

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
20th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 30 October 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE
(continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Dashtseren (Mongolia)
Mr. Martynov (Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Al-Shaali (United Arab Emirates)
Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan)

*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 DC-2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/39/PV.20
9 November 1984

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 65 AND 142 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The Mongolian delegation wishes to congratulate the Chairman on his election to that high post and to express our best wishes for his success in the exercise of his responsible functions. We congratulate also the other officers of the Committee on their election to their respective posts.

We also congratulate Mr. Kheradi on his appointment as Secretary of our Committee.

The year which has elapsed since the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly has witnessed an increase in the tension in the world and further growth in the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war.

This extremely dangerous situation in the world has been created by the aggressive designs of the imperialist circles, especially the United States, which are endeavouring by every means to undermine the existing military and strategic parity and to achieve supremacy over the socialist world.

The new round in the United States nuclear-arms race is complemented by a programme to develop "chemical super-weapons". Previously unimaginable "star wars" projects are now entering the realm of practical policy.

The negative and obstructionist position of the United States as a whole has blocked all negotiations in the area of disarmament, be they bilateral or multilateral. In a word, it is conducting an active policy designed to aggravate the nuclear confrontation and to break the existing treaties and agreements on vital matters relating to the limitation and cessation of the nuclear arms race and disarmament.

All these acts are being dressed up in peace-loving rhetoric dictated by circumstantial domestic considerations. At the same time, in order to justify the increased escalation of military preparations pursued with ever-greater zeal the bugbear of the "Soviet military threat" is waved before us.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

The peoples of the world are deeply concerned over the adventurist plans of the militarist imperialist circles, which are pushing the world closer to the brink of nuclear disaster. They firmly reject the inhuman doctrines based on the "acceptability" and "permissibility" of a nuclear war.

This is clearly shown by the unprecedented growth of the anti-war and anti-nuclear movement in the most varied corners of our planet. The deep concern over the growing tension in the world and the escalation of the arms race is reflected in the Final Communiqué adopted recently by the meeting of ministers and heads of delegation of the non-aligned countries at the present session of the General Assembly.

The state of affairs in the world once again convinces us that peace will not come by itself, that we have to struggle for it actively and purposefully. This idea is the main theme of the Declaration by the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) on the maintenance of peace and international economic co-operation, which was adopted at the highest level this June in Moscow.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

The participants in the meeting, in analysing the present political and economic situation in the world, attached prime importance to the cessation of the arms race, the reduction of armaments and the maintenance of a military and strategic balance at lower and lower levels.

The recently concluded general political discussion and debate here in the Committee have once again very convincingly confirmed that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations justly regard the prevention of nuclear warfare as the number one problem. It is no accident that the General Assembly at its previous session resolutely and unconditionally condemned nuclear war as the most monstrous crime against peoples and as a violation of the foremost human right - the right to life.

In the present circumstances, when the technological arms race is undergoing qualitatively new changes which can immeasurably complicate the possibility of curbing it, it is absolutely essential that effective steps be taken on a broad range of problems related to nuclear disarmament. That cause would be advanced to a significant extent if the nuclear Powers that have not yet done so would undertake a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is our view that such an obligation could take either the form of unilateral declarations or the form of a single international legal document.

It is generally recognized that the nuclear Powers have a particular responsibility to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. For that reason, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic attaches extreme importance to the proposal made by the Soviet Union that agreement be reached on the joint recognition of specific norms to govern relations among nuclear States and that they be given a binding character. It would be desirable, as we see it, to reflect that timely proposal in the resolutions of the present session of the General Assembly.

Multilateral efforts will undoubtedly play an important role in bringing about a positive solution to the problem of preventing nuclear war. Talks should be started without further delay at the Geneva Disarmament Conference in order to develop and reach agreement on practical steps on this vital problem. Concrete proposals which have been submitted by the socialist countries on this subject are on the negotiating table.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

An easily implemented and, at the same time, effective way of stopping the nuclear-arms race, in our opinion, could be a freeze on nuclear weapons, both qualitatively and quantitatively. If such a step were taken, it would amount in practice to putting an end to the qualitative refinement and development of new nuclear-weapons systems, to the production of all forms of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery and to the production of fissionable materials for military purposes. In other words, a freeze would serve as a point of departure for the adoption of genuine nuclear-disarmament measures. That is why we welcomed and supported the Joint Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania dated 22 May of this year.

Among the nuclear-disarmament issues, particular attention must be paid to the problem of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, which is the subject of various negotiations that have been going on now for more than a quarter of a century. In-depth consideration of this problem indicates that every prerequisite exists for the speediest possible conclusion of the treaty concerned. The problem of the so-called inadequacy of the means of verification, which has been artificially created by a handful of States, should not hinder an agreement on this important question.

In connection with the forthcoming Third Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Mongolian delegation would like to reiterate the importance of strengthening the non-proliferation régime in every possible way. The nuclear ambitions of the racist régime of South Africa and Israel make it extremely urgent that the number of Parties to that Treaty be further increased.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, for example, in northern Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East, Africa and the South Pacific and the provision of guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States would make a significant contribution to strengthening the non-proliferation régime.

The Mongolian People's Republic has consistently advocated the practical implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the holding of an international conference on the matter, during the first half of 1985.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

The sole realistic basis for achieving mutually acceptable agreements on matters directly affecting the vital interests of state security is the strict and unswerving observance of the fundamental principle of equality and equal security. The rejection of this principle and, what is more, deliberate attempts to impose unacceptable solutions not only frequently lead to deadlocks but, what is most dangerous, undermine the very foundation of any talks.

This is extremely relevant to the Soviet-United States talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic weapons and on the limitation of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, which it has been impossible to continue because of the deployment of new United States nuclear missiles in certain countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which began at the end of last year.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

In the face of a nuclear and missile confrontation, the task of preventing an arms race in outer space and ensuring peaceful international co-operation in this new sphere of human activity is becoming ever-more timely and urgent. If the arms race were to extend into outer space, that would mark a qualitatively new stage in the arms race. The programme of deploying a large-scale system of anti-missile defences, the development of various types of anti-satellite weapons and the creation of a variety of "third generation" weapons for use in outer space and from outer space against the earth are all calculated to bring about a first-strike capability. It is essential that steps be taken urgently to erect a dependable barrier to the militarization of outer space.

For that reason, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, whose delegation has been actively involved in attempts to find a solution to this problem, fully supports the proposal of the Soviet Union entitled "Use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind", which has been submitted for consideration at the present session of the General Assembly. That initiative represents a logical continuation of the efforts made by the socialist countries to prevent the deployment of any types of weapons in outer space and prohibit the use of force in outer space and from outer space against the earth.

The implementation of the new Soviet proposal would, in our opinion, facilitate a comprehensive solution to the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space and would thereby promote the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

An important prerequisite for reaching multilateral agreement on preventing the militarization of outer space is that bilateral talks be held between the Soviet Union and the United States on the matter. As we see it, the Soviet Union's proposal that any aggressive space attack weapons, including anti-satellite weapons, be renounced completely and that a mutual moratorium be established on the testing and development of such systems as an immediate step provides a constructive basis for the resolution of this important problem.

With growing international tension, the peaceful life of the peoples is becoming more and more vulnerable to the threat of a nuclear holocaust. Aware of this danger, people of good will are filled with resolve to combine their efforts to establish lasting peace, which in the present nuclear age is the chief

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

prerequisite if mankind is to continue to exist and if world civilization is to be preserved. In these circumstances, our Organization, whose main purpose is the maintenance of international peace, must confirm and wholeheartedly support the inalienability and legitimacy of actions undertaken by peoples to prevent nuclear war and preserve the world for the present generation and future generations.

The peoples of our planet have a sacred right to peace, that is, to project international peace. The right of peoples to peace must be reliably safeguarded by all States.

In the light of these considerations, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic has put forward a proposal that the General Assembly consider at its present session an item entitled "Right of peoples to peace".

The adoption of the declaration that has been proposed on the subject would, we believe, be an important political action on the part of the United Nations with a view to mobilizing and fostering efforts by the international community to avert the threat of nuclear war and create a climate favourable for the adoption of practical steps to limit and put an end to the arms race.

Those are the views of our delegation on the urgent problems of eliminating the nuclear threat and halting the arms race.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Our delegation has already had an opportunity, during the first part of the discussion in this Committee, to speak on a number of vital problems of the present day, in particular the question of preventing nuclear warfare and ensuring that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Today we intend to state our views on a number of other specific issues.

The Byelorussian SSR attaches particular importance to the activities of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Unfortunately that body has not yielded the results that might have been expected. It was, after all, created - and here I am quoting paragraph 113 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament - for the purpose of guaranteeing "maximum effectiveness" for the efforts of the international community in the field of disarmament.

The reason that machinery is now limping is by no means any omissions in its construction or the general plan for it. The reason is a lack of political will on

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

the part of a number of those who are members of that body. In the First Committee and in the plenary session, the delegation of the United States has mentioned an alleged desire to carry out negotiations on disarmament. But when an attempt is made in the Disarmament Commission to reach agreement on specific recommendations for such talks, the apparently promising statements of the United States delegation come into direct conflict with its actual position. That was witnessed at the last session of the Disarmament Commission, where of the proposed recommendations on nuclear disarmament, as a result of certain actions undertaken by the United States and some of its allies, it was possible only to agree on the introductory phraseology. Attempts to establish priorities for the means of preventing nuclear warfare and achieving nuclear disarmament provoke a very violent reaction on the part of those delegations. As has already been pointed out by the delegation of Mexico, in the context of the Disarmament Conference, the word "talks" causes real disgust and even horror.

The situation that has arisen in the Disarmament Commission on the question of confidence-building measures is alarming. As to confidence-building, a few days ago, in the First Committee, the delegation of Japan quite properly pointed out that:

"Whatever measures may be adopted, it is imperative that nations with different views and positions should have an accurate understanding of the views and positions of the others." (A/C.1/39/PV.10, p. 31)

As the Committee is aware, in this area the socialist States favour combining broad political and international legal steps with military and technical steps.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Unfortunately, at the Commission's last session certain delegations bent every effort to ensure that that approach was not duly reflected in the session's documentation and thus made it impossible for world public opinion to be broadly acquainted with the existing positions. At the same time, the methods used by those delegations by no means helped to promote an atmosphere of trust during the Commission's actual work on this item.

Is it not a paradox that the representatives of those States particularly active in this matter are with one hand waving the flag of confidence-building measures and with the other removing any limitations on themselves for the production of strategic aircraft and long-range missiles? Obviously, there is something that is not quite right here.

The problem of the relationship between disarmament and development is also a complex one; that, too, was considered by the Commission. As has also been shown by the present discussion, a number of States from various parts of the world attach great importance to this problem. It is a positive factor that at the present time in the United Nations hardly anyone would be emboldened to state - at least not in so many words - that the arms race helps development in any way. However, the curve of the arms race - for reasons already referred to by my delegation - continues to spiral upwards.

Furthermore, as a result of the fact that reactionary forces in the world have ignited new sources of conflict and fanned alight old ones, there is also the geographical extension of the arms race. In these conditions, it is essential to have a very clear understanding that the creation of any fund, when an end has not yet been put to the arms race, would really be tantamount to undermining the very idea of the relationship between disarmament and development. Such a step would be directly damaging to disarmament and, in the final analysis, to development.

It is only in the context of real measures for the limitation and reduction of the arms race that we can guarantee any successful figuration of this idea into practical language. The Byelorussian SSR's position appears in some detail in its reply to the questionnaire sent out by the Secretary-General and published in document A/CN.10/57/Add.3.

In referring briefly to the situation on other agenda items before this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, I would simply point out that

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

the nuclear ambitions of South Africa and other aggressive régimes in various hot spots of the world are increasing the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons.

With regard to the question of the reduction of military budgets, in my delegation's opinion it has not been solved simply because the West has undertaken vain efforts to replace the whole idea of a freeze and subsequent reduction of military budgets by general talks on information gathering, including espionage information.

With reference to the Conference on Disarmament, the Byelorussian SSR delegation would like to dwell on two items appearing on its agenda: the prohibition of chemical weapons and the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

As representatives know, in recent years the Soviet Union, in keeping with its consistent policy in favour of the prohibition of chemical weapons, has made a number of major initiatives along these lines. I am referring, first and foremost, to the basic provisions for a convention on the prohibition of the development, manufacture and accumulation of stockpiles of chemical weapons and their destruction, which was submitted in 1982. In that document the views of many other States were borne in mind, including views on questions of control. The draft which was submitted by the Soviet Union - and which received great commendation - made it possible in a very short time to achieve generally acceptable agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons and establishing proper control over the observance of that agreement. Recently, at the end of February this year, in the Conference on Disarmament the Soviet Union took a further important step in the verification area: it proposed that the entire process of the destruction of chemical weapons should be under constant control. That step helped towards the solution of one of the questions of the forthcoming Conference which has been the subject of unworthy speculations. It was also supplemented by other proposals put forward by the Soviet Union. And what was the reaction of the United States to those steps?

In order to neutralize the incentive created by the Soviet Union proposals and to slow down the pace gained by the Conference on Disarmament on the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons, the United States, as previously, proceeded to erect new barriers on the way to concluding a convention. The history of disarmament talks is already replete with examples of the countermeasures constantly taken by the United States. Whenever the Soviet Union takes a step

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

towards the American position, the United States immediately sets additional conditions that are quite remote from any political realism. That is what has happened this time as well. When the United States put forward its highly publicized draft convention, it immediately became clear how far it was from what was needed to promote the achievement of agreement. Furthermore, any unprejudiced person who studied the American draft convention could have no shadow of a doubt that it was drafted in such a way as to make it unacceptable in advance to all those who are concerned that there should be no chemical weapons anywhere on earth - and that applies first and foremost to the control provisions contained in the American draft.

It has already been indicated that the system laid down in it regarding control methods would be tantamount to virtually free access of the monitors to any sites and objects, whether or not they related to the production of chemical weapons and in general to the chemical industry - and all this on the basis of a so-called constant invitation. Such demands would have nothing at all in common with controlling or monitoring the observance of a possible agreement prohibiting chemical weapons which is of equal concern to all potential participants.

It would be misleading to believe that in proposing that absurd system of control the United States was prepared to extend such control to itself as well. By no means. It appears - and this is in fact actually written into the American draft in black and white - that it would extend only to those sites belonging to or controlled by Governments. Consequently, American chemical corporations - which, as representatives know, have grown rich on the sufferings of the Vietnamese people victims of the use of American chemical weapons - could, with impunity, continue to produce chemical weapons since they are private enterprises. They could also look at other countries' chemical technology, even if that technology had nothing to do with the production of chemical weapons.

Can one imagine a more cynical approach to a very serious matter?

The malevolence of that American proposal to exempt private chemical enterprises from control is particularly obvious when one takes into account the fact that, at the same time, the United States maintains that a private firm should have the right to produce, without any control whatever, highly toxic substances under the pretext of their being used for peaceful purposes and chemical compounds that could be used for components of new forms of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Against the background of such clear efforts to block progress in the multilateral talks in Geneva, we are particularly alarmed at the further United States plans to add to what - may we say in passing - is the largest arsenal of chemical weapons in the world a long-term programme of chemical over-armament.

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

For the 1985 financial year alone, the White House intends to spend \$1.1 billion on nerve-paralysing chemical substances in the production of so-called binary chemical weapons. In Pine Bluff the United States is going ahead with the building of new facilities for the production of such weapons.

Washington has already received the consent of the Governments of the United Kingdom and Italy to locate these chemical weapons on their territories. Quite recently we were informed that the United States and the United Kingdom intended, in the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), very shortly to locate on the territory of Western Europe, primarily in the Federal Republic of Germany, new stocks of poisonous military substances. Such a decision runs counter to the demands of world public opinion to create a chemical-weapon-free zone of the continent of Europe. On the territory of that country there is more than 10 per cent of United States chemical weapons of nerve-paralysing type substances capable of destroying 40 million people. Shortly Washington intends to locate in the Federal Republic of Germany cruise missiles with warheads containing paralysing gases.

All this indicates that the United States and NATO are trying to turn Europe into a beachhead not only for nuclear but also for chemical warfare.

The intentions of the United States Administration are clearly to be seen in the directives of its Ministry of Defence for 1985-1989, which serve as a guidebook for action, where the armed forces of the United States are intended to be prepared by 1985 "for the swift utilization of chemical weapons". Against the background of such actions and designs on the part of the United States the real value of the notorious American draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons immediately becomes clear. As stated by a member of the United States Senate, Mr. Pryor,

"It is ridiculous to propose the prohibition of chemical weapons and at the same time to plan development of new types of these weapons. This is a typically upside-down logic of the Pentagon to produce more in order to have less."

The Byelorussian SSR attaches particular importance to the question of how to prohibit new forms of weapons of mass destruction and new systems for such weapons. This is a matter which has been on the agenda of various international forums for a number of years. A number of resolutions on the subject have been adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations. World public opinion is getting a much clearer idea of the fact that the scientific and technological

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

revolution and the accelerating rate of progress in various fields of science create not only favourable conditions for solving the basic problems of mankind but also, to the extent that they are used for military purposes, a serious danger for new rounds in the spiralling arms race. A realization of this situation and of the absolute need to avoid such a development of events is directly reflected in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

Today mankind has reached the threshold of a new danger. On land, at sea, in the air and in outer space the development of military technology has witnessed profound changes. Qualitatively new types of weapons are being elaborated, primarily weapons of mass destruction, such types as make control over them - which means agreed limitation, reduction and prohibition - extremely difficult if not impossible.

A new stage in the arms race will undermine international stability and considerably increase the danger of the outbreak of war. The task of placing an effective barrier on the way to such a turn of events has now taken on particular urgency and significance. In this connection we should like to emphasize the importance of the preventive approach to the prohibition of new forms of weapons. We are gratified to see that the delegations of a number of States have expressed similar views in the debate in the current session. An illustration of the effectiveness of such a preventive approach is the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, which was confirmed at the recently held Review Conference on that Convention. Furthermore, at that Conference delegations also referred to the importance of the preventive approach. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR is profoundly convinced that there is need for further efforts to be made to prohibit new forms of weapons of mass destruction before they are actually placed in the arsenals of States.

In conclusion may I point out that the "basket" of the Western States is full of proposals made by other countries. It is high time for these proposals to be considered in a constructive spirit, with a demonstration of political will, in order finally to ensure some progress towards the prevention of the nuclear threat and the curbing of the arms race.

Mr. AL-SHAALI (United Arab Emirates) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a source of great satisfaction to my delegation, speaking for the first time in this Committee, to convey to Ambassador Souza e Silva our sincere congratulations on his election to the chairmanship of this Committee. We are confident that his skill and ability will constitute an effective and positive contribution in guiding the work of the Committee to a successful conclusion. Our congratulations are addressed also to the other officers of the Committee.

Our interest in the question of disarmament, and nuclear disarmament in particular, is part of the concern of all mankind in the future of a world which is seeing the deterioration of international relations and an unchecked race towards the development of new kinds of weapons. It is regrettable to note that, despite all efforts, all meetings held and all resolutions adopted by this Organization and in many other forums in the world, no significant progress has been achieved in the field of disarmament. At the same time, the arms race has taken on new and fearsome dimensions, increasing the danger to which mankind is exposed and leading to the disappearance of any hope in the capacity of the international system to preserve peace and security in the world. All this is a direct result of the mistrust prevailing in international relations because of the fact that political will is dominated by concepts based on force as the most important means of carrying out international policies. The concept of force is often harmful to relations between States and increases their concerns, notably those of the great Powers that are engaging in an arms race to develop, acquire and accumulate arms at a rate that defies all imagination.

In this connection, suffice it to refer to expert reports according to which the number of accumulated nuclear weapons is enough to destroy the world several times over and to figures provided by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), showing that military expenditure on armaments has reached \$750 to \$800 billion.

This frightening figure suggests that we should promptly reconsider our expenditures on weapons and courageously assume our responsibilities in order to save mankind from the threat of mass destruction. Accordingly, we appeal to the two super-Powers to resume negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear weapons and the limitation of strategic weapons, as a necessary condition in responding to our hopes in the capacity of man to control the disastrous implications of the nuclear-arms race.

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab
Emirates)

What is of equal concern is that the development of research and technology in the manufacturing of weapons has made much greater progress than have the negotiations on the limitation of strategic weapons and on disarmament - this despite the growing concern shown by the world community about the unleashing of a nuclear war and the fear of nuclear war.

We all harbour the hope that discoveries in outer space will open up greater possibilities for mankind, providing many more resources for the development and progress of mankind. However, we have been disappointed so far because we have noted that outer space has been placed in the service of military objectives, thus worsening the dangers that face mankind on his own planet.

My delegation shares the view that outer space is the common heritage of mankind and should be preserved from military uses.

Similarly my delegation attaches particular importance to the question of guarantees to be afforded to non-nuclear countries against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon Powers. We hope that efforts will be steadily exerted until an agreement is reached on this issue as soon as possible.

We are firmly convinced that the establishment of nuclear-free zones will be of great help in reducing the growing danger emanating from the deployment of nuclear weapons and the establishment of such zones will play an effective and positive role in the realization of our final aim: the limitation of strategic weapons and the task of reversing the arms race.

Therefore, my country has supported the creation of nuclear-free zones in the Middle East, Africa, Latin America and South-East Asia. The reason is that we have witnessed such developments in the Middle East, a region that has been exposed to the possible danger of nuclear conflict on more than one occasion, as a result of the policy followed by Israel, which is the true driving force of foreign ambitions in the area and the instrument of their implementation. Thus, the role played by that racist State - a subversive role - has led to the unleashing of wars and a worsening of the tensions in the region, infringing upon the independence of Arab countries and opening up the way to foreign intervention in the affairs of the region with the possibility of a conflict between the great Powers, possibly even a nuclear conflict. This racist State does not stop at these acts. It seeks

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab
Emirates)

steadily to achieve a nuclear-weapon capacity; indeed, it has obtained the assistance of certain great Powers for that purpose and is co-operating with another racist régime in South Africa outside any international control. This increases the potential danger not only for the Middle East but also for the African continent.

Along the same line of thought, we would appeal once again to those Powers that supply Israel and South Africa with the material and technology that help them to produce nuclear weapons to refrain from providing any such assistance to those countries in order to spare these regions the danger of nuclear war.

We also call upon the international community to face the need to exert tireless efforts to submit nuclear activities in South Africa and Israel to the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

My delegation shares the view that a close link exists between disarmament and economic development. Military expenditure on weapons and the arms race form a formidable obstacle to the possibilities for the international community to benefit from its own capacities, to realize economic progress in the developing countries and to achieve an agreement that may attenuate or halt the arms race, which would have a positive effect on development. We therefore appeal that a United Nations conference be held to examine the link between disarmament and development, because we are convinced that such a conference would constitute the appropriate forum for such a discussion and for the evaluation of the harmful effects of military expenditure that should be directed towards development.

My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express its concern that third-world countries are being obliged to engage in the arms race and in the accumulation of weapons and to transfer a large part of their national income to expenditure on armaments. The majority of these countries are suffering from poverty, ignorance and disease and are forced to do this by external pressures - pressures which seek to have a harmful effect upon their independence, as does the role played by certain forces in fanning local conflicts, thus giving them an international dimension and placing obstacles before these countries with the objective of interfering in their internal affairs.

In this context my delegation believes that all countries should refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of States - notably, certain great Powers - and that the peoples of these countries should be allowed to shape their future in

(Mr. Al-Shaali, United Arab
Emirates)

complete freedom and to preserve their independence free of any external pressure, be it military or economic. The freedom and independence of peoples should have absolute priority in all matters concerning international relations. Nations and peoples should not be confined in an arena which is used for the conflicts of the great Powers, and there is a need to respect the ambitions of peoples to live in peace.

My country, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, is deeply concerned about the non-implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and about the obstacles being placed in the way of the holding of an international Conference on the Indian Ocean as a result of the lack of consensus and the justifications that are being offered to hamper the holding of such a Conference. The lack of seriousness of such justification, of course, leads to an increase of the military presence in the Indian Ocean, which is contrary to the objectives of the Declaration.

The international situation has reached an unprecedented level of complexity and relations between the great Powers such an impasse that any misunderstanding or miscalculation could lead to the end of the world.

Several observers have called this session of the General Assembly the disarmament session. The Committee, therefore, should assume a particularly great responsibility in view of the need to arrive at practical resolutions that could open up the way to agreements on disarmament and a slowing down of the nuclear-arms race. We hope that the lofty words spoken on the subject of disarmament at the beginning of the session will be translated into appropriate action.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): I should like to congratulate you wholeheartedly, and through you the other officers of the Committee, on your unanimous elections to your respective posts. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan shall spare no effort to help in the successful conduct of the work of the Committee.

The Security and Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly has begun its deliberation of relevant items on its agenda at a time when an extremely complicated and dangerous international situation prevails.

Next year we shall celebrate the fortieth anniversary of our Organization. The men of vision who had high hopes for the future of mankind, learning from the terrible experience of two world wars, fought in the first half of the century, declared in the Preamble to the Charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, ... and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security ..."

After almost forty years the international community is now faced with the gravest of threats to the existence of man and his civilization by an ever-increasing build-up of the most horrendous means of war, involving weapons of great sophistication and destructive capability, high accuracy, vastly expanded flight range and disproportionately huge loads. Just for ever-new systems of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, such as the new inter-continental MX and Midgetman missiles, long-range cruise missiles and Stealth and BlB strategic bombers, bring out the highly disquieting reality that deliberate and well-organized preparation for a nuclear war is well under way in the warmongering, imperialist circles. To complete their scenario of such a war, these forces have now unleashed a new spiral of the arms race, this time into outer space. A gigantic programme, aimed at the creation of a so-called impenetrable shield, is already being implemented through the development and production of a new anti-ballistic missile system. Together with such material preparations for a surprise nuclear attack, under the pretext of a possible defence in the event of retaliation, a monstrous psychological propaganda campaign has also been launched. This warfare has at its core the infamous doctrines of the admissibility of "pre-emptive or countervailing" first nuclear strike, and "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war. Such an irresponsible and mad drive towards the unprecedented

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

escalation of the arms race has brought the world ever closer to the verge of complete annihilation. The danger of the outbreak of an all-out nuclear confrontation is now haunting the whole of humanity whose very survival is put into question.

The World Health Organization's report of 1984, entitled "The consequences of nuclear war for health and health services" estimates that half of the population of the world will immediately perish in the event of a global nuclear exchange, while the other half will fall victim to the long-term effects of such a war. A new scientific theory, developed and supported by highly authoritative and competent personalities and institutions, talks of drastic atmospheric pollution and a prolonged nuclear winter in the aftermath of a total nuclear war, which would extinguish all life that may for some reason have escaped the instant blow of the atomic weapons' explosions and would destroy all forms of life and vegetation on earth.

At a time when the most conservative estimates rule out the possibility of a surviving civilization after a nuclear holocaust, and when many other biological, geophysical and atmospheric interactions and contractions resulting from a nuclear war are not as yet known, the unabated drive plunging our planet into the abyss of nuclear catastrophe, should serve as sufficient reason for all peace-loving humanity to continue and expand its struggle to curb the arms race and to avert the danger of a nuclear war. This constitutes the supreme task of all mankind if we are to secure any future for this and forthcoming generations.

The international community has every reason to be shocked that some irresponsible warmonger finds it amusing to joke about nuclear warfare. Despite the hapless and futile attempts to the contrary, the gaffe, which was not meant for broadcast, has clearly revealed the hidden evil designs harboured by those who have their fingers on the buttons of the largest arsenal of nuclear weapons in the world.

The General Assembly has already adopted a declaration condemning nuclear war as the most monstrous crime that can be committed against the people of the world. This declaration is the clearest verdict of the international community on the inadmissibility of a nuclear war.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, true to its principled and responsible approach towards the issues of war and peace, has already made its position very clear on this matter. In this context, we have expressed our satisfaction that the

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Soviet Union has assumed a unilateral obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If similar commitments were made by other nuclear-weapon States, the threat of the outbreak of a nuclear war would be reduced to naught.

Afghanistan is a party to the proposal of the other non-aligned countries for the signing of a convention between all nuclear-weapon States on banning the use of nuclear weapons. The conclusion of such a convention would naturally result in the creation of an atmosphere conducive to serious and business-like negotiations on all related issues of nuclear disarmament. Here we would like to voice our concern at the reluctance of the United States to remove those obstacles to the resumption of the dialogue between it and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which were created as a result of the stationing of United States cruise and Pershing II missiles on the territories of some European countries.

Notwithstanding the importance of these and other bilateral talks, further impetus should be given to multilateral negotiations on disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament, in our view, should be urged to take up, on a priority basis, the drafting of a comprehensive programme on nuclear disarmament. In this connection, we would like to express our support for the working paper submitted by the socialist countries to the Conference on Disarmament last March, proposing certain practical measures to avert a nuclear war through narrowing and limiting the material basis of such a war.

The work of the Conference on Disarmament on the drafting of a treaty on a general and complete nuclear test ban has been less than satisfactory to us. The Soviet Union has already submitted a draft which can serve as a good basis for negotiations on this issue. It is regrettable that bilateral treaties limiting underground tests and nuclear explosions to peaceful purposes have not yet been ratified by one of the parties. At the same time, we would like to call for an early resumption of the trilateral talks on a complete test ban which were unilaterally suspended by the United States. Pending the conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear tests, we deem it appropriate that a moratorium be issued on such tests.

We consider as timely and valuable the proposal of the Soviet Union that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States should declare a bilateral nuclear freeze without any delay. The United Nations gave its support to this Soviet initiative by adopting a resolution on this matter last year.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

We are strongly of the view that if such a freeze could be enacted by the major nuclear-weapon States the possibilities of reaching agreements on the reduction of certain types of those weapons could also be facilitated. The Joint Declaration by Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania on freezing nuclear weapons has also been warmly welcomed by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Any attempt to disturb the rough balance and parity that exists between the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States will inevitably trigger a quantitatively and qualitatively new spiral of the arms race.

Experience has proved that the attempts of the United States to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union have immediately and quite naturally been matched by the Soviet Union. This has resulted in the re-establishment of overall balance of forces, but each time at a higher and more frightening level.

The holding of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty is scheduled for 1985. That occasion must be utilized to redouble our efforts further to strengthen the non-proliferation régime through increasing the number of signatories and stricter compliance by the Parties with the provisions of the Treaty. At this juncture we would like to express our grave concern over the uncontrolled ambitions of Israel, South Africa and some fascist régimes to acquire nuclear-weapon capability. To be sure, a few additional nuclear warheads in the world-wide arsenal of nuclear weapons may not bring about a drastic change. What worries us particularly, however, is the nature of certain régimes. Those who have repeatedly shown their willingness in the past to seek military solutions to bilateral problems or have launched military aggressions against neighbouring countries may not hesitate to use nuclear weapons in the event of a new armed hostility. One has to consider the very dangerous implications for the regional balance of forces and international security that the acquisition of such weapons by those racist, expansionist and aggressive régimes can have.

We also call for great caution in military and nuclear collaboration with those countries which consistently refuse to join the non-proliferation régime.

It is our hope that international legal instruments could be worked out that would provide sufficient security guarantees for those non-nuclear-weapon States which have no such weapons on their territory. We welcome the unilateral obligation assumed by the Soviet Union and its expressed willingness to sign bilateral agreements with non-nuclear-weapon States on the non-use of those weapons against them.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world could serve as an additional barrier to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in new geographical regions. We commend the efforts of some countries to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in the South Pacific and northern Europe. In our view, regional agreements could be worked out on the pattern of the Tlatelolco Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America. Such initiatives as the Soviet Union's proposal on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of those countries where there are no such weapons at present could be revitalized for this purpose.

In considering measures towards nuclear disarmament, the prohibition of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes should be given appropriate attention by the Conference on Disarmament.

The working out of reliable procedures and modalities for verifying compliance with the provisions of agreements on nuclear disarmament may lead to alleviation of suspicions with regard to the sincere implementation of commitments. But it should be mentioned that such modalities and procedures cannot hope to be effective unless they enjoy the full agreement of all parties concerned.

In recent years certain militaristic circles have been advocating a case in favour of large-scale and massive production of the so-called clean bomb. Gigantic plans are already being carried out to produce neutron weapons that are to be deployed in various parts of the world, particularly Europe. We express our concern that the Conference on Disarmament has been prevented for many years from elaborating the draft of a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of these weapons, a convention that was proposed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

I would like now to turn to the uses of the peaceful uses of outer space. The opening of space to mankind more than two decades ago, which brought about great hopes for the future of all humanity, is now becoming the source of a serious threat to the existence of our planet. To some militaristic and adventurist circles, the planet earth seems not to be large enough and they have decided to introduce a highly sophisticated military system into outer space.

By establishing a Special Space Command and a Joint Control Center for Military Operations in Space, the United States has concentrated enormous attention on research and development of weapons that could be used from earth against

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

targets in outer space, weapons that could be stationed in outer space for use against space and earth targets and weapons that could be launched by high-flying F-15 fighter bombers against both earth and space objects. The first generation of the latter type has already been tested within the anti-satellite interception systems programme.

A big fuss is being made over the so-called defensive nature of laser and particle-beam weapons systems. Given their sophistication, undeterminable stations and targets, these weapons carry a highly destabilizing impact since, according to plans developed by the Pentagon and the National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA), those weapons will play the key role of rendering blind the means of observation, monitoring military movements and satellite tracking of the other side. This would enhance the dangerous temptation to launch a surprise nuclear attack by reducing the warning time for the other side in the illusory hope of preventing or crushing a retaliatory strike.

The enormity of the efforts exerted to develop such weapons can be measured by the fact that the United States has allocated \$26 billion for the purpose of military space research and development alone within the next five years. According to preliminary calculations, the first generation of space weapons will cost over \$100 billion, while the cost of all space-based systems may go as high as over \$1 trillion, an unprecedented figure for any earlier weapon system.

These developments all take place at a time when there exists, in full force, a treaty signed and ratified between the United States and the Soviet Union limiting anti-ballistic missiles and banning their development. Violation of such legally binding instruments calls into question the validity of many other similar documents that are the result of many years of tireless negotiating efforts.

Last year the United Nations General Assembly adopted by 147 votes resolution 38/70 urging the Conference on Disarmament to start negotiations on the elaboration of agreements to prevent an arms race in outer space. The United States, which cast the only negative vote on that resolution, has done everything possible, with the help of some of its allies, to block any serious negotiations on the subject in the Conference on Disarmament.

It is our earnest hope that an important issue such as this will not be allowed to be dropped from the priority agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. We have heartily welcomed the call of the Soviet Union on 29 June of this year for

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

bilateral negotiations with the United States on preventing the militarization of outer space. We also extend our full support to the new proposal of the Soviet Union on the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind and shall cast an affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.1 submitted on that issue.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

I should like to conclude my statement by quoting excerpts of a statement made on 27 June this year by Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan delivered at a seminar of the Defence and Justice Departments of the Provincial Committees of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. He said:

"It should be clear that we, as patriotic forces and staunch defenders of the national interests, not only have to ensure peace and security inside the country, but we should fulfil our duties towards the consolidation of international peace and security ...

"Our attitude is clear. We are in the ranks of our friends, in the ranks of revolutionary and workers' movements, the national and social liberation movements, in the ranks of all vanguard revolutionary, democratic and peace-loving forces of the world, the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, this mighty economic and military force and guarantor of peace and security of the peoples of the world.

"This course is indicative of our principled internationalistic attitude, and we, along with all peoples of the world, have the responsibility to defend peace and security in a united front in the struggle against aggressive and military policies of world imperialism, hegemonism and reaction. We should take our part in the struggle against the escalation of the nuclear-arms race and for decreasing international tension."

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.