriages among the population. The United Nations is called upon to investigate this horrible matter and to take the necessary measures to protect the Arab population of the occupied territories from such brutal exercises.
The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones greatly contributes to the reduction of the danger of nuclear confrontation, minimizing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, limiting the transportation of such weapons and strengthening the non-proliferation régime. The Syrian Arab Republic has always strongly supported the establishment of such zones, in particular in Africa and the Middle East, where the nuclear armaments of the Pretoria and Tel Aviv régimes constitute a direct threat to peace and security in those two regions. The Syrian Arab Republic has always supported the proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to make the Korean peninsula a zone of peace, free from foreign military bases and nuclear weapons.

The arms race is a serious obstacle to the establishment of normal international relations based on balanced and mutual confidence and a grave destabilizing factor in the political, economic and social fields. The maintenance of international peace and security cannot be achieved through the arms race. It can be achieved only through the realization of rights, the establishment of justice and the elimination of all forms and manifestations of aggression, racism, foreign domination and occupation, and by enabling peoples to exercise their right to self-determination and to enjoy their natural resources in an atmosphere free from terror, fear and threat.

We hope that this session will be able to meet the expectations of all the peace-loving peoples of the world.

Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia): It gives me great pleasure warmly to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as President of this very important special session of the General Assembly. It is my firm conviction that your vast experience and knowledge will undoubtedly contribute to the success of the session.
Mr. Dugersuren, Mongolia

My Government highly commends the untiring services of the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in the interests of peace and security and wishes him every success.

This third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament is taking place in a relatively favourable international environment. The world situation is characterized by a growing spirit of realism and by strengthening the principles of peaceful coexistence on the basis of respect for the right of peoples freely to determine their own destiny.

Initial positive trends can be seen in the application of new approaches vis-à-vis the cardinal issues of peace and security in the interests of universal values. The Treaty on the elimination of Soviet and American intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles, which has just entered into force, represents the first historic step towards real nuclear disarmament. The Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, has provided a fresh impetus to the efforts to conclude a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction of Soviet and American strategic offensive arms and agreements on strengthening the régime of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty. At the meeting further progress was recorded in the improvement of Soviet-American relations, which has an important positive bearing on the stabilization of the world situation as a whole.

The statement made at this session by Comrade Shevardnadze, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, sets out a wide range of measures designed to expand and intensify the disarmament process and to build common security on a qualitatively new level. All those are first steps in the materialization of the new political thinking in the solution of urgent world problems in the spirit of the United Nations Charter.
At the same time the international situation continues to be complex. Nuclear weapons still pose a threat to mankind's existence. The proponents of the policy of confrontation and nuclear deterrence harbour schemes to compensate for the nuclear missiles being eliminated and to perfect other types of nuclear weapons, as well as chemical and conventional armaments. The policy of neo-globalism is strongly manifested in many parts of the world. The deterioration of the economic situation of the developing countries and their external debt become ever more acute.

Given such a state of affairs, the current special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament is faced with complex and urgent tasks. Its main goal, in the Mongolian delegation's view, is the elaboration of concrete and effective disarmament measures, above all nuclear disarmament. In this connection, the current session should build on the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, held in 1978, and should further develop those provisions in conformity with present circumstances and imperatives.

My delegation believes that a sound basis for that work would be the memorandum entitled "Security through disarmament", submitted at this session by the delegations of the countries members of the Warsaw Treaty organization (A/S-15/26), and the final communiqué of the Special Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Havana from 26 to 30 May of this year (A/S-15/27). There are also valuable proposals and views introduced by other countries, including the action plan submitted yesterday by India.

Permit me to substantiate the views of the Mongolian Government on the main problems set forth as priority tasks in the aforementioned documents.
Nuclear disarmament is the main road to creating the foundations of a comprehensive system of international peace and common security. It is necessary that this session elaborate a phased nuclear disarmament programme for the purpose of the complete elimination by the year 2000 of all nuclear weapons.

We expect that this session will call upon the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to conclude in the shortest possible period a treaty on the radical reduction of their strategic offensive arms. My delegation proposes that the present session make an appeal to the other nuclear-weapon States to take concrete steps to participate in the efforts aimed at achieving the objectives of nuclear disarmament. As first steps these States should join the declaration of the USSR and the United States on the inadmissibility of a nuclear war. Those nuclear States which have not undertaken an obligation to refrain from the first use of nuclear weapons should follow the example of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China. In this connection my delegation submits that the present session could make a recommendation to the Security Council to explore the possibility of elaborating a legal document on the question of non-first use of nuclear weapons which would be acceptable to all the nuclear States. We propose that this session should also call upon all States, particularly the nuclear and so-called near-nuclear States which have not yet done so, to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty.

The Mongolian People's Republic views the complete prohibition of nuclear tests as an effective means of nuclear disarmament. It welcomes the progress at the Soviet-United States full-scale, step-by-step negotiations on the issues relating to nuclear testing and endorses the ultimate goal pursued by those Powers. My Government supports the efforts of the members of the Six-Nation
Initiative designed to establish an integrated verification system for the effective prohibition of nuclear tests.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones constitutes an important measure of disarmament. Such zones and corridors help to reduce the threat of nuclear conflicts and restrict the territorial spread of nuclear weapons. The Mongolian People's Republic calls upon all those nuclear Powers which have not yet signed the respective protocols to the Rarotonga Treaty to follow the example of the USSR and the People's Republic of China, which have signed those documents. My delegation proposes that the current session call upon the nuclear Powers to withdraw their nuclear weapons from foreign territories.

The Mongolian delegation expects that the current session will come out for the strengthening of the treaties and agreements on preventing an arms race in outer space. It advocates the immediate beginning of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the questions of establishing an international verification system for the prevention of the introduction of weapons into outer space and concluding an international agreement on the prohibition of anti-satellite weapons. The creation of a world space organization would represent a significant step in maintaining outer space as a zone of peace and co-operation in the interests of all countries.

Mongolia considers the complete prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons as one of the most urgent tasks. It condemns the use of this abhorrent weapon and stands for the strengthening of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

My delegation is of the opinion that there is a real possibility of completing as early as this year the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition and complete elimination of chemical weapons, provided all participants in the negotiations display in equal measure the necessary political will. It is quite evident that the only way to save mankind from this dangerous type of weapon lies
not through the production of new types of such weapons or retaining so-called strategic stocks, but through its complete elimination. In this connection, allow me to state that the Mongolian People's Republic does not possess chemical weapons and will not produce or acquire them. My delegation entertains the hope that the current session will exert efforts designed to give a fresh impetus to the negotiations on the elimination of chemical weapons.

The reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces on the basis of the concept of reasonable sufficiency is assuming ever greater significance. We support all efforts for the implementation of regional, subregional, bilateral and national measures in this field.

The urgent necessity of taking such measures is dictated in particular by the process that is going on of obliterating the distinction between conventional weapons and weapons of mass annihilation in terms of their destructive power. In this connection my delegation reiterates its proposal that the General Assembly should advocate the elaboration of an international agreement on the prohibition of the production of new categories of conventional weapons of especially destructive power.

We maintain that a phased programme for the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, as put forward at this session by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, constitutes a good basis for the resolution of this vital problem.

Though the Mongolian People's Republic is a landlocked country, it is by no means indifferent to the naval arms race. It considers that negotiations on this problem should be started without delay. A positive solution of the problem would have a direct bearing on the prevention of the territorial spread of nuclear weapons and on the liquidation of military bases outside national boundaries. One of the important tasks before the present special session is to adopt concrete
recommendations aimed at the full implementation of the Programme of Action approved by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The Mongolian delegation is of the opinion that the United Nations regional economic commissions, within their mandate, could play an important role in elaborating and encouraging regional measures in favour of disarmament for development. The Mongolian People's Republic fully supports the proposal on convening a summit meeting of the members of the Security Council to discuss the problems of disarmament and development in their entirety as well as the idea of establishing in the United Nations an international Disarmament for Development fund open to all States.
It is important that the special session reaffirm the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the process of disarmament. A concrete step in that direction can be made by the implementation of the proposal for the creation, under United Nations auspices, of a comprehensive and effective verification system with regard to the implementation of disarmament agreements as well as for the settlement of conflict situations. The realization of the proposal put forward by the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, on the establishment within the Organization of a multilateral nuclear alert centre would serve the objective of strengthening the peace-making role of the United Nations.

The strengthening of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament has a direct bearing on the enhancement of the efficiency of the work of the Conference on Disarmament. The Mongolian delegation supports the measures proposed in the document submitted by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty on this question.

The Mongolian People's Republic traditionally attaches great importance to combining the efforts of the United Nations with the struggle of mass public movements for peace and disarmament. The Mongolian delegation therefore welcomes the participation in the work of the special session of representatives from a large number of non-governmental organizations.

The Week devoted to fostering the objectives of disarmament held annually in accordance with the decision of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has become an important part of United Nations efforts to mobilize world public opinion in support of the cessation of the arms race and disarmament. We are satisfied that the United Nations is paying increasing attention to the observance of that important event, as is pointed out in the report of the United Nations Secretary-General (A/S-15/8).

The United Nations Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace, which was adopted in 1984 at the initiative of the Mongolian People's Republic, provides a
legal, moral and political basis for the movement of world public opinion in favour of peace and disarmament. It should be noted that the Declaration invites Governments to promote the realization of the right concerned.

The World Disarmament Campaign has a particularly important role to play in the further mobilization of the public in the struggle for disarmament. My country strives to take an active part in the activities conducted within the framework of the Campaign.

The measures for strengthening confidence, particularly on the regional level, are acquiring greater significance in the creation of favourable conditions for further progress in the disarmament field. The European process, and especially the outcome of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, serves as a good example in this regard. My delegation underlines the topicality of the proposals to establish nuclear-free zones in the Balkans and in central and northern Europe, and on creating zones of enhanced confidence and lower density of armaments along the lines of contact between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The Mongolian People's Republic is a firm advocate of strengthening confidence, security and co-operation in Asia and the Pacific region. In spite of the complexity of the over-all situation in the region, we are witnessing many developments and trends that promote its improvement and the development of peaceful co-operation in the area, especially since the Vladivostok initiative taken by the Soviet Union. The Mongolian People's Republic supports all constructive efforts in that direction. For its part, Mongolia advanced the proposal on the establishment of international machinery ruling out the use of force in relations between States of Asia and the Pacific Ocean. The political settlement of the regional conflicts that unfortunately plague the Asian continent
today is of paramount significance in this regard. The signing of the Geneva
Agreements on the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan represents an
event of historic importance. That development provides a convincing demonstration
of the possibility of resolving a conflict situation no matter how complicated it
may be. It is most imperative for all parties strictly and fully to fulfil the
obligations they have undertaken. Only in that way can international conditions
for the development of the Republic of Afghanistan along the road to peace and
progress be ensured. Only in that way can an important component of the system of
peace and security in Asia and the Pacific region be established.

The Mongolian People's Republic welcomes the positive changes emerging in the
efforts to achieve a political settlement of the situation around Kampuchea on the
basis of the national reconciliation policy pursued by the Government of the
People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The well-known peace proposals by the Soviet Union, the three countries of
Indo-China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the States members of the
Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the other States of Asia and
the Pacific, constitute a basis for the struggle of the peoples of the continent to
strengthen over-all Asian security.

I should like to stress particularly the significance of the initiatives on
the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East, in South-East Asia,
on the Korean peninsula and other parts of the region. The Mongolian People's
Republic favours the convening not later than 1990 of an international conference
on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. The questions of disarmament and
security in the Asian and Pacific regions now deserve the same increasing attention
as the region's growing role in world development.

We express the hope that the special session will give a steady and increasing
momentum to the disarmament process.
Mr. KAFE (Comoros) (interpretation from French): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to renew to you, on behalf of my delegation, our warm congratulations on the wise choice the General Assembly made in entrusting you with the conduct of our work. There is no doubt that your experience and your readiness for dialogue will be most useful to us in dealing with so complex an issue as that of disarmament.
I should also like to express here my country's great appreciation of the
tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, to preserve
world peace.

It is now two years since we solemnly marked the fortieth anniversary of the
United Nations. It was also the fortieth anniversary of the first use of nuclear
weapons.

Since then, while another world war has been avoided, there has continued to
be insufficient progress towards disarmament or the limitation of armaments. We
have every right to deplore that, since the first purpose of the Charter is stated
to be:

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

The United Nations is the most appropriate forum for the expression of the
will of the international community. Therefore, it is more essential than ever
that our shared aspirations be reaffirmed here. In our view, world peace and
security are their foundation.

However, by engaging in the arms race certain powers are endangering world
security, thus jeopardizing the legacy entrusted to us. Modern weapons are capable
of destroying, in a few hours or minutes, the achievements of civilization and the
whole cultural heritage of the world.

Therefore, no ideological confrontation is more important than preserving
world peace. That must be understood, for what is at stake is the interests of all.

That is why we are pleased by the new dynamism that has recently marked
relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of
America, culminating in the signing in December 1987 of a Treaty on the withdrawal
and destruction of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. It is clear that
the Treaty's implementation will be a first victory on the way towards nuclear disarmament.

Those significant results deserve our whole-hearted encouragement. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that progress in disarmament should not depend solely on those bilateral talks. Indeed, we believe that the bilateral process must be envisaged as supplementing the primary process taking place at the multilateral level. Therefore, it is up to each State to make its contribution to the collective, joint action being carried out by our Organization in the field of disarmament.

Similarly, we have been following with interest the bilateral negotiations under way to make a 50-per-cent reduction in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers. However, we are deeply concerned about increased militarization on the seas and in outer space. In those specific areas the only way to put an end to an arms race is to prevent its beginning, since it is much more difficult to reach agreement once it has begun.

Moreover, we believe that it is crucial to redouble efforts to achieve a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. We must also show that we are firmly resolved to deal seriously and quickly with other weapons of mass destruction - in particular, chemical weapons. We cannot champion human values while threatening millions of innocent human beings with blind destruction.

Conventional weapons are also playing an increasingly alarming part in the arms race, mainly because of their qualitative improvement. Therefore, there should be an examination of new technologies allowing for the perfection of a new generation of weapons of mass destruction with effects similar to those of nuclear weapons.
(Mr. Kafé, Comoros)

While waiting for the achievement of complete disarmament, the international community must ensure that the non-nuclear-weapon countries do not fall victim to that scourge. As a result, those countries have a right to demand the non-proliferation of such weapons so that they may feel safe from any kind of nuclear blackmail or nuclear attack. At the same time, the creation of demilitarized and non-nuclear-weapon zones could also contribute to reducing the danger of war.

In the light of that, my country deplores the fact that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace has still not been implemented, although implementation would undoubtedly have positive effects on relations between the States of the region and their relations with foreign Powers. That is all the more true since the overwhelming majority of the States of our subregion are newly independent countries.

My own country, the Islamic Federal Republic of the Comoros, wishes to see justice done more fully, since it has lost a part of its national territory, the Comorian island of Mayotte.

All that we hope for is that our countries may develop in unity and harmony, without being involved in any rivalry between the great Powers. We therefore support the efforts of the non-aligned countries for the convening, in 1990 at the latest, of an international conference on the Indian Ocean to bring about the attainment of the objectives of the Declaration adopted 17 years ago.

The question of implementing the denuclearization of Africa is also very important. It is nearly 25 years since the African leaders, meeting in Cairo, adopted the Cairo Declaration. We regret that it has still not been implemented. That presents a great threat to our continent, especially if it is confirmed that South Africa has nuclear weapons.
Even worse, certain industrialized countries are attempting to use our African continent as an enormous dumping ground for their nuclear and industrial wastes.

In this era of uncertainty about the future of youth and of despair for the poor and hungry, the arms race, whether nuclear or conventional, threatens the survival of mankind. Last year's International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development was a positive factor. The Conference highlighted the fact that expenditures on weapons upset the economies of countries with the result that development has become one of the main victims of the arms race. It also pointed the road to reason and rationality.

We are pleased that this special session is a further step along that road. In our view, the Assembly must commit itself to implementing the Programme of Action of the Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament. It should also create machinery to govern the transfer to development purposes of resources freed through disarmament. Finally, the special session provides an excellent opportunity to consider again all the goals we set in 1978 and to revitalize them.

Disarmament is of concern to us. We are all aware of the goals: They are set out in the Final Document. We are convinced that political decisions along those lines by Governments would enable us to reach those goals. To do this, our peoples also have their role to play.

The Charter of the United Nations begins with the words "We the peoples" because our Organization was established so that peoples could realize their aspirations through it. Disarmament is therefore the business of all.

In the nuclear age, decisions affecting war and peace cannot be left to Governments alone. Every man and every woman among us must take such decisions. It is therefore up to all of us here to break the vicious circle of distrust and insecurity in order to respond to mankind's desire for peace.
Mr. Ouko (Kenya): Since the world entered the nuclear era 43 years ago the spectre of self-destruction and the final annihilation of mankind has remained ever present. The nuclear epoch has taken on the countenance of nuclear terror. In the search for credible defence, the most destructive weapons have been developed. Others with an even greater destructive capacity are on the drawing-boards, all in the name of deterrence. We continue to worry about the future of mankind.

The present world political scene continues to be polarized. Conflicts continue unabated in Africa, the Middle East, South-East Asia and Central America; these require urgent attention and resolution. In those places several billion dollars are being wasted in building stockpiles of armaments while millions of persons suffer inhuman degradation or perish due to poverty, malnutrition and disease. It is against that backdrop that this special session has been convened to deliberate the cardinal problem of our time: disarmament.

The threat of self-destruction which mankind is facing emanates from the readiness of States to use force in the pursuit of what they conceive of as their defence needs. The only practical solution is the application of cohesive and realistic measures which will reverse the current situation and convert the crisis of confidence into a relaxation of tension.

It is in that context that I congratulate the two great leaders of the United States of America and the Soviet Union on the Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces, which was ratified a few days ago. The Treaty is not only the first agreement which will reduce the deadly arsenal of nuclear weapons; it is also a practical demonstration that where there is a will there is a way, even in the field of disarmament.
My President, His Excellency Daniel arap Moi, is a lover of peace for mankind. His philosophy of love, peace and unity has become the guiding light in Kenya's domestic activities and a pillar of Kenya's foreign policy. He believes, like President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

Kenya shares the view that the signing of the recent Soviet-United States agreement to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe and elsewhere is a significant step. We are encouraged by the possibility that a super-Power accord will be concluded in the near future for a 50-per-cent reduction in strategic offensive arms. We subscribe to the view that these agreements will together constitute the crossing of an important psychological threshold, since they would lead for the first time to mutual withdrawal and destruction of a fully operational class of nuclear-weapon system. We hope that success in these efforts will lead to further agreements on more complex issues of space and strategic nuclear arms.

Like many other countries, Kenya calls upon the super-Powers to spare no effort in implementing all their joint decisions in order to protect the security interests of the whole world and to meet the universal desire for complete disarmament.
Of paramount importance to my country is the question of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. No other issue in the field of arms control has been the subject of so much international deliberation and negotiation as that of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. Since the late 1950s, the General Assembly has adopted dozens of resolutions calling for a nuclear test ban; several of them contain an outright condemnation of tests. Thirty years of international diplomatic efforts and mass public demonstrations throughout the world against nuclear tests have resulted in agreements on only partial measures. By signing the partial test-ban Treaty, the original parties to the Treaty agreed to undertake a firm political commitment to pursue a comprehensive test ban and prohibit, prevent and refrain from carrying out any nuclear explosion covered by the Treaty at any place under their jurisdiction or control, and also to refrain from causing, encouraging or in any way participating in nuclear-weapon testing anywhere. Even though initially believed to be an occurrence of historic significance, the emergence of the partial test-ban Treaty did not slow down – and most unfortunately has not slowed down to this day – the nuclear arms race among the major nuclear Powers. On the contrary, that Treaty seems to have served only as a licence for accelerating nuclear testing despite the existence of numerous General Assembly resolutions and the continued public outcry against such testing.

In fact, well over 1,600 nuclear test explosions of different sizes and intensity have been carried out in different environments by the five nuclear-weapon Powers. Moreover, the so-called firm commitment of the parties to pursue a comprehensive test ban has never been put into effect. Similarly, the political will and the firm commitment necessary for the effective realization of agreements and decisions among nations have been eroding with respect to the implementation of decisions and resolutions of the General Assembly adopted
annually over the past quarter of a century on the question of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

The Government of Kenya, under the wise and able leadership of His Excellency President Daniel arap Moi, continues to endorse the two central messages contained in all actions taken so far by the international community on this fundamental issue. One is the conviction that, whatever the differences of opinion on the issue of verification, there are no insurmountable obstacles necessitating a delay in the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The other is the need to recognize that a comprehensive test ban would render further nuclear-weapon development virtually impossible. The race for the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons - an important channel of the super-Power arms competition - would thereby be considerably reduced. That is why my delegation has all along supported the call to establish within the Conference on Disarmament an ad hoc committee on a nuclear test ban and also on the cessation of the nuclear arms race, with an unlimited negotiating mandate, as stipulated by the General Assembly in its numerous resolutions. Short of a total ban, significant restraints on tests are no doubt better for the purpose of an arms-control ban than unrestrained nuclear testing. However, any partial arrangement must contain an explicit, unequivocal commitment to achieving a complete prohibition of tests by all States.

Paragraph 18 of the Final Document of the first special session underscored the duty of the international community to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. It also pointed out the possible grave consequences of the continued escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. That sentiment envisaged an international disarmament strategy whose end result must be general and complete disarmament under effective and verifiable international control. It was prompted by the realization that all peoples of the world and
their countries have a stake in the avoidance of war, nuclear or otherwise. We expected the systematic and early translation of those consensus recommendations and decisions into concrete and practical solutions to the disarmament problem.

Most regrettably, no significant progress has been made since 1978 in the implementation of those decisions. On the contrary, the dangerous spiral in the arms race has been intensified, refined and sharpened, especially in the most dangerous field – that of nuclear arms. The fundamental objectives, priorities and principles set forth in the Final Document still remain only on paper, and military expenditures have actually grown from $US 500 million in 1978 to well over $US 1 trillion – that is, $US 1,000 billion – at present. That demonstrates how our hopes and aspirations have been frustrated. The international agenda for disarmament is still as fully loaded today as it was before the first session.

Many problems remain unresolved. These include the problems of nuclear and conventional weapons, of chemical weapons and of radiological weapons; the problem of the reduction of military expenditures and armed forces; the problem of the relationship between disarmament and development and between disarmament and international peace and security; and the problem of the peaceful application of nuclear energy and of the achievement of a comprehensive programme for disarmament under effective international control – to mention only a few. Therefore, this third special session should be an occasion for us to map out a workable strategy for addressing all those fundamental problems of disarmament with a view to achieving some verifiable progress.

My delegation believes that the establishment of subsidiary negotiating committees within the Conference on Disarmament should be agreed upon by this special session, because we are convinced that such bodies can serve as a means by which key issues of disarmament can be tackled effectively and adequately.
My delegation attaches great importance to the question of effective international arrangements to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. I have pointed out already that nuclear weapons constitute the gravest threat to humanity and, as in the case of a nuclear test ban, the question of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States has been the subject of various resolutions of the General Assembly. The question of assurances by nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be seen as a step towards the elimination of those weapons and not as an end in itself. I therefore reiterate the call of President Daniel arap Moi to the nuclear Powers to re-examine their unilaterally declared policies and positions relating to the arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
We consider that nuclear-weapon States should provide concrete and legally binding assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States. However, in the present circumstances, until nuclear weapons are totally eliminated, the only politically and morally justifiable security assurance is the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as a step parallel to the joint or unilateral declarations of the nuclear-weapon States. My delegation calls for full adherence by all non-nuclear-weapon States to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a secondary measure.

The elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is yet another matter to which my Government attaches considerable importance. For several years, the General Assembly, through several resolutions, has been urging this body to elaborate a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Regrettably, the political climate has never been favourable enough to permit the Conference on Disarmament to make progress in that direction. It is the hope of my delegation that at this session the Assembly will be able to agree to resolve the outstanding issues. It is the considered opinion of my delegation that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will be an instrument through which progress in general and comprehensive disarmament can be attained. While we welcome the agreement which seemed to have emerged on the division of disarmament measures into three stages, at the same time we regret that fundamental differences still exist on the key issues of the relationship between the stages of time frames, review, and implementation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. These relationships should be recognized since the programme must be truly comprehensive and global in character.

My delegation continues to subscribe to the proposal for a 20-year time frame within which a comprehensive programme of disarmament should be implemented, that is, up to the year 2000, with a five-year period of review and appraisal of the implementation of each stage of the programme. Furthermore, we believe that
the implementation measures should be identified both in the context of the objectives, priorities and principles of the programme and in the context of the short-term, medium-term and long-term perspectives. This is the only way the programme can become an instrument in the disarmament process, the realization of which will also depend on supportive measures and effective mechanisms, especially the negotiations on arms reduction talks between the super-Powers.

In the area of chemical weapons, we are encouraged by the considerable progress that has been registered in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We anticipate an early conclusion of a comprehensive and internationally respected convention which would outlaw the development, production, stockpiling, storage and use of chemical weapons, and would provide for the destruction of existing stocks. In this context, we believe that, with the present preliminary negotiated and drafted treaty-structure of the convention on chemical weapons that the Conference on Disarmament has so far agreed upon and with more intensified negotiations on the verification issues, accompanied by a strong political will and trust between the major chemical-weapon States, a treaty could be concluded. We recognize that the process of elaborating the non-controversial parts of the convention has reached a qualitatively new phase. However, major difficulties of a highly political nature still remain to be overcome before the convention can be completed for international endorsement. However, notwithstanding the political sensitivity of the issues involved, the pace of the negotiation process has been unduly slow. Pending the conclusion of such a convention, all States should co-operate in efforts to prevent the use of chemical weapons in accordance with the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

Kenya also considers that the time is ripe for the early negotiation of a convention on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Outer space - which the international community in the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the
Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, designated as a common heritage of mankind - is now being contemplate as a new frontier for the extension of the nuclear arms race. This may prove to be the most extraordinary development in military history since the advent of the nuclear epoch and thus warrants universal concern. My country believes that at this session, in recognition of the importance and urgency of preventing this ominous development, discussions should be held on how best to reach a more comprehensive legal régime which, with sufficient guarantees, would prevent the militarization of outer space. Such a régime should enhance the effectiveness and consolidate the importance of strict compliance with existing agreements such as the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the 1967 outer-space Treaty, among others.

Today our continent, Africa, is riddled with serious political, social and economic problems which require urgent attention. The search for peace on our continent must encompass, among other issues, the total elimination of apartheid, independence for Namibia, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, respect for the territorial integrity of all countries, peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and rapid economic development. Progress in any of these spheres could produce beneficial effects on all of them. Conversely, failure in one field could have negative effects on the others. Most of the issues that are being addressed by this special session are necessary prerequisites for peace in Africa, as they are for the rest of the world.

For two decades now, African States have continued to demonstrate their concern for, and commitment to, the denuclearization of the continent as expressed in the Cairo Declaration of 1964 of the Organization of African Unity. Over the years, African delegations have initiated resolutions calling upon all States to consider and respect the African continent as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.
Similarly, the African delegations have sought the international community's condemnation of South Africa's nuclear arms programme and all forms of nuclear or other forms of collaboration by any State corporations, institutions or individuals with the racist South African minority régime. The acquisition of nuclear weapon capability by the racist régime in South Africa constitutes a very grave danger to the African continent and indeed to international peace and security. The attainment of nuclear capability by South Africa can only be designed to hold the whole of Africa hostage and hence delay the independence of Namibia and Azania.
This session should appeal to those countries which are collaborating with South Africa to terminate forthwith all forms of collaboration with that racist régime in the military, nuclear and all other fields.

Kenya continues to attach particular importance to the establishment of zones of peace in various parts of the world. Such zones could strengthen the fabric of regional peace and stability and promote extra-regional co-operation in the field of socio-economic development. In the light of that fact, the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace reflects the hopes and aspirations of my country, as a littoral State, to enhance and share the prospects of peace, stability, security and the promotion of the well-being of the States in the region. We consider that the first step towards the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean would be the convening of the long overdue international conference. That conference would harmonize the interests and viewpoints of the countries in the region, of major naval Powers and of maritime users. It is a matter of regret that the Ad Hoc Committee mandated to prepare the conference has not been able to achieve any meaningful progress on the substantive issues.

The recently concluded Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development adopted a Final Document in which it was recognized that, considering the present resource constraints of both developed and developing countries, reduced world military spending could contribute significantly to development. But the most significant outcome of the Conference was the recommendations of the Action Programme to foster the interrelated perspective on disarmament, development and security and the central role of the United Nations in that regard. Kenya views the achievements of this Conference as a most significant step and calls for the full implementation of the agreed recommendations.

Before I conclude my statement I should like to reiterate certain points of emphasis. The search for peace must begin in the minds of world leaders, for it is
in the minds of those leaders that programmes for nuclear destruction are conceived. This search for peace cannot succeed if there is no love for mankind. The tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki brought untold suffering to large numbers of the world's population, and many still suffer to this day. Love for humanity will preclude designs to destroy mankind, but preventing such destruction is not the task of any individual nation. It is certainly not the task of big Powers alone. It is the responsibility of all nations on earth and of all the leaders who guide their destiny. That means that the world must act in unity in order to reduce and subsequently to eliminate the threat of war and abandon instruments of destruction.

When there is love for humanity, and when the world acts in unity, peace will have a chance. What we all want is peace. My President, His Excellency Daniel arap Moi, President of Kenya, has sent me here with one message for the world: "Give peace a chance".

Peace has no chance when expenditures on armaments continue to soar. For example, yesterday's New York Times carried an article on page A29 about new fighter bombers now being developed which will cost $US 520 million each. Similar military planes are no doubt being built in many other parts of the world. Peace has no chance when suspicions rule nations, when conflicts abound, when trust gives way to greed and when the desire for military supremacy outstrips the speed and extent of disarmament.

The United Nations has done a commendable job in initiating actions aimed at agreements for disarmament. I therefore wish to seize this opportunity to congratulate the United Nations, through its Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, on the contribution it has made. But the world must act in unison in its demand for disarmament and for the elimination of the military instruments of destruction.
The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development held last year articulated the existence of such a relationship, but that is not enough. The international community must do something to redress the inexcusable imbalance which exists between levels of expenditure on armaments and funds devoted to development.

It is a matter of grave concern that South Africa, which for decades now has defied this General Assembly and the Security Council, has found room for and comfort in pursuing a nuclear programme. The racist régime in South Africa can have only one reason for seeking to arm itself with nuclear weapons: to defend apartheid and to destroy neighbouring countries. History will never forgive this generation if South Africa's nuclear ambition is not arrested in time, and we have the capacity to do that.

Nuclear armaments must not be allowed to feed and defend apartheid, which the rest of the world has vowed to destroy. Those nations which by design or by default still support South Africa must realize that they owe it to humanity to end that collaboration and to join hands with the rest of the international community in seeking the immediate and total elimination of apartheid. Apartheid is absurd and one cannot rationalize absurdity.

In summary, my delegation believes this special session should make specific recommendations for future action, first, to review and appraise the recommendations and decisions of the two previous special sessions devoted to disarmament, taking stock of the achievements and failures so far; secondly, to strengthen the negotiating capacity of the Conference on Disarmament; and, thirdly, to adopt the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The two previous sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament succeeded in laying a sound foundation for an international strategy for disarmament. The present session should succeed in establishing a firm political
consensus to implement promptly the provisions of the Final Document that will be agreed upon at the end of this session. My country will continue in its efforts to make valuable contributions to the cause of disarmament. Let me end with President Moi's philosophy and say that in Kenya our efforts have been and will continue to be to work for peace, love and unity.
Mr. OSMAN (Somalia): Mr. President, it is indeed gratifying to know that this important meeting is taking place under your Presidency of the General Assembly. The leadership qualities you have already displayed will undoubtedly contribute to the successful conclusion of this session.

The convening of this special session, the third of its kind, underlines the urgency of the disarmament question in an age of nuclear and space technology. This meeting also serves to reaffirm the central role of the United Nations in the disarmament process. My delegation strongly hopes that the outcome of the session will be a strengthened consensus on disarmament issues and the movement of those issues towards satisfactory resolution.

Disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, is the crucial element of the United Nations effort to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security. My delegation believes that disarmament issues are also closely bound up with international action to overcome economic and social problems and to preserve the global environment, since nuclear war could nullify all these endeavours. The Conference on disarmament and development has rightly emphasized that it is time to change an order of priorities which calls for the expenditure of billions of dollars on weapons for death and destruction, while a majority of the world's people remain sunk in the mire of poverty, ignorance and disease.

In my delegation's view, it is important for us all to consider why it has been so difficult to change such an inhuman order of priorities. One answer is surely the fact that political maturity has not kept pace with the technology that gave rise to the arms race in nuclear and other weapons. The establishment of the United Nations and the adoption of its Charter were certainly evidence of mankind's ability to envisage and to plan for the challenges of our times. But over the past four decades the principles of the Charter and the mechanisms of the world Organization have not had the necessary impact on international affairs. In the
main, the principles of the Charter have received lip-service or grudging acceptance as a means of last resort.

In my delegation's view, the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will not be achieved unless Member States are prepared to give greater weight to their responsibilities as signatories to the United Nations Charter; unless they recognize the interdependence of States and the fact that on the international as on the national level disregard for a system of laws can lead only to insecurity, instability and chaos.

Unfortunately, the world community as a whole has still not accepted the fact that there is only one effective guarantee for a reasonably secure and civilized world. That guarantee is the acceptance of the principle of collective security by all States, be they large or small, militarily powerful or militarily insignificant. International tension, regional conflicts and the arms race in nuclear and conventional weapons are all measures of the failure of Member States to co-operate in strengthening the system of international law established by the Charter and by relevant declarations and resolutions of the General Assembly.

In every period of history there has been a valuable place for such international principles as the non-use of force or of the threat of force; the peaceful settlement of disputes; respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and non-intervention and non-interference in their internal affairs. In an age of nuclear and increasingly sophisticated conventional weapons, the observance of such principles has become a matter of global survival.

There has never been a stronger need than at the present time for trust and friendship between States based on mutual respect for differing ideological, political and economic systems. Peace in our times also demands respect for the right of people to self-determination, justice and independence and respect for
fundamental human rights. It has been obvious that the denial of these rights and the non-observance of the principles I have mentioned are the underlying causes of international tension and of the regional conflicts which plague so many areas of the world. These conflicts both fuel the arms race and are fuelled by it. This is evident whether we consider great-Power rivalry or situations in southern Africa, in the Middle East, in the Arab Gulf, in West Asia or in South-East Asia. Clearly, efforts for disarmament and peace must be accompanied by a change in the political attitudes which foster confrontation and conflict.*

Let me say here that my Government warmly welcomes the current improvement in the climate and outlook for disarmament, a development highlighted by the historic visit of the President of the United States of America to the Soviet Union. It is our profound hope that the signing of the bilateral agreement on the elimination of intermediate and short-range nuclear missiles has initiated a process which will make even more significant contributions to nuclear-arms limitation.

The world certainly breathes more easily when there is constructive and amicable communication between the super-Powers. A revitalized and strengthened spirit of peaceful coexistence is an essential element of disarmament and of efforts for the reduction of international tension.

* Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Vice-President, took the Chair.
I believe it is true to say that, just as disarmament measures contribute to peace, political initiatives for reducing regional tension and conflict also contribute to disarmament. In this context, the Somali Government welcomes the agreement reached at Geneva for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan. It is our profound hope that Afghanistan will resume its independence and sovereignty under peaceful conditions and that the millions of Afghan refugees in neighbouring countries will soon be able to return home to safe and stable conditions.

In the Horn of Africa, there have also been developments aimed at ending or at least reducing regional conflict and tension. As a result of talks that have been carried on over the past two years Somalia and Ethiopia have taken positive steps to overcome divisive problems of long standing. The mutual disengagement of military forces along our common border and their withdrawal to an agreed distance under joint supervision have already been completed. Other measures contained in the agreement are also in the process of implementation. For too long both the land and the peoples of our region have suffered the ravages of drought, conflict and mass refugee flows. My Government remains committed to the process of negotiation, which we hope will achieve a just and lasting settlement and allow the energies of our people to be channelled into the work of development, nation-building and peace.

I have so far expressed my Government's views on the broad political context of disarmament. We are, of course, equally conscious of the urgent need for the world community to deal on a practical basis with the disarmament priorities established at the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

As I have already indicated, the Somali Government is extremely gratified at the improvement in the disarmament climate that has taken place since the second special session devoted to disarmament was held. Important ground has certainly
been broken by the bilateral Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces. We also welcome the significant achievements of multilateral disarmament efforts, notably the progress of negotiations in Geneva towards a treaty banning chemical weapons and the encouraging results of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. We strongly hope that there will be no turning back or further delay in concluding a treaty outlawing the horrors of chemical warfare. We also trust that the positive aspects of the Conference on development and disarmament will be further developed. The application to development, and to the alleviation of human misery, of funds saved as a result of disarmament could only advance the cause of world peace and security.

Welcome as these developments are, they cannot obscure the fact that there is still a long and difficult road to be travelled in order to translate the principles and priorities of the tenth special session into positive action. As we travel that road our foremost challenge is unquestionably that of nuclear disarmament. My delegation shares the widely held view that without a more fundamental approach to this question the efforts of States to promote the well-being of their peoples will be meaningless. The same is true of international efforts to solve political conflicts, to foster co-operation in overcoming economic and social ills and to protect the global environment. The world community must continue to insist that the nuclear Powers end a weapons contest that cannot ensure their own security and that puts both nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States equally at risk.

Somalia joins the vast majority of Member States in calling for a comprehensive test-ban treaty and a freeze in the production of nuclear weapons, in order to put a stop to the spiralling of the nuclear-arms race. Only when this has been achieved will efforts to reduce nuclear arsenals assume major significance. We also hope that the nuclear Powers will heed the lesson of the frightening
nuclear dilemma and refrain from developing other weapons of mass destruction and from extending the arms race to a new arena — that of outer space.

In other areas there is also a disappointing lack of progress towards the goal of undiminished security for States at the lowest level of armaments. It should be cause for international alarm and concern that the steady increase in the sophistication of conventional weapons has narrowed the gap between them and weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, one of the grim realities of our times is that the profit these weapons bring to their sellers and their wide availability are major incentives for the initiation and for the continuation of regional conflict.

Of course, distinctions must be made between support, on the one hand, for the legitimate struggle of peoples fighting for self-determination or against evils such as apartheid and colonialism and, on the other hand, support for the fuelling of suspicion and hatred and policies such as expansionism, unprovoked aggression, occupation and military intervention. The right of States to provide for their own self-defence is of course guaranteed by the United Nations Charter. Nevertheless, there must be a greater recognition of the danger to world and regional peace and security posed by the proliferation of conventional weapons, both in quality and in quantity. The situation, I believe, calls for more mature and responsible approaches to this problem by both the buyers and the sellers of arms.

One of the strong recommendations of the tenth special session was for international and regional support for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, following the example set by Latin America in the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Somalia continues to support the establishment of zones of this kind wherever they have been proposed, since we believe that they would make important contributions to disarmament and to regional peace and security. More specifically, as an Indian Ocean and an African State, Somalia has consistently
supported the General Assembly's Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace
and that on the Denuclearization of Africa.

We deeply regret the repeated postponements of the Conference on the Indian
Ocean and we call on all concerned to ensure the speedy convening of the Conference
at Colombo. It is long past time for the process of implementing the provisions of
the Indian Ocean Declaration to be set in motion.

With regard to the denuclearization of Africa, the importance of this goal for
African States cannot be over-emphasized, in view of South Africa's nuclear
capability and its attempt to extend its racist hegemony over the southern African
region.

The list of disarmament measures which call for urgent action is a formidable
one and it demands the exertion of a great deal of political will on the part of
Member States. The task of implementing these measures will undoubtedly be
facilitated if there is increased recognition of the centrality of the role of the
United Nations in disarmament affairs.
My Government of course welcomes bilateral and multilateral efforts for disarmament. Indeed, we realize that the most significant steps towards disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, will be initiated by the nuclear-weapon States. Clearly, all States have a vital stake in the success or failure of efforts to make the world a safer place and all can make valuable contributions to those efforts, whatever their size or military significance.

In this context, my delegation wishes to stress the importance of the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign. Member States share with the world Organization the responsibility for ensuring that peoples everywhere, and particularly at the grass-roots level, are made fully aware of the underlying and immediate causes of the armaments race and its ever-present dangers. My Government gives its unqualified support to international efforts to ensure that the right decisions on disarmament are made in our time and that future generations will not repeat the mistakes of the past.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to associate itself with the call for a renewed commitment by all States to the principles and priorities established by the historic consensus achieved at the tenth special session of the General Assembly. It is no exaggeration to say that it is not only world peace and security which is at stake but also the very survival of our world civilization.

Mr. DAZA (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): The international community views this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament less pessimistically than its predecessors. Relative signs of détente between the super-Powers, which were manifested in the signing of the Treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear forces (INF), and some evidence of willingness in the future to sign other treaties on strategic weapons are encouraging and should be properly channelled by this Organization.
It is a secret to no one that, notwithstanding perhaps exaggerated hopes placed in the role the United Nations might play with regard to disarmament, this Organization has not carried out its fundamental mission. Thus, we note with particular discouragement and frustration that year after year the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament meet without any significant progress being made or any alteration to the existing precarious state of relations. Furthermore, there is a tendency to reproduce mechanically earlier resolutions and recommendations - something which smacks of a concern with formalities rather than of a real political commitment to bring about practical disarmament. Indeed, the startling and growing sums spent on the arms race suggest that the United Nations has played a merely peripheral role with regard to the establishment of minimal conditions for world peace.

My delegation considers that the matter now under consideration should become an item of permanent and deep concern for the United Nations. Let us not forget that the first resolution ever adopted by the General Assembly, in 1946, referred precisely to disarmament. The representatives of our peoples, in adopting that text, wished thereby to signal to future generations the importance and priority to be attached to this complex and delicate issue.

Many efforts have been made since then, but if we are objective we must acknowledge that the results have been scarcely commensurate with the intensity of our activities. That is why we must take advantage of this period of relative détente between those who bear primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of justice in order to press for the revitalization of the multilateral disarmament mechanisms, which will be possible only if there is the necessary political will. We sincerely hope that the climate of greater restraint and a more constructive dialogue between the super-Powers can become forces to
reactivate on more serious and rational bases the pursuit of the cause of disarmament in the United Nations, in harmony with the principles and purposes of the Charter.

It is urgent in and of itself to revitalize the cause of disarmament in the United Nations in order to restore the Organization's eroded credibility with regard to its fundamental objective, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. That is recognized in the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), adopted in 1970, entitled "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", which identifies seven fundamental principles in the United Nations Charter that qualify as part of general international law - *jus cogens*. These obligations include the non-use or threat of force and refraining from intervention. Since they qualify as *jus cogens* they are legally binding, because they are coupled with the fundamental objective of the United Nations, that is, the preservation of peace.
If it is to take root, confidence, which is beginning to emerge and develop as a result of negotiations between the super-Powers, must extend to all countries of the globe. An agreement which served to reduce nuclear arsenals would clearly be of momentous importance, but its impact would be lessened if it were not coupled with a decisive commitment to ensure full respect for the principles to which we have referred. The arms race, as we all know, is a symptom of distrust. Hence we must attack the disease at its roots, fostering a climate that can lessen doubts and suspicions between States and fashion a predictable framework for their relations, in accordance with international law.

My country has been affected by a sustained violation of the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs practised by one of the super-Powers, which has encouraged and fostered violence, subversion and terrorism with its toll of destruction and suffering. This does not foster a climate of confidence in international relations.

Consequently, the new attitude being demonstrated by the super-Powers must be reflected in all their international activities, not merely between the super-Powers themselves. The General Assembly must translate these elements into reality and ensure that they have world-wide impact. At the same time, it must continue to bring appropriate pressure to bear on those nations that have primary responsibility for ensuring effective disarmament founded on the concepts of strategic balance and shared global security. There must be a drastic change in the international scene and a move from a system of confrontation to one characterized by co-operation.

The present political context within which this special session is taking place may make possible a less pessimistic view of things and help to outline some paths to co-operation in the field of disarmament. It is important to stress that
Chile, a peace-loving country, has always strongly supported the cause of disarmament. More particularly, within our region we have fostered practical steps to strengthen mutual trust and an appropriate balance between disarmament and development. In this connection our country has given tangible evidence of the importance we attach to so-called confidence-building measures. This was borne out in the talks which took place recently between the Chilean and Peruvian chiefs of staff. Furthermore, the immediate and positive response by the Chilean Government to the proposal by President Alan Garcia of Peru for the creation of a regional centre on disarmament and development constitutes clear proof of our heightened concern to foster and encourage peaceful, stable and just relations between the peoples of our region and with other countries of the world.

Nor should we forget the signing of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Argentina. That document contains a non-aggression clause that led to the elimination of a source of tension or conflict between two brother peoples.

Accordingly we believe that the most rational way of averting the overt or covert crises and disputes which beset the world and lend their own dynamic to international relations, fostering the arms race rather than serving to lessen tensions, is through a concerted pursuit of consensus procedures resulting in greater recognition of the relationship between trust and disarmament. This point must be fully emphasized.

The complex interdependency of the present world makes it all the more important to adopt collective measures to curb the unbridled arms race. It is essential to act in unity, bearing in mind the right of each and all members of the international community to live in peace. The guidelines recently offered to us by His Holiness Pope John Paul II in his encyclical Sacerdote Rei Socialis are illuminating in this respect, in particular when he said,
"At the same time, in this divided and troubled world beset by all kinds of conflict, there is a growing sense of radical interdependence and of the need for solidarity that must be reflected on the moral level. Today perhaps more than ever before, men, realizing that they have a common destiny, must work together if they are to avoid catastrophe for all."

Shared solidarity and balanced security should become vehicles for fostering a climate of reason that may lead to gradual disarmament consistent with the principles of international law.

This session of the Assembly coincides with a dual crisis that has emerged and been recognized in this Organization: a crisis in development and a crisis in co-operation for development. We know that co-operation for development has been characterized by a serious shortage of resources and commitment. The success of any bilateral or multilateral approach to disarmament would become all the more significant and take on special ethical standing if the resources released served to strengthen co-operation for development.

There would thus be a salutary change of commitment and we would be strengthening a tool essential for promoting well-being among developing nations, thus serving to strengthen further international trust and peace.

We must also emphasize the slow pace of activities in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. This is perhaps due to the scale and range of questions it considers together with the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee of the General Assembly. It would therefore be useful to consider ways of streamlining the consideration of these issues.

It is also necessary to ensure more effective co-operation among various United Nations bodies which deal with disarmament problems. By way of example we
could recommend that the outer space Committee work more closely with the committee on space disarmament, providing it with technical information for rigorous examination of military uses of outer space. Similarly, the Special Committee on the non-use of force, of the Sixth Committee, could co-operate with all disarmament bodies. This is particularly important if we recall that the prohibition on the use of force is the essential principle underlying the law of nations and the United Nations itself and, together with the principle of non-intervention, should govern negotiations on the reduction or curbing of armaments.

The best co-ordination could be achieved through a mechanism whereby reports from various bodies would be communicated to all the other bodies that have competence in the field of disarmament.

In order to ensure a proper follow-up to recommendations arising from this body, we think it would be extremely useful for the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the best way of implementing recommendations arising from this special session.
Once the replies of States Members have been received, we would have important information available at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly to assist us in giving appropriate consideration to this matter in future talks and activities.

We believe that the diagnosis of the issues and the statements made at this special session are furnishing a basis for the co-ordination of better and more stable relations among our various States. The Assembly cannot provide an answer merely by repeatedly exhorting us to consider problems whose very familiarity results in their being given insufficient attention. On the contrary, we would like to see a significant change in the perception of disarmament and the development of a new sense of commitment. The procedures and machinery of the Organization must now be adapted to focus more clearly on the problem of the global arms race.

We believe it is important to move forward on three levels, global, regional and sub-regional. A single step may seem small, but when it is added to those that have gone before it can help to carry us further forward.

War cannot be waged without weapons. In order to disarm men, we must arm them with solidarity, respect, co-operation and confidence. It is our hope that the special session of the Assembly will serve to lead us along that path.

Mr. TABONE (Malta): I should like to add my Government's most sincere felicitations to the President on his election to guide the work of the special session. We are confident that he will lead it to a successful conclusion with the same skill and wisdom with which he successfully guided our work as President of the forty-second regular session.

On behalf of my Government I also wish to pay special tribute to our Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his untiring efforts to advance
and strengthen the cause of international peace, which is one of the principal objectives of our Organization, the United Nations.

Thousands of years ago it was written:
"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isaiah II:4)

The cry for disarmament expressed in those lines can hardly be improved upon even today. Yet here we are again, leaders of nations, meeting in a third special session of the General Assembly to discuss the question of disarmament. While this is tangible evidence of everyone's desire to contribute to disarmament, to end the conflicts that feed the appetite for weapons, it is also evidence that our performance over the past decades has, by and large, failed to match our words with deeds.

Ten years ago the Assembly, at its first special session devoted to disarmament, adopted by consensus a Final Document that set out basic principles and proposed a Programme of Action intended to enhance the security of all nations through progressively lower levels of armaments, with a set of priorities for progress towards the ultimate, unanimously accepted goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The adoption of the Final Document at the first special session devoted to disarmament was seen as a landmark in international relations.

The second special session in 1982 reaffirmed the conclusions of the first special session, but it failed to give life to the unfulfilled Final Document, and it failed also to build upon the solemn commitments undertaken by Member States in 1978. The international climate at that time was not favourable, and, instead of progress in disarmament, there was an escalation in the arms race on a global level. The mistrust, suspicion and confrontational attitudes evident in East-West
relations left little room for constructive deliberations and negotiations on disarmament issues, and a sense of futility in international relations pervaded the atmosphere.

The convening of such special sessions is a very expensive exercise that imposes demands on our resources, human and otherwise. It also raises the hopes of our people, to whom we shall be doing a great disservice if all that we shall have to show for our efforts is an exercise in churning out clichés and platitudes or volumes of documents that do not turn one single sword into a plowshare.

My Government approaches the question of disarmament from the realistic and basic premise that all people need to be and to feel secure. All talk of disarmament is absolutely meaningless unless it is accompanied by credible assurances of security. If the people who gave birth to the Organization after the terrible destruction and mayhem of the last war still feel the need to buttress their feeling of security with huge stockpiles of weapons, by joining military alliances, by preferring to allocate their resources to producing or procuring weapons rather than to raising the living standards of their common people, by making their military cadres the elite of their society - then we have every reason to feel concern.

However, the special session has been convened at a most opportune moment, when constructive dialogue between the two super-Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, is taking place and producing significant results. The summit meetings between President Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev have opened up new horizons for a whole range of international peace and security issues, with clear indications of a healthy shift in attitude and perception. The most tangible result so far is the conclusion of the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF
Treaty. That Treaty marks the beginning of a real reduction in nuclear armaments, which we hope will be followed soon by another agreement on a 50-per-cent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons.

It is only fitting that we should pay tribute now to the efforts of the two great Powers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and to their respective leaders for having the courage and the wisdom to break the vicious circle of distrust and the quest for better and more armaments. They have stopped behaving as if disarmament were the primary responsibility of the other party, and, together, they have taken the first steps, which are becoming bolder as they become more difficult and complicated. The world looks to them in hope and trust—hope that the process will go forward in spite of the difficulties that will be encountered, and trust that the process will not upset the precarious balance that has prevented another world conflict in spite of the disagreements that have characterized the world scene over the past decade.*

---

*Mr. Perera (Sri Lanka), Vice-President, took the Chair.
For small vulnerable countries like mine, this balance is an essential underpinning of our security. It is true that the big-Power rivalry has given birth to unwholesome divisiveness which grouped States in so-called defensive blocs against each other, a divisiveness which was exported to practically all regions of the world, and at times split nations and gnawed at the very unity of States. This is a reality which cannot be denied. Hopefully, the new spirit of confidence will reduce this divisiveness and replace the balance of terror by the will to collaborate.

The military expertise of most United Nations Member States is not such as to qualify us as experts in the technical minutiae of disarmament. For a truly militarily-neutral State like Malta, this means that we are not likely to come to the forefront to repeat clichés or to champion slogans and initiatives whose military implications, especially in the maintenance of balance, are not very clear to us. Nevertheless, we are clearly interested in the pursuit of disarmament and its implications. With the rest of the world, we urge those States with military arsenals to intensify their efforts towards reducing armaments and building the mutual confidence and trust which is the basis of this process; these nations should also keep in mind that the security of others is equally at stake.

In a modest but genuine contribution to this process, we wish to put forward some considerations, as follows. I start with nuclear weapons. Their indiscriminate destructiveness should spur us to eliminate them. Here I wish to note that President Reagan recently expressed this hope in Moscow in reply to a question from university students, a hope that is equally shared by General Secretary Gorbachev. However, such weapons are by now an integral part of the security structure of many States, directly or indirectly. We cannot conceive disarmament in nuclear weaponry without simultaneous attention being given to
disarmament in conventional weapons, whose refinement is blurring their distinction from nuclear weapons.

We read and hear a lot about nuclear-weapon-free zones. In this regard, we should distinguish between existing nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones where nuclear weapons are already an integral part of the security system. It is easy to agree that existing nuclear-weapon-free zones should remain so; however, in areas where such weapons are already a part of the security arrangements their removal will necessarily affect the military balance, and therefore more accurate judgement, greater flexibility and persistence will be required in any disarmament deliberations relating to such areas.

As an island State, we cannot but associate nuclear weapons not only with land-based delivery systems, but also with sea-based and airborne delivery systems. That is why we would have wished to see the INF Treaty extended to include them. We accept the contention that this presents great technical difficulties, especially in the field of verification, but we would urge that it is precisely because of these difficulties that efforts must be redoubled to overcome them effectively.

We stress "effectively", because we would wish to separate wishful thinking from realism, and propaganda from fact. In the quest for the extension of the INF Treaty to which I have just referred we do not seek to deprive any nation of its right of free navigation on the high seas and in our own Mediterranean, reminding all at the same time that Article 88 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea states:

"The high seas shall be reserved for peaceful purposes."

Malta is an island State with a tradition of offering the hospitality of its sheltered harbours to ships of all States, and its neutral status does not
diminish this role. As hosts, however, we are confident that our guests will not jeopardize our status and our security and safety. Such trust is a basic requirement of friendly relations between nations; most States have no adequate means of verifying any written, spoken or understood assurances, especially on nuclear weapons. This trust cannot be replaced by emotional declarations, well-meaning as they may be.

When the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) was set up it acknowledged, in the very composition of its participants, an inescapable interregional dimension. In its Final Act the interrelationship of security in Europe and security in other parts of the Earth was acknowledged, the link with security in the Mediterranean being highlighted in a special section.

The role of the CSCE in confidence-building among States, leading to military measures which should lead to disarmament, has already been mentioned by the Vice-Chancellor and Foreign Minister of Austria, Mr. Alois Mock. Today I wish to stress two points.

The first is the link between security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean. We feel that there is a great potential that has remained untapped in this respect. It is a matter of some disappointment that not one single confidence- and security-building measure relating to sea movements has been able to command consensus so far, even though such measures could apply equally to other, surrounding seas. That is why we stress the need to overcome the difficulties in this respect. Here we do not limit ourselves, necessarily, to nuclear weapons, but would point to confidence-building measures connected with movements in or near territorial waters. The compromise document presented by the nine neutral and non-aligned European States does not contain such details, but it
does present an opportunity to consider further the link between security and
co-operation in Europe and security and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

The second point is the increasingly important moderating role of the European
neutral and non-aligned States in this security process. This is a role which can
be extended into other areas, as long as the political will does not flag, and as
long as a sense of responsibility is maintained.

As a parallel, I would point to the initiative of the Mediterranean members of
the Non-Aligned Movement at their meeting in Brioni last year and the follow-up
action at the General Assembly on the resolution on security in the Mediterranean.
No State should be excluded from this process if disarmament and real peace are to
prevail. We need hardly stress that the war arsenals in the Mediterranean, whether
belonging to the super-Powers, their allies or other States, are staggering, and
the ever-turbulent situation makes the presence of such arsenals more disquieting.

I have dwelt at some length on the importance of the reduction of nuclear
weapons, with a view to their ultimate elimination, but this is far from a balanced
picture. Conventional weapons, apart from their direct relevance to the balance of
power, can be as lethal as any other weapon, and the need for their balanced
reduction is just as great. We have seen this happening in recent accidents, we
see it happening in regional conflicts, and we saw it happening during the last
war, when one raid on Dresden using conventional bombs caused more casualties than
those caused by the nuclear explosion in Nagasaki.
Small countries such as Malta are as vulnerable to conventional weapons as to nuclear ones; realistically, indeed, conventional weapons are more likely to be a threat to our security.

Equally menacing are chemical and biological weapons, which experts tell us have been introduced once again into some conflicts. That is a serious and retrograde step, which should open our eyes to ever-present but dormant dangers. Disarmament measures must necessarily take such weapons into account.

This reckless defiance of world opinion makes us wonder about the real value of the non-proliferation Treaty, whose twentieth anniversary we shall be celebrating soon. Malta is among the 156 countries that have become parties to that Treaty. For those that do not possess nuclear weapons, adherence to the Treaty signified an act of faith: faith in those States which possess nuclear weapons and were allowed to keep them; faith in those States which had the capability to produce nuclear weapons and which had the option to join the Treaty but decided not to do so; faith in those States which became parties to the Treaty and which therefore are bound to keep its provisions in good faith.

All States Members of the United Nations, without distinction as to size, status or region, have an obligation to humanity not to shake that faith.

Disarmament is the process of destroying the weapons of war. If it is to be credible and to succeed, it must be paralleled by a simultaneous process of building the instruments of peace. We live in an imperfect world and in spite of our good intentions there will arise occasions for disagreement, occasions for fear and insecurity. We must have the instruments to bring about the peaceful settlement of such disputes.
One of the reasons for the creation of the United Nations was precisely to provide such mechanisms. We do not ignore the positive role the United Nations has often played in that respect. Here I wish to pay a tribute to the indefatigable efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, and his staff in actively seeking solutions to vexed questions which pose a threat to world peace. However, an examination of the agenda of the General Assembly and a cursory look at the daily news bulletin should make us realize that the United Nations is more often than not ignored or used not so much to solve problems as to lay claims and make accusations.

Nevertheless, the United Nations has a unique potential in this process. We are aware that the most important change that has to take place is in ourselves. We must replace suspicion with trust, injustice with justice, the spirit of overpowering with the spirit of solidarity and mutual co-operation.

The progress recently made in the negotiations between the super-Powers, the Stockholm breakthrough in confidence- and security-building measures in Europe with prospects for disarmament, and progress in resolving some regional disputes, such as the recent Geneva accord on Afghanistan, underline the possibilities of tomorrow.

At the same time, all must recognize that notwithstanding the untiring efforts of statesmen, politicians and institutions, regional conflicts persist and widespread injustice still prevails in many parts of the world. Entire peoples are still denied self-determination and a State of their own. A vivid example of this is the plight of the Palestinian people. The people of South Africa remain oppressed under a racist régime. The war between Iran and Iraq continues unabated. And in other regions near and far we witness attempts to resolve disputes by armed force rather than by peaceful means.
In the face of all this it should be the task of all of us, great nations and small, to perfect existing instruments and institutions and possibly to create others for the peaceful settlement of international disputes. If our efforts towards that end are as persistent and as vigorous as those directed towards the reduction of armaments we should in time succeed in creating sufficient confidence in the tools and instruments of peace as to render resort to force unnecessary and wasteful.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 1st plenary meeting, I call upon the Chairman of the delegation of Switzerland.

Mr. CHENAUX-REPOND (Switzerland) (interpretation from French): I wish first of all to convey the congratulations of my delegation to Ambassador Florin on his election to the presidency of the Assembly at this special session. I am confident that his great ability and professionalism bode well for the success of the session.

As the representative of a State not a Member of the United Nations, I should like to express my gratitude for this opportunity to make a statement during the general debate at this special session. The Swiss Government warmly welcomes the endeavours of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and arms control. If those efforts are paralleled by improvements in international relations and if they produce concrete results, they will constitute a true, major contribution to the survival of mankind in a world of security and mutual trust.

The general debate has thus far revealed a broad consensus on the urgency of nuclear disarmament and nuclear-arms control and on the prohibition of chemical weapons. That consensus is encouraging, but it requires a broader view. We share the opinion expressed by a number of speakers that disarmament measures have to be viewed in an overall context and must cover all aspects: conventional, chemical
and nuclear weapons. That means that while we have seen progress in nuclear disarmament, imbalances in the field of conventional arms require particular attention. If disarmament is to further peace it must be balanced. In our opinion, disarmament agreements must aim for balance both in the overall level of forces and within each weapons category. They should promote greater stability by replacing imbalances in weaponry with balance at a lower level.
We have set ourselves a goal of large dimensions and obvious urgency. Its achievement will require tireless efforts. If those efforts are credible and do not take exclusively into account primarily national interests, they will contribute to establishing the confidence-building capital indispensable to the next stages of disarmament. To emphasize Switzerland's position in this respect, I should like to quote from a statement made by Foreign Minister Felber on 13 May last in Vienna to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE):

"In the field of military security and disarmament, progress depends largely on the strengthening of confidence. All our countries need stability, security and peace to live and to develop. Each of them seeks to realize its aspirations in accordance with its means and its particular conditions. For Switzerland, this means not merely armed neutrality, but an enhanced international commitment as well."

The progress achieved within the CSCE and particularly the 1986 Stockholm document clearly show that disarmament is the concern of all countries, and not just the great Powers. Together with the conclusion by the United States and the Soviet Union of the recent Treaty on intermediate-range missiles in Europe (INF), these developments can promote a process that could lead us, among other things, to the major step: an agreement on the reduction of strategic nuclear arms (START). In that context, legally binding and militarily significant verification methods must obviously play a decisive role.

Disarmament must serve peace. Peace, in the meaning we give to that word - that is, peace in security and freedom - must promote human rights and increased human contacts as well as economic progress in a better-protected environment. International relations would also become more stable if States had recourse more systematically to the peaceful settlement of disputes, if they had more respect for
international law - humanitarian law in particular, such as that laid down in the 1949 Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols of 1977 - and, finally, if all peoples could exercise their right to self-determination.

Disarmament is without any doubt a general goal, but it must take account of specific conditions. In that context, regional initiatives deserve support, so long as they do not obstruct this general goal. In that respect, I would note that the countries whose armaments serve only for the strict safeguarding of their territory certainly contribute to a world of security and peace. For its part, Switzerland's concept of military defence pursues that aim exclusively.

I would recall here that Switzerland is a party to all the international disarmament treaties to which it has had access. Switzerland also participates actively in the drawing up of new agreements to strengthen peace and security. Based on its sense of responsibility and international solidarity, Switzerland is determined to continue to support all bilateral and multilateral actions designed to promote or strengthen arms control and disarmament. We take this opportunity of repeating that we are available to make our contribution in the field of the settlement of disputes and verification measures.

I express the hope that our work will help to meet the growing concern all over the world about over-armament. May our debate here also promote an international political climate of mutual trust.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at our 1st plenary meeting, I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. CHOI (Republic of Korea): I wish at the outset to express my appreciation for the decision by the General Assembly to allow the delegation of the Republic of Korea to participate in the general debate at this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.
I should like also to extend my warmest congratulations to Ambassador Florin on his election to the presidency of this important special session. We are confident that under his wise and experienced guidance the special session will achieve positive results.

Our deep gratitude goes to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations, for his tireless pursuit of international peace and security. We also thank Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi and Ambassador Mansur Ahmed of Pakistan for the excellent way in which they prepared this special session.

We are meeting for the third time since 1978 in a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is unprecedented for the Assembly to convene a special session three times to examine the same issue. That clearly shows that the United Nations attaches high priority to the task of disarmament and arms control.

I am happy to note that this third special session devoted to disarmament is being held against the backdrop of an international climate propitious to disarmament. Recently we have witnessed some noticeable progress in the super-Power negotiations for nuclear disarmament. The aspirations of the peoples of the world to substantial measures of disarmament and arms control are stronger than ever before. All those and other indications demand that we who are gathered here produce substantive results from this special session - and I am confident that that will happen.

My country has always been committed to the principle that world peace and security should be maintained on the basis of mutual trust and co-operation among the members of the international community.
As the people of a country which experienced an atrocious war in the early 1950s, we particularly abhor the use of military force and firmly believe in the peaceful settlement of disputes. It took our people many painful years to recover from the devastation caused by the Korean war. The agony we went through still lingers in our minds. For that reason we are deeply motivated to ensure progress towards disarmament and to seek peace.
We share with the majority of countries the view that the enormous resources spent for armaments are a source of intense concern and outrage, considering that so many millions of people still live in poverty. These resources should instead be used for more constructive purposes, promoting economic and social development.

We therefore welcome the recent trend towards détente in East-West relations and the general mood of rapprochement, which gives the peoples of the world a renewed sense of optimism and expectation.

Progress is represented by the ratification of the Treaty on intermediate range nuclear forces (INF) and the signing of the two important agreements on testing and on ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads at the summit meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union held recently in Moscow.

We note with interest that the INF Treaty has provisions for eliminating the medium-range missiles deployed in East Asia, in whose target range the Republic of Korea is located. We hope that the two super-Powers will continue to strive to achieve similar progress in strategic arms reduction as well.

I wish to reiterate my Government's firm support for the multilateral disarmament negotiations being conducted in the United Nations for the purpose of achieving the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. These negotiations have produced an encouraging development: progress in the discussions of a convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. We would like to see an early conclusion of this convention.

It should be noted that the Republic of Korea has long been a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We strongly believe that a nuclear war cannot be won and must not be fought. My delegation urges all those States which have not yet acceded to the NPT to do so at an early date.
In spite of the recent positive developments in East-West relations, conflicts and tensions still prevail in many parts of the world. The survival of mankind is continuously threatened by the existence of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction as well as conventional arsenals. Unfortunately, the Korean peninsula is one of those areas facing acute military confrontation.

To us, no aspect of disarmament is more critical than disarmament on the Korean peninsula. We believe that the reduction of tension and disarmament on the Korean peninsula are feasible only through step-by-step measures to build mutual trust and co-operation between South and North Korea.

For four decades the Korean peninsula has been dominated by general mistrust between the South and the North. A fratricidal war was fought between the two parts of Korea, and a bitter enmity ensued. Even now, more than 38 years after the war, suspicion and hostility persist. Along the 155-mile military demarcation line dividing the South and the North, about one and a half million heavily-armed soldiers confront each other. Moreover, between Koreans in the South and the North there are no contacts at all; no visits, no telephoning, even no letters across the border.

Under these circumstances, nothing is more urgent and important than taking steps to overcome mistrust and to build confidence between the two parts of Korea in order to defuse the tense situation. Establishment of mutual understanding and respect is a vital requirement. This process involves engagement in dialogue, and initiation and expansion of contacts in all fields. That is why we have continuously sought an early resumption of dialogue between the South and the North - the parties directly concerned.

I now wish to remind the Assembly that the maintenance of peace and security on the Korean peninsula is closely related to the peace and security of the entire world.
Korea occupies a geopolitical position where the interests of the great powers in the East and West intermingle with one another. In view of the seriousness of military concentration and the geo-strategic importance of the Korean peninsula, an outbreak of new hostilities between the South and the North might easily escalate into a global conflict. Hence, the situation in northeast Asia necessarily has an important bearing on the discussion of international disarmament.

But what is the most constructive way to address the issue of disarmament in northeast Asia?

Without a foundation of confidence-building measures that would create an atmosphere suitable for negotiations, precipitous proposals for disarmament cannot be accepted as practical, but can only be construed as propagandistic or rhetorical.

How, for example, can one expect measures for inspection and verification to materialize when there are no exchanges at all? Openness between our societies and a free flow of information are required from both sides before progress can be made on disarmament, just as our openness to the world has contributed to political and economic development in our country in recent years.

Thus, my Government gives top priority to the resumption of the South-North dialogue in all our efforts to reduce tension and secure peace on the Korean peninsula.

Another constructive way to pursue disarmament negotiations is to conduct a concomitant discussion of new security arrangements which will put an end to the confrontation currently prevailing on the Korean peninsula.

With regard to the issue of establishing regional nuclear-free zones including northeast Asia, we believe that such a proposal can materialize when there is agreement among all States concerned and when a genuine will to co-operate exists. In considering such issues, regional characteristics should be fully taken into account. Also, any unilateral announcement of disarmament or armed forces
reduction should first be verified in an objective manner to establish international credibility.

As emphasized by many previous speakers at this session, confidence-building measures, though only a first step, are as important as disarmament itself. As arms and armed forces are merely a reflection of underlying political hostility and tension, disarmament alone cannot resolve regional conflicts. We must assiduously address the root causes of such confrontation.

Based on this perception, my Government has made continuous efforts to promote dialogue with North Korea. We have advanced many constructive proposals for exchange of visits, communications, mutual trade and economic co-operation and conferences between authorities at various levels. Although there has been some intermittent South-North dialogue, significant progress has yet to be achieved.

We proposed a South-North summit meeting and renewed this proposal on several occasions with a view to initiating inter-Korean dialogue in an overall way. Other initiatives we took include my own proposal last year for talks between the Foreign Ministers of the South and the North with an open-ended agenda. The most recent proposal made by my Prime Minister, on 3 June, calls for South-North Ministerial-level talks.

That proposal was made in order to discuss North Korea's participation in the Seoul Olympics, promote personal exchanges and resume the suspended South-North dialogue.

In my country, with the inauguration of President Roh Tae Woo, a new Government was established on 25 February. In his inaugural address, President Roh expressed his firm determination to seek rapprochement with North Korea and improved relations with the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union and other countries with which we have no diplomatic ties. He termed these objectives the "northern policy".
I should like to quote part of the inaugural address:

"The Republic of Korea will intensify its diplomatic efforts to promote international peace and co-operation with all nations in the world. We will broaden the channel of international co-operation with the continental countries with which we have had no exchanges, with the aim of pursuing a vigorous Northern diplomacy. Improved relations with countries which have ideologies and social systems different from our own will contribute to stability, peace and common prosperity in East Asia."

I wish to reassure this Assembly that our doors are always open to anyone who wants to talk with us, to improve relations with us and to co-operate with us. The fact that on the Korean peninsula there remains sharp military confrontation inherited from the cold war era is an anachronism and a haunting tragedy for the Korean people.

It is our people's ardent hope that we will dismantle any last vestiges of conflict and establish everlasting peace on the Korean peninsula. To that end, no matter how difficult, we shall endure, we shall strive and we shall negotiate. It is incumbent upon our generation to find a permanent solution, so as to relieve our children of the agony and fear of instability from which we have suffered so long.

We urge our brethren in North Korea to join us in our efforts for peace. Both the Republic of Korea and North Korea know that we will not achieve anything without co-operation with each other.

The Korean people are looking forward to hosting the twenty-fourth Olympiad in September. We truly hope that the Summer Olympic Games will be a festival of peace and harmony. We are glad to note that 161 member countries of the International Olympic Committee have accepted the invitation to participate. Only six countries, including North Korea, have not responded. We sincerely want our brethren in the
North to join in this festival. The doors are open for them either to accept the compromise proposal made by the International Olympic Committee or simply to participate in the Seoul Olympics on their own. We will wait until the last moment.

We have learned from past experience that however simple a goal may be there is no short cut to achieving it. Indeed, the loftier the goal the longer the road that leads to it. Given the reality of current international relations and the complexity of factors involved in disarmament, the only practical method will be a step-by-step approach, as I have already pointed out. If we are to achieve any concrete results we need to be realistic and specific, rather than hyperbolic and general.

With that basic recognition, the delegation of the Republic of Korea wishes to put forward a three-stage approach towards disarmament on the Korean peninsula. First, through an early resumption of dialogue and subsequent expansion of contacts and co-operation between the South and the North we should build up mutual trust and confidence. That could then lead to the reduction of tension between the two parts of Korea. Secondly, as an institutional arrangement for preventing the recurrence of hostilities, the South and the North should agree to conclude a non-aggression pact by which peace and stability on the Korean peninsula could be secured. Thirdly, the South and the North would then be able to enter into negotiations on concrete measures to achieve the goals of disarmament on the peninsula.

For this purpose I strongly appeal to North Korea to respond positively to the proposal made by the Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea on 3 June for ministerial level talks between the responsible authorities of the South and the North.
It is our earnest hope that this special session will serve as a valuable forum for exchanging constructive ideas and seeking a consensus on issues of great importance for enhancing international security, not only between the East and the West but also within troubled regions, including North-East Asia.

Allow me to conclude my statement by again expressing my delegation's fervent wish that North Korea will heed our pleas and that this special session will be successful. I pledge my Government's full support and co-operation towards that end.

_The President:_ In accordance with the decision taken at our 13th plenary meeting, I now call on the Observer for the South West Africa People's Organization.

_Mr. Angula_ (South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)): May I, on behalf of the embattled Namibian people, and indeed on behalf of their liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) of Namibia, add my voice to the numerous expressions of warm sentiments which Mr. Peter Florin has already received, and extend congratulations to him on his election to the presidency of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Our two peoples share a common vision of this world, in which mankind must have the courage and foresight to halt the intolerable long nightmare of living in perpetual expectation of a nuclear apocalypse. We earnestly hope that the results of this session will contribute significantly to the unceasing efforts of the United Nations towards the objective of general and complete disarmament.

May I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the untiring efforts he has undertaken for the advancement of the cause of peace and disarmament in the world.

The ratification of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - and the progress made at the Moscow summit
meeting towards the reduction by half of their strategic nuclear weapons by the
United States and the Soviet Union may constitute a significant first step on the
road towards general and complete disarmament, if indeed those agreements can halt
plans for the expansion of more menacing electronic weapons systems into outer
space and the search for new and more sophisticated weapons systems.

Out of the Second World War came a universal desire that the scourge of war
should never again be allowed to threaten mankind. That vision was given substance
in the founding of the United Nations. Peace, so well espoused in the Charter of
the United Nations, undoubtedly flows from an abiding faith that violence and
aggression should not threaten the sovereign rights of peoples to decide their own
destiny. Nevertheless, the Charter, though well meant, has not brought the
disarmament mankind has desired since 1945. Over a hundred wars have been waged by
several nuclear and non-nuclear Powers on the territories of African, Asian and
Latin American countries which possess neither nuclear power nor armaments
factories. The fundamental objectives of those colonial and imperialist wars of
aggression have been to subjugate the political aspirations of our peoples in the
three continents and to usurp our territories.

The summit meeting between the leaders of the United States of America and the
Soviet Union constitute a historic landmark in East-West relations. It opens new
hope and ushers in a new era in nuclear disarmament, which will benefit mankind as
a whole.
While welcoming this development, we urge the international community to exert pressure on the other nuclear-weapon Powers to join the Soviet Union and the United States in negotiations to accelerate the process of universal disarmament. As long as the other nuclear-weapon Powers remain outside the framework of negotiations, the military-industrial complex, the transnational corporations which draw colossal profits from the arms race, will exploit the situation by transferring their technology to the nuclear Powers not participating in the talks and will use other countries as testing grounds. These transfers of technology will inevitably lead to the spiral of a new arms race. In recent times the expansion of the military-industrial complex has lead to the formation of the military economy of capitalism as a specific sector of the capitalist world economy outside the control of the political leadership. Its function is to prepare for war materially, to escalate the arms race and to achieve the political aim of retaining control of the sources of natural resources on a global scale.

Bearing in mind that the military economy is above all represented by complex and rapidly developing high-tech industries, it is easy to imagine the barriers it has raised in the way of the normal functioning of the world economy. The military-industrial complex adversely affects the solution of global problems. It plays an important role in determining the foreign policies in the West, ever relying on the most aggressive and reactionary circles in the imperialist countries. It not only prevents a change in the psychological and political climate but strengthens the positions of those groups of monopoly capital which are the mainstay of the ruling political groups in the West.

The military-industrial complexes clearly gain from the existence of hotbeds of tension in the world - in southern Africa, the Middle East, Central America, Indo-China and South-East Asia. The preservation of those flash-points of tension
implies not only the squandering of huge resources but also the impossibility of finding a joint solution to the acute problems common to States in those regions. Such regions have become testing grounds for the new technically advanced weapon systems.

In the course of the past 40 years the peoples of the world have been able to avoid another world war and to safeguard world peace over the longest period in the century. In Africa, however, and in southern Africa in particular, the peoples of Angola, Namibia, Mozambique, South Africa, Zimbabwe and other States have been victims of protracted colonial wars imposed upon them by the minority régimes in the region. More than anyone else, we long for peace.

The problem of disarmament should not be a one-sided issue. It should not be a concept that is meant to benefit Europe and Europeans only. It must be a universal concept. Any double standard in the concept of non-nuclear proliferation and disarmament must be rejected with contempt by this body. We are dismayed by the double standard of many West European States and others, including the United States which, notwithstanding their public, declared policy of opposition to apartheid South Africa's domestic policy and in contravention of Security Council resolution 418 (1977) instituting a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, have continued on an ever greater scale not only to provide that régime with conventional military hardware but to feed the apartheid régime with weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear technology. As is known, the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa based in Oslo and the Centre Against Apartheid have frequently compiled reports implicating various States Members of this Organization in the violation of United Nations Security Council resolution 418 (1977). Those countries have supplied South Africa with advanced offensive weapons, including helicopters, gunships, submarines, the latest
artillery weapons, which are being used now on the Namibian-Angolan front, reconnaissance and transport planes, radars, cluster bombs, army trucks, lasers, chemical and biological weapons and nuclear technology.

Ironically, some of those countries were victims of Nazi Germany. It is a known fact that present South African rulers were very sympathetic to the Nazi cause and even participated in subversion against the Allies' efforts. Those very States which are supporters of racist South Africa have the audacity to lecture the rest of humanity on the virtue of human rights. Are they too blind to see that those weapons of mass destruction which they send to South Africa violate our human rights and our right to exist as a people and to be free and independent?

We should like to echo the words of the Foreign Minister of Nigeria, who said when addressing this Assembly:

"In my own region of Africa, the effect of a universally agreed comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty will be to strengthen African resolve to free the region of nuclear weapons. It will be the most effective check on apartheid South Africa's nuclear weapons ambition. ... As is well known, the nuclear-weapon programme of apartheid South Africa constitutes a flagrant affront to the collective wish for a nuclear-weapon-free Africa proclaimed by African Heads of State and Government in the 1964 Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa." (A/S-15/PV.11, pp. 36-37)

In spite of the express will of the African peoples to keep the African continent free from nuclear weapons, Western nuclear collaboration with South Africa continues unabated despite Pretoria's determined refusal to sign the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty.

Last year we drew the attention of the international community to a threatening and evil plan to dump nuclear waste in our country. That warning was repudiated, and even our friends had doubts about the validity of our concern. The
entire world now knows that our concern was not without foundation. Scandalous revelations have now surfaced sending shock waves of terror through the entire African continent.

The dumping of nuclear and industrial waste on the African continent by extra-continental transnational corporations and other enterprises is a reality that threatens the very survival of the African peoples. This threat comes from the same source as that which, through the ages, has denuded the continent of its peoples in the process of the slave-trade, of colonization and the imposition of colonial wars of aggression, and now we are threatened by nuclear-waste contamination.

Alarmed by the criminal behaviour of the foreign industrial conglomerates dumping their garbage on the African continent, the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity resolved at the twenty-fourth summit of that organization to declare the dumping of nuclear and industrial waste on the African continent a crime against Africa and the African peoples, and to propose this matter as an item for the agenda of the forty-third session of the United Nations General Assembly.
We ask, where are the moral principles of those States that allow these criminal acts to emanate from their soil? Why do they dump this garbage in Africa and not in Europe? Why do they arm pariah and fanatical régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv with deadly nuclear weapons? Are they really ignorant of the power of nuclear energy in the hands of such barbaric groups?

Given its racist philosophy, its aggressive and destabilizing policies against the front-line States and its inability to deal with the inevitable revolutionary internal revolts and the challenges it now faces on the Namibian-Angolan fronts, it will not be long before the racist régime resorts to nuclear blackmail. According to an extract from the Johannesburg Home Service broadcast from the State-controlled radio on 15 March 1984, although "it is capable of producing nuclear weapons, South Africa has utilized her nuclear energy strictly for peaceful purposes". The radio then referred to the agreement due to be signed with Mozambique on the following day and stated: "Happily, therefore, the omens are good, and South Africa does not feel compelled to utilize her nuclear capacity in another direction". Indeed we are faced with an imminent threat from racist South Africa. This body must bring maximum pressure to bear on the States providing nuclear technology to racist South Africa to force the latter to give up its nuclear-weapon programme and sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In my childhood I had always taken it for granted that we Namibians had suffered most in the world. My historical knowledge on the extermination of my people by the imperial German colonial army, my personal experience of running the gauntlet of the police sjambok and our recollections of the events in the aftermath of the Cassinga massacre made me believe our experience to be the most miserable one. After Cassinga, talking to the survivors and burying our dead, I had the audacity to give courage to the survivors while wishing farewell to the martyrs.
However, in 1982, I was a participant in the Eighth World Conference Against Atom and Hydrogen Bombs, held in Tokyo and Hiroshima. I came face to face for the first time with the reality of the atom bomb when we visited the Hibakusha, or nuclear victims, in the hospital in Hiroshima. Looking into their faces, I did not need to be told any more of the story. I could not resist the power of anxiety. I broke. I do not remember having at any time felt so helpless. It was a moving experience that I shall always live to remember. The power of nuclear energy is so devastating that only reckless or mad people actually could contemplate using it. Only the abolition and the banning of the nuclear weapon from earth will save our planet and its biodynamics from total annihilation. Mankind should never live to see another Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The President: We have heard the last speaker for this meeting. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to 5 minutes for the second and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Granger (United States of America): We have heard from a number of delegations this week whose remarks have demonstrated much thought and seriousness of purpose. We all had hopes that this special session would not become bogged down by contentious and unnecessary political discussions of issues that are not on its agenda. Unfortunately, Nicaragua has decided to try the patience of the delegations to the third special session on disarmament by attempting to distract us from the matters at hand.
We find the outburst against us by the representative of Nicaragua unfortunate. It is a well-known fact that Nicaragua, the poorest country in Central America, has now become the most heavily armed nation in the area. The Sandinista régime began to rearm itself from the very first day it entered Managua in 1979, long before anyone had heard of the armed resistance. The Sandinista régime prefers to use its resources to build up its military machine rather than to carry out economic programmes that will benefit its impoverished population. As a result, its economy is in shambles.

The people of Nicaragua are clearly suffering under the repression of the Sandinista régime. Nicaragua is a clear example of what can happen when a Government's political-military agenda takes precedence over the needs and wishes of its people.

The personal attack by the representative of Nicaragua on the President of the United States not only demonstrates an unfortunate lack of civility and decorum, it also demeans the stature of this special session.

The PRESIDENT: The observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a non-Member State, has requested to be allowed to make a statement in reply. In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its first meeting of this special session, I call upon him to make a statement in reply.

Mr. LI YONG HO (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Concerning the statement made by the south Korean representative, I should like to outline our position very briefly, in response to what he said was an appeal to us for high-level North-South talks.

As for talks between the authorities of the north and the south, they have an unfortunate past. In the 1970s and 1980s much time and energy were spent on a
dialogue between the authorities. Yet they failed to solve even the problem of discontinuing mutual slanders, which is urgent for national reconciliation and unity, let alone the peace and peaceful reunification of the country. If the north and the south have a dialogue to solve the problems both in name and in substance, such a broad arena of negotiation as a joint conference attended not only by the authorities but also by all parties, all groupings and people of all walks of life should be chosen. The north-south joint conference already proposed by us is a reasonable and realistic place for dialogue at which the urgent pending issues between the north and the south can be discussed and resolved effectively and in a fair way, by ascertaining the general will of the entire people without excluding anyone and without disregarding the will of anyone, in conformity with the nature of the reunification problem.

If a north-south joint conference is convened, it will be possible for the authorities, political parties and individual figures and collectives to meet one another and open their hearts to one another, to share opinions without formality and seek an excellent agreement within its framework. Since our side has already proposed that we discuss and resolve the pending issues between north and south, including the co-hosting of the Olympic Games and arms reduction matters, at a north-south joint conference, if the conference is convened the problems which the South Korean authorities propose to discuss will be solved.

The problem of resuming the suspended multi-channel talks will be naturally solved if a north-south joint conference is opened. The problem of mutual travel will also be solved automatically without opening talks between the authorities, if the joint conference is held in Pyongyang and Seoul alternately.
But the point is to hold wide-ranging negotiations, such as a North-South joint conference participated in by representatives of the whole nation. It is from this point of view, as mentioned by the Chairman of my delegation yesterday in his statement to the session, that we are willing to consider the proposal of the south Korean authorities, as a part of preparations for a north-south joint conference.

If they want talks between the authorities of the north and south at any cost, the talks should be held in the form of a preliminary meeting in preparation for a north-south joint conference, and it may discuss the procedural matters as a whole, arranging and holding the north-south joint conference and other related matters for ensuring it. That stand of ours is an expression of our sincere efforts to arrange negotiations between the north and the south by all means, bridging the difficulties with joint efforts of the nation, and an expression of magnanimity to deal leniently with the will of the south Korean part as well.

In conclusion, we urge that the south Korean authorities accept our broad-minded proposal and that a north-south joint conference be held at an early date.

Mr. SERRANO (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): If the representative of the United States had not reiterated an attitude that we have heard before, I would say that on this occasion it is curious that it is precisely those who are the aggressors and responsible for the warlike situation from which Central America is suffering who are surprised that those of us who are besieged opt for the legitimate right to self-defence. I would say that such affirmations are very perplexing and surprising, had they not been reiterated in various forums, as if those who uttered them felt they were somehow chosen as the only representatives, speakers and flag-bearers of justice, democracy, freedom and peace.
In availing themselves of those attributes that no one has conferred upon them, they should first of all be consistent with certain principles governing the life and norms of the international community; they should respect the highest bodies that make coexistence among peoples possible; they should resort, not to force but to legality whenever conflicts arise, and in this case respect and comply with decisions such as that of the International Court of Justice of The Hague, which has ordered them to stop their aggression. They have neither respected nor abided by that decision, and in so doing they have also set aside the jurisdiction of the highest tribunal on our planet.

For our part, we can only reaffirm our constant determination to achieve peace - a determination that has been expressed not once but many times and not only in statements and declarations but also in unbroken practice that no one can deny. We can only reaffirm our determination to achieve peace, as explicitly spelled out in the Esquipulas and Sapoa Agreements, and demonstrated in the efforts Nicaragua has been making in many international forums to ensure that Central America is recognized as a zone of peace, free of foreign military intervention and foreign military presence.

We can only recall that it is precisely this United States Government which is responsible for the military, social and economic crisis in Central America. It is precisely that Government which has armed the mercenaries who have brought war and death to a country which is merely trying to build its own destiny, create its own history, and decide what its role, function and political, economic and social institutions should be.

We reaffirm our determination to achieve peace and call upon the United States once again to adopt a responsible attitude, one that is historically consistent and would enable it truly to endorse the Esquipulas peace process that it is at present sabotaging, blocking and preventing from being fully implemented.
We believe, and we must hope, that the new United States Government, which will shortly be elected, will have a sufficient knowledge of history and the capacity to understand the aspirations to peace of the Central Americans, and particularly the Nicaraguans. It will then perhaps be possible in the not too distant future to begin a new era of respect, understanding, democracy and peace.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Republic of Korea, an observer non-Member State, has requested to be allowed to make a statement in reply. In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at the first meeting of this special session, I call on him.

Mr. KWON (Republic of Korea): The observer delegation of North Korea has just made points which my delegation finds not only objectionable but also preposterous. In view of the lateness of the hour, however, my delegation will refrain from making a detailed statement in reply. Instead I shall just briefly state my Government's position on the dialogue between the South and the North.

The Government of the Republic of Korea supports the debate between the South and the North. However, the debate on unification must be clearly distinguished from the actual implementation of the unification policy at the Government level. At present, the South and the North remain locked in a sharp confrontation and their relations are almost totally severed.

In the light of such realities it is necessary for the authorities to discuss ways to initiate and to facilitate exchanges among people, including politicians, businessmen, journalists, scholars and students. It is for that purpose that on 3 June 1988 our Prime Minister proposed high-level inter-Korean talks. Not only the Korean people but also all nations of the world are ardently hoping that the forthcoming Seoul Olympic Games will serve as a catalyst to bring together East and West, South and North.
In view of such expectations and the necessity speedily to dispel the mistrust now standing in the way of achieving the unification of the Korean peninsula, we strongly urge North Korea to come up with an affirmative response to our reasonable, realistic proposal.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.