



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Rajakoski (Finland)
Mr. Jamal (Qatar)
Monsignor Lebeaupin (Holy See)
Mr. Ould Mokhtar (Mauritania)
Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria)
Mr. Adan (Somalia)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 123 AND 135 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Two weeks ago my delegation spoke on problems of arms control and disarmament in Europe. Today I shall speak on problems of a more general character.

Arms control negotiations do not take place in isolation from security interests. They are part and parcel of international politics. As such they have clearly been a victim of present policies of confrontation and dissipation of confidence. The focus is on arms, not on disarmament. The stagnation of negotiations and the continuation of the arms race have been amply reflected in the debate in this Committee. Yet the United Nations cannot afford to despair. Its duty is to make its contribution to recreating conditions under which real arms control and disarmament negotiations could resume.

That should be the main task of the second special session on disarmament next year. The second special session can and should give a new incentive to arms control and disarmament. Its duty is to reassess the general situation in disarmament and to strengthen and broaden the foundation of an international disarmament strategy for future years. The Final Document adopted by consensus at the first special session on disarmament provides a solid basis for the assessment. The international community should make every effort to build further on this basis.

In line with this, the adoption of a comprehensive programme on disarmament will be one of the main tasks of the special session. While this cannot solve any substantive arms-control problems, it will serve as a more precise guideline outlining the international community's aims of arms control and disarmament. Political realities which determine the realities of the disarmament process do not easily lend themselves to rigid time frames. Yet some kind of time frames may be justified as a token of the impatience and legitimate aspirations of the international community.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

Another important item on the agenda of the special session is the machinery for disarmament. We all agree that it should be more effective. The question is how. The causes that impair the effectiveness of, for instance, the Committee on Disarmament must be squarely addressed and ways and means of enhancing its role as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament must be explored.

Finland has observed the work of the Committee on Disarmament and its predecessor since 1965 and maintained a special office for this purpose. The reform undertaken at the first special session on disarmament has given non-members a better possibility of making their views known. But for a country deeply interested in disarmament that is not enough. Finland continues to seek full membership in order more fully to contribute to its work. We expect that interest to be taken into account in the context of the forthcoming review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament.

Despite the failure to achieve negotiated results or even tangible progress, the Committee on Disarmament has been able to concentrate on areas identified as the most urgent by the first special session on disarmament. That in itself is encouraging but of course not sufficient.

With the exception of the talks scheduled to begin on 30 November in Geneva on so-called theatre nuclear weapons, which we hope will be followed by talks on strategic weapons, all negotiations aiming at restraining the nuclear arms race are at a standstill. That is clearly reflected in the work of the Committee on Disarmament on the matters concerning nuclear arms control. First, there has been little advance in the efforts to achieve a comprehensive test ban, a prime objective of disarmament efforts ever since the conclusion of the partial test-ban Treaty in 1963. Only a few years ago, the tripartite negotiations on a draft comprehensive test-ban treaty seemed to be making good progress. Major obstacles such as treaty participation, peaceful nuclear explosives and, most important, verification seemed to have been solved. The parties involved gave regular encouraging reports about their progress to the Committee on Disarmament and its predecessor. No reports have been presented since the summer of 1980. As in so many other fields, negotiations have been discontinued for more than a year, and they remain at dead centre.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

The Committee on Disarmament has continued its work on the rapid evaluation of seismic data. Reliable transmission through the global telecommunications system of the World Meteorological Organization has also been tested. Finland has from the beginning made its contribution to that work through experts and through the services of its seismic array system. Because of its technical capability and uniquely favourable geographical location, it has an unparalleled seismic detection capability in our part of the world.

One of the priority items on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament has been the question of chemical weapons. Risks of an arms race in that field give the problem added urgency. In that regard Finland welcomes the possibility of States not members of the Committee on Disarmament taking part in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group. It is well known that we have attached special importance to the efforts towards chemical disarmament. While the main difficulties in the field of chemical weapons are political in nature, technical problems also remain to be solved. The most critical of these is verification.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

This is a complex field, where both trust and concrete measures are necessary. In order to meet the problems of a technical character, Finland has since 1972 devoted both efforts and resources to a project aiming at developing a national chemical-weapons-control capacity, which, if needed, could be put to international use. In order to be useful in alternative situations, the Finnish project has been conceived as a multi-purpose one, both substantively and functionally. We have been submitting to the Committee on Disarmament reports on that project on a regular basis, and this year we were happy to offer a rather comprehensive report presenting an approach to the environmental monitoring of nerve agents, "Trace analysis of chemical warfare agents". Furthermore, and in order better to inform the delegations of the Committee on Disarmament on the origin, goals and organization of the Finnish project, a special workshop was held in Finland from 2 to 4 July. Its purpose was to demonstrate the analytical systems developed within the project, including the relevant equipment. The workshop was attended by about 30 experts from 16 countries and the United Nations Secretariat. It provided the participants with a welcome opportunity for informal discussions on problems related to the project. The views expressed were valuable from the point of view of both the scientific structure of the project and its overall orientations. The positive response from the participants in the workshop gave further encouragement and, indeed, convinced my authorities to continue the project. We shall do so and we shall, as hitherto, report on its results to the Committee on Disarmament in the form of subsequent "blue books".

Important as it is, verification is but one of the problems concerning the banning of chemical warfare. The main difficulties still lie elsewhere and are political in nature. Nevertheless, the Committee on Disarmament has recognized the urgency of this question, and we hope that its coming session will see some tangible progress on it.

The ultimate aim of a comprehensive test ban is to restrain the nuclear arms race and thus reduce the threat of a nuclear war. Another imperative for this purpose is the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. That is

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

why my Government has, from the beginning, been not only a firm supporter but an active promoter of an effective non-proliferation régime. This aim is no less important than it was at the conclusion of the Treaty in 1970. On the contrary, recent events should be an obvious reminder to us all. We note with satisfaction the increasing adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, not least by key States, such as Egypt. The fact that 115 States - an overwhelming majority of the international community - now are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is proof of its viability. At the same time, this fact serves to expose the position of a number of important countries which have chosen to remain aloof from the Treaty. Regardless of the argument used, their opposition to the Non-Proliferation Treaty goes to the core of the Treaty: they are undermining international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear explosive capability. The fear of proliferation adversely affects both global and regional security. In our opinion, the Non-Proliferation Treaty is the most important arms limitation measure so far achieved, and it remains the best tool to prevent the danger of proliferation. Effective non-proliferation measures would also be a contribution to the elimination of impediments to wider international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The accelerating nuclear arms race increases the fear of nuclear war. It is against that background that we view the proposal by the Soviet Union that this session of the Assembly adopt a declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. As a matter of fact, the General Assembly has for a number of years adopted by overwhelming majorities resolutions condemning any use of nuclear weapons in whatever circumstances. Finland has given its support to those resolutions not as a matter of taking a stand on the nuclear strategic doctrines of the great Powers but in order to register the fear of nuclear horror which we all share.

Most of the numerous arms control agreements in force have been concluded in order to exclude parts of our globe or our environment from a potential arms race. This is a modest yet worthwhile endeavour. Antarctica has been completely demilitarized; the seabed and outer space have been declared out of

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

bounds for weapons of mass destruction. Both of the latter restrictions were inspired by the idea that these environments should be used for peaceful purposes only. As yet, this has not been achieved. As far as outer space is concerned, talks have been conducted between the United States and the Soviet Union on one aspect of the problem: the prohibition of anti-satellite weapons. We regret that these talks have been inconclusive. Further steps should be taken and appropriate negotiations be held in order to prevent an arms race in outer space. This is stated, inter alia, in the Final Document of the first special session. In this connexion, we also stress the special responsibility of the two great Powers, which have the major technological capability of using outer space. It is against this background that we welcome the recent initiative of the Soviet Union and the opportunity given by it to consider further the question of preserving outer space for exclusively peaceful ends. It would be for this Assembly to assign the appropriate forum for dealing with this question.

Another matter which has engaged the attention of the Committee on Disarmament concerns effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The aim of this effort is not in dispute. The methods are - from the point of view not of non-nuclear-weapon States but of those that may use or threaten to use these weapons against them - namely, the nuclear-weapon States. The present unilateral assurances, such as they are, are not without value. But most of them suffer from defects. They fall short of the goal of effective international arrangements, not to speak of a legally-binding instrument. They are functions of the respective military doctrines and are based on differing political perceptions. They thus reflect much less the wishes of the non-nuclear-weapon States and are, besides, diluted by political and legal reservations.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

One particular aspect of security assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons concerns nuclear-weapon-free zones. On these, agreement is easier to reach than on a universal blanket guarantee comprising all non-nuclear-weapon States. The equation of reciprocal commitments is more clearly defined, and so is the geographical area. This is particularly pertinent to those areas of the globe, such as the Nordic region and others, which are largely characterized by the absence of international tension.

Let me reiterate Finland's position with regard to the criteria by which we judge any arrangement for negative security assurances. Finland has, through international arrangements, committed itself to non-nuclear status. We expect that status to be respected by other States and international arrangements to be devised to assure us against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Consequently we assume that the nuclear-weapon States will give guarantees that they will respect our non-nuclear-weapon status and that they will under no circumstances use these weapons against us. The non-nuclear-weapon status implies also that Finland does not wish to be included in any such nuclear strategic planning which new technological developments in nuclear weapon systems and their delivery systems may make possible. We expect our sovereignty and territorial integrity to be respected also in that regard.

In the light of my country's vivid interest in the question of international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, my Government is frankly disappointed that the Committee on Disarmament has not made headway in this matter during its last session. The discussion in the Committee clarified some points but it did not advance the matter in any substantial way.

In order to conclude on a more positive note, I should like to mention some concrete, albeit limited, achievements. The first is the conclusion and opening for signature in New York on 10 April 1981 of the Convention on Prohibition or Restriction of Certain Conventional Weapons which May Be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The Convention

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

now has 45 signatories; we hope for the largest possible number of accessions to it. Secondly, a number of important studies initiated by the General Assembly have been conducted. The most important is the study on disarmament and development, based on an initiative by the Nordic countries. In depth and scope, that study is unique. Another is the study on confidence-building measures, which have been successfully applied in the context of the Conference on Security and Co-Operation in Europe. Furthermore, the study on regional disarmament is related to both confidence-building measures and nuclear-weapon-free zones. In our opinion, the study on nuclear weapons was particularly well timed, as was the study on institutional arrangements, in view of the fact that a second special session on disarmament is to be held. We have also endorsed the initiative taken by the Government of Denmark concerning a study on conventional disarmament.

These are the comments my Government wished to offer at this stage.

Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, as my delegation is speaking for the first time in this Committee, we wish to offer you our sincerest congratulations on your unanimous election to preside over this Committee. We are fully confident that your ability and your great experience in the field of disarmament will undoubtedly help this Committee to produce fruitful results. My delegation would also like to offer its congratulations to the other officers of the Committee on their election to their important posts.

Now that three years have elapsed since the establishment of the Committee on Disarmament, we are led to wonder whether there has been any change in the general aspect of armament activities throughout the world during these past three years, whether the international efforts for disarmament have brought about the least change in the concepts of traditional defence strategy which are fundamentally responsible for the continued escalation of the arms race and competition in the production of the most destructive weapons and in the expenditure of enormous funds for the development of counter-weapons neutralizing other weapons.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

An answer to those questions would obviously not require much research. We all have enough evidence in this regard to show that no positive change has occurred in efforts to achieve disarmament. There are, unfortunately, signs of a reverse trend and that the world-wide arms race is being intensified at a time when the efforts of the two super-Powers in the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT II) have reached a stalemate and their competition in developing the most destructive weapons and in deploying them in European confrontation points is continuing. This recalls the image of the cold war, which the world almost forgot with the advent of international détente in the 1970s. It seems that the stagnation in international efforts to consolidate international détente - which is considered a prerequisite to the creation of a suitable political climate for negotiations on the limitation of strategic weapons, as a first step towards subsequent negotiations on complete disarmament - which seems to us today merely an illusion - was a normal result of the concepts propagated by strategic thinkers, through the period of the international détente mirage, and subsequently, concerning a strategic balance, nuclear deterrence and the adoption of nuclear armament in order to deal with a certain quantitative or qualitative imbalance in conventional forces.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

All such concepts have created a sort of anasthaesia, the effects of which were rapidly dispelled when the international community discovered quite recently - in the light of the deteriorating world political situation, the expansion of local and regional rivalries, the increasing international tension, the waste of natural and human resources in developing, acquiring and stockpiling weapons at the expense of development rates, since the world expenditure on armaments reached an average varying between 5 and 6 per cent of the total world product - that it is imperative to renounce the concepts of strategic balance and nuclear deterrence, so that the international community may feel the urgent need to agree to banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. This should of necessity lead us to another strategic concept which has recently been advocated in order to alleviate the concerns of Europeans who are objecting to having their continent become a theatre for nuclear confrontation, as envisaged in the concept of a limited nuclear war. To accept such a principle is indeed to accept the option of instant or gradual death. Therefore, the delegation of Qatar would like to express its total rejection of these principles. It calls upon the international community, at the same time, to ensure that any agreement on banning nuclear armaments, includes prohibition of the production and stockpiling of neutron bombs, and an end to the campaign of mutual accusations between the two super-Powers on chemical weapons, through an agreement to be reached on banning chemical weapons and on getting rid of their stockpiles through stringent and effective control measures.

Three years have elapsed, but this Committee has not been able to reach a single agreement. In fact, it has not been able so far to produce a procedural framework for considering some of the urgent issues, such as a total ban on nuclear tests and nuclear disarmament. We believe that responsibility for such failure should, to a large extent, rest on some of the countries concerned. In the absence of intention, devoid of the aim of achieving narrow short-term tactical objectives, and of political will and a broad human outlook, the Committee on Disarmament will continue to find itself in a vicious circle. If the two major poles in efforts for disarmament are blaming each other for hampering such efforts, it is now time that the international community practically declare that issues of disarmament are not only confined to those two Powers but are in fact of concern to all countries of the world, particularly to the third world

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

countries which are now affected by the steady increase in world military expenditure which has in the recent years reached astronomical figures. These countries of necessity will be adversely affected - whether they want it or not - by the consequences of any global conflagration. Therefore, the international community should not spare any effort in order to protect those countries which do not possess nuclear weapons and which are not party to the international conflict and competition over spheres of influence. This protection can only be provided through an international agreement on strengthening guarantees to the countries which do not possess nuclear weapons. It is only natural for these countries to be concerned, as long as the world faces a great danger of recourse to force in international relations, including the use of nuclear weapons.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and peace zones promotes this objective. Therefore, Qatar supported the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. Unfortunately, no conference has so far been convened to agree on disarming this vital area in spite of the common wish of the countries of the area and their determination to keep it out of the international military rivalry which has of late taken on grave dimensions, thus threatening the peace and security of the area, but also that of the whole world. Though the General Assembly had called in its resolution 32/63 (XXIX) for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, we should note that nuclear weapons exist only in Israel. That country is not only refusing to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) but has decided that it should have the monopoly of nuclear research, even for peaceful purposes, as shown by its action in Iraq. It has given itself the right to carry out aggression against the sovereignty of Iraq and to destroy its nuclear facilities, using nuclear weapons of which it has the monopoly, as a means of blackmail and intimidation. Israel was not satisfied with threatening the Arab world. In fact, its nuclear intimidation network has extended to South Africa, where there is a dubious co-operation between the two outlawed régimes in order to produce nuclear weapons. Although the international community has condemned the Israeli raid on the Iraqi nuclear installations, as in Security Council resolution 487 (1981), and the nuclear co-operation between Israel and the racist Pretoria régime, as in many resolutions of the General Assembly, without achieving any concrete result in this regard, we should not let ourselves be overtaken by frustration and failure, otherwise the international arena would become an open field for military intimidation and nuclear blackmail.

(Mr. Jamal, Qatar)

Hence, Qatar, like all the countries of the area, is watching with great concern the strategic co-operation between the United States and Israel. We consider this to show further support for Israel in addition to what it is already receiving in the form of massive military and economic assistance from the United States. This support and co-operation, unwelcome to the countries of the area, is to be interpreted as a reward to an aggressor country occupying by force the territories of other countries and refusing to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations. This strategic co-operation will gravely disrupt the military and strategic balance in the Middle East. It will consequently heighten tension in one of the most tense areas of the world. It will also lead to the escalation of the arms race in order to cope with this new unbalance. There is no logical justification whatsoever for such a course.

In conclusion, I should like to confirm my Government's position on the need to bring about comprehensive world disarmament. We are convinced that real world security stems from the respect of all countries for the principles of international law and international conventions and agreements, from the promotion of the principle of the inadmissibility of seizing the territory of other countries, from the renunciation of the principle of use or threat of use of force in international relations, and from the non-violation of the rights or independence of other peoples.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations.

Monsignor LEBEAUPIN (Holy See) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my delegation I should like to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Committee. We know that the subject of disarmament is unfamiliar neither to you nor to your country. That is why we are certain that you will keep the proceedings of the First Committee on the right course.

At the end of a general debate which has highlighted the concern of each of us in the quest for a disarmament which will assure security and lead to a common life of peace and international collaboration for all societies, the delegation of the Holy See is happy to be able to speak at this time.

Our generation has a historic responsibility in the matter of disarmament. It seems to us that disarmament is and will be the fruit of a sense of responsibility as much individual and governmental as international. To be responsible for one's future and to forge instruments of co-operation among human groups are the objectives that human beings have sought to attain, beginning with the origins of social life and the time when they desired to be faithful to their purpose in life, which is to arrive at a type of relationship between individuals and societies based on respect and mutual help. If it is easy to judge the past and the responsibilities of those who have had the task of leading peoples, it is more difficult to imagine the future in the light of the moral necessities related to the government of mankind. That is why it seems to us necessary to examine disarmament in the light of a just exercise of responsibilities as much at the national, as the international, level.

To be responsible in a society requires bringing into the hearts of peoples the sense of confidence and of openness to the diversity of societies in order to lead them to work for a single objective, that of understanding among human beings and among nations, because it is clear to the mind that life must triumph over fear and death.

At the national level, to work for greater understanding is to work to render disarmament indispensable because armaments, conceived in a climate of permanent threat, are no longer justified. Some people may think that what we have just said is a pure mental vision, and yet it is not difficult to find examples in

(Monsignor Lebeaupin, Holy See)

contemporary history of changes of mentality comparable to real conversions in favour of peace and friendship. For example, Europe has shown, and can show still more, that after two wars which covered the region with blood, it is possible to forgive and to go beyond centuries of hostility and hatred. Misunderstanding and insensitivity are so often the artisans of division leading to aggressiveness and to fear of the other, or what is different from oneself or from one's own way of thinking. The truth of the meeting between human beings requires that they have the curiosity to discover new sources of wealth in the experience of others. A mutual knowledge of cultures allowing an appreciation of what is different can only be constructive for peace and for real détente between peoples. It is essential for the establishment of relations based on mutual respect that human beings and ideas circulate freely. The more people grow in knowledge of alien cultural expressions, the more they are led to hold the creators of those expressions in esteem.

I should like to quote here a passage from the message of His Holiness Pope John Paul II on the occasion of the celebration of the Day of Peace, 1 January 1981:

"One of the lies of violence consists in seeking to discredit, systematically and radically, the adversary, his actions and the socio-ideological structures in which he acts and thinks, in order to justify oneself. The man of peace, however, knows how to recognize the part of truth that there is in every human endeavour, and even more, the possibilities for truth which reside in the inmost recesses of each person."

It seems to us, then, that if the need for knowledge of cultures by means of encounters is envisaged, realized and encouraged by all those who today bear responsibility for the future of societies, it will be possible to accept that the arms race has become superfluous and scandalous since it is the misappropriation of goods, resources and investments, both material and intellectual, for something useless. The more we are persuaded that arms have a negative non-constructive aspect, the more it will be evident that real choices of social, cultural and spiritual progress must be made. For persons, just as much as societies, choices based on facts and not on prejudices is essential for the future. There is a blindness of peoples which leads them to a false conception of their neighbour against which it is absolutely necessary to struggle if we want genuine disarmament.

(Monsignor Lebeaupin,
Holy See)

If a responsibility with regard to matters of disarmament exists within each separate society, there is another responsibility whose field of action lies at the heart of the international community, both on the level of bilateral relations and on that of universal multilateral relations.

It seems to us that it is necessary today to state again and again what has already been said, but which it has become increasingly urgent to recall. On both levels, the bilateral and the multilateral, a dialogue must be renewed if it has been interrupted, or it must be broadened if it has not totally lapsed into silence. Indeed, what we said of societies taken individually is equally true of relations among societies. Understanding will be achieved through a process of negotiation that takes into account the legitimate interests of each party. Negotiations in the matter of disarmament should lead not only to quantitatively significant arms reductions, but also to a decision to work together for human, social and economic development. It should be a common endeavour that would be a manifestation of the truth of the agreements undertaken to disarm. It is in leading people to work towards a common ideal of mutual assistance that the barriers can be broken down, that the guns can be silenced and that what is expected of all, the large and the small, can be accomplished. Détente arises out of the co-operation of men and women translating into the terms of daily life the meaning of the interdependence of peoples.

Disarmament through limited bilateral or multilateral negotiations is part of a universal multilateral context. People who bear international responsibility do so for various reasons, either because they represent an economic potential of the first rank, because they are the heirs to cultural riches that belong to the human spirit as a whole, or because they represent immense communities of men and women. We think that such people should ponder the share of responsibility they bear with regard to disarmament matters without taking refuge behind motives that thrust the responsibility for the arms race, the increase in military budgets or an aggressive attitude onto their international partners. It is for that reason that it seems to us necessary to recall that the idea of a true dialogue is the only possible course, and that it must be followed.

(Monsignor Lebeaupin, Holy See)

There is a multilateral dimension to the dialogue on disarmament which has a universal character. It is hard to imagine that conflicts can remain localized when they entail the eventual opportunity to carry out the threat of nuclear terror. Alas, this is not the only manifestation of the horror of modern war, but it constitutes a real sign to remind us that our generation has a moral duty, namely, to accept its responsibility, to achieve not only the non-use of nuclear weapons or their mere limitation, but, above all, the implementation of all our economic, intellectual, moral and spiritual possibilities in the service of relations between peoples for man's harmonious development. This is why the idea of a fund for development, fed by resources drawn from military expenditures, must be considered with the greatest interest. It seems to us that such a fund would be a symbol of a common effort borne by all men and that it would demonstrate that the international community had made a choice to serve the entire human family, not only by words, but also by actions taken to build solidarity among all.

In conclusion, we should only like to say that for ourselves, the human factor of disarmament is not to be overlooked, because it poses the problem in terms of responsibility, a responsibility that is part of the history of mankind for which it must answer before God, to the One who is the origin and end of all things. Our responsibility as representatives is committed here. Its exercise must not be paralyzed by a pessimism that would be an escape. Mankind's capacity to reflect on its relationship with the external world is the mirror of its inner thought and its spiritual life. Disarmament will always - and only - be the result of a deliberate act of the human person, it will never be a gift.

Mr. OULD MOKHTAR (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): Out of a concern to respect your directives, I shall confine myself, Sir, to associating myself with the well-justified expressions of appreciation addressed to you by preceding speakers. The same sentiments are also addressed to the other officers of the Committee.

(Mr. Ould Mokhtar, Mauritania)

The work of the First Committee has been taking place this year in international circumstances that have rightly been called disquieting, in view of the increasing use of force in international relations, the consolidation of rivalries between various blocs and the continuing nefarious effects of the arms race on the world economy.

Détente seems to be blocked in a way that seriously threatens peace and stability throughout the world, whereas the increasing sophistication of weapons, in particular nuclear weapons, has reached such a level that the spectre of the massive destruction of our planet looms before us.

This disquieting but true picture of the international situation is darkened by the unleashing of forces hostile to the progress of peoples, forces that do not hesitate to impinge upon the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries and upon the right of peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Ould Mokhtar, Mauritania)

Furthermore, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has entered its second decade without having attained its goal. The maintenance of international peace and security has not been achieved. The very fact that people tend to conclude that the world was generally more stable at the time that the Declaration was adopted than it is today drives one nearly to despair.

In the field of the relationship between disarmament and development, we see that military budgets maintain their terrifying tendency to increase, whereas official development assistance has been shrinking regularly. The report of the Group headed by Mrs. Thorsson gives even more justification for this concern, since it stated that in the world there are as many starving and undernourished people today as there are stockpiles of arms and munitions. The report should, in our view, be taken as a basis for action to remedy the adverse effects of arms increases on economic development. The countries of the third world, to which Mauritania belongs, are those which suffer particularly severely from the pernicious effects of the present arms race.

Doubtless there have been positive results in the sphere of disarmament, since nations have striven to find ways and means to reverse the arms race. This progress is particularly important because there is an implacable will on the part of the majority of Member States which has given rise to the existence of rich documentation which has analysed all aspects of the arms race. The dissemination of these documents has begun to bear fruit through the organization of demonstrations throughout the world, and hence a growing awareness of this danger. The role played by the non-governmental organizations in this field deserves our appreciation. These demonstrations underline the collective and general commitment in favour of disarmament.

The present debate should, we feel, not confine itself to taking note of obstacles to disarmament, but should try to create an atmosphere which would promote the sincere desire to find practical solutions to the urgent problems of disarmament.

The success of the next special session devoted to disarmament depends on the thrust of the initiatives that we shall now be taking. The unanimous view that priority should be given to nuclear disarmament opens up prospects of compromise on the possibility of ridding humanity of the danger of massive

(Mr. Ould Mokhtar, Mauritania)

destruction presented by the stockpiling and growing sophistication of nuclear weapons. The international community is becoming more aware of the growing dangers inherent in the stockpiling of vast means of massive destruction. While the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament lies with the nuclear-weapon countries, the desire of the non-nuclear countries to participate is justified for the simple reason that, in the case of a nuclear catastrophe, all mankind will be threatened. Participation of the non-nuclear countries in the negotiations on the nuclear disarmament process can only help to consolidate this process. It is this conviction that leads us to share the opinion of the Group of 21 within the Committee on Disarmament on the way the negotiations should be conducted.

The vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons is also a source of concern. Here again, the nuclear States have not managed to make the necessary efforts through concrete, adequate measures to reverse the present alarming trend and create a new framework for dialogue which would promote fruitful negotiations. We are, however, encouraged by the opening in the near future of negotiations in Geneva between the United States and the USSR, and we hope that the results of these negotiations will contribute positively towards reversing the present escalation of nuclear armaments.

The accession of more and more countries to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is another positive sign which testifies to the interest of Member States in the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It is fitting to recall that the Israeli act of aggression against the nuclear facility in Iraq, which was devoted exclusively to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, constitutes at the same time a failure of the IAEA safeguards system and an act of defiance towards the international community. The terrorist act perpetrated by Israel, directed against a country which is party to the NPT and which respects its verification rules, has tarnished the image of the Treaty's régime and undermined the confidence of States parties to it. It is only by stringent and effective sanctions against Israel that the credibility of the NPT and of the IAEA system can be restored. If, unfortunately,

(Mr. Ould Mokhtar, Mauritania)

Israel were to escape the sanctions that its action calls for, the effectiveness of the NPT and of the IAEA system would be placed in doubt for ever. Furthermore, nothing stops the aggressor from repeating his crime, nor any other country from having recourse to the same practices, so the exception may well become the rule.

The creation of nuclear-free zones in Africa and the Middle East is a field where we wish to see progress. The consensus of African States promotes the creation of and respect for a nuclear-free zone in our region. If this initiative is respected by all nuclear countries, it will doubtless contribute to the objectives of the NPT régime in general and nuclear disarmament in particular.

We are encouraged by the effectiveness of the Tlatelolco Treaty in Latin America and by the new attitude of the United States with respect to Additional Protocol I of that Treaty.

Mauritania likewise supports the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Hopes for seeing a zone of this kind established have been unfortunately dimmed since the Israeli act of aggression, which the world community condemned. Israel has proved by this act and by its refusal to accede to the NPT that it opposes the desire of the countries of the region to live in peace, safe from the nuclear spectre.

We are convinced that any attempt at denuclearization in Africa and the Middle East should try to resolve the problem of the danger of the nuclear potential in South Africa and Israel, in order to shield these two regions from the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. That is why we appeal to countries which, directly or indirectly, contribute to the development of the goals of the nuclear policy of those two countries, to re-examine their attitude in the light of the interests of peace and regional disarmament and, therefore, of the security of the world.

(Mr. Ould Mohhtar, Mauritania)

Priority should be given to nuclear disarmament, but we think we should not minimize the importance of other types of weapons, in particular conventional weapons. These conventional weapons play an important role in the worsening of tensions, because of their quantity, quality and, in particular, because of the readiness with which they are generally used. The flourishing trade in conventional weapons remains a danger to the independence and territorial integrity of a fair number of countries in the third world, where this phenomenon constantly creates an atmosphere of mistrust which has often led to regional conflicts.

My delegation recognizes the many difficulties that nations must overcome to reach tangible progress. The road to general and complete disarmament has proved itself to be long and hard. The next special session devoted to disarmament will be a unique occasion for all countries of the world to mitigate the difficulties inherent in each aspect of disarmament, or at least to demonstrate the political will to attain that goal. To this end, any action in this present debate which might restore confidence would contribute to affording more chances of success to the next disarmament session.

It is in this spirit that Mauritania envisages its modest participation in the present and future discussions on disarmament.

Mr. BEDJAQUI (Algeria)(interpretation from French): It gives me great pleasure in extending to you, Sir, the heartfelt congratulations of the Algerian delegation on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. There are many reasons why we are happy to see you guiding our work. They have to do, first, with the personal qualities that are the basis of your reputation, which so rightly preceded your election and, secondly, with the excellent relations prevailing between your country and mine at all levels of international life as we work in solidarity for the advent of a world of peace, progress and co-operation. Lastly, these reasons have to do with the common hopes of our two peoples, expressed in our shared devotion to the policy of non-alignment.

The congratulations of the Algerian delegation are likewise addressed to the other officers of the Committee on their election.

The fact that the deliberations of the First Committee have year after year dealt with the same problems might lead one to believe that our world has no control over its destiny. However, how many times have we recalled here that our basic task is none other than a quest for the ways and means to promote a true disarmament process? But if the attainment of that goal is today still beyond our reach, it is because the factors of confrontation continue to prevail over the sense of responsibility required by the needs of our times.

The spread of tension which is at present manifest on the international scene and, parallel with this, the difficulties encountered by the process of international dialogue are manifestations inherent in a system of international relations based on power and relations of force. So long as such a system continues to base itself on structures of domination and hierarchy, these must of necessity give it a distinctly conflict-ridden nature and obviously make it precarious. In these conditions, it is hardly surprising to note that the seeming international balance engendered by this system has proved itself to be a continual source of tension and intensification of the arms race.

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

In such a system the use of force naturally plays a part, as do the policy of zones of influence, doctrines of intervention, the opening and reactivation of bases, and the establishment and deployment of so-called rapid deployment forces.

It suffices, in this regard, to observe the extent of the disorder which is undermining international relations to be fully aware of the risks of accident inherent in the present situation. Indeed, present developments bear obvious signs of rupture. Whether we are talking about insecurity, the arms race, crises in the world economy or existing pockets of tension, we are confronted by an ever-more uncontrollable situation.

The present deterioration in the international political climate can therefore not be perceived as a mere reversal which could be redressed by returning to the status quo ante. This deterioration can, of course, appear to be a periodic renewal of tension on the world scale. Nevertheless, it is different from previous phases because of its unprecedented gravity resulting from an accumulation of problems maintained by a cramped conception of divisible international peace. The gravity of this situation will shed new light on the conditions for establishing real peace in the world.

Can one today still imagine that peace consists basically in a quest for adjustments in the relations between the big Powers? Can one still imagine that peace can adapt itself to the existence of local wars, as well as to the policies of intervention and pressures of various kinds, of which the third world is a victim, which flout the basic principles of the United Nations?

A sober assessment of the state of the world obviously proves that the resurgence of international tension and the renewal of the arms race which accompanies it are not phenomena in themselves; quite the contrary, they result from a combination of forces which provoke and promote them. Hence the achievement of peace and disarmament necessarily requires the elimination of the very causes that have given rise to tension and the arms race.

As stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session:

"To meet this historic challenge is in the political and economic interests of all the nations and peoples of the world as well as in the interests of ensuring their genuine security and peaceful future."

(Resolution S-10/2, para.1)

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

But since 1978 no significant progress has echoed these hopes. Moreover, we see that dialogue has regressed, and the deadlocks that have surfaced in the Committee on Disarmament are a patent illustration of that.

An examination of the report of the Committee on Disarmament unfortunately gives us very few causes for satisfaction. No significant breakthrough on the disarmament path has been made. First of all, negotiations on assurances against the threat or use of nuclear weapons to be given to non-nuclear-weapon States are focused rather on the more or less extensive restrictions that the majority of the nuclear Powers intend to impose on them than on the assurances themselves.

Furthermore, unfortunately again this year, the Committee has not embarked on negotiations on two high priority matters: the complete prohibition of nuclear tests and the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. The urgent appeal addressed by the General Assembly in its resolutions 35/145 A and 35/152 C to establish two ad hoc working groups on those two matters has not been heeded. In both cases the Committee's competence has been questioned and discussions in a limited circle have been presented as the panacea.

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

Lastly, we must note that the meagre progress made by the Working Group on Chemical Weapons has met with the impossibility of broadening the Group's mandate to enable it to undertake the negotiation of a draft convention.

The absence of progress, particularly on the last two matters, stems largely from the determination of some Powers to reduce the Committee's role to that of a registry of accords negotiated in private clubs. The Group of 21 in the Committee on Disarmament has on several occasions expressed our refusal to be reduced to the status of spectators in the discussion and in the decision-making process on questions that affect our future as much as they affect the future of the great Powers.

We do not seem to have learned all the necessary lessons we should have learned from our experience with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Despite the promises made in connexion with that Treaty, the principle of access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes has not been implemented, particularly for those that need it most for their economic and social development.

Because there has been this selectivity, the Treaty has not prevented those primarily concerned from acquiring the technological capacity necessary for the production of nuclear weapons.

In this connexion, the Zionist aggression against nuclear facilities in Iraq for peaceful purposes - an aggression that has been unanimously condemned - has brought out the overriding need for scrupulous respect for paragraph 12 of the Final Document adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session.

The stalemate in the Committee on Disarmament is not an isolated fact. It is only one example of the climate affecting all disarmament discussions. Bilateral and multilateral negotiations have been frozen. The Conference on the Indian Ocean, which should have taken place this year in Colombo, has been postponed and the very principle of its being convened has been placed in jeopardy.

For our part, we do not believe that the deterioration of the international situation is a valid argument for the suspension of dialogue. On the contrary, it demands intensified negotiations.

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

That is why the resumption of Soviet-American negotiations, which we are told will take place towards the end of this month, has aroused such hopes and is hailed as a possible prelude to an improvement in the international political climate. It is one more opportunity to seek solutions that meet the requirements of international peace and security, provided the foundation is correctly laid.

It is a fact that since 1945, through the intricacies of precarious balances, a third world war has been avoided. But that does not mean that universal peace has been assured. The absence of world war does not mean world peace. That truism prompts us to take a hard look at the world, which is suffering from the growing confrontation between the major Powers, the persistence of hotbeds of aggression and tension and intolerable assaults on the right of peoples to self-determination - a world suffering from the continuing domination of peoples and the growing gap between some pockets of prosperity and the immense expanses of a destitute third world.

Given today's international situation, the Study of the Relationship between Disarmament and Development submitted to the First Committee is a timely reminder of the tragedy of a world working on its own destruction through unacceptable wastage of precious resources while blind to any serious settlement of its grave socio-economic problems.

The delegation of Algeria would like to extend its congratulations to Mrs. Inga Thorsson and to the Group of Experts whose work she directed. They have received a well-merited unanimous tribute, in which Algeria, which has made the establishment of a New International Economic Order a cardinal element of its policy, wholeheartedly joins.

The study contains a wealth of material, justifying the judgement of its authors, who had the courage to break with the fragmented approaches of the past to clearly demonstrate the incompatibility between the arms race and development. The study is a pressing invitation to look beyond the manifestations of the crisis afflicting the world and to go back to the original causes, which must be cured if world peace, security and development for the benefit of all is to be achieved. The stress on the non-military dimensions of international security serves to heighten our awareness

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

of the more profound realities of the day. This is an outstanding piece of work that counters the logic of destructiveness imposed by an unbridled arms race with the logic of lives to be safeguarded, progress to be promoted and universal peace to be established.

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament may well be a perfect time to move forward in the area of disarmament to a qualitatively new stage. It must adopt a critical approach to assess sternly the results that have been achieved over four years in implementation of the Programme of Action adopted at the tenth special session. When we take stock we must stress past inadequacies while indicating the remedies needed to advance the general process of general and complete disarmament.

The comprehensive programme of disarmament is the central issue of the special session and its success will ultimately depend on the political will of States and especially the will of the nuclear Powers to promote a start on disarmament through the adoption of concrete significant measures on priority issues. In this context the forthcoming special session must give priority to the nuclear arms race and identify stages and fix deadlines for the achievement of general and complete disarmament. It is our fond hope that the difficulties encountered by the Preparatory Committee in drawing up the agenda of the session do not foreshadow future deadlock. We hope too that the political will to succeed will prevail in the end.

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

A great contemporary philosopher said, about 30 years ago, that "To say that life is or is not worth living is to answer the fundamental question of all philosophy." But if, from that standpoint, suicide can be considered as a dimension of one's own freedom, no one has the right to order the collective suicide of humankind.

In the dilemma in which the world finds itself, there is only a choice between life and death. What has been called the balance of terror has become an obsession with balance, per se, and any delay, real or imagined, and the necessarily subjective perception of a gap to be bridged brings us day by day closer to the abyss.

It is high time that we faced this truth and that we committed ourselves, together, to the only battle worth waging: the fight for life and for the well-being of man.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): Since this is the first time I am speaking, I should like to extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election.

My delegation is most concerned that the work of this Committee and of other disarmament bodies is often projected as being irrelevant to the harsh realities of international political practice. Indeed, the distance between world events and the international consensus on disarmament issues seems to grow steadily wider.

We note with regret, for example, that there have been retrograde steps, rather than progress towards halting the nuclear arms race - a disarmament goal rightly given highest priority by the first special session on disarmament. Today even the modest gains of SALT I seem threatened and a new spiral of the arms race in nuclear weapons and weapon systems seems likely to be initiated.

In spite of the judgement of the Secretary-General's Group of Experts that any form of nuclear war would be the highest level of human madness, the concept of limited nuclear warfare and the possibilities of winning and surviving an all-out nuclear conflict are being seriously aired. The

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

non-nuclear States, which would be the innocent victims of nuclear conflagration, have a right to demand of the nuclear Powers a greater sense of responsibility and a bolder exertion of political will in order to halt the senseless movement towards nuclear catastrophe.

My delegation shares the widely expressed regret over the suspension of negotiations on SALT II. We believe, however, that this suspension can still be of some benefit if the negotiations are soon resumed but on a different basis. We urge the nuclear Powers to abandon the balance of terror as a basis for arms control, since this has obviously acted as a spur rather than as a rein on the nuclear arms race. A more constructive aim would be the achievement of a balanced and significant reduction of nuclear arsenals and weapon systems, with the help of national and international verification methods. This approach is, of course, demanded of the nuclear Powers by the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and it would go far towards increasing international security and adding momentum to the process of general and complete disarmament.

Since both nuclear and non-nuclear States have a vital stake in the outcome of negotiations for nuclear arms control, my delegation supports efforts to bring these negotiations within the purview of the United Nations system of collective security.

The continued failure of the tripartite negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty is another cause for alarm. This measure, for so long demanded by the international community, and given high priority by the tenth special session, should be implemented without further delay. We find it regrettable also that the opposition of the tripartite Powers has obstructed the setting up of an impartial ad hoc working group of the Committee on Disarmament to work on the draft of a generally acceptable test-ban treaty.

Our concern over the slow pace of negotiations for a convention to outlaw chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons is heightened by the evident revival of the idea of chemical warfare, and by the growing suspicion that these inhuman weapons are being used in certain combat areas.

We welcome the appointment by the Secretary-General of a Group of Experts to investigate the charges that have been made. All forms of warfare have

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

cruel effects, but the world community has rightly singled out chemical and bacteriological weapons as being particularly abhorrent. The use of such weapons must earn universal condemnation and contempt.

My delegation appreciates the patient work of the Committee on Disarmament to establish conventions outlawing chemical weapons, banning radiological weapons, prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. These questions have the gravest import for the peace, security and survival of our planet. It is a matter of the greatest urgency that international law should keep abreast of and control the dangerous application to military purposes of sophisticated technological and scientific developments.

In this task the Committee must of course have the co-operation of the nuclear and militarily significant Powers. We trust that those who bear the heaviest responsibility in these matters will display the necessary political will so that draft agreements on these issues can be presented to the second special session on disarmament next year.

My delegation regrets that the Disarmament Committee has been unable to find a common formula for assuring non-nuclear States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Their difficulties, no doubt, stem from the nuclear rivalry of the main nuclear Powers and from the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. The formula they seek would not, of course, protect non-nuclear States in the event of the unleashing of nuclear weapons, either by accident or by design, but we believe that a legally binding instrument of this kind would strengthen the non-proliferation régime. We hope the Committee will continue with its efforts to find the necessary formula.

The partial Non-Proliferation Treaty, to which my country is a party, is one of the few significant disarmament agreements drawn up by the United Nations, and so it is particularly important that its provisions should be respected. Israel's unprovoked destruction of Iraq's peaceful nuclear reactor not only was an act of aggression against the sovereignty and integrity of a neighbouring State but was also a violent and irresponsible assault on those provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty dealing with the peaceful uses

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

of atomic energy. The tacit acceptance of such acts of aggression undermines the disarmament process. Unfortunately, however, Israel has escaped with a mere condemnation of its gross violation of international law. My delegation believes international action should be taken to ensure that Israel's act of state terrorism does not set a dangerous precedent. We strongly support the Swedish proposal to include a prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities in the draft convention on radiological weapons. We also believe that the relevant provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty must be elaborated and strengthened to provide protection for all States which develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

Recent events should also heighten the concern of this Committee over Israel's nuclear armament. The avowed nuclear-weapon capability of Israel is a patent threat to regional and international peace and security when it is viewed against the background of Israel's aggressive assaults on neighbouring countries and its refusal to become a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We believe that Israel should not be afforded the benefits of nuclear or military co-operation of any kind while it continues to flaunt its contempt for international law.

Somalia has always supported the concept of zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones as a constructive approach to strengthening the non-proliferation régime. Unfortunately, the success achieved by Latin America in this area has not been duplicated elsewhere. Since the General Assembly declared the Indian Ocean a zone of peace ten years ago, great-Power rivalry in the region has turned it into a new cold-war arena. In recent times the military intervention of a super-Power in a local conflict in the Horn of Africa and its introduction of surrogate forces there, its establishment of naval bases and a strong military presence in a littoral State and its military occupation of Afghanistan have served to increase regional instability and international tensions.

Regrettably, these tensions have delayed the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean. My delegation hopes that Member States will not be deterred by the difficulties which must be encountered by the Conference and that a date for its convening can be set. A bold effort should be made to find agreement on a programme for implementing the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The denuclearization of Africa is another question where there is a wide divergence between theory and practice. While universal support has been expressed for the desire of the members of the Organization of African Unity to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons, racist South Africa has been provided with a nuclear-weapon capability. There can be no doubt that the Pretoria régime has the capability and the will to threaten with nuclear blackmail the African liberation movements and the African States which support legitimate freedom struggles. The time has long since come for the complete cessation of all kinds of nuclear co-operation with South Africa's racist minority régime.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

Progress towards general and complete disarmament, and particularly nuclear disarmament, depends largely, of course, on the establishment of a climate of confidence, and here again the declarations and resolutions directed towards this end have little relevance to world events. It has been widely noted, for example, that it is the super-Power which was the foremost champion of the doctrine of the non-use of force in international affairs which launched the massive armed aggression against Afghanistan and which is still engaged in a cruel war aimed at subjugating the people of that non-aligned State. In Africa, Asia and other areas the right to self-determination and to national independence is still being threatened by the same super-Power, by its client States and by its surrogate forces. These developments have without doubt jeopardized the conditions in which progress towards disarmament goals can be made.

Obviously, many of the declarations and resolutions proposed for adoption by this Committee, while unexceptionable in themselves, serve to cover up a lack of commitment to genuine progress towards disarmament.

A major task of the second special session on disarmament will be the drawing up of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. It is certainly essential that disarmament priorities should be established and that time frames for the implementation of specific measures should be set. However, we fear that this exercise will be no more effective in bringing about progress on matters of substance than was the programme adopted by the tenth special session of the General Assembly. As long as a global power struggle continues to have precedence over the welfare of mankind, it will be difficult to be optimistic about the prospect for disarmament and in particular for nuclear disarmament. Yet studies such as those on nuclear war, on the reduction of military budgets and on the relationship between disarmament and development underline the fact that those who pursue security through nuclear or other military strategies inhabit a dangerously unreal world.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

In this context I should like to quote some words of President Eisenhower which were recently recalled by a correspondent of The New York Times. In 1953 President Eisenhower stated:

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."

That statement is even more pertinent today, in a world endangered by the nuclear arms race, than it was when it was made almost three decades ago. There should be no illusions about where we stand today under the nuclear threat. There must be a sense of urgency about the need to turn back from nuclear disaster.

In this connexion, we strongly support all the initiatives being taken by the United Nations to mobilize world public opinion and we urge that the Centre for Disarmament be strengthened to enable it to deal effectively with its vital tasks.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded the list of speakers in the general debate, but several representatives have requested to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I would remind members that statements and exercise of the right of reply are limited to ten minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second. I shall now call on those representatives.

Mr. MOHAMMADI (Iran): The representative of Iraq made certain strange allegations yesterday. He said that there are two expansionist and racist States in the Middle East, Israel and Iran. I have no dispute with him over the fact that Israel is an expansionist and racist State; but as regards the second such State in the region he was dead wrong. It has been more than a year since the régime of Iraq disregarded the international boundaries of Iran and launched a massive armed aggression against my country and, by utilizing some of the most cowardly tactics, such as continuous indiscriminate bombardment of residential areas of

(Mr. Mohammadi, Iran)

several of our cities by long-range artillery and surface-to-surface missiles, rendered more than 2 million civilians homeless. It is sheer hypocrisy on the part of the Iraqi régime to regard their countless crimes in Iran blessings on mankind while at the same time it regards a single Israeli air raid as the gravest act of aggression.

It is also sheer hypocrisy for the representative of a régime that insists that the war it has imposed upon Iran is a war against what it calls the Persian threat against the Arab identity to call the Islamic Republic of Iran a racist State - as if he has forgotten that he calls himself a Moslem and that a Moslem should know that Islam is an anti-racist faith.

In fact everyone is aware that the Iraqi régime calls its war of aggression against Iran the Qadesieh of Saddam, referring to the holy wars of the dedicated followers of the Prophet in spreading the message of God. It is the most serious insult to Islam to equate the Islamic armies fighting for God with an army using cowardly tactics against civilians and serving only the interests of imperialism and international Zionism in destroying the vital resources of two great Moslem nations that could unite their efforts in a common struggle against imperialism and international Zionism. It is the duty of all dedicated Moslems to be concerned about this most serious insult.

Iraq has repeatedly made the allegation that Iran is an expansionist State. To reply to that, it is sufficient to refer to the map of Iran published by the Ministry of Culture and Information of Iraq in a book called Al Ahwaz of April 1980, that is, several months before Iraq launched its war of aggression against Iran. In that official map, all of the southern regions of Iran have been detached and given Arab names for which there is no basis. Such maps and books have been officially published by Iraq for years. Our response has been to mock such childish and silly tactics on the part of Iraq, and we shall continue to respond similarly in the future. I merely wanted to bring this single example to the attention of this Committee.

(Mr. Mohammadi, Iran)

Regardless of such arguments, it is clear that the representative of Iraq is trying by such polemics to divert attention from a basic reality, and that is that the régime of Iraq made a grave mistake by attacking Iran and now is looking for a way out of the quicksand it finds itself in.

The Iranian people discovered the hard way that an organization which can accommodate the representative of an aggressor State as the President of one of its most important organs, and whose organs can be used as tribunes for the justification of acts of aggression, cannot be relied upon to end aggression.

(Mr. Mohammadi, Iran)

Our people is determined to rely upon God and upon itself to fight the aggressor until all traces of aggression are terminated, regardless of the sacrifices that are necessary. The reason for this determination is that we do not wish to grant recognition to the act of armed aggression by accepting an imposed peace. The aggressor must be convinced that aggression is not going to pay off. We believe that if all nations were to treat aggression in the same way, there would be no more aggressors left in the world.

I should like to end this statement by inviting members of this Committee to witness in the field the vivid marks of aggression and to determine for themselves whose army of aggression is entrenched in whose occupied territory.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): In his statement this morning, the Soviet representative complained that the delegation of the United States had frequently exercised its right of reply during this Committee's general debate. He also complained that my delegation had made "blatant attacks" against the policies of the Soviet Union. He diagnosed the United States as suffering from a disease which he described as hysteria anti-Sovietica.

Having taught medical law for 10 years at the Medical College of Virginia, I also have some experience in the field of medicine and I found it particularly interesting to hear such a diagnosis from a doctor whose own Foreign Minister just a few weeks ago in this very building blamed the United States for virtually all the ills of the world.

Such sensitivity and defensiveness on the part of the Soviet Union to a free and open exchange of views has been their pattern for over 60 years. It denotes an acute fear of facts, a phobia that the truth will be told. Like my colleague, I might suggest a diagnosis for our Soviet friends, and that is acute redundancy syndrome; its symptoms are represented by a repetitious posturing to advance abstract and hollow proposals and haranguing this Committee with myopic views of United States arms control policy.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

My prescription would be for my Soviet colleague to focus on the serious agenda of this Committee and engage in some realistic introspection.

It is the Soviet and non-Soviet Warsaw Pact military-industrial base which is by far the world's largest in number of facilities and physical size. The Soviet Union alone produces more weapon systems in greater quantities than any other country. The Soviet military industry has grown steadily and constantly over the past 20 to 25 years. Its physical growth and the commitment of large quantities of financial and human resources is its most dynamic aspect. But its cyclical production is its most important. Production plants remain at work. As old weapons programmes are phased out, new ones are begun, leaving no down-time or long periods of lay-offs and inactivity. Is this an indication of a country which is seriously interested in arms control? The Soviet delegation has been unable to deny or refute the facts, figures and quotations cited by my delegation and others to demonstrate the wide discrepancy between the noble Soviet rhetoric and concrete Soviet deeds. We are not surprised that the Soviet Union demonstrates sensitivity when delegations document this discrepancy, whether the issue is the Soviet Union's continuing massive arms build-up, its invasion and continuing occupation of Afghanistan, its support for the Vietnamese occupation of Kampuchea or its threats, directly or by proxy, against other sovereign States.

We regard it as our responsibility to contrast concrete facts with Soviet words. We hope that our efforts will help us all to approach the serious issues before us in an open, balanced, equitable, honest and realistic way.

Mr. AWANIS (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, I beg you to forgive me and I seek the indulgence of the members of the Committee for asking to exercise the right of reply for the second time in response to what has been said by the representative of Iran.

The slanderous campaign and the lies propagated by the representative of Iran against Iraq and its patriotic and national leadership will not be answered in the same terms by us. I am not going to attack the head of State of Iran or the competent and official authorities of Iran because we do not wish to get involved in such a vicious circle. We would leave it up to the members of the Committee to settle this matter.

However, I should like to recall that I mentioned the name of Khomeini yesterday, not because I wanted to attack the political leadership in Iran, because it is very well known that political leadership, in accordance with international law, should devolve upon the head of State or the Prime Minister or cabinet members. However, Khomeini is not the President of the Republic of Iran. He has no status under international law. He is just the Imam, the Imam of the massacres taking place in Iran.

I should like to confine myself to certain claims and allegations made by the representative of Iran. By these he wished to beautify and improve the image of his group in Iran.

Yesterday I mentioned expansionism on the part of Iran and by that I meant the exportation of the so-called Iranian revolution, particularly to the Muslim peoples and to the Arabian Gulf in particular. Yesterday we referred to declarations by competent Iranian authorities in this matter and I need not state all these things again today. As for the Arabistan area, it is very well known that Arabistan is an Arab area inhabited by Arabs since earliest historical times.

The representative of Iran referred to aggression. In fact, he has spoken at length of that supposed aggression. I am fully confident that the representative of Iran does not know the real meaning of the term "aggression", at least as defined in United Nations documents.

(Mr. Awanis, Iraq)

If what he says is true, then perhaps he would be able to mention some resolutions containing such accusations that were adopted by international organizations or at some of the meetings that have taken place recently and which condemn the so-called "aggression" against his country. All the allegations and claims advanced by the representative of Iran are, constantly repeated only on Iranian television and throughout the Iranian press.

Next, the Iranian representative has been shedding tears over the victims among the Iranian population in the cities which have been shelled by us. However, he has forgotten that only a few months ago his régime engaged in an undeclared war against the Iranian population. A régime which is engaged in a war against its own people does not have the right to shed tears over "aggression". Perhaps the Khomeini régime should stop its aggression against the Iranian population.

As members know, every day in Iran there are more and more executions. I have here an Iranian bulletin which deals exclusively with the names of those people who have been executed, whether young or old people, including photographs of some of them. I can distribute all those photographs to any member interested in having them.

As to Khomeini, the so-called Imam of the Iranian revolution, he stated, with respect to those executions, that "that blood will purify the Iranian revolution". So Khomeini is not only a criminal, he is also blood-thirsty. In fact, Khomeini has issued orders to the effect that the corpses of those executed should not be returned to their families unless the families pay the price of the bullets that were used in executing those victims.

Mr. MOHAMMADI (Iran): We have listened time and again in the past to similar polemics by representatives of Iraq concerning the aggression of Iraq against Iran. Their intention is to divert the Committee from the main subject-matter and to try to teach us how to run our own country. It is not the business of the representative of Iraq to teach us how to run our

(Mr. Mohammadi, Iran)

country, but to get back to the main issue with which this Committee is supposed to be dealing, that is, armaments and the question of disarmament and related matters, such as armed aggression.

I would just repeat the invitation that I extended to members of the international community to go to the field where aggression is taking place, to see what is happening and to determine for themselves whose army of aggression is in whose occupied territory.

Mr. AWANIS (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): First, I should like to clarify for the representative of Iran that we have no intention whatsoever of educating the Iranian people on how to manage their own affairs or of intervening in the domestic affairs of any other neighbouring country. At the same time, we ask the Khomeini régime to stop making continual declarations concerning "exporting the Iranian revolution to neighbouring countries". Such statements are considered to be direct interference in the domestic affairs of other countries.

The representative of Iran also spoke of aggression, and throughout my reply to him I wondered whether he had a definition of the term "aggression" and whether he had any documents to justify his claim of aggression.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation had not intended to speak at this meeting, but the intervention by the representative of the United States compels us to make a brief statement. In his intervention, the representative of the United States repeated the hackneyed anti-Soviet allegations which the United States delegation has already voiced several times at this session of the General Assembly and to which the Soviet delegation has given an appropriate reply. Today's statement by the representative of the United States was a new manifestation of the disease of Hysteria Anti-Sovietica, which was mentioned today by the Soviet delegation. In his intervention, the representative of the United States called upon the Soviet delegation to examine disarmament questions seriously. I must say that that appeal

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

should have been addressed to his own delegation, to the United States of America, which is guilty of having broken off a number of important negotiations in the field of disarmament and on arms limitation. It is precisely the United States which is impeding the solution of urgent disarmament problems, and that has been shown by the discussion in our Committee at this session.

(Mr. Prokofiev, USSR)

I must state that the Soviet delegation is prepared to engage in a constructive and serious discussion on realistic measures to limit the arms race, and that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have taken appropriate, concrete and constructive initiatives in this respect. The United States, for its part, has not made such constructive proposals, and the intervention by the United States delegation therefore gives rise only to regret on ours.

We reserve the right, if need be, to speak further on this matter and to reply further to the statement by the United States delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded the general debate on all disarmament items. Twenty-three meetings have been devoted to the general debate and we have heard close to 140 speakers, which connoisseurs tell me is a remarkable number of statements and participants. I think it should serve us in good stead for the second phase of our work on disarmament items, namely, the consideration and action upon draft resolutions.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.