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The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

ADDRESS BY GENERAL OF THE ARMY ALFREDO STROESSNER, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

_The President:_ The Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the Republic of Paraguay.

_General of the Army Alfredo Stroessner, President of the Republic of Paraguay,_ was escorted into the General Assembly Hall.

_The President:_ On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations the President of the Republic of Paraguay, His Excellency General of the Army Alfredo Stroessner, and to invite him to address the Assembly.

_President STROESSNER_ (interpretation from Spanish): My presence at the United Nations is the result of an invitation to attend the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, an invitation it was my honour to receive from the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, a distinguished Latin American statesman who has placed his keen intelligence and great dedication at the service of the Organization and who has through his distinguished labours won the recognition of the international community. Mr. Perez de Cuellar is a man in the service of peace and he therefore deserves our greatest encouragement.

My heartfelt greetings go to you, Mr. President, and wish you all success in your important endeavours.

On behalf of the people and Government of the Republic of Paraguay, I am here to reaffirm the faith of our country in the fundamental principles of this prestigious Organization.

I come once again to the United Nations with the same message of coexistence that I have taken to so many countries of America, Europe, Asia and Africa, so that we may experience positive encounters of true friendship and fruitful co-operation.
I am honoured to bring to this lofty forum the voice of the Republic of Paraguay, the thinking of a nation truly dedicated to peace, which shares universal ideals of security, freedom, justice and development.

I am pleased to be once again at the Headquarters of the Organization, where I came in March of 1968, when I was most cordially received by the then Secretary-General, U Thant.

Our country participated in the historic founding of the United Nations, having placed its hopes in the Charter signed in San Fransicso on 26 June 1945, which states the following as one of its basic purposes:

"to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace".

The Republic of Paraguay firmly upholds the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, the legal equality of nations and the self-determination of peoples.

In all international forums we maintain clear positions in favour of relations between nations based on fair legal principles of mutual respect and co-operation.

In the United Nations and in the Organization of American States (OAS), we uphold the principles of friendship and co-operation, with full confidence in the beneficial results that accrue whenever relations between States are established with goodwill and in a spirit of solidarity.
At all international events, conferences and meetings we speak the constructive language of peace, thus projecting the reality being lived by the Republic of Paraguay.

Paraguayan constitutional law takes as its essential principles respect for international law; condemnation of wars of aggression and conquest and all forms of colonialism and imperialism; the peaceful settlement of international disputes by lawful means; respect for human rights and the sovereignty of peoples; and the aspiration to live at peace with all nations.

The world is legitimately concerned about the risks created by the spread of nuclear and conventional weapons. Mankind is calling on the nuclear Powers to give more serious thought to their ineluctable responsibility in the cause of peace and security throughout the world.

It is not admissible for the arms race to continue unabated in full knowledge that it could bring about a universal disaster.

The search for disarmament to open up the way to the future should not be reduced to mere rhetoric but should be embodied in concrete acts that show a real interest in co-operating to bring about the success of an endeavour based upon rationality and respect for the fundamental values of human existence.

At the tenth special session of the General Assembly, held from 23 May to 30 June 1978 and the first special session of the General Assembly devoted entirely to disarmament, a final document of great value was approved. It stated that:

"The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament, that is to say, through a gradual but effective process beginning with a reduction in the present level of armaments". (S-10/2, para. 1)
The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held from 24 August to 11 September 1987 under the sponsorship of the United Nations, a most important meeting in which Paraguay took part, called attention to the fact that:

"The continuing arms race is absorbing far too great a proportion of the world's human, financial, natural and technological resources, placing a heavy burden on the economies of all countries, and affecting the international flow of trade, finance and technology ..." (A/CONF.130/CW2, para. 3)

The Conference, which was the first of an international character relating to the relationship between disarmament and development, pointed out the positive repercussions for peace and security which could be achieved by applying the resources freed by disarmament measures to the promotion of the welfare of all nations and the improvement of the economic situation in which the developing countries find themselves.

The realities of our world call for more détente and for greater moderation in the treatment of disputes which, if not faced with a commitment to peace, could lead to serious conflicts the spread of which could be catastrophic for mankind, and pose the terrifying threat of the annihilation of all signs of life on our planet.

His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, who visited Paraguay about two weeks ago in response to our special invitation, spoke before the United Nations in 1982 and, with the dignity of his moral authority and with real wisdom, gave it a vital message in which he said that:

"Peace is the supreme goal of the activity of the United Nations. It must become the goal of all men of goodwill." (A/S-12/PV.8, p. 62)
"Peace is not a utopia nor an unattainable ideal nor an unrealizable dream."

"War is not an inevitable calamity."

"Peace is possible, and because it is possible, peace is a duty - a very solemn duty, a supreme responsibility." (A/S-12/PV.8, pp. 62 and 63)

Hope was awakened worldwide by the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed in Washington on 8 December last year and recently ratified.

This initiative, which was a milestone on the road to solid international security had the firm support of the United Nations from the first. The signing of this document was seen as a factor that could have a positive impact on multilateral or bilateral disarmament negotiations.

It is an honour for me to come and speak of peace in the name of a country that lives peace. When we assumed the leadership of our nation as determined by the will of the Paraguayan people at the ballot box, we put an end to almost four decades of anarchy, backwardness, coups d'états, insurrections and revolts with high tolls of dead and wounded, which brought no long-term solution, but which overwhelmed the nation with pain, sorrow and uncertainty. For more than three decades the country has now been living in firm political stability, order and liberty, with the three powers of the State functioning normally, and with periodic, clean elections by which the President of the Republic, the senators and representatives of the nation, the members of the municipal councils and the electoral board are elected.

My country is governed by a constitution, which was worked out in a National Constitutional Convention, in which the National Republican Association, the Colorado Party, the Radical Liberal Party, the Liberal Party and the Febrerista
Revolutionary Party participated. We live in a genuine democracy, with freedom and security, a democracy without terrorism and anarchy. We are firm defenders of human rights. For this reason, we protect the life of all inhabitants, and we enjoy a social and political order that is continually improving. There is tranquillity in the homes, in the streets, in the cities, in the countryside and full guarantees for the exercise of all rights embodied in our constitutional law. There are no political prisoners. We have freedom of the press. The parliament and the municipal and electoral boards, besides representing the majority, include the participation of the minority.

Democracy cannot be defended by a weak government. Therefore, a weak government is unable to defend democracy. We conduct our government with firmness and with vigour to make people respect the rule of law. We have proclaimed and have achieved peace, and we shall let nothing and no one take it way from us, because it is the basis of our liberties and national progress. That peace has its armour in the conscience of the Paraguayan people.

We follow a policy of unity, of respect for the dignity of man and an intense promotion of social justice. We do not delude the citizens with demagoguery. We honour democracy with deeds, for we understand that democracy is not content with praise of its existence. It demands facts which prove fidelity to the ideals invoked.

The armed forces of the nation carry out firmly and efficiently their task of defending our sovereignty and democratic way of life, and they also co-operate as factors of social progress through the construction of roads and schools, support of literacy campaigns and assistance to remote towns and villages of our territory. There is no poverty in Paraguay. The percentage of unemployment is extremely low. In our fight against illiteracy we have achieved extraordinary results, an effort that has been recognized at the international level. Another
sign of well-being is the following: in the report of the Inter-American Development Bank at the governors' meeting held in Caracas recently, Paraguay was among the nations with the highest economic growth rate in Latin America during 1987.

Our governmental efforts have the solid support of the Paraguayan people, whose virtues serve to inspire us. Their dignity has never suffered from setbacks when defending their independence and the freedom of Paraguay. Our nationalism is the moral fibre of a noble and creative race, and it is a generous attitude of spirit, open to all peoples, with a permanent fidelity to the principles of international law and a clear will for free and constructive co-operation.

Accordingly, I am especially pleased to underscore that the Republic of Paraguay and the sister Federal Republic of Brazil have jointly built Itaipú, the largest hydroelectric power plant in the world, an outstanding example of integration and an eloquent proof of the heights that can be reached by nations when they practise a policy of peace, work and mutual respect.

With great satisfaction as a citizen of the Americas, I also point to the value of the extraordinary co-operation for development represented by the hydroelectric project of Yacyretá, which we, the Paraguayans, are building together with our sister Republic of Argentina.

Our country produces and exports electric power. Through the infrastructure that we have built, we are fostering large-scale agricultural production, with marked success in dealing with soybeans and cotton. While prior to the Triple Alliance War Paraguay was self-sufficient in wheat, afterwards during the time of the Governments characterized by indolence and carelessness, not a ton of that grain had been produced. However, retying the thread of history, Paraguay is once again self-sufficient in this field and is in a position to export wheat. Likewise,
cattle breeding is outstanding both in quality and in quantity and has won many international awards.

With the generous co-operation of the Federative Republic of Brazil, we now have a way open to the sea, with free ports and entrepots in Paranaguá, Santos and Río Grande do Sul. We have also received offers from other neighbouring countries with regard to this significant aspect of international trade.

There are ideological currents which distort the reality of Paraguay, a country of peaceful evolution and extensive and continuing progress, that has made this era the most constructive in the life of our country. Certain groups which lack any representativity and have been seriously compromised by participation in the subversion carried out on a continental level, find an echo in some sections of the international press, which spread false information about the picture in our republic, which is one of complete normality and filled with a spirit of progress.
Politicians and journalists from all over the world who visited us on the occasion of the general elections on 14 February last have publicly stated that they saw a calm, secure, happy country, with unblemished elections and freedom of action for all political parties.

The result of the aforementioned elections was an overwhelming triumph for the National Republican Party, which designated me as its candidate for the office of President of the Republic for the term 1988 to 1993. This party, with powerful nationalistic and democratic roots, was founded by General Bernardino Caballero, a hero of the Triple Alliance War of 1865 to 1870, a great patriot who rebuilt the country after that terrible event. General Bernardino Caballero was a faithful soldier of our greatest hero, Marshal Francisco Solano Lopez, who gave his life at Cerro Cora, the last battlefield, on 1 March 1870, thus inscribing this unparalleled event on the pages of world history.

I am preparing myself for a new term of government following the aforementioned elections, and my decision is to defend without compromise, as I have until now, peace, representative democracy, concord and respect for human rights, which prevail in Paraguay today.

With the Constitution and the laws, we are confronting those who are trying to weaken our free institutions, the detestable agents of that social cancer, the drug traffic. In defence of the physical and spiritual integrity of our people, of our healthy and magnificent youth, and in protection of values which are of interest to us and to all mankind, we shall combat and continue energetically to fight against the drug traffickers involved in loathsome and criminal transactions which make them true enemies of the life and dignity of human beings. At present, on the initiative of the Executive Power, a reform of Law No. 357 is under consideration, a law designed to repress illegal traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs, as well
as other crimes, with a view to placing at our disposal even more rigorous legal instruments in the battle against this tremendous scourge.

The serious and dramatic problem of foreign debt is undermining the foundations of the economic structures of Latin American countries. It is attacking their democratic foundations and obstructing legitimate efforts for development, which must not be delayed.

The Republic of Paraguay is paying its foreign debt in a normal way, but for imperative moral reasons based upon a deeply rooted sense of brotherhood and because of common democratic ideals, it supports Latin America with solidarity in its deep concern about this question, which demands treatment based on the essential criteria of justice and equity.

Latin America needs better international prices for its products and more facilities for its exports; solidarity should be not merely claimed but supported by concrete measures serving the objective of growth. Culpable omissions and selfish attitudes should be eliminated in view of the moral claims of the human right to development and the human right to general well-being. A Latin America without economic disturbances that create anxiety and tension will make a more vigorous and effective contribution to the cause of world peace.

The Paraguayan people values peace, because it considers peace a fundamental prerequisite for the development of its creative spirit and because of the two painful international conflagrations it had to bear, as well as the long period of anarchy, with frequent bloodshed, which forced it to make great sacrifices and to face extreme hardships.

I participated as a soldier in the defence of my homeland in the cruel Chaco War from 1932 to 1935, and I have witnessed and lived through the sufferings caused by war. In those experiences of bloodshed and fire I gained a greater awareness of
the stoicism and courage of my people and deepened even more my conviction of the countless benefits born of peace.

In recent years the Republic of Paraguay, which throughout the course of its glorious history has always furthered sentiments of peace, has converted the energy of its heroism into a strength of mind which is moving our nation towards the future by dynamic social, economic and cultural development.

For the sake of better understanding between peoples it is necessary to ban conduct based on force and to practise real respect for the sovereignty of nations.

The international community wants disarmament, but the road leading to it requires a more open attitude towards the creation of a climate of ever wider confidence. Every State has the undeniable right to choose the means that serve the cause of national security, but that security should not be an excuse for giving free rein to armament processes, which lead to risks about which mankind is justifiably concerned.

With dramatic emphasis, the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, has said: "There is no possibility of winning a nuclear war, in any conceivable sense of the word 'win'; the end of civilization could hardly be a victory for anybody."

In response to the demand for disarmament we declare that we hope that efforts to combine realism, imagination and prudence will continue. Tragic irrationality and collective suicide cannot be the way. The universal conscience must triumph, because it is not only the security and the development of nations that are at stake but the very survival of mankind.

My country, with its deep commitment to peace and its faith in the future of the human race, will continue to give firm support to all efforts, all initiatives and ventures on the part of the United Nations with a view to disarmament and arms limitations, principally in the sphere of nuclear arms, and to the strengthening of international peace and security and social and economic progress for all nations.
On behalf of the people and Government of the Republic of Paraguay I express my fervent wishes for the success of this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The use of force against law and provocations for purposes of hegemony are incompatible with freedom and the aspirations to a security built on solid foundations.

In pursuit of the goal of disarmament, the key is to disarm ourselves of aggressiveness and to arm ourselves with a peaceful and creative spirit in a passionate search for a more just and humane world.

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

General of the Army Alfredo Stroessner, President of the Republic of Paraguay, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.
AGENDA ITEM 8 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. GENSCHER (Federal Republic of Germany) (spoke in German; English text furnished by the delegation): I have been entrusted with the honourable task of addressing this distinguished assembly on behalf of the 12 member countries of the European Community.

Permit me first to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election to this highly responsible post. You may rest assured that we shall do our utmost to support you in the performance of your important functions.

The world pins high hopes and expectations on this third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is being held against the background of encouraging progress made in the ongoing arms-control and disarmament negotiations and of improved West-East relations. We Europeans fully welcome that progress, which we shall continue to promote and assist strongly. In so doing, we shall place the greatest emphasis on all elements across the range of military arsenals: nuclear, chemical and conventional.

The INF Treaty, which entered into force last week, is a milestone in the field of nuclear-arms reductions. It marks a breakthrough from arms control to genuine arms reductions. Instead of limiting armaments at a high level, it eliminates for the first time an entire class of weapons. The principle of asymmetrical reductions is also applied for the first time. Whoever possesses more weapons must scrap more. A far-reaching co-operative verification régime has been agreed on.

The reduction of nuclear arsenals remains one of the highest priorities. The United States of America and the Soviet Union have a crucial responsibility in this respect. The INF Treaty must provide a significant impetus to further progress in
arms control and disarmament. Disarmament negotiations are already under way or will shortly be commenced in three important areas.

First, we hope that agreement is reached before the end of the year on halving the offensive strategic nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States. We hope for a solution to the problems relating to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We continue to attach the utmost importance to an effective international non-proliferation régime.

Secondly, the negotiations for a global ban on chemical weapons have made encouraging progress. The horrific reports of the use of these terrible weapons in the Gulf conflict have served to highlight how important is the need for a global ban. We Europeans condemn vigorously their continued use. We strongly support the work of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament in seeking to agree on a comprehensive, effectively verifiable chemical weapons convention, and appeal again to all the other countries represented here to do likewise. We are convinced that joint efforts can bring closer the resolution of the pending problems, including the complex but fundamental verification issues, in a way acceptable to all.

Thirdly, in the field of conventional weapons, we Europeans see an urgent necessity to achieve progress in disarmament. Conventional disarmament is an integral and important part of the overall disarmament process. Expenditure on conventional weapons and troops places a heavy burden on the social and economic development of most countries. It is conventional weapons that have been the cause of untold suffering during wars in recent years in various parts of the world.

For Europe, the establishment of stability at a lower level of conventional forces is the central task, necessary to redress the conventional imbalances in Europe. We are strongly in favour of the early commencement of negotiations within a framework of balanced results at the Vienna negotiations. But we also appeal to
all other countries in this assembly to address urgently conventional disarmament and arms control in their own region. We would submit that the development initiated in Europe of promoting both conventional arms control and confidence- and security-building measures might encourage countries in other regions to tackle these problems.
This special session is taking place at a favourable juncture. The dynamic developments occurring in disarmament and arms control and in West-East relations as a whole show that it is possible to reverse the arms race visibly. That process, which has been successfully initiated, must affect the multilateral disarmament debate more than it has up to now. Notwithstanding their specific nature, the concrete disarmament negotiations require constructive support and additional stimuli by the countries gathered here. Conversely, the global debate on disarmament issues must take due account of the ongoing negotiations. We must seize the opportunities afforded by this constructive parallelism. The United Nations must play a central role in the quest for disarmament, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

Disarmament and arms control, confidence building, concrete steps towards strengthening international peace and security - those will be the key topics of this special session in the coming weeks.

This special session faces important challenges. Familiar concepts must be reconsidered and new concepts developed. This includes, in my view, thoughts on how the United Nations can play an even more effective role in this field. This calls for courage and an awareness of what can actually be achieved. It calls for a readiness to reach and expand consensus to the greatest extent possible. Central to our debate must be this recognition: that arms control and disarmament should create greater security; that they can pave the way towards lasting peace and the prevention of any war, whether nuclear or conventional.

The Twelve expect this special session to take stock of the efforts made towards global and regional disarmament, due attention being paid to recent progress in disarmament. That progress must gain global recognition. Concrete
conclusions must be drawn from it to continue and accelerate efforts in all relevant areas to ease international tensions and further to promote arms control and disarmament.

We Europeans also expect this special session to provide an important momentum for the development of confidence-building concepts, for effective verification and for the promotion of more openness and transparency in the military field. In this respect we believe ground-breaking developments at the European level should be taken into account.

Verification will be an important topic for this special session. Effective verification is a basic requirement for compliance with each individual arms control agreement. Each verification régime must be geared to the specific requirements of the particular treaty. We hope that this special session will be able to agree on concrete recommendations, building upon this year’s successful work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Here, our debate can draw on recent European developments. The Stockholm Conference and the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (the INF Treaty) have brought about arrangements which were still inconceivable only a few years ago. Impressive and useful procedures for the mutual inspection of military activities have been developed among the 35 States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). Soviet and American inspectors will in future verify compliance with the INF Treaty through on-site inspections. This reveals a new awareness: that reliable verification is both necessary and feasible; verification generates confidence.

Confidence is also generated through greater transparency and openness in military matters. Here the United Nations has a major role to play. Thus the United Nations standardized reporting system is an important means for making
military expenditure comparable world-wide and hence more transparent than hitherto. The 12 countries of the European Community already participate in that system without exception. We appeal once more to all other countries to take part in it as well.

Would it not be possible for the United Nations likewise to provide a framework for more openness and transparency with regard to world-wide arms exports and imports?

There is a common denominator for these considerations: it is the building of more confidence. We must now seek to ensure that the network of confidence-building measures is expanded and intensified on a global scale. Regional approaches are very important in this respect. The United Nations has already laid significant groundwork upon the initiative of the Federal Republic of Germany. A few weeks ago the United Nations Disarmament Commission agreed on a catalogue of guidelines for confidence-building measures. That catalogue can now at last be adopted by the General Assembly and then applied by each country.

The most immediate contribution that the Twelve can make to international peace and stability is through the actions on their own continent. To prevent any kind of war in Europe once and for all and to ensure lasting peace, to obtain security through political dialogue and co-operation in all fields, to bring people closer together and to achieve respect for human rights - that is the political philosophy underlying the Helsinki Final Act. We shall continue to work towards achieving more security and closer co-operation among the States participating in the OSCE.

We are firmly committed to an outcome of the Vienna follow-up meeting which benefits all people in the 35 participating States. The reason is that respect for
human rights and fundamental freedoms constitutes an essential prerequisite for confidence, understanding and co-operation, not least in the field of security, arms control and disarmament.

We adhere to the goal of overcoming confrontation in Europe, as expressed in the Helsinki Final Act. Our continent must overcome its division again. To us the CSCE process remains the central element of a policy aimed at peace, disarmament, respect for human rights and co-operation. Its aim is that people and nations may develop in peaceful competition and without mutual fear.

Allow me to add the following comments in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The challenges of our time confront us with intellectual, ethical and political tasks on a scale not faced by any previous generation. We are exposed to the risk of weapons of mass destruction and faulty ecological developments putting an end to mankind and nature, indeed to the future itself. Economic instability and poverty in the third world cause social tensions world wide. At the same time we have the chance of creating a more humane world and of ensuring that the growing world population may live in dignity. This requires that we assume greater responsibility and become accessible to new thinking. Safeguarding peace, preserving natural resources for our own and future generations, solving global social and economic problems - that must become the categorical imperative of our political actions.
For how long can we justify the arms spending by rich and poor countries
world-wide absorbing unimaginable sums? For how long can we justify our only
gradual efforts to tackle the hazards to our environment? We need a peaceful
world-wide campaign to protect natural resources. We must take precautions so that
our children and grandchildren inherit a world that is worth living in. The
recognition that only in unison can we safeguard our future requires that everyone
participate in the undertaking. It requires that all nations become aware of their
responsibility for the survival of mankind, for the survival of future
generations. That task cannot be mastered by any Government, by any group of
countries or by any political system on its own.

In the history of mankind, 2 million years elapsed before the population of
the world reached 1 billion in about 1800; in 1987 the 5 billion mark was
attained. If that development were to continue unchecked there would be over
10 billion people on earth by the year 2050. These figures indicate the magnitude
of the problems that have to be solved.

Peace, common responsibility, solidarity and mutual respect therefore require
that all countries of the North perceive the poverty of the third world as a joint
challenge. The development of the third world is a common task of the
international community. The United Nations report by Mrs. Brundtland, Prime
Minister of Norway, highlights the vicious circle in which many third-world
countries are deeply entangled and from which they cannot free themselves without
assistance. The vicious circle of poverty and increasing environmental destruction
in turn has repercussions on the economic and ecological systems of industrial
nations. For the industrial nations of the North the fight against poverty in the
third world is therefore imperative not only for reasons of human solidarity and
economic prudence but also because of shared ecological interests. A more
important reason is that the fight against poverty is a contribution towards the safeguarding of peace. The Brundtland report also stresses the importance of employing technological progress for the benefit of mankind.

New high technology lessens the need to use raw materials and energy, thus conserving the environment. It helps us to mitigate the fundamental clash between ecological and economic factors. It indicates new ways and means of solving the global problems of food shortage, health care, education and energy supply.

We need a new ethic of the industrial age, an ethic of responsibility for nature and man's place in it. If mankind were threatened by the inhabitants of another planet the nations of the world would quickly unite their forces and would immediately realize that man's survival has long become the task of a responsible global domestic policy. Countries in the West, the East and the third world must all participate. Only jointly can we find answers to the innumerable challenges of our time.

The peace which we need is more than the elimination of military conflict. Peace requires respect for human rights, for civil, economic and social rights. Responsibility for the environment includes that for the forests and waters in Europe and in the tropics, as well as for the atmosphere surrounding our globe. We all bear responsibility for new technology which can either open up the future or jeopardize it.

Technological, economic and ecological developments have global effects; they influence one another. The increasing interdependence of these challenges demands effective strategies by the international community. We must use all available instruments of international co-operation to prevent crises turning into wars, to prevent a lack of vital supplies leading to famine, and neglect of the environment
leading to disaster. All of that is impossible if we seal ourselves off from each other. Openness and trust are required.

The experience of two world wars, as well as living at the dividing line between West and East, has heightened German awareness that our destiny is closely bound up with the destiny of all European nations. We regard our foreign policy as a European peace policy. Our Constitution, which calls upon us to preserve our national and political unity, commits us to serving the peace of the world as a partner in a united Europe.

The Germans in the two German States live up to their joint responsibility for peace. As Mr. Oskar Fischer, Foreign Minister of the German Democratic Republic has said, German soil must never again be the source of war; it must only be a source of peace. That shared responsibility of the Germans serves all Europeans.

As a member of the European Community, the Federal Republic of Germany makes a significant contribution towards the creation of a European union of democratic nations. The European Community is a community for freedom, peace, progress and social justice. The unique Franco-German partnership is its centrepiece.

In its capacity as a member of the Atlantic defence alliance, the Federal Republic of Germany strives for a just and lasting peaceful order in Europe, as defined in the Harmel report of 1967. Adequate military security as well as disarmament and arms control are integral, indispensable parts of our security policy. Anyone who genuinely seeks balanced and verifiable arms control agreements leading to greater stability will find in the Federal Republic of Germany a committed and open-minded partner in this undertaking. That is borne out by the INF Treaty, which my Government helped to bring about through substantive contributions of its own.
Further deep cuts in the strategic nuclear weapons of the United States and the Soviet Union are an attainable goal that we strongly support. I appeal to the two super-Powers to do their utmost to reach agreement before the end of this year on halving their strategic arsenals. Permanent consolidation of strategic stability between the super-Powers serves the security interests of all countries. This would meet a central demand of the final document adopted by the first special session devoted to disarmament.

The summit meeting in Moscow has given mankind fresh hope. The United States and the Soviet Union have achieved a new mutual relationship. President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev live up to their responsibility for world peace with vision and courage. They have planted a sapling of hope, which still needs to be tended by many gardeners. I appeal for an alliance of reason so that that new development may be strengthened and may prevail against the faint-hearted, the spiteful, the short-sighted and those who are still captives of their hostile preconceptions.
In Europe, advantage must be taken of the new developments in the Soviet Union in order to create a peaceful European order, to build a common European house. We shall develop and expand my country's relations with the Soviet Union, which are of key importance for the attainment of this great goal. History has shown how significant the relationship between us Germans and the peoples of the Soviet Union is for the situation in Europe.

In this nuclear age, the aim cannot and must not any longer be to fight and win wars. Thinking in terms of scenarios for fighting wars involving regionally limited nuclear theatres must vanish from the minds of planners and theoreticians. Nuclear weapons perform a political function. They are political means of war-prevention. Though it is true that nuclear weapons have helped to avoid war in Europe since the Second World War and though it is true that we shall continue to need them in the foreseeable future for our alliance's strategy aimed at preventing war, it is just as essential to reduce, through a co-operative security policy, the reliance on nuclear deterrence. The risks that are also inherent in this deterrent can be mastered only by rational, responsible conduct on both sides. We must apply the same responsibility and rationality to create peace-promoting structures for ensuring our common survival. Here, too, mutual trust is called for. The aim is to generate additional security by removing the causes of tension and developing co-operative structures.

Europe has the chance of creating security of a new, exemplary quality. 1988 must be the year in which negotiations on conventional stability are started. The conventional imbalance in Europe, the Eastern superiority in military fields, is the root problem of European security. We seek for Europe a system of co-operative security that makes it impossible to start and wage a conventional war.
Negotiations on conventional stability must be seen in that perspective. This is what we are striving for: the establishment of a secure and stable balance of conventional forces at lower levels, and, as a matter of high priority, the elimination of the capability for launching surprise attack and for initiating large-scale offensive action.

The strength, equipment, deployment, readiness and structure of conventional forces must be seen in that light and they must be reduced to a level meeting the requirements of a non-offensive capability. The objective is to attain a situation in Europe in which neither side possesses any longer the capacity to attack foreign territory. That already holds true of the forces of the Western alliance.

Building on the success of the Stockholm Conference, we wish to create more transparency and confidence in Europe. True conventional stability and further confidence-building also require agreement on the philosophies underlying the defence postures. We seek agreement on the functions to be performed by forces on both sides. That must be reflected in the strength, equipment and command principles of each side's forces. They should exclusively serve the purpose of self-defence and the prevention of war.

Throughout the world the perception is gaining ground that more security through fewer weapons is a realistic goal. That is encouraging. The horrifying pictures of the use of chemical weapons in the Gulf war and the dreadful suffering of the victims impose on us all the duty to attain a convention banning chemical weapons worldwide. Only a global ban can effectively prevent the proliferation of this terrible class of weapons. A convention for the complete and verifiable prohibition of chemical weapons is within reach; it can be concluded by the end of
this year. The report by the Geneva Conference on Disarmament that has been submitted to the Assembly is impressive proof of the progress made in drafting a convention.

I appeal to the international community to redouble its efforts in order that the final obstacles can be surmounted. Practical solutions that are capable of consensus and based on the Conference's careful preliminary work can be found to the still unsettled questions of the draft convention. On the difficult verification issues, joint efforts can be made to reach agreement that meets the security needs of all countries. This special session must bring its full political weight to bear so that the convention can be concluded before the end of the year.

Chemical weapons are immoral. They must no longer have a place in military arsenals. In view of the recent use of chemical weapons in third world conflicts, we already need now an effective United Nations instrument that is available at all times for investigating alleged violations of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Useful preliminary work has already been done in resolution 37/98 D, and various fact-finding missions by the United Nations Secretary-General have provided practical experience. Now we must lay down - on the basis of broad agreement - procedures for international investigations permitting swift clarification of any suspected use of chemical weapons. The international community must demonstrate by all available means that it does not want to remain indifferent to violations of the Geneva Protocol. Such an instrument of investigation would furnish practical experience for shaping the verification régime under the envisaged chemical weapons convention. It would also be a useful precedent for any further instruments of political crisis management within the United Nations system.
The new, fundamental developments which give us in Europe good reason to
nurture strong hopes now in the field of arms control and disarmament, too, have
been made possible by new perceptions. They can give rise to the structures of a
new, co-operative security policy, thus providing the framework for the secure and
harmonious coexistence of peoples and nations. This special session must
strengthen the peace-preserving capacity of the United Nations and define the
parameters of a co-operative security policy at the global level. Major elements
of such a system of worldwide security should be:

First, modern security thinking must be geared entirely to the rational goal
of ensuring joint survival. The security interests of the other side must be borne
in mind. There must no longer be any hankering after superiority and hegemony.

Second, relations between nations must be determined by restraint and not by
the search for unilateral gains. That applies not only to West and East but,
equally, to the relationship between the countries of the North and the nations of
the third world.

Third, we need the eradication of hostile pre-conceptions; the promotion of
peaceful attitudes and respect for other nations; the opening, democratization and
humanization of societies; the application of the United Nations human rights
covenants and of other pledges, as made by the signatories of the Helsinki Final
Act. Every country must be measured by its conduct towards other countries and
towards its own citizens.
Fourth, mutually beneficial co-operation must be widened and deepened in all fields. In this interlinked world we must create positive forms of mutual dependence that make the path of co-operation between equals become irreversible.

Fifth, disarmament steps must eliminate superiority and establish equilibrium at a lower level in all military fields.

Sixth, disarmament steps must generate increased security. If disarmament in one sector is matched by new armaments in another, this will give rise to new instability and thus jeopardize disarmament.

Seventh, qualitative changes to the structure of forces must remove the capacity for invasion and surprise attack.

Eighth, effective mechanisms for global and political crisis management must prevent unforeseen conflicts triggering off greater crises.

Ninth, confidence-building measures and transparency must be achieved world-wide. The elimination of distrust is a universal task. Countries in which one can place justified confidence are not regarded as threatening.

Tenth, global arms exports must be brought under control. We need, at last, a United Nations register of the arms exports and imports of all countries.

This imposes responsibility not only on the countries involved in a conflict. The United Nations with its wide range of instruments is particularly suited to contributing, as indeed it must. A peace policy must increasingly be universal in nature. This universal responsibility for peace should therefore prompt us to consider how to enhance the United Nations instruments for peace-keeping and the settlement of conflicts. We are open to all constructive suggestions. As early as 1929, Salvador de Madariaga stated that the problem of disarmament is in reality a problem concerning the organization of the international community.
Our children and grandchildren will judge us by whether we managed to perceive the challenges and initiate the necessary action to cope with them. In so doing, we must look beyond the present day. We must not only ask: what does this step bring us today? We must also ask: can we still answer for it tomorrow?

The philosopher Hans Jonas once stated on the subject of human action as it should manifest itself in a political and ethical process:

"... sharing liability for unknown things to come is, in view of the ultimate uncertainty of hope, an essential prerequisite for responsible action - it is what is known as the courage to bear responsibility."

Let us in East and West, North and South, view the safeguarding of our future and the survival of mankind as our common task and let us tackle it with determination.

The twelve countries of the European Community will be found ready to play an active and constructive part in the deliberations and drafting work during the coming weeks. We will make our contribution to a debate that should be focused on the existing situation and on the future objectives of disarmament and arms control. We seek a final document that is short and concise, sets out common ground and can be adopted by consensus.

The Twelve want to see this special session devoted to disarmament being brought to a successful conclusion. In this endeavour, our support can be counted on.

Mr. Ssemogerere (Uganda): I should like to state how delighted we are, Sir, to see you presiding over the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Uganda delegation is happy to see a diplomat and statesman of your calibre, from a country with which Uganda enjoys cordial relations, steering the work of the Assembly at this opportune moment when we are seriously considering the virtues of peace to which you are committed.
On numerous occasions the Uganda delegation has worked with you both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. I wish on behalf of my delegation to extend to you our sincere congratulations on your election to the Presidency of this special session. Your outstanding qualities and vast experience in multilateral diplomacy, and in particular your knowledge of disarmament issues, are well known. Your record of performance in guiding the forty-second regular session of the General Assembly gives us every hope and confidence that our deliberations will be successful.*

I wish also to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his efforts to find acceptable solutions to the various problems facing the world.

Following the Second World War the United Nations was created with the clear purpose of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In the preamble to the Charter the founding fathers resolved:

"to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours,

"to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security,

"to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

"to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples".

Article 1 (4) of the Charter spells out that the United Nations should be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends. It is to the credit of the United Nations that it has played a leading role in the decolonization process, as a result of which many of our countries are now

* Mr. Salah (Jordan), Vice-President, took the Chair.
represented here. Furthermore, countries with diverse political, ideological and religious persuasions are all Members of this Organization. Similarly, authentic liberation movements have been given observer status and participate in our discussions. The United Nations has nearly achieved this goal of universality and hence become a true forum for harmonizing the actions of nations. It follows, therefore, that the United Nations is an appropriate platform for deliberations on global issues that confront humanity. One of the most important problems on the global agenda is the question of disarmament and development.
Mankind is confronted with a choice. We must proceed to disarm or risk annihilation of the human race. Man must seek security in disarmament rather than engage in continuous production, accumulation and use of the instruments of destruction. Therein lies the wisdom and strength of the Final Document of the United Nations first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament held in 1978.

When the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was convened here, our aspirations were raised, only to be dashed four years later when, due to East-West tension at the time, the second special session failed to achieve anything substantial.

Peace we must achieve. But that peace is not the mere survival of man, it has to be a universal and comprehensive peace. It is a peace that looks at mankind in its totality. Peace is more than the absence of war. The peace we strive for must perceive mankind in its social milieu. Man must not only survive, but also live a decent life within hospitable social environs. He must be free, housed and well fed. He must be educated and made literate. Our Organization must, in concrete terms, deliver the right of people to peace.

The challenge confronting us is stark: whether to spend trillions of dollars per year on armaments of destruction or to feed mankind; whether to research into Star Wars or the causes and cures of the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS); whether to construct ammunition dumps or hospitals; in short whether to kill or save lives. That is the subject-matter of the relationship between disarmament and development which I intend to stress.

There is no doubt that the process of disarmament is inextricably linked to the economic and social development of all peoples. As we make progress in disarmament, military expenditures will be considerably reduced - thus releasing
funds to be devoted to economic and social development, of the developing countries
in particular.

The report of the International Conference on the Relationship Between
Disarmament and Development (A/CONF.130/21) reveals the negative relationship
between armaments and development. The continued release of already woefully
finite resources towards armaments further aggravates the precarious situation of
real economic growth and development and provides a serious impediment to the
implementation of the objectives of the new international economic order. Efforts
should not be spared to identify and implement ways and means of releasing
resources from disarmament for development purposes. In this regard, my delegation
strongly supports the setting up of a disarmament fund and an appropriate financial
mechanism under the auspices of the United Nations to transfer the resources thus
released from the disarmament process to development.

It would be naive to perceive security in solely military terms. Security
must not be judged from the level of available sophisticated instruments of death
and destruction. It should be addressed in its global dimension, particularly its
socio-economic imperatives.

When addressing the forty-second session from this very rostrum on
21 October 1987 my President, Mr. Yoweri Museveni, had the following to say:

"... a more fundamental commitment to the improvement of our socio-economic
conditions is the prime imperative of our times. A hungry man cannot be said
to enjoy a full life; a sick man is an incomplete human being ... it is
impossible to guarantee the human dignity of the people in a state of poverty,
disease, ignorance and economic backwardness. In these circumstances, such
efforts will be rendered peripheral to the real human rights problems which ...
are based on the consequences of underdevelopment". (A/42/PV.45, pp. 7-8)
Developing countries are caught in a dire dilemma. On the one hand, we are over-burdened with debts; on the other hand, we are under-rewarded with our export earnings. There are huge capital outflows from developing to developed countries, to the massive disadvantage of the former.

Africa alone lost $34 billion worth of resources as compared to $18 billion of inflow of resources in 1986. By the end of that year, Africa's total debt was estimated to be $US 200 billion, a significant portion of which is due to arms imports. It is estimated that by 1995 the annual average debt-service payments will reach about $US 31 billion or 48 per cent of export earnings, with some of our countries far exceeding 100 per cent.*

It is unfortunate that developing countries have been turned into pawns of super-Power rivalries. Resources for development, which otherwise could be usefully ploughed into the socio-economic betterment of our peoples, are being superseded by military "aids" to fit into the strategic calculations of the big Powers. We are caught in a vicious circle. While we desire peace so that we can devote our previous finite resources and time towards economic and social development, arms merchants continue to exacerbate our conflicts for their own profit.

To a considerable extent the developing countries share responsibility for this imbalance. Some fall prey to the overtures of the arms dealers who, in many cases, contribute to creating a sense of false insecurity. Consequently, they devote a disproportionate share of their budgets to military expenditures. We must also be prepared to redress that imbalance by spending less on armaments and more on development. Confidence-building measures, the demonstration of a spirit of

* The President returned to the Chair.
good-neighbourliness among States and the promotion of the peaceful settlement of disputes would go a long way towards reducing tension and curbing the arms race, thereby contributing to regional disarmament. We must find non-military means to achieve peace and security. That is within the ethical context of the United Nations Charter.

My delegation maintains that the true cost of the arms race includes what could have been produced with the scarce capital, labour skills and raw materials that are devoted to the armament industry. It is to us a matter of regret that research on weapons world wide exceeds the combined funding of research devoted to development, improving human health and agricultural productivity. In our view, military-industry development is the least efficient way of increasing the stock of human capital. As the post-war developments in Europe and Japan have demonstrated, a conversion from the military industry to other more productive activities geared to economic and social development can successfully be undertaken.

The traditional notion of security in terms of military and political prowess should be abandoned. We submit that the notion of insecurity encompasses the denial of human rights, underdevelopment, poverty and the destruction of the environment, all of which threaten man's survival. There is no military solution to the insecurity arising from human degradation, poverty, disease and ignorance or pollution.
The danger of the arms race, particularly in its nuclear dimension, looms large over mankind. In spite of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the vertical expansion of these dreaded weapons has continued unabated over the years. We in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries have ceaselessly called for nuclear disarmament. Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and its civilization. We have been told in this forum, and it has been acknowledged by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, that a nuclear war can never be won and should never be fought. In this regard, we welcome the Treaty between the United States of America and the USSR on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - banning for the first time a whole category of nuclear weapons. It is our hope that the two nuclear giants will, as their leaders have pledged, proceed expeditiously to reduce by half their strategic nuclear arsenals by the end of this millenium.

We welcome these positive developments in the international environment. We are also encouraged by the new spirit of co-operation between the USSR and the United States and ask for continued dialogue between the two. The exchange of visits between the leaders of the super-Powers and the discussions between them are a welcome development.

However, it is imperative that we remain vigilant. The recent agreement should not lure us into complacency. We all remember only too well the period of détente in the 1970s, which culminated in the Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms - the SALT II Treaty. Unfortunately that détente was swiftly replaced by a period of great tension between the super-Powers and massive re-armament programmes, the upshot of which was the failure of the second special session on disarmament (SSOD II) in 1982. It is, therefore, essential that we guard against any factors that may endanger the present détente. Agreements to
reduce existing nuclear weapons should not serve as preludes to the further qualitative improvement of weapons of mass destruction.

It would be a great danger if the recent agreement were a consequence of technological advancement in other realms of the arms race and the abandonment of generations of obsolete systems in preference for even more sophisticated and deadly ones. We hope that we are eventually proved wrong. While the INF Treaty is a step in the right direction, it must in our view be accompanied by decisive measures to check the development of a new generation of even more dreadful weapons.

We are concerned that steps are afoot to extend the arenas of competition in the arms race to outer space and beyond. This trend is contrary to the existing international instruments, particularly the Treaty on the Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which require that outer space be utilized for peaceful purposes only, for the benefit of all mankind, as it is our common heritage. We fully subscribe to the position of the non-aligned countries, reiterated in the Declaration adopted by our recent ministerial meeting in Havana, against the militarization of outer space and calling for the speedy conclusion of a multilateral treaty to this end.

In 1964 the first summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) held in Cairo adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, which called upon all States not to test, manufacture or store nuclear weapons on the continent of Africa. That Declaration was endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in resolution 2033 (XX) in 1965. Independent States of Africa have faithfully honoured the terms of that Declaration. We have chosen the path of utilizing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only.
Uganda, like most African States, is a signatory to the non-proliferation Treaty. In the framework of the non-proliferation Treaty the Heads of State or Government of the OAU in 1986 decided to organize an African regional symposium to explore ways and means of using nuclear energy for the resolution of Africa's pressing developmental problems in the context of the African Priority Programme on Economic Recovery (APPER). Arrangements are under way for the symposium to take place in Uganda later this year. Approaches for assistance in the successful realization of the symposium have been made to the relevant agencies of the United Nations, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It is a matter of regret and concern to us that the response elicited thus far from these agencies has been lukewarm. As it is the duty of the United Nations to promote the peaceful application of nuclear energy, it is our hope that the relevant United Nations agencies, such as IAEA, the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the Department for Disarmament Affairs, and so on, will come forward and provide financial, material and technical support for this worthy endeavour.

It is regrettable that some nuclear-weapon States have chosen to make Africa a dumping-ground for storage of their nuclear wastes with imponderable consequences for the health of present and future generations and for our environment. The twenty-fourth Assembly of OAU Heads of State strongly condemned this policy and practice. It is our view that this is a crime that must not be tolerated. It is incumbent on the Assembly to put an end to this criminal mischief.

While independent Africa strives to acquire nuclear technology and harness it for peaceful purposes only, South Africa, on the other hand, has, with the tacit collaboration of some Members of the Organization, acquired nuclear-weapon capability with the clear intent of using it for offensive purposes. This is contrary to resolution 2033 (XX). We find it paradoxical that developing
countries, which intend to apply nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, are denied assistance to this end while a pariah State, like the racist South African régime, gets easy access to nuclear-weapons technology, albeit clandestinely.

The nuclear capability of the apartheid régime poses a grave danger to the peace and security of Africa, in particular, and of the world at large. South Africa continues its illegal occupation of Namibia, contrary to Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In order to make the southern African region safe for apartheid, the racist régime embarked on the destabilization of the front-line States and aggression against them. South Africa's troops are to date in occupation of southern Angola. Armed with the nuclear option, the racist régime would like to hold the entire international community to ransom so that it can be left to perpetuate its evil policies and practices. It is incumbent on the Assembly to prevent such a dangerous eventuality.

The United Nations has played a critical role in setting standards for the conduct of States and Governments. One of the most outstanding contributions in this regard is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which has been incorporated into the Constitutions of almost all States. While all countries try to comply with the noble goals of the Declaration, the racist South African régime has consistently and flagrantly continued to trample on the basic human and political rights of its people. Worse still, the Pretoria régime continues to commit acts of aggression and breaches of the peace against the front-line States. The Assembly may well recall that our Charter provides for collective action under articles 39, 41 and 42 in such cases.
In contemporary history there is no State that is such an outlaw as is the racist régime. It is to us a matter of disappointment that the collective action provided for in the Charter has not been invoked. To collaborate with the apartheid régime is reprehensible enough; but to aid and abet it in acquiring nuclear-weapon capability is criminal.

In 1978, the first special session on disarmament spelt out the priorities of disarmament as outlined in the Final Document. Those priorities are as valid today as they were then.

I have underscored the urgency of reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons. Equally urgent is the need for drastic reduction of conventional weapons and the elimination of chemical weapons. As we all know, all the wars since 1945 have involved the use of conventional weapons, which have consumed millions of lives. It is also deplorable that chemical weapons, have been used in areas of conflict contrary to the 1925 Geneva Convention.

The Conference on Disarmament must draw up a comprehensive programme on disarmament. A speedy agreement must be reached on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The Conference on Disarmament should also speedily conclude an agreement on a chemical weapons convention whose success seems to be in sight. It is vital that the Conference be strengthened and made a more effective instrument for achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The multilateral role that Conference plays is a symbol of the centrality of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We remain concerned that those who downplay the usefulness of the United Nations are putting artificial barriers on the smooth functioning of the multilateral negotiating process. This has, for example, led to the failure of the Conference to establish an ad hoc committee to deal with the issue of a nuclear-test ban.
We are deeply encouraged by the consciousness of international public opinion as aroused by the World Disarmament Campaign. It has become clear that matters of international peace and security cannot be the monopoly or domain of a few States. It is, therefore, very important to involve every country and people in disarmament and its negotiating process. We support the six-nation initiative and their Stockholm Declaration stressing the responsibility of all States in disarmament. It is in this context that we hope this session will endeavour to review the membership of the Conference on Disarmament in order to encourage a rotational membership similar to that of other United Nations organs.

It is our fervent hope that this session will rekindle the aspirations of the first special session on disarmament and reaffirm the vitality and validity of the Final Document of SSOD I. In the same vein, I wish to underscore the inextricable link between disarmament and development and to reaffirm Uganda's support for the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

Mr. ORZECHOWSKI (Poland) (spoke in Polish; English text furnished by the delegation): Sir, I wish to congratulate you cordially on your assumption of the presidency of this session and to express my conviction that your experience and devotion to disarmament will contribute to the achievement of significant results.

I should like at the same time to convey our expression of appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his untiring efforts towards disarmament and the strengthening of international security and enhancing the role of the United Nations in this regard as well as to extend to him the assurances of our unwavering support.

Poland considers the convening of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament to be a momentous event.
The development of the contemporary world bore fruit in the unparalleled rise of civilization but at the same time it caused mankind to face threats and challenges on an unheard of scale. The greatest of them is the unremitting, all-encompassing and debilitating arms race. To halt and reverse it has become the top-priority task for the international community. The universal, system-transcending character of threats and challenges in the conditions of growing interdependence of the destinies of States and nations compels us towards understanding on the widest scale. We declare ourselves in favour of its embodiment in the comprehensive system of international peace and security, political, military, economic, humanitarian and ecological. The United Nations provides the most suitable forum for its realization. All States, irrespective of their potential and extent of influence, can find room within their framework for the articulation of initiatives and the development of activities in the great undertaking of building a world durably secure, free from weapons of mass destruction, a world of general and complete disarmament.

The common effort to solve today's dilemmas requires the democratization of international relations, increasing confidence and a concordant will to seek compromise, taking into consideration the interests of all parties. Practice has shown how much strenuous effort goes into reaching a position acceptable to all. However, there is no way other than by dialogue, mutual persuasion, patient and persevering negotiations. Confrontation, striving for domination, hostile and distrustful attitudes bring harm to all.

The 10 years that have elapsed since the first special session devoted to disarmament have confirmed the lasting topicality and significance of the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document.
(Mr. Orzechowski, Poland)

One of the most valuable results of the first special session has been the consolidation in the minds of nations of a conviction that in the nuclear era security cannot be assured through the expansion of arsenals and the addition of ever-newer and more lethal weapons. The only alternative to the nightmare of armaments is international security through disarmament and a gradual but effective scaling-down of the level of armaments. This key concept, whose pertinence has been brought into relief by the past years, should find full reaffirmation at the current special session.

The Socialist States have made a significant contribution to strengthening the conviction of the need to enhance security through disarmament. In past years we have submitted numerous peace and disarmament initiatives, both collectively and individually.
They have all stemmed from the underlying firm belief that a democratic confrontation-free disarmament dialogue carried out according to the principle that one's own security does not conflict with the security of others is not only necessary but also possible.

The international climate has recently undergone a considerable, generally felt improvement. The major driving force behind these positive developments in international relations is a growing realism and pragmatism in the activity of parliaments, governments, political parties and organizations, dissemination of the concept of new thinking and increased efforts on the part of broad social forces in many countries for peace, détente and disarmament.

The Washington Treaty on intermediate-range nuclear forces has initiated the era of real nuclear disarmament. The Soviet-American dialogue, intense and fruitful - as emphatically demonstrated by the recent Moscow summit meeting of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States - paves the way to a lasting improvement of the international situation. The attainment of an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of the strategic offensive nuclear weapons of both great Powers has become more feasible.

In viewing the issues of the contemporary world we do not indulge in excessive, unfounded optimism. Disarmament is not a self-powered engine. It requires constant political action, ever new stimuli and efforts, permanent public pressure. Further disarmament steps are a necessity. The third special session should resolutely speak out in favour of giving the disarmament process the stamp of continuity, universality and irreversibility. Bilateral and multilateral undertakings serving disarmament should mutually complement and enhance one another.

In particular, a total and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests is necessary. It is the only effective barrier against the development of new types and the
modernization of the existing nuclear means of destruction. Equally necessary are guarantees for preventing the restoration of nuclear weapons in a new guise.

It is with attention and interest that we are following the course of our debate. In my belief, it allows us to come up with the general thesis that any objective analysis of contemporary times proves, irrespective of its philosophical and methodological premises, that the solution to problems afflicting humanity can only come about in conditions of peace and security equal for all States and peoples. By rejecting the maxim "Si vis pacem para bellum", by expressing the will of nations to build a lastingly secure world through the consolidation of instruments of peace, not war, the third special session of the General Assembly on disarmament may constitute a significant step towards the elaboration of a long-range, yet concrete, disarmament programme.

The international community is at a cross-roads. The future of mankind will depend on which direction we shall take. The Polish people and the highest authorities of my country share deeply this conviction. The humanistic, peaceful aims and intentions of Polish foreign policy are expressed to the fullest in the message addressed to this Assembly by the President of the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, Wojciech Jaruzelski. Here is that message:

"The Polish people welcome the convening of the third special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament with satisfaction and hope. The time of an unbridled escalation of the arms race, especially in the nuclear field, has brought mankind dangerously close to the point of no return. Crossing that point would be tantamount to annihilating our civilization. The economic consequences of the arms race have left their ominous mark on the world economy, aggravating disparities between States and leading to dangerous tensions in different parts of the world.
"The last few months, however, have eloquently demonstrated that what for decades was considered sheer Utopia is in fact perfectly possible. The Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has restored to the word "disarmament" its proper meaning. It has turned out that a physical elimination of the means of mass destruction is fully practicable. This should be transferred to other fields of disarmament as well.

"An event of great importance was the last meeting, in Moscow, between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. It demonstrated that the great Powers were intensifying their dialogue. The improved quality of their mutual relations that is gradually taking shape is in the interest of the whole international community. The agreements reached pave the way towards new disarmament accords. In particular, they bring closer the conclusion of a treaty on the 50 per cent reduction and limitation of Soviet and American strategic offensive weapons.

"The present special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations stands a historic chance of adding momentum to the disarmament process. That chance must not be lost. The vast potential of intellect and political will of those participating in this world forum, their accumulated historical experience and a favourable political climate at present should yield the fruit of a creative development of the concept of common security through disarmament and enhanced mutual confidence as well as the mapping out of the ways and means of putting that concept into effect. Poland's historic experiences account for its keen interest in the conduct of disarmament negotiations. We have put forth a number of proposals and ideas over the past years. Among them, the concept of atom-free zones, for example, has become a concrete reality in many parts of the world."
"Over a year ago, on 8 May 1987, from the rostrum of the second Congress of the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth, I had the honour to submit a plan on decreasing armaments and increasing confidence in Central Europe. The essence of the initiative was elaborated in detail in a memorandum of the Polish Government of 17 July 1987 and subsequently was presented at the forty-second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

"The Polish initiative has been the subject of talks and consultations both with its direct addressees and with all other interested States.

"The underlying objective of the Polish proposal is to lay down the foundations of a system of common European security, to eliminate the destabilizing impact of the present level of military confrontation in Europe upon the overall international situation. The crux of the plan is to transform military potentials into strictly defensive ones through a set of comprehensive measures of political, military, doctrinal and technical character. We propose that appropriate undertakings cover nuclear and conventional armaments, the character of military doctrines and confidence-building measures.

"We regard as most pressing the scaling-down of the possibility of a surprise attack by any party, a goal that can be attained through a substantive reduction of the offensive components of the military potentials while retaining forces sufficient to ensure effective defence against any attack.

"While developing and concretizing our initiative we kept in mind the postulates articulated by our partners as well as the requirements and possibilities offered at the present stage of the disarmament dialogue."
"Recognizing the tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe to constitute a singularly dangerous element of the potential that could also be used for a surprise attack, we come out for its gradual reduction and subsequent elimination. As a preliminary step we propose to undertake a commitment not to increase the level of nuclear armaments in Central Europe and to refrain from compensating for the armaments reduced as well as not to deploy new types of such arms.

"Appropriate undertakings in that regard, while closely linked to all-European conventional disarmament, could be considered independently, in a separate negotiating forum.

"Seeking to ensure military stability in the field of conventional armed forces and armaments at a proportionately lower level, we advocate first of all the elimination of the existing disproportions and asymmetries in armed forces and individual kinds of weapons. To this end we envisage, inter alia, a possibility of 'package' deals, allowing for the sides to reduce different - but equivalent - components of the military potentials.

"In our considered view, the disarmament undertakings in Central Europe should lead to the creation of a zone of thinned-out armaments enjoying a special régime that would cover the numerical strength, armaments, disposition and readiness of the armed forces. In such a zone, the most threatening components of armaments would be moved farther away from the line of contact and put into a state of lower readiness or eliminated altogether from the armed forces. Such a zone of thinned-out armaments would reduce or pre-empt the possibility of launching a surprise attack, particularly a large-scale attack."
"Postulating the evolution of military doctrines so that they could be based on the principle of defensive sufficiency, we suggest that both the political, and the military and technical aspects of such doctrines be taken into due account. An expanded version of the plan also embodies an inventory of confidence-building measures for Central Europe embracing, among other things, the exchange of military information, limitation of the activities of armed forces depending on where they are stationed and the establishment of a 'hot line' communications system between the supreme authorities and military high commands.

"All the undertakings proposed by us would be subject to strict verification, including mandatory inspections, exchange of military information and appropriate supervision. Also subject to control would be the observance of levels obtaining as a result of the implementation of agreed measures.

"We are also proposing a manner of implementation of the measures envisaged in the plan which would not be to the detriment of the security interest of any State.

"The Polish proposal retains its open character. We stand ready to co-operate with all interested Governments on the development of the proposals incorporated in the plan.

"The elimination of threats to the security of Europe, a continent where both world wars originated, would constitute a concrete contribution to enhancing confidence and co-operation between nations and to the consolidation of peace and security world-wide.
(Mr. Orzechowski, Poland)

"I am confident that the representatives participating in this session will muster sufficient courage, wisdom and sense of responsibility to attain the goals set before them by the international community. I have the honour to convey to the session my best wishes for every success in the discharge of its lofty mission."

The most vital national interests of Poland, which is situated at the centre of the old continent at the intersection of civilizational and cultural influences of East and West, have been, are and shall remain inseparably linked to peace, security and stability of territorial and political order in Europe.

The positively developing Soviet-American dialogue and the present trends in East-West relations give Europe very promising opportunities. It is a common cause of all States and nations of the continent to take advantage of them. The Polish People's Republic, acting in the best traditions of its activity, will continue to make its own contribution to the consolidation of the edifice of all-European security, dialogue, disarmament and peaceful co-operation.

The state of political, economic and cultural relations and the steady progress in the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) hardly warrant the maintenance of such a high level of military potential and preparedness as is the case today and, by the same token, of the risk of confrontation.

It is from this belief that stems Poland's consistent striving for an evolution of the political and military situation in Europe which would lead to the undiminished and equal security of all States at a considerably lower level of armed forces and armaments.

Because of the size and nature of its military potential, Poland is particularly interested in the beginning of conventional disarmament in Central Europe and on the whole of that continent, from the Atlantic to the Urals.
We come out in favour of military détente and increased confidence, multilateral elimination of all existing asymmetries and disproportions and maximal limitation of the danger of the outbreak of an armed conflict, in particular of the possibility of a surprise attack.

We are justifiably concerned at the unwillingness of some States to engage in constructive negotiations, at the pushing through of new armaments concepts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), referred to as "compensation" or "modernization". Their realization would entail the risk of squandering the political capital gained as a result of the ratification of the Washington INF Treaty. We cannot overlook the fact that new generations of conventional weapons with increased strike accuracy and precision are frequently no less destructive than tactical nuclear weapons. In this context, the question of dual-capacity weapons becomes particularly significant. Generally considered conventional, they can at the same time be used to deliver nuclear loads. Besides large-calibre artillery and strike air force, this category should also include missiles capable of delivering conventional warheads. The exclusion from the negotiations on the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments of dual-capacity weapons could preclude the elimination of existing disproportions.

The recommendations of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament pertaining to conventional weapons should be given concrete form. We would like this special session to add this question to the priorities in the field of disarmament.

We are for the conclusion of the Vienna CSCE meeting for the signing of a balanced final document by the foreign ministers, as soon as possible.
It is high time for Europe genuinely and fully to become a region of peaceful co-operation and not one of aggravated ideological and political confrontation. It is only by common effort that we can contribute to bringing the two parts of divided Europe closer together and to revival of the sense of unity of the old continent. Only a partnerlike and peacefully co-operating Europe jointly meeting challenges and defusing threats will deserve, in the opinion of all its inhabitants, to be called a common European home.

The fundamental dilemma is either progress in disarmament and life in a more secure world or maintenance of the armaments spiral and condemnation to annihilation.

Disarmament is not an end in itself; it is a means of maintaining peace and strengthening international security. In recent years, this idea has been gaining ever greater recognition. It has been exemplified, inter alia, in the message of John Paul II addressed to this Assembly, filled as it was with humanism and concern for the future of the world. We have found there many important reflections which correspond with our country's position and flow from the paramount conviction that peace is humanity's supreme value.
Recent years have witnessed disarmament's ceasing to be the exclusive preserve of politicians and military men. It has acquired new dimensions through the voices of broad sections of the international community. The humanistic, ethical and moral aspects of disarmament have been brought into focus. The partisans of peace have gained new arguments and incentives. Disarmament means also releasing resources for development that could be utilized in accordance with the programme of action adopted last year by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. Disarmament means also overcoming hostility, bringing nations closer together and increasing the flow of information and ideas.

It is precisely in that broad context that we view the role and significance of the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are glad that the efforts of the non-aligned countries go in the same direction. In particular, important disarmament postulates are contained in the final communiqué of the meeting of foreign ministers of the member countries of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, concluded recently in Havana.

Consistently with our concept of the responsibility and role of Heads of State and Government, we attach major significance to their personal commitment to disarmament. We welcome with full appreciation the Stockholm Declaration adopted at the Third Summit Meeting of the Heads of State or Government of the Six-Nation Initiative. Its content, permeated with profound concern for ridding the world of nuclear arms and all forms of violence, reinforced with the moral authority of prominent leaders, represents a major factor stimulating and strengthening the disarmament dialogue.

It is in our tradition to consider carefully and support all regional disarmament initiatives, specifically those that aim at establishing
nuclear-weapon-free zones in Europe, north-east Asia and other sensitive regions of the world.

Poland, although it does not manufacture or possess chemical weapons, has for years been actively involved in efforts to have them eliminated. Our aim is to bring about the earliest ban on chemical weapons of all types, in all countries and for all time. We shall do our best to see that that happens as soon as possible.

We are vitally interested in the speedy finalization of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. That is evidenced by the activity of the Polish delegation to the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. That finalization depends solely on the political will of all the participants in the negotiations in question. We are in favour of the direct involvement of ministers for foreign affairs in an effort to overcome the differences still existing. It would be good if this special session were to add its power and authority to the endeavour to have such a convention concluded at the earliest date, as has been underlined by many preceding speakers.

We propose that at this special session the General Assembly should renew its appeal to States participating in the elaboration of the convention to refrain from any action likely to complicate, delay or even render impossible the completion of the draft convention. Such appeals take on special significance when chemical weapons are again being used on battlefields, when decisions are being taken to go ahead with the production of binary chemical weapons.

For a number of years the prevention of an arms race in outer space has been a pressing issue. Its special importance lies in the necessity of protecting that important part of the common heritage of mankind against armaments and in the threat of highly destabilizing consequences leading to a competition in the rapid development of offensive nuclear systems and of systems alleged to be of a
defensive nature. Such a competition could result in the dismantling of the existing disarmament agreements. Without any doubt, the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 would most likely fall as its first victim.

The time has come for the Conference on Disarmament to take advantage of its considerable wealth of knowledge and ideas accumulated during a comprehensive review of these problems and to proceed at the earliest opportunity with the elaboration of a single comprehensive agreement or a series of partial accords on banning the militarization of outer space. We expect the current session to adopt specific recommendations with a view to making progress in that regard.

The disarmament mechanisms defined by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were tailored to the tasks set forth in its Final Document. In principle they remain valid today. The passage of time and the corresponding developments make it necessary, however, to review their structure and effectiveness. Poland approaches the question of disarmament mechanisms in an open-minded and constructive way. We are prepared to undertake a careful consideration of any new proposals in that regard. We consider, however, that any such proposal must meet the following two fundamental criteria: first, it must offer guarantees genuinely to enhance effectiveness, since a mere change in mechanisms does not necessarily lead to the attainment of prescribed goals; secondly, it should enhance the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

We are vitally interested in increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations disarmament organs. We have in mind in particular the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, the leading multilateral disarmament negotiating body. Thus we wish to reiterate the relevant proposals spelt out in the document entitled "On increasing the effectiveness of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament", adopted last
year by the Prague meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of
the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty.

In particular we are prepared to lend our support to the idea of transforming
the Conference on Disarmament into a standing, universal negotiating body,
permanently in session and with most of its time devoted to the work of its working
groups.

We also see the need to consider at the current session ways and means of
increasing the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament by including
the Organization in the process of the monitoring of compliance with multilateral
arms limitation agreements and accords regulating conflict situations.

The results of this session will depend not only on good intentions and the
awareness of the exceptional importance of the tasks facing us but also on our
common resolve to reach understanding and to act effectively on all key issues on
the agenda for disarmament. For that goal to be attained it is indispensable, in
addition to that common resolve, for all delegations to demonstrate a new approach
and a strong commitment to the negotiating process. We appeal for a comprehensive
effort to reach an understanding. The Polish delegation will endeavour to reach
that end.

The political climate in which this special session is taking place allows us
to hope for the achievement of results that would stimulate the arms control and
disarmament process and trace clearly the tasks of the international community in
the building of a more secure world. Let us therefore take full advantage of these
favourable conditions.
(Mr. Orzechowski, Poland)

The success of this session will be our common contribution to the lofty cause of securing a safe future existence for mankind and eliminating the danger of its total annihilation. We trust that responsibility, goodwill and readiness to compromise will once again unite the United Nations.
Mr. SAHBANI (Tunisia) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. President, it is a source of satisfaction to my delegation to see you presiding over this third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We wish to congratulate you on the trust once again placed in you by the General Assembly. The wisdom, experience and great skill that you have demonstrated in presiding over the forty-second regular session of the General Assembly is the surest guarantee of the success of this third special session.

I am pleased also on this occasion to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General of the Organization, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, for his commitment to the cause of disarmament and the active role he has consistently played with such determination in the service of the principle of the United Nations and for the attainment of the noble objectives set forth in the Charter of our noble Organization.

This special session of the General Assembly for which member States of the Non-Aligned Movement have actively striven and for the success of which we have spared no effort, clearly constitutes a significant development in view of the danger implicit in the arms race, the characteristics of the international situation today and the crucial and diverse problems which the world is facing. The international community must be fully aware of the dangers and must take the appropriate steps to deal with the situation effectively and in earnest.

The session takes place in a climate of confidence but there are also misgivings and concerns. For a number of months the world has been witnessing events that nourish our hopes and our confidence, the events which have led up to the INF Treaty concluded on 8 December 1987 in Washington between the United States and the Soviet Union. That treaty, which has been ratified by both parties in recent days, has given the disarmament process a new and vigorous impetus. The Moscow summit between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union, the
convening of which coincided with the special session of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries and with this special session, has led to the promise of a rebirth of confidence between the two super-Powers, and marks a new milestone along the road to complete disarmament. That is why we welcome that praiseworthy effort and call upon everyone to give it all necessary support. It is our hope that intentions will become increasingly sincere and that the two super-Powers will be able to develop a new image, a new approach to the world of tomorrow, a world from which hatred and mistrust will be banished and where freedom and dignity will prevail among men, a world from which injustice and privations will be removed.

At the same time we are concerned about the fact that, according to the statements of specialists, the nuclear super-Powers possess sufficient nuclear weapons to destroy the entire planet and every trace of life upon it more than 13 times over. The expenditure devoted to arms continues to increase. In the large countries it amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars, destroying financial and human potential and the scientific opportunities that will soon be needed to secure prosperity and progress for all peoples and to eliminate all forms of underdevelopment and deprivation wherever they may exist.

Since 1978 the programme of work adopted after the first session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has affirmed the necessity of proceeding to a continuous and gradual reduction in the level of armaments and in the level of expenditure, notably among the nuclear countries and the militarily significant countries. This would have contributed to limiting the arms race and to reallocating resources now used for military purposes to the service of economic and social progress, notably in the developing countries. However, so far none of that has been realized. This is most regrettable. On the contrary, we note that
at a time when poverty, hunger and underdevelopment are taking on increasingly alarming proportions around the world countries which have the means are devoting astronomical amounts to a sphere of expenditure that can only in the final analysis lead to destruction and desolation. It is no longer possible to remain passive by-standers before such a situation because the interdependence of interests and the interdependent fates that characterize international relations today require that we seek a solution to overcome that contradiction, a contradiction that is unworthy of our century and which runs counter to the values which we uphold. The advanced countries must be aware, and they must have the courage to recognize, that their economic progress in the middle and short term in the end will depend to a great extent on the economic progress of the developing countries, and that in the final analysis the chasm which separates the North from the South can only have harmful effects upon the economies of the North.
A phased rechannelling of the enormous resources now earmarked for disarmament towards economic and social progress not only would save our planet from certain danger but also could guarantee the progress and prosperity of all the peoples of the world, including those in the developing countries. Such a rechannelling would redound to the benefit of all peoples, including those in the advanced countries, which would then be able to devote all their resources to economic and social progress and, hence, to strengthen the security of their peoples and, by the same token, remove the spectre of war and crises. That is a noble objective. It is a challenge that all of us should take up. It is a challenge for the future of mankind. A condition for success in the field - and for the success of this special session too - is the necessary political will and the pooling of all efforts to achieve the aspirations of all peoples to justice, peace and prosperity.

We are also concerned over the expansion of focal points of tension and confrontation, which threaten the security of peoples and countries and peace throughout the world. The developing countries have been the theatre of all the tragic armed confrontations experienced by the world during the past 40 years. Those countries have become the preferred scene for the testing of conventional weapons, which are becoming increasingly sophisticated. Apart from the danger of a nuclear disaster hanging over the entire world, an even more pressing threat is represented by technological progress in the conventional weapons industry. It is regrettable that there are those who disregard that real danger, as if it were of no concern to them. Similarly, they attach no importance to the financial burden involved in the stockpiling of conventional weapons, especially those that developing countries are flocking to obtain, to the detriment of the achievement of their development aspirations and of regional peace.
There can be no doubt that any threat to the security of a region can induce
the countries of that region to consider the need to organize their own defence.
It is clear that in the absence of a collective security system, envisaged in the
United Nations Charter, each State must take the steps it deems necessary to
preserve the security of its people and its territorial integrity. Moreover, it is
clear that the fact that certain developing countries are resorting to the
stockpiling of quantities of advanced conventional weapons that far exceed their
security needs can only lead neighbouring countries to feel threatened and hence to
arm in turn, despite the high cost of such armament and their lack of resources.
That frequently leads to the loss of economic security in those countries, while
they seek their military security.

The increase in the number, the scope and the cost of transactions related to
the supplying of weapons, to the profit of the arms dealers and the countries with
arms industries, imposes great financial constraints and heavy burdens on the
recipient countries, which sometimes bankrupt them. That threatens their economic
and social growth and poses a serious danger to peace and stability in their
regions and in the world.

I have the honour of conveying to the Assembly from this rostrum an appeal
from President Zine El-Abidine Ben Ali to all developing countries, especially those
in the Mediterranean region, to renounce the arms race, because it cannot really
guarantee their security or development, and to call a halt to confrontation,
allowing dialogue to take the place of recourse to force and the energies of their
peoples to be devoted first and foremost to combating underdevelopment, achieving
social well-being and keeping up with the forward march of civilization.
There is another domain which poses a great threat and in respect of which serious efforts are required - that is, the disturbing phenomenon of the proliferation of nuclear weapons that we are witnessing in the Middle East and in Africa, a proliferation for which the blame lies with Israel and South Africa. It must be noted that today the extremely close co-operation between the Pretoria and Israeli régimes in the nuclear sphere is a dangerous threat to the security of the African and Arab countries. There is sufficient proof, also, that Israel and South Africa possess nuclear weapons. That fact crushes all the hopes of the Arab and African countries to become nuclear-free zones. It is truly difficult to understand or justify the silence of those who have had the habit of raising a hue and cry about a hypothetical danger of nuclear proliferation in Arab and Muslim States. How can one justify the silence in the world mass media about the nuclear potential of Israel and South Africa? A little more objectivity is the least that one might expect from this forum.

The meeting that took place last year in Brioni, Yugoslavia, among the Mediterranean countries that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries provided an opportunity to strengthen our common determination to promote co-operation and security in the region and our efforts to make that strategic sea a zone of peace and progress. But we are entitled to wonder if it is possible to make the Mediterranean a zone of peace and progress while Israel maintains the sixth place among the nuclear Powers of the world. The international community, particularly the large nuclear Powers, must shoulder its responsibilities and ensure that Israel's and South Africa's nuclear facilities are placed under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency - especially when we know that the Governments of those two countries resort immediately to persecution, aggression, expansion and arbitrary action.
My country has on several occasions expressed its views on questions of disarmament. Representatives who have spoken before me at this rostrum have sufficiently explained the concern surrounding the present world situation and have elaborated on the steps through which the arms race has passed, especially in recent years. They have expressed their deep concern over the increasing dangers that threaten civilization, and I should like to say to all of them that Tunisia shares those concerns.

In its geographical area and in co-operation with the non-aligned countries, my country has always striven to bring about an era of peace and stability and to bring the level of armaments down to the lowest possible level so that we might gradually rid ourselves of all weapons.

The concern felt by the international community over the arms race was embodied in an appeal by the leaders of six countries from different regions addressed to the leaders of the two super-Powers, urging them to spare no effort to save mankind from the nuclear threat. The Heads of State and Government of the non-aligned countries at the conclusion of their summit meeting at Havana in September 1985 also addressed a personal message to the leaders of the two super-Powers, urging them to commit themselves to disarmament, an appeal that was renewed in urgent terms in Havana last May by the ministerial meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries addressed to all countries, whatever their potential.

On this occasion I wish to affirm that the United Nations has a central role - one which it must play - in the sphere of disarmament. Its universal character, the moral influence conferred upon it by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and its objectivity in the service of peace and security in the world mark this Organization as the one to play that role. The Charter emphasizes
the importance of international co-operation in the economic sphere and the
necessity of working to preserve international peace and security by devoting only
a minimum of human and economic resources to armaments.

My country has always remained faithful to that principle. Very little of our
resources are devoted to armament. We rely on solidarity between the children of
our country and those of others and co-operation with neighbouring countries.
Consequently, among the Powers of this international Organization there is a duty,
after the Moscow Summit, for the Organization to show the way and call upon the
great Powers to redouble their efforts to conclude other agreements that may ensure
complete disarmament in every sphere of weaponry, in particular nuclear weapons.

In saying this we base our view on the belief that possession of
nuclear weapons, even if limited to a small number of countries, constitutes a
threat to the entire world without exception. We are very hopeful that this third
special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will conclude by
adopting useful and effective recommendations, and here Tunisia wishes to join its
voice to those of members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries who have always
urged and appealed to all countries, especially the great Powers, to respond to the
aspirations of mankind to bring about a world of peace, progress and prosperity.
That is a noble objective, one that deserves support from us all.

Mr. TINDEMANS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to
offer you, Sir, on behalf of my country, my warmest congratulations on your
election as President of this special session of the General Assembly on
disarmament. We are all aware that your task is of capital importance. Your
presence in the chair is a guarantee of the successful outcome of our work. I
should also like to thank all those who have remained behind to listen to me.
In his statement on behalf of the member States of the European Community, Mr. Genscher, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, has expressed the position of the Twelve on a number of items on our agenda. I should like to thank him for his statement. Consequently I will limit myself to a certain number of issues that are of particular importance to my Government.

This third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament has been convened in an international context that is much less gloomy than was the case at our second session in 1982, when the impossibility of fulfilling the high expectations resulting from the first session, held 10 years ago, created a mood of frustration.

In his statement at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the representative of Belgium, of which I was at that time Prime Minister, already stressed the need for pragmatism. Two dangers needed to be avoided: the maximalist point of view, presenting general and complete disarmament as being at hand, and, at the other extreme, scepticism, which considered the arms race as a fatal and inevitable phenomenon to which it was impossible to react effectively.

Keeping these caveats in mind, I will endeavour to give a brief evaluation of our progress and an outline of what I think should be our priorities for the future.

The objectives set by the international community in 1978 were clear and ambitious. The ultimate goal was nothing less than general and complete disarmament even though this would be attained in successive steps, of which ending the arms race, and in particular the nuclear arms race, was to be the first.
We have to acknowledge that universal disarmament still eludes us. But concrete results have been obtained, since, for the first time, an agreement on the effective reduction of military nuclear capacity and the elimination of a whole category of armaments – land-based intermediate range missiles – has been reached. This agreement also puts the principles of asymmetrical reduction and on site verification into practice.

This result is encouraging, even though we should not overestimate its relative importance for the reduction of overall nuclear capacity. It is particularly so when we consider it not as the end of a process but rather as the basis for new developments towards more security and increased stability, greater trust, and, ultimately, a less nuclearized world.

The Moscow summit did not fulfil the expectations for an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction of the strategic capacities of the two super-Powers. There is however real hope that such an agreement may still be reached this year. In any case, the progress made since the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) I and II exercises is considerable: instead of merely channelling the arms race, very significant reductions in arsenals are now being made.

Over the past few months rapid progress has been made in the Geneva talks on a complete and global ban on chemical weapons. There also, the objective is within view, in spite of real difficulties that still need to be dealt with. We have to increase our efforts to achieve that goal as soon as possible.

Finally, there are now new approaches to the important question of the reduction of conventional forces and armaments. This item, which was only mentioned in passing in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, is now recognized as being of particular importance, nay even a matter of priority.
This new preoccupation is a welcome one. It is justified by the unprecedented proliferation of conventional arms, including the most modern ones. The so-called classical capabilities of destruction are constantly growing. The increasing number of armed conflicts in the world are an everyday reminder of this.

The increased attention being paid to conventional arms is also a consequence of the fact that a substantial reduction of nuclear arms in Europe would necessarily imply an important rebalancing and reducing of conventional arsenals. Little or nothing has been done about that in the past 10 years but great hopes are warranted. It is our wish that this year major negotiations will be undertaken from the Atlantic to the Urals between those countries whose forces contribute significantly to determining the balance of power in Europe.

However, if the developments I have just mentioned are relatively encouraging, we are nevertheless constantly reminded of the large gap that exists between the vision of a peaceful world and the reality of wars and the death and destruction that follow in their wake.

Today's world is probably more complex and less polarized than that of 10 years ago. It is however not more peaceful. The arms race has taken on a more multifaceted and insidious form. It spares no region. Whereas 10 years ago it dominated East-West relations, it now proliferates out of any bloc context and quite autonomously.

Technological innovation has spread throughout the whole world, requiring ever higher investment and an acceleration of procurement programmes, including the most sophisticated types of equipment. The proliferation of arms producers in the world has led, under the pressure of commercial competition, to an increased transfer of technologies. Today all regions in the world can boast - if we may use the term - of major arms producers in their midst. In other words, a major revolution has taken place in the arms market over the past 10 years.
It is not our desire here to criticize an unavoidable development but rather to emphasize that today more than ever, industrial development and disarmament are everybody's concern and should be practised in all regions of the world. In spite of good intentions, there has been no real slackening of military effort, even if growth rates might be showing some sluggishness because of the pressures of budgetary constraints. With this in mind, it might be easy to voice pessimism or to be disheartened. That, obviously, is not what I have in mind.

To be useful, an Assembly like ours must recall the objectives sought by mankind. This special session devoted to disarmament has already made headway and there is even today, in spite of nuances and reservations, a broad consensus on these matters. This discussion therefore does not need to be reopened. What matters now is to define ambitiously but realistically the progress that needs to be made in the coming years. At this third special session we must address this task, taking into account not only what is at stake but also at the same time being aware of its difficulties and limitations.

We must all recognize that disarmament is a complex and evolving process. The aim is to increase security in a well-defined political context. Disarmament is not an end in itself, nor is it a miraculous cure for all the problems which the nations of the world face, individually or collectively. Disarmament is no substitute for a development policy and even less for a policy of peace. Disarmament cannot be carried out in a closed environment. Only its own dynamics can change the nature of this world.

The arms race has undeniably its own momentum: it must be brought to a halt. Agreements such as the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF) will contribute to that effect, as the START negotiations will do in the near future in the field of strategic armaments, and as the convention on the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons will do. But one
must not overlook the fact that the arms race and, ultimately, overarmament take place because of tensions and deep-rooted causes. There is armament and then overarmament because there are tensions, geopolitical differences, active or potential conflicts of interest, exacerbated by political, religious and racial intolerance: all of those are elements which propel the dynamics of power relations and which develop too often into armed conflicts. The arms race, even when it does not develop into war, is nevertheless a symptom of a form of confrontation based on force.

The process of arms control and disarmament is a political as well as a military one. It implies a will for dialogue and co-operation which transcends the spirit of confrontation. Europe is a case in point. The progress achieved in recent months would not have been possible without the revival of a certain spirit of trust, without the resumption of dialogue and without a desire to look for compromise.

The Final Document adopted at the first special session on disarmament emphasized that nothing durable could be achieved in the field of disarmament unless States were committed to abiding strictly by their obligations under the Charter. There is no use preaching disarmament to those who want war; on the other hand, arms control may help them, in time, to consolidate peace, if they so wish. What in our view should be the programme for the coming years?

Considering that disarmament is a process which must contribute to reinforcing the security of all, we must all, in a spirit of openmindedness and with the necessary honesty, relate the aim to the legitimate security requirements involved. It is essential that a minimum of mutual understanding be established, otherwise nothing will be possible.
One may certainly wish for a world without nuclear weapons. But this can only be a remote goal, the attainment of which will take place, as we see it, beyond any timetable that could reasonably be envisaged during this session. This being said, it appears clear that we have the duty to look, through negotiations, for a balance of force at the lowest possible level, compatible with our security. The levels of conventional and nuclear arsenals are much too high. Substantial reductions are not only desirable but necessary; this is the task we must take upon ourselves.

Europe has no ambition to pose as a model for other regions, all the less since its features are such that the nuclear element plays a much more decisive role there than anywhere else. The establishment of nuclear-free zones outside of Europe and under certain conditions, may be an interesting approach. But then the countries involved should take the appropriate initiative to find the necessary safeguards for their own security.

Nuclear non-proliferation, on the basis of a broad accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or under conditions offering similar guarantees, must continue to be the focus of our attention. I should like to underline here in particular the responsibility of military nuclear States which have committed themselves to reducing their capacities. Non-nuclear States must, for their part, understand that denuclearization, which some of them rightly call for, considering their specific security situation, will not be served by their continued refusal to become parties to an international system whose aim is to prevent a proliferation that would end up jeopardizing their security.

I had the opportunity to stress the priority my country attaches to the reduction of conventional capacities. Europe will engage in an exercise of a dimension and complexity unknown to date. The results of these negotiations will largely determine the context for all disarmament negotiations for the final years.
of the century. Here, as well, Europe should not pose as a model, but one should emphasize, as Belgium has always done, that the regional approach offers considerable opportunities and that, when it comes to conventional armaments, in particular land-based armaments, it is, in our view, the most practical path. The regional dimension, whether it pertains to security, as such, or whether it seeks, at that level, stability through military forces reductions, is not new. The principle is enshrined in the Charter. Universalism and the regional approach are not two antagonistic concepts but are complementary.

The problem of chemical weapons cannot and must not leave any one of us indifferent. In recent years, the world has been faced with an alarming use of this type of particularly heinous weapon, which we would have hoped belonged to a bygone and barbaric age. The Geneva Protocol of 1925, the only international legal standard in this field, has been violated. The risk of the moral and legal force of the Geneva Protocol being eroded may well open the door to the proliferation of the use of chemical weapons. Therefore something has to be done.

The historic sensitivity of Belgium to the use of chemical weapons is well known. My country will pursue its efforts towards the earliest possible attainment of an agreement on a complete and global prohibition of the use of these weapons. In this context, as I stated last year at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, Belgium is ready to host the international organization which would be in charge of the implementation of the relevant provisions of any future treaty. Until then, we will continue to support, as we have always done in the past - indeed, we were among the States which devised the procedure in 1982 - all efforts to permit the Secretary-General to verify by all available means, all allegations of violation of the Geneva Protocol.
Let me also underline the importance we attach to the concepts of transparency, confidence, openness and dialogue. Transparency begins with the provision of reliable and verifiable information on military budgets, and, more generally, on all areas related to the defence effort. Information must also deal with the doctrines and the force structures which, more than speeches, give a precise idea of intentions. Transparency means also the communication of reliable data on export flows and arms transfers. Belgium has always supported the idea of creating an international register or of notifying the Secretary-General. We continue to believe that such an idea deserves to be acted upon.

The Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures is a good example of what can be done in a field where much improvement is still called for. Such measures do not necessarily constitute a precondition, but must necessarily accompany more ambitious approaches based on the reduction of military capacities.

I wish also to mention the relationship between disarmament and development. Obviously, there is a link to the extent that the arms race mobilizes resources which, in practice and in theory, could be devoted to more productive investments. But we must avoid a simplistic approach which would deny that security - including security based on armaments is, like development, a priority need, at least in the foreseeable future. Development also implies maintaining an undiminished level of security, and if possible a reinforced security. Disarmament and development are, therefore, two priority goals: both must be pursued through appropriate channels. The recent Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development has allowed us better to grasp the complexity of a problem which must remain in the forefront of our preoccupations; my country naturally will make every effort to develop its bilateral and multilateral assistance while pursuing the controlled and verifiable reduction of military arsenals.
As I have already said, paraphrasing the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament (SSOD I), disarmament is everyone's concern and responsibility, although those States whose military capacities are stronger, above all the super-Powers, obviously bear a particular responsibility in this field.

Thus it comes as no surprise that the progress recorded in these last years was achieved essentially through bilateral negotiations and agreements. Belgium welcomes the positive dialogue that has been reestablished and is now developing between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

My country expects this process to lead to new agreements that will bring us step by step towards this more peaceful and less armed world to which we have all committed ourselves. But this bilateral or multilateral process cannot be isolated from the universal context nor can it neglect the specific responsibility and role of the United Nations.

Our Organization has a major role to play as it embodies the conscience of the international community. It has to define the purposes and principles that should inspire us all, whether we design comprehensive, regional or bilateral plans. It is in this context that the Final Document of SSOD I retains its validity.

It is also part of the United Nations mandate to assess overall achievements; this should be done without complacency and with realism.
The point should not be to create new mechanisms but to ensure that full use is made of the existing ones. We must not forget that procedures and mechanisms are of no avail if the political will is lacking and that they cannot on their own fundamentally modify the various geopolitical contexts. The First Committee of the General Assembly, generally speaking, appropriately fulfils its role of establishing its general approaches. Its work would undoubtedly be enhanced if it were more streamlined. Let us admit that endeavours in this direction have not as yet met all our expectations.

The Disarmament Commission constitutes a useful body where all opinions may be heard. Recent sessions have been quite encouraging in this regard. Discussions on such important matters as conventional disarmament, verification and confidence-building measures have not only proven useful but have allowed for certain converging views to be defined.

The performance of the Conference on Disarmament has been more uneven but, as a negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament faces difficulties that should not be underrated. Aside from the question of chemical weapons, which I have already mentioned, other fields should be explored in depth. In this context, the Conference should concentrate more than it has in the past on a nuclear-test ban. This should be done with a prevailing sense of realism along the lines of a step-by-step approach, as set forth by the Belgian delegation at the forty-first and forty-second sessions of the General Assembly. Here again, encouraging developments have recently taken place.

Likewise, on the subject of outer space, the Conference should first of all assess and consolidate the existing legal framework and later on, if need be, define precise dispositions which should obviously be elaborated with the participation of the super-Powers. The aim is not so much to prohibit all
space-related activities; it is rather to develop a system where both the stability of deterrence and the security of all are guaranteed at the lowest possible level of forces.

Belgium is actively involved in the work of the Conference and will continue to be so, displaying all the necessary dedication. My country favours an extension of the Conference membership, which should be brought up to 44 States. There is already a consensus on this point, but we still have to reach agreement on the candidates for the enlarged membership. Belgium believes that here the question of enlarging the membership of the Conference should be kept quite distinct from that of participation in the negotiations. We believe that an enlargement must remain limited if the Conference is to play its role efficiently.

On the other hand, all States that so wish - be they members of the Conference on Disarmament or not - should be entitled actively to participate in all negotiations, since their scope is universal and since those countries believe that they can effectively and usefully contribute to a positive outcome. There is already the case regarding the negotiating framework on chemical weapons.

For the sake of efficiency and openess, Belgium believes that contributions by States that are not members of the Conference on Disarmament should be taken into consideration and duly reflected in the documents approved by consensus. The Conference on Disarmament, we believe, should be asked to consider this question.

In conclusion, Belgium would like to express the hope that SSOD III will combine the moderation of each of us and the sense of commitment of all of us with a view to establishing a new global and multilateral framework through which an effective and reliable reduction of forces and military capabilities can be achieved.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.