

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records*



FIRST COMMITTEE
36th meeting
held on
Monday, 12 November 1984
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH 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. Emery (United States of America)
Mr. Allagany (Saudi Arabia)
Mr. Fonseca (Angola)
Mr. Mahboub (Iraq)
Mr. Wegener (Federal Republic of Germany)
Mr. Mosele (Botswana)
Mr. Rose (German Democratic Republic)
Mr. Carasales (Argentina)
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)
Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran)

UN LIBRARY
NOV 20 1984
UN COLLECTION

*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 DC2-750, 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.36
16 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. EMERY (United States of America): I am introducing today on behalf of the Government of the United States of America a draft resolution under agenda item 64, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". It was submitted on 1 November and is numbered A/C.1/39/L.10.

When President Reagan addressed the Assembly in September he reaffirmed the American commitment to the two great goals of the United Nations - the cause of peace and the cause of human dignity. No problem facing this body better demonstrates how these two objectives - peace and human dignity - are conjoined than the problem of chemical weapons.

Since the First World War, when the people of the world were exposed to the terror of these weapons of mass destruction, the international community has sought to outlaw the use of chemical weapons. Following that horrible experience, which caused more than 1 million casualties, political, moral and legal barriers against the use of chemical weapons were erected. In 1925 in Geneva the international community took a principled and solemn stand against the destruction unleashed during the First World War and agreed that the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in war be banned. The Geneva Protocol is now one of the oldest existing arms control agreements in force. Although it was a beginning and did restrict their use, it did not, unfortunately, eliminate chemical weapons. Today the Protocol's prohibition on the use in war of chemical weapons is a corner-stone of international law. This agreement was followed up in 1972 with the signature of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. It prohibits the development, production, transfer and stockpiling of biological and toxin weapons. And today in Geneva efforts are continuing to reach agreement on a complete and effective ban of an entire class of weapons - chemical weapons.

Despite decades of international efforts events have reinforced the bitter lesson that chemical weapons remain a threat to peace. Notwithstanding the international legal prohibition and the universal condemnation of chemical weapons use, as long as chemical weapons have existed, in fact, they have been used. The unfortunate fact is that the threat of their use will also endure.

(Mr. Emery, United States)

Over the past several years the United States has spoken in great detail in this hall and elsewhere on the question of chemical weapons use, has shared its concerns in this regard, has condemned such use and has called for it to stop. While I will not repeat the grim facts, some facts are worth noting. Since 1925 when chemical weapons have been used they have been employed surreptitiously in remote locations. Their use has always been denied, even in the face of hard and overwhelming evidence. Since 1925 the victims of chemical attacks have primarily been peoples and nations incapable of defending themselves against chemical warfare and without any credible or effective means to retaliate. This cruel experience has taught us that chemical weapons pose the gravest threat to the peace and security of all the nations of the world - developed and developing alike. Chemical weapons are a regional and a global danger, a common and a vital concern for all peoples. The urgent elimination of this danger world-wide, therefore, must become the common goal of all of us.

The United States believes that we must not miss the opportunity today to prevent the spread of these barbarous weapons and rid the world of them once and for all. Neither can we turn a blind eye to their use today, however, lest we also lose sight of the urgency of concluding an effective ban and abandon efforts to free mankind of this scourge. As reports of their use continue the world must act and must not become hardened to such inhumane acts. What shall happen to the cause of arms control and disarmament and to international law if some States persist in violating one of the oldest arms control agreements with impunity?

Chemical weapons constitute a unique assault on human dignity, the second of the two great goals of the United Nations. Anyone familiar with the reports of victims and eye-witnesses of chemical warfare will certainly understand why. Usually they have been used against defenceless people, often civilians simply caught in the way of war. They have been used precisely because of the terror they inspire not only to kill, but to kill in the most gruesome way imaginable. All decent and good people abhor the indiscriminate and horrible effects of chemical weapons. In this we can speak here only with one voice.

(Mr. Emery, United States)

We must all act together to meet the challenge posed by chemical weapons to peace and human dignity. We should all rededicate our efforts to protect mankind from chemical and biological warfare. In order to meet our common objective, we must all work together to ensure strict adherence to existing political, legal and moral obligations, and we should act quickly to condemn actions that contravene these obligations. Only by such steps, joining together and speaking in one strong voice, can we hope to bring the necessary pressure of the world community to bear, thereby to ensure that such weapons are never used again. Alone we have little impact. Together we stand a chance of succeeding. We must not shy away from speaking our convictions firmly. We should also ensure that constraints on chemical and biological weapons are the most effective possible. And finally, we should accelerate our efforts to eliminate the threat altogether, by achieving as soon as possible a complete and effective ban on all chemical weapons.

The United States believes it necessary that the world community go on record in support of these objectives. Here in this hall we must meet the challenge that chemical weapons pose to peace and human dignity. To that end the United States has introduced draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.10. It is designed to complement some of the other important draft resolutions introduced under agenda item 64, and those resolutions will receive the full and unequivocal support of the United States. We believe our draft resolution will make the picture complete.

It is a simple, straightforward initiative. It calls for strict observance of existing legal constraints on chemical and biological weapons and condemns actions that contravene these constraints. It welcomes efforts to ensure the most effective possible constraints on chemical and biological weapons. It urges the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to accelerate its efforts aimed at banning these weapons altogether from the world's arsenals.

These are objectives that we all share. It is the firm hope of my Government that the General Assembly will speak in consensus with one voice on this important item through support of resolution A/C.1/39/L.10.

Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me first, Mr. Chairman, to convey to you our warmest congratulations on your election to preside over this Committee. We are confident that, by virtue of your well-known ability and experience, you will contribute to the success of this Committee's proceedings.

(Mr. Allagany, Saudi Arabia)

We are meeting in this Committee several weeks after this Organization marked World Disarmament Week. We are still anxious, owing to the fact that no progress has been achieved in the field of disarmament despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its last session as well as at all previous sessions since the United Nations was founded. On the contrary, it has become clear that the arms race, especially nuclear armaments, has assumed new and grave dimensions with the attendant spiralling of the cost of armaments to astronomical figures, so much so that this decade has been marked by pessimism, vis-à-vis the speedy achievement of peace and security as well as by the slow pace of the march of development and prosperity for the developing countries.

The Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia reaffirmed the following in his statement before the General Assembly on 28 September 1984:

"Disarmament has become a vital issue today for the security, safety and progress of the world. The arms race and the gigantic sums being spent to finance it have resulted in increasing tension in the world. This situation has forced many countries, especially the developing ones, to earmark a substantial part of their limited resources for defence, at the expense of their progress and social and economic development. In this context, I should like to express our appreciation of the initiatives and resolutions the United Nations has attempted to implement over the years. At the same time, we hope that the efforts by our international Organization... will achieve some progress in protecting humanity from the imminent dangers and safeguard the developing countries from being drawn into the conflicts and hazards of competitive influences which threaten all humanity." (A/39/PV.13, pp. 62-63)

A quarter of a century has elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959, in which it emphasized that general and complete disarmament is the most important question facing the world today. If that was the situation 25 years ago, today the question is all the more important. The arms race has worsened, especially in the field of nuclear armaments, and has now extended to outer space.

This arms race is taking place at a time when the forces hostile to the liberation of peoples and the march of history in the Middle East as well as in southern Africa continue to violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States as well as the right of peoples under colonial and foreign domination or subject to foreign occupation to self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Allagany, Saudi Arabia)

The communiqué of the non-aligned countries issued in New Delhi recently asserted that nuclear weapons are more than just weapons of war. They are means of mass destruction. Therefore the Heads of State or Government maintain that it is inadmissible that the security of the whole world - rather, the survival of mankind itself - should be hostage to the security interests of a handful of countries possessing nuclear weapons.

Our fears have not been lessened concerning the possibility of an outbreak of nuclear war as a result of the continued stockpiling in the arsenals of nuclear weapons as well as the dangerous doctrines based on the concept of a nuclear deterrence blitzkrieg and on a limited nuclear war, as well as other doctrines that would lead to an escalation of the arms race, heightening international tension and subjecting mankind to a nuclear conflagration whose limits only God Almighty knows.

(Mr. Allagany, Saudi Arabia)

Saudi Arabia wishes to confirm the major role of the United Nations, the international will and international public opinion in disarmament. In this respect, we welcome the constructive initiatives and proposals submitted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Conference on Disarmament. These are in keeping with the endeavours of the international community to halt the arms race and eliminate completely the threat of nuclear war.

The unfortunate situation of certain peoples because of the wastage of material and human resources on the arms race and its negative consequences for the economies of the developing countries, their development and their cultural projects confirms the close link between disarmament and development. This also results in increasing the debt burden of those States.

The information confirming the military nuclear collaboration between the racist régime in South Africa and the Zionist entity in Israel, despite the General Assembly resolution declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone and the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, is a cause of concern for the countries of the Middle East. The purpose of the reinforcement of the nuclear arsenals of those two racist Powers is to use those lethal weapons as a means of threatening hegemony and domination over neighbouring countries, whether in Africa or the Middle East.

We call on all countries, nuclear and non-nuclear, to support the United Nations stand in this matter and to cease forthwith all collaboration with those outlawed racist régimes, which flout all the principles, values, laws and norms observed by Members of the United Nations which adhere to the Charter and are committed to the implementation of the Organization's resolutions.

The issue of Israeli nuclear armament has become one of the perennial items on the Committee's agenda. This is in contradiction with Israel's claim that it supports declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone, at a time when Israel continues to refuse to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to subject its nuclear installations to control and inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Those are some of the most important observations that we wish to make at this stage of the Committee's work. We hope that the intensive efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General will make clear to all peoples and to the mass communication media the dangers of the nuclear arms race in all its aspects.

Mr. FONSECA (Angola) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time that our delegation has spoken in the First Committee at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, we should like to convey to you, Sir, our warmest congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of this important United Nations body.

We also wish to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Henning Wegener of the Federal Republic of Germany and Mr. Milos Vejvoda of Czechoslovakia, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Ngare Kessely of Chad.

At the present time the world is facing an extremely complex, delicate and dangerous situation caused by the unbridled arms race. The present deterioration in international relations clearly reflects the confrontation between the forces of democracy and national liberation on the one hand and the imperialist, colonialist and racist Powers on the other.

An increasing number of democratic régimes are being established in Africa, Asia and Latin America and there is an increasing awareness on the part of peoples which enables them to become masters of their own destiny and natural resources. At the same time, however, disregarding contemporary international law and the United Nations Charter, the imperialist Powers are adopting all possible measures to further their geo-strategic interests, in particular through acts of intervention and military manoeuvres of a provocative nature against non-aligned States, such as mining their ports, establishing military bases and returning to the old gun-boat policy within the framework of the policy of State terrorism aimed at undermining the political and social régimes of other independent sovereign States.

To maintain the situation that enables them to plunder oppressed peoples the imperialist Powers need constantly to foment hotbeds of tension in Africa, Asia and Latin America, bring about a continuous escalation of the arms race and thus impede détente and general and complete disarmament.

Angola supports all serious proposals aimed at a qualitative and quantitative freeze on nuclear arsenals, the cessation of all nuclear-weapon test explosions, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones of peace and the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. We also support all practical measures intended to ensure that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind.

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

We believe that the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa should in future be given more serious, thorough attention by the Committee.

In the report prepared by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, we see that there are South African nuclear installations submitted and some not submitted to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). On the one hand, it states that

"The International Atomic Energy Agency has been applying safeguards to the SAFARI-I research reactor since 1967 under a Safeguards Agreement between IAEA, the United States of America and the Republic of South Africa."

(A/39/470, para. 55)

and that

"IAEA applies safeguards to the Koeberg nuclear power plant under a Safeguards Agreement of 5 January 1977 between IAEA, France and South Africa." (para. 56)

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

On the other hand, the same report states that

"The following facilities are not covered by IAEA safeguards:

"(a) The Pilot Enrichment Plant;

"(b) The Fuel Element Production Plant;

"(c) The Metallurgical Hot-Cell Complex." (para. 59)

At the same time, we see that certain Western States which possess nuclear weapons, despite the arms embargo decided on by the Security Council, have contributed to the rearming of the Pretoria racist régime and to the establishment by racist South Africa of its present capability for manufacturing nuclear weapons. This represents a real threat to international peace and security and in particular jeopardizes the security of independent African States and adds to the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Faced with this alarming situation which obviously jeopardizes the security of African States, we once again ask the Western Powers, allies of the minority racist régime in Pretoria, to bring their influence to bear with the South African racists so as to prevail upon the latter to bring all their nuclear installations under the inspection of IAEA.

In that connection, we wish to recall to the enemies of the denuclearization of Africa that that denuclearization has always been a concern of the Heads of State and Government of Africa since the establishment of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In 1964, African Heads of State and Government appealed to all States in the world to respect the African continent as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. At that time they recognized that the denuclearization of Africa would be, inter alia, a possible and practical measure to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world so as to arrive at general and complete disarmament, thus realizing the objectives and principles of the United Nations.

With regard to the massive reinforcement of the military apparatus of racist South Africa, particularly by the unbridled acquisition by that country of a nuclear capability intended to be used for repressive and aggressive purposes and as an instrument of blackmail, we consider it useful and necessary to emphasize that, at its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly in resolution 38/181 B of 20 December 1983 condemned all forms of nuclear collaboration by any State, corporation, institution or individual with the racist régime of South Africa since such collaboration enables it to frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

Denuclearization of Africa, which seeks to keep the continent as a zone of peace, free from nuclear weapons.

As many representatives have stated, the credibility of any non-proliferation system essentially depends on the attitude of the nuclear-weapon States. Thus, in order to make progress in that field, the nuclear-weapon States must renounce the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

"In the southern part of our continent" - I am quoting His Excellency the President of the People's Republic of Angola, Jose Eduardo Dos Santos - "the People's Republic of Angola continues to be the main target of the global strategy of the imperialist Powers, which try to destabilize and strangle the legitimate and nationalist Governments of African countries struggling to assert their personality and their national sovereignty and independence".

And the international community does not ignore the fact that the racist troops which have committed and continue to commit crimes of war and genocide against the peoples of southern Africa are still occupying part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola in violation of national sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Resisting the policy of aggression, of blackmail, of subversion and of State terrorism waged in the name of "Western civilization" by the minority racist régime in Pretoria against our non-aligned State, we continue to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory.

In that context and taking account of the seriousness of State terrorism as a means of conducting the foreign policy of certain States Members of the United Nations, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola has supported the proposal to include in the agenda of the First Committee item 143 on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States.

We attach great importance to the constructive and practical proposals of peace-loving States aimed at concluding a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Nevertheless, we regret to note that certain militarist circles in the West continue to affirm that they are ready to negotiate the prohibition of chemical weapons, in order to distract the attention of the international community

(Mr. Fonseca, Angola)

from their plans for the proliferation and increase of the arsenals of that type of weapon. There are even those who are not happy with the enormous arsenals of chemical weapons which they already possess, and which they have already renewed, but they wish to expand them and qualitatively renew them further. We are referring particularly to the binary chemical weapons which a Western Power for a long time has been preparing to stockpile throughout the world in order to bring about the chemical rearming of itself and its allies, obviously including the South African racists. That Machiavellian plan of the Western militarist circles to give the racist Republic of South Africa the capacity to produce that type of weapon as well will further increase the aggressive attitude of the minority racist régime in Pretoria. Such close military collaboration with the minority racist régime in Pretoria against the African peoples is one which we denounce and condemn. In view of the danger which chemical weapons pose to mankind, we demand the total prohibition of that type of weapon.

Lastly, we should like to refer to the serious threat to international peace and security posed by the existence of foreign military bases on the territory of other States.

The People's Republic of Angola, since its establishment, has been a non-aligned State. It is as such that our country is against foreign military bases on the territory of non-aligned States and in colonies.

That position on the part of Angola is embodied in our Constitution, in particular in article 16:

"The People's Republic of Angola shall not belong to any international military organization and shall not permit the establishment of foreign military bases on its national territory."

In conclusion, we should like to appeal to the States Members of the United Nations to respect the status of non-aligned States and to make a positive contribution to the elimination of all foreign military bases from their territory. Such action by States Members of the United Nations would have a beneficial effect on our common struggle for the creation of a world of peace and of peaceful co-existence.

Mr. MAHBOUB (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The representatives who have already spoken have stressed that this Committee is meeting at this session in a world typified by concern and disillusionment and within the context of an international situation that is dangerous and complicated in comparison with our previous session. The situation is characterized by the escalation of the cold war, tension and intervention in the internal affairs of other States, which have had unfavourable consequences as regards implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence and confidence-building measures, along with the efforts to strengthen the policy of good-neighbourliness. This deterioration is a consequence of acts of aggression against the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of various countries. This state of affairs is particularly dangerous inasmuch as the arms race continues, especially the nuclear-arms race, resulting in mistrust, competition and the wasting of the resources and energy that could otherwise be devoted to remedying the economic and social conditions which have gone from bad to worse in most countries, especially the developing countries.

In this extremely dangerous context, the need for joint action and total adherence to the United Nations principles in the implementation of United Nations decisions has become more and more urgent, in order to achieve and guarantee international peace and security and general and complete disarmament with effective international controls.

Although the question of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests has been on the agenda of the United Nations for many years, and despite all the decisions that have been taken in this regard, the Conference on Disarmament was not able at its last session to achieve any progress on procedures that would have enabled it to establish an ad hoc committee with new terms of reference, thus promoting negotiations aimed at reaching an agreement. This failure was due to the exaggerated use of the consensus rule that prevented any progress, and showed that some nuclear-weapon States insist on developing their nuclear armaments qualitatively and quantitatively. My delegation will support any measure for the proclaiming of a moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests on the part of the nuclear-weapon States until such time as a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests can be signed.

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

The worsening of international relations and the increase in tension between the two super-Powers go hand in hand with the escalation of the arms race at an unprecedented pace. International peace and security cannot be based on a balance of deterrence or a development of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, which now number more than 5,000 on each side and are capable of destroying our planet several times over. The Group of 21 at the Conference on Disarmament has often expressed its refusal to link the peace and security of the world with the state of relations between the nuclear Powers. That would be devoid of any political or moral justification. The outbreak of nuclear war could destroy all the participants and all the non-participants.

My delegation supports the appeal that the arms race be halted and reversed, and we should like to express our feeling of disappointment at noting that no progress was achieved at the last session of the Conference on Disarmament, since it was not able to reach a consensus concerning the establishment of an ad hoc committee in regard to item 2 of the Conference's agenda.

I should like to quote here from the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, which expresses our point of view:

"the renewed escalation in the nuclear-arms race, both in its quantitative and qualitative dimensions, as well as reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations. Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass annihilation ... Measures for the prevention of nuclear war and of nuclear disarmament must take into account the security interests of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike and ensure that the survival of mankind is not endangered. [The Heads of State] rejected all theories and concepts pertaining to the possession of nuclear weapons and their use under any circumstances." (A/38/132, para. 28, p. 14)

Despite the importance of item 3 of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war", the Conference did not succeed in making any progress on that matter, since it could not reach a consensus on the draft terms of reference for the establishment of an ad hoc committee which would promote multilateral negotiations.

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

The arms race is being pursued in outer space - which increases the danger of the nuclear-arms race. The General Assembly at its last session adopted a decision on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and stressed the need to take further effective measures in that regard. It reiterated that the Conference on Disarmament had a primary role in the negotiation of an appropriate agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. I wish to express our feeling of disappointment at the fact that the Conference on Disarmament at its last session was not able to achieve the necessary progress, for the same reasons that prevented any progress in regard to the matters I mentioned previously.

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

In this regard, I should like to draw attention to paragraph 60 of the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, which states that the Group of 21:

"stressed its firm belief that the Conference on Disarmament, whose members included all the nuclear-weapon States, should be allowed to fulfil its task in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and certain nuclear-weapon States should not abuse the rule of consensus so as to prevent the Conference from dealing with the nuclear issues on its agenda." (A/39/27, para. 60)

If there is a field where it is possible to understand the evolution of the consensus rule as it has come to be applied, in the sense of requiring the total unanimity of all the members of the Conference on Disarmament, even on procedural matters such as the creation of an ad hoc committee to deal with a particular question, we cannot in any case agree with the way in which it is applied in the Conference on Disarmament since it has become an obstacle, depriving States that were founder Members of the United Nations but are not members of the Conference on Disarmament of the opportunity to make a declaration explaining their views on important points on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament.

In this regard, I wish to draw attention to paragraph 28 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, which says:

"All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations. They have the right to participate on an equal footing in ... multilateral disarmament negotiations ..." (S-10/2, para. 28)

I should also like to draw attention to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session entitled "International co-operation for disarmament", which states that it is the duty of States to co-operate in this field. In paragraph 8 the General Assembly:

"Calls upon the Governments of all States to contribute substantially ... to halting and reversing the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, and thus to reducing the danger of nuclear war." (38/183 F, para. 8)

That paragraph declares clearly and explicitly that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of the disarmament negotiations and have the right - indeed, the duty - in accordance with that paragraph, to contribute to efforts made in the field of disarmament, a matter that is vital to all countries of the world. However, it is deeply regrettable that the application of the

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

consensus rule has become an obstacle preventing any State member of the Conference on Disarmament - the only multilateral disarmament forum - from exercising its right or fulfilling its duty to take part in disarmament efforts and to provide information, opinions and answers.

Iraq stresses that the nuclear-weapon States must give the States that do not possess such arms the guarantee that they will not attack them or threaten them with nuclear weapons. Iraq supports the elaboration of a precise formula which may be included in an international legally binding document. Iraq also supports all efforts aimed at the conclusion of a treaty forbidding the development, production and stockpiling of all kinds of nuclear weapons. Similarly, we support the United Nations resolutions on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, including resolutions 37/99 C and 38/188 D.

We are firmly convinced that the bombing of nuclear installations, even with conventional weapons, has results similar to the effects of a nuclear strike, because of the emission of dangerous radioactive material that pollutes the environment. The Israeli aggression against the Iraqi reactor used for peaceful purposes was launched under the cover of the Israeli concept of security. However, this pretext is only a desperate attempt to prevent Iraq and the other Arab countries achieving the scientific and cultural progress to which the Arab nation aspires.

Iraq is absolutely convinced that it is urgently necessary to speed up the preparation of an international instrument forbidding attacks on nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes, for otherwise the international community will be exposed to grave dangers no less worrying than the use of nuclear weapons themselves.

Iraq advocates the creation of nuclear-free zones throughout the world. The declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-free zone would require, first, the elimination of the Zionist nuclear threat and the withdrawal from the region of the nuclear weapons possessed by Israel, which is co-operating with the racist régime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields.

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

We should like to stress a passage in the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Group of Experts working on the study of Israeli nuclear weapons. The Group of Experts recommended to Israel that it

"should renounce ... the possession of ... nuclear weapons, submitting all its nuclear activities to international safeguards ... in accordance with ... Assembly resolution 35/147 ... through accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or by unilaterally accepting such safeguards." (A/36/431, annex, para. 83)

If that were done it would be an important step towards carrying out the decision to have the Middle East declared a nuclear-free zone.

The Indian Ocean area has witnessed a very serious worsening of the situation, not only for coastal States or States of the hinterland but also for the whole world because of the escalation of military activities of the super-Powers in the Middle East and their natural extension towards the Arabian Sea and the Arabian Gulf, which are an integral part of the Ocean.

Iraq fully supports the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and calls for an end to be put to all nuclear-weapons activities and all nuclear weapons existing in the area, to the competition between the nuclear Powers and to the military presence of those Powers. Iraq considers that the Conference on the Indian Ocean to be held in Colombo is a very urgent matter in order to guarantee peace and security in the area. The holding of that Conference should in no way be linked with the solution of some disputes which have nothing to do with that question.

While nuclear disarmament has priority, the question of conventional disarmament is also a most important matter, since conventional weapons are capable of an extremely high degree of destruction and are very dangerous for the rest of mankind and especially for the economies of the developing countries of the world, which confront economic crises and which sometimes fall prey to conventional warfare.

Those who have spoken before me have described very brilliantly the problems of our present-day world. Many of them have spoken of solutions to those problems and have submitted draft resolutions, as at previous sessions. All of this is very good. Problems come up and decisions have to be implemented; decisions without implementation will not lead to international peace and security. Many countries are still attached to the doctrine of force and want to continue the arms race.

(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

Others do not. We suffer from armed conflicts in the world. We need political will, especially against countries which commit armed aggression and interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. We must see to it that those countries respect United Nations decisions. Other countries should, under the Charter, avoid thinking only of their own short-term interests. We must ask the countries which wage war to respect the decisions of the Security Council. Thus we should be able to achieve international peace and security and strengthen the credibility of the United Nations and its decisions, increasing factors of stability within the framework of international security.

I should like to recall paragraph 13 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly:

"... lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations ..." (S-10/2, para. 13)

In conclusion I should like to stress that the strengthening of an effective system of collective security through the United Nations would be the best remedy for the ills that have befallen our world through the arms race.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): In my present statement I would like to deal with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. I deliberately place my contribution under agenda item 59 (f) on the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters. In the view of my delegation, the viability and success of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the maintenance and further improvement of the non-proliferation régime are among the most significant strategies for the prevention of nuclear war.

We all know that the Third Review Conference relating to the Treaty is scheduled for 1985 and that the review exercise is of particular importance in view of the approaching expiration date of the treaty instrument and of the need for all parties to the Treaty to take joint action and to extend it.

The forthcoming Review Conference has prompted many delegations to go on record in this Committee and state their determined support for the Treaty. It has prompted others - countries that have not signed the Treaty - to reiterate the reasons for their abstention. The purpose of my statement is to reiterate briefly the reasons why the Federal Republic of Germany attaches priority importance to the continuation and further development of the Treaty, but also to discuss some arguments put forward against it.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In the opinion of the Federal Republic of Germany the conclusion, large-scale adoption and successful maintenance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty continue to be major achievements of the multilateral arms control process. No new nuclear-weapon State has been added to those in existence at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty. Rarely in the history of treaty-making have such a large number of States joined hands in a common endeavour, convinced of the stabilizing effect and long-term benefits which emanate from this singular treaty instrument. On the part of the non-nuclear weapon States, renouncing the option of nuclear weapons and accepting international control in a sensitive part of their national industrial establishment signify major sacrifices of rights of sovereignty. The Federal Republic of Germany, like more than 120 other non-nuclear-weapon States, has chosen to contribute its part to this solidarity effort of the world community to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

The Treaty thus possesses an overriding goal which all signatories, nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States alike, share and to which each of them contributes in the prescribed way. Part of the reward which the parties to the Treaty can expect from their adhesion - the enhancement of international stability - accrues, therefore, quite independently from the additional compensations that derive from the Treaty. For a non-nuclear-weapon State such as I represent, these latter benefits that can be demanded from the participating nuclear-weapon States are mainly contained in articles IV and VI of the Treaty. Article IV has helped to enhance peaceful nuclear co-operation, specifically with developing countries. On signing the Treaty in November 1969 the Federal Government stated its view that the Treaty lays the foundation for ever-growing co-operation among the parties to it in the nuclear field, especially with regard to negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Article VI provides the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty not only with a claim against nuclear-weapon States. Since the Article is addressed to all States parties, they share the responsibility in this field. But the major responsibility for nuclear disarmament lies with the nuclear-weapon States.

The Federal Government will continue to bring its full political weight to bear in order that article VI be fully implemented. The Federal Government is convinced that the one-sided withdrawal from nuclear arms-control negotiations does not correspond to the spirit of article VI and it therefore appeals to those concerned to return, early and without pre-conditions, to the negotiating table.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

In this context the Federal Government would like to restate its view that the conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban would have great importance with regard to the implementation of article VI. The aim of a comprehensive test ban is explicitly mentioned in the tenth preambular paragraph, which relates to the Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water of 1963. Therefore, my delegation would wish to voice its regret about the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear-testing issues that could have generated gradual but steady progress towards the establishment of some of the essential prerequisites of a test-ban treaty.

Let me now turn to some critical questions being posed with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

One argument put forward against the Treaty is that the instrument establishes discriminatory obligations and responsibilities for the nuclear-weapon Powers on the one hand and for all other nations on the other. That argument is undoubtedly true in the sense that nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States by the very nature of the Treaty do not have identical obligations and responsibilities. However, eliminating this distinction would mean fostering horizontal proliferation by opening up the acquisition of nuclear weapons to all States on an equal level. Thus one of the objectives which led the majority of nations to accede to the Treaty, namely, to prevent the destabilizing effect of a spread of nuclear arms, would be frustrated. This may be a cause of regret in the eyes of some, but discrimination is thus a built-in feature of the Treaty and, indeed, of the principle of non-proliferation and no wistful exploration of its history and ramifications which will make it go away.

As to the question of equally valid alternatives to the Treaty, I do not wish to question the serious intention of States which have remained outside the Treaty and others that might join them to honour a national promise not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons. However, I should like to emphasize that in the view of the Federal Republic of Germany the universal acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty has to remain the ultimate goal. Then any doubt, distrust or suspicion remaining as to the respect which national commitments would command in the future would be dispelled.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

As far as the benefits of the Non-Proliferation Treaty are concerned, we should pay attention to the statistics of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which reveal the number of countries which, under the umbrella of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its system of safeguards, have made tremendous strides in building a nuclear-power base and in acquiring an infrastructure of nuclear research and technology of unprecedented proportions. These developments have taken place in the climate of mutual reassurance and stability which the Treaty has created.

Let me finally focus on another major question in this context, the implications of vertical nuclear proliferation for the Treaty. It is, indeed, a most regrettable fact that the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States which are within the Treaty system have grown considerably since the inception of the Treaty and continue to grow. Article VI is thus still awaiting its implementation, and the parties to the Treaty have been unable to invoke it to the necessary intent. However, the Treaty provides a legal synallagma between the undertakings by the non-nuclear-weapon States and the obligations which the nuclear-weapon States themselves have accepted. This is a legal relationship. All parties to the Treaty, therefore, have a legal claim against the nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their part of article VI.

In this context, we should not overlook the fact that it is only for the parties to the Treaty to invoke their right to nuclear disarmament as a legal premise. The States parties to the Treaty are therefore in a better position than those outside the Treaty system, being able to combine the political argument for nuclear disarmament with a fully grown legal claim. It is incumbent upon them to use the Treaty fully, working from within, to bring their weight as members to bear and to stress the fact that they have accomplished their part of the Treaty agreement.

Summing up, I should like to emphasize that my delegation shares with regret the opinion of those who state that the expectations of the non-nuclear-weapon States connected with article VI have not been met as yet. But we do not draw from this a negative conclusion with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a whole. We rather demand that everything be done by the nuclear-weapon States in order to meet the obligations they have undertaken in article VI. An early resumption of nuclear negotiations is a first step towards this end.

(Mr. Wegener, Federal
Republic of Germany)

The joint endeavour of the large majority of the States of the international community within the non-proliferation Treaty is a most persuasive and welcome demonstration of international solidarity for a common objective, for the common good. It is regrettable that a limited number of States have not yet joined in that exercise of solidarity. By acceding to the Treaty, they would create a strong momentum for all parties to the Treaty to abide fully by its standards and would thus make a contribution to international peace and stability.

Ms. MOSELE (Botswana): Allow me, as I am speaking here for the first time, to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. My delegation is convinced that under your able leadership this Committee will achieve concrete and constructive results in its quest for world peace and security during the current session.

My delegation wishes also to extend its congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, who will no doubt work equally hard to ensure that the ideals and goals of this body are attained.

As a matter of conscience to all who are concerned, my delegation wishes to comment briefly on items 55 and 57 (b), that is, the relationship between disarmament and development and the nuclear capability of South Africa. From the various statements delivered here it is quite apparent that one need not elaborate on the technical details concerning nuclear arms, their destructive capacity nor the costs of the nuclear-arms race.

The Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) says:

"The international community today finds itself at a crossroads. Two major challenges face it - on the one hand, an unchecked arms race which threatens to destroy human civilization and, on the other hand, the problems of underdevelopment in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, which threaten the quality of human civilization. In both these cases, the search for solutions appears to have reached a dead end, while the magnitude of problems increases steadily."

It is sad to see the emphasis placed on politics in an arena that is supposed to be seriously considering ways in which life - be it plants, animals or mankind - is to be made more secure. Neither Judas Iscariot nor Simon Peter ever wanted to be pointed out as people who would betray Jesus Christ in their different ways.

(Ms. Mosele, Botswana)

Yet both men did. Both super-Powers are willing to meet and seriously discuss methods of constructive disarmament; that means there is yet hope for mankind and for Mother Earth. Mushroom clouds will not clothe this world because, not being actors on a stage or part of a Shakespearean tragedy, we will continue to strive for world disarmament and for development.

It will be a pleasure to see the senseless nuclear-weapons arms race come to an end and to see the unimaginable amounts of money spent on the arms race give way to development. Hunger, poverty and the need for shelter are rampant in the third world. A lot of private organizations, as well as the United Nations through its various organs, are working hard trying to meet the needs of the third world and they would welcome receiving more funds to aid with development. Contained in the UNIDIR Director's statement is both the problem of the nuclear-arms race and its solution, namely, the need to reallocate funds from the arms race to the development of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean islands.

At the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1965, 35 African countries requested that an item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" be included in the agenda. Since the intention was to promote peace and security and to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons, the General Assembly still has on its hands the difficult task of inspecting nuclear facilities of the régime of South Africa through its International Atomic Energy Agency. Since South Africa is just on Botswana's doorstep, my delegation feels that it is appropriate to show its appreciation of the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency, especially because there is no knowing how far the aggressive régime of South Africa would go in its determination to protect its abhorrent apartheid policy.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): Particularly in recent days the issue of disarmament negotiations has received considerable attention in the debate. We appreciate that the necessity of such negotiations has been underlined, but we also see distinct differences regarding the practical approach. This induces us, in the spirit of a constructive dialogue, to make a few remarks on that issue.

Let us begin with the multilateral negotiations at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Work on the priority items on its agenda has been blocked for years. The Conference is in a crisis. Several delegations have pointed out the reasons and the responsibilities for that deplorable situation. Also the report submitted

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic
Republic)

by the Conference on Disarmament in document A/39/27 is quite clear in this respect. I need not repeat this.

There remains, however, the question: what is the way out?

It is from this angle that we have carefully studied the statement made by the representative of the United States on 8 November. Regrettably we do not find the slightest indication of a change in the position his country has adopted there over the past four years. The Conference on Disarmament is not even mentioned. Obviously this did not just happen by mistake. Furthermore, we looked in vain for any remark on agenda item 1 of the Conference regarding the nuclear-test ban. Negotiations on agenda item 2 regarding the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament are implicitly, but clearly, rejected.

The United States delegation turned with special emphasis against the most urgent measures for the prevention of nuclear war, that is, item 3 on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, even though practically all other participants in the Conference are in favour of relevant negotiations or discussions. Arguments that have been known for years were repeated. They have not become more convincing. Immediate measures for preventing nuclear war are artificially put in contradiction to the reduction of the nuclear arsenals, as if anybody said that, for instance, the prohibition of the first use of nuclear weapons would automatically lead to reductions.

The aforementioned statement names a number of basic criteria for what is called arms control agreements. However, the decisive one is unfortunately not mentioned. Paragraph 57 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to which the United States also once agreed, says:

"Pending the achievement of this goal" - that is, nuclear disarmament - "... the nuclear-weapon States have special responsibilities to undertake measures aimed at preventing the outbreak of nuclear war, and of the use of force in international relations, subject to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including the use of nuclear weapons." (resolution S-10/2, para. 57)

And in paragraph 58 it is stated that:

"In this context all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States, should consider as soon as possible various proposals designed to secure the avoidance of the use of nuclear weapons". (Ibid., para. 58)

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

In conformity with the desire of the great majority of States, we propose that the obligation of the non-first use of nuclear weapons be undertaken as a relatively easy step for the nuclear-weapon States, since such a commitment would certainly have a strong confidence-building effect and a positive influence on the whole process of disarmament negotiations.

That is also true of the freeze on nuclear arsenals, which has become a world-wide demand. Such a measure above all offers the guarantee that numerical reductions of nuclear weapons are not cancelled or even reduced by the qualitative development and improvement of weapons systems. And that is the point: a nuclear-weapons freeze would leave no room for intentions to upset the existing military balance and achieve military supremacy. However, that will only be beneficial for international security and the striving for disarmament.

We are making these points out of concern for the continuation of the work of the Conference on Disarmament in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. There exist not only the security interests of one State. However, security for all can be achieved only by a genuine preparedness for co-operation. Lectures about "strong leadership" will hardly lead to that goal. One should not try to deny the danger of nuclear war and pretend that there is no such thing as an arms race. The peoples' concern must be taken seriously, especially by those States which have the most powerful nuclear arsenals.

As has been rightly noted in the debate, attempts have been made, on the one hand, to delete the word "negotiations" from the vocabulary of the Geneva Conference, while, on the other hand, calls are repeated for negotiations on an issue where the basis for negotiation has been destroyed systematically. Furthermore, in the aforementioned statement the well-worn cliché was used again to the effect that the strategic nuclear weapons of the United States were ipso facto stabilizing and those of the USSR destabilizing.

I should like to make some comments on the issue of medium-range missiles. I do not want to go into the details of the early history of the deployment of new United States first-strike weapons in Western Europe; they are well known. We recall the far-reaching proposals of the Soviet Union and the countless urgent appeals of the peace movement and of statesmen from all over the world addressed to the United States not to thwart the negotiations by an approach of ultimatum. It was all in vain. What is more, the deployment of Pershing-II and Cruise missiles

(Mr. Rose, German Democratic Republic)

was then hailed by the other side as a tremendous victory. Now it is continuing without interruption.

The socialist States gave timely and urgent warning of the consequences of such deployment. Unfortunately, some of those who are now complaining did not take that warning seriously. They preferred to believe those who promised that a policy of strength, substantiated by deployment, would bring the socialist States to accept United States demands and thus seriously endanger their security. Now they will hardly feel more secure than before that step, which was so fateful for the situation in Europe. The fact remains that more missiles do not bring more security for the peoples but less.

Some bring up again and again the myth of a threat by the SS-20; others apparently believe that they can speak up more clearly now. No less an authority than General Rogers, Supreme Commander of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), explained in a press interview on 9 August of this year that the point was to be able to reach the territory of the Soviet Union from Western Europe with new land-based nuclear missiles. His statement concluded with the following: "We decided that we had to modernize - not because of the existence of SS-20." That makes it quite clear.

The willingness of the socialist States to negotiate cannot be questioned by anybody. However, negotiations must be on the basis of equality and equal security. It is for the United States to give clear signals that it is ready for such negotiations. That applies to both the multilateral and the bilateral fields.

In conclusion, I feel bound to state the following. In his statement last Friday, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Wegener, among other assertions, said it was an uncontested fact that the Eastern States continued to possess and produce chemical weapons. Obviously, he did not say that inadvertently, because a similar formulation can be found also in his statement of 2 November. Such a statement seems to imply that the German Democratic Republic produces and possesses chemical weapons. That is simply a lie, and the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany knows it. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic emphatically rejects such deliberate defamations. Despite all the differences that countries may have on important matters, the minimum standards for civilized political dialogue should be observed. I believe that we have enough reason to expect such accusations against socialist countries to be stopped.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of the delegations of India, Mexico, Sweden and my country, I have the honour of introducing the draft resolution on cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament which has been circulated in document A/C.1/39/L.43. It is also a pleasure to announce that the delegations of Greece, Indonesia and Romania have joined in sponsoring the draft.

As stated in the preambular part of the draft resolution, the need to put an end to the nuclear arms race is increasingly clear. Existing nuclear arsenals at present are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth and have brought about an untenable state of insecurity.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which so correctly conveyed the thinking of the international community on this issue, contains very eloquent paragraphs that reflect the urgent need to reverse a situation which is becoming ever more dangerous and disquieting.

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

There is virtually no international forum dealing with disarmament which does not express profound alarm over the prevailing state of affairs and which does not reiterate the need to step up as much as possible all efforts aimed at ending the nuclear-arms race.

In this context, we should highlight - and this is reflected in one of the preambular paragraphs of the draft - the Joint Declaration of 22 May 1984 issued by the Heads of State and Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania, which called for the suspension of tests, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, followed by a substantial reduction in nuclear forces.

In the light of that Declaration and on the basis of the positions which the Group has traditionally held, the Group of 21 submitted to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva a document (CD/526) once again emphasizing the need to undertake effective action to initiate the process of nuclear disarmament, pursuant to paragraph 50 of the Final Document.

Despite everything which has been said on this subject, and the dangerous situation which prevails today, efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race are either stagnant or have not even begun. The bilateral negotiations in Geneva have been interrupted and the Conference on Disarmament has not yet been able to undertake multilateral negotiations on item 2 of its agenda.

This is the aim of the draft resolution which it is my honour to introduce, which mentions:

"that efforts should be intensified with a view to initiating, as a matter of the highest priority, multilateral negotiations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 50 of the Final Document" (A/C.1/39/L.43, operative para. 1)

It also:

"Requests the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc Committee...to elaborate on paragraph 50...and to submit recommendations...as to how it could best initiate multilateral negotiations of agreements..." (A/C.1/39/L.43, operative para. 2)

The Conference on Disarmament should have taken that first step a long time ago in compliance with the Final Document and its own agenda. Further delay is

(Mr. Carasales, Argentina)

neither possible nor warranted, and it is to be hoped that the adoption of this draft resolution - which we hope will occur - will represent, in accordance with the will of the States represented in this Assembly, a definitive push forward which reason claims and which the future of mankind requires.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): This very brief statement is intended to formulate a request which I dare hope the Secretariat will find it easy to comply with. This request relates to document A/C.1/39/L.11, which deals with the Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. That is a Conference which was held in Geneva from 10 to 20 September this year.

The draft resolution in that document contains words of praise for the Review Conference in question and also for the Convention mentioned therein.

Since my delegation is not accustomed to voting blindly for draft resolutions of this type, we consider it essential to have the relevant documentation before putting the draft resolution to a vote. It is for that reason that it is essential for us to be able to obtain the Final Act of the Conference or, if the Final Act is too long, then at least the Final Declaration, which is specifically referred to in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.11.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the Committee Secretary with regard to the statement we have just heard.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The Secretariat has taken note of the request made by the representative of Mexico and, as this is a request emanating from a Member State, it will be complied with, as appropriate.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Were it not for the accepted tradition of the Committee, I would extend my congratulations and tribute to you, Mr. Chairman.

Although many representatives have spoken before me during this thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly and at previous sessions of the Assembly, I cannot conceive of any one of them having spoken in favour of weapons of mass destruction; yet there are some indications that, in spite of this unanimity, when specific cases of chemical warfare are discussed some unexpected and unjustified reservations seem to appear.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani,
Islamic Republic of Iran)

"War is waged with weapons, not with poison", wrote the Roman jurist. War is as much a part of human political history as the effort to minimize or at least to humanize it. Since, in the light of man's nature, outlawing war altogether has had very little impact on the actual behaviour of human political societies, as was the case with the fate of the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928, outlawing aggressive war, far-sighted men have sought to establish a norm, according to which in the course of a war one should be as humanitarian as possible.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

One of the areas of great concern seems to be the use of poisonous weapons in war. On 27 August 1884 the Conference of Brussels concerning the Laws and Customs of War adopted a Declaration stating:

"According to this principle are strictly forbidden: (a) The use of poison or poisoned weapons ...".

That is from article XIII.

The issue was debated again a few years later, during the Hague Conference of 1899 and again in 1907. As the final outcome, the position of the Brussels Conference was reaffirmed. The Convention dealing with the Laws and Customs of War on Land, in article 23, chapter 1, section II, of the final resolution, declared:

"Besides the prohibitions provided by special conventions, it is especially prohibited: (a) to employ poison or poisoned arms; ... (e) to employ arms, projectiles, or material of a nature to cause superfluous injury".

At the time of the drafting of those Conventions, the problem did not appear so urgent. The scientific and technological advances of the twentieth century increased the potential of poisonous weapons, in particular in the form of chemical and bacteriological elements. Up to the time when Iraq began using chemical elements such as nerve agents, toxins and mycotoxins, the most widespread use of chemical weapons occurred in the First World War. The first massive attack was in 1915 and claimed 5,000 human lives. Unfortunately, the use of this dangerous weapon claimed many more lives during the course of the war. A United Nations publication on chemical weapons, for example, states:

"It is estimated that from then" - that is, from 1915 - "until the end of the war in 1918, at least 125,000 tons of toxic chemicals were used, and according to official reports gas casualties numbered about 130,000, of which about 100,000 were total".

The horror of the mass killing prompted the move towards an international convention on the banning of the use of chemical weapons, and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was the outcome. Unfortunately, the Protocol did not stop countries from using this weapon, and certainly not the Iraqis, who happened to be among the signatories of that Protocol. Chemical weapons were employed by the Iraqi Army against the Iraqi Kurdish rebels in 1970. Thus when the Iraqi authorities resorted

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

to chemical weapons against the Islamic Republic of Iran they were simply repeating the experience obtained from the use of the same prohibited weapons against their own people.

At this juncture I do not have the intention of reiterating the details of the numerous incidents in which Iraq has used chemical weapons against us, since all that has been recorded in United Nations documents. I am sure the representatives here have all noticed the many letters circulated as Security Council documents regarding the cases of Iraqi chemical warfare against us, and they have also taken note of the experts' report contained in document S/16433 as an annex to the note by the Secretary-General. The representatives here have seen many pamphlets, photographs and posters concerning the Iraqi chemical war against us, exposing the magnitude of the Iraqi crimes against my country. I am sure that they have seen posters like this and that they have seen this book, because a copy has already been given to all the delegations in the United Nations. These posters, pamphlets and books demonstrate only very selected cases illustrating the effects of the chemical war against us. The sympathetic and sincere response we have received from many delegations indicate that, even if we reiterated all those facts again and again, they would all find it justified because, as many have rightly put it, no matter how much we say about the Iraqi chemical warfare, it would still not be enough.

The fact is that Iraq has simply used chemical weapons against us. The types of chemical agents, according to the report of the Secretary-General, were mustard gas and a nerve agent known as Tabun, which is among the most dangerous and deadly. Tabun can kill in 10 minutes.

What really matters is that neither the report of the Secretary-General nor the statements of the Security Council have discouraged the Iraqi authorities from repeating this crime. They have repeatedly committed the crime of resorting to chemical weapons, even after the Secretary-General's report was circulated. This fact too has been reported to the international community in a letter which has been circulated in document A/39/333.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

Moreover, and worst of all, Iraqi officials have claimed that they will commit the same crime again; so said the Commander of Iraq's Third Army. The Kuwaiti newspaper Al-Anba'a in its issue of 19 September this year quoted a high Iraqi official as saying:

"And generally Iraq will certainly employ such weapons whenever the defence of its nation's dignity and territorial integrity as well as that of the Arab nations warrant it."

Just a few days ago The Washington Post in its issue of 3 November reported:

"The Iraqis used almost all their stocks of chemical weapons at that time [March 1984] but have significant stocks of gas weapons."

For this boldness of the Iraqi authorities we believe the inaction and acquiescence of the international body are similarly to be blamed.

Devices of mass destruction such as chemical and bacteriological weapons, as well as atomic weapons, have been the most important concerns of people of all countries and of all international organizations. This Committee has been persistently struggling to control, reduce and - it is to be hoped - if possible - defuse and annihilate all such weapons, which have brought the greatest nightmare to all mankind in this century. Many concerned and good hearted people, like all members of this Committee, have been striving for the past six or seven decades, and even the past century, to save mankind from that horrible nightmare, although little has been achieved, in spite of all those efforts.

The problem of our people, however, is slightly different from the nightmare which scares the whole family of mankind, in that one of those lethal weapons, the vision of which brought the nightmare to the whole of human society, has been poured on our heads. In other words, unlike many others, we are trying not simply to save ourselves from this nightmare but from chemical warfare itself. What can the Committee do for us in these urgent and serious circumstances? If members of the Committee were in our place, what would they do?

It must be remembered that in a certain respect chemical weapons are even more dangerous than atomic weapons, because they are easy to produce, probably too easy to produce. Highly sophisticated chemistry is not really needed. Even the Iraqis can do it. Chemical war is a more immediate danger than atomic war, since it can be launched so easily. The Committee should therefore give a certain degree of urgency and priority not only to the issue of chemical warfare in general but to

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

the recent specific cases of chemical warfare against us, which can recur at any moment.

The saddest fact of all is that some countries unjustifiably apply certain political considerations, simply because this deadly prohibited weapon has been used by Iraq, or because it has been used against us. I say to those concerned: "Please do not behave like those who feel a threat only when it comes to their own doors." Matters of chemical and atomic disarmament must be treated as completely detached from all political considerations, simply for the sake of mankind. Otherwise, there are always friends of one or other future adversary, and therefore in every conflict some will just keep irresponsibly silent.

Another important matter that makes our case uniquely different from the general issue of chemical war or any other previous cases is that it is the only well-documented case before the Committee. I say to members: "Please concentrate on it. If you cannot stop a specific, unequivocal and clear case like this, on what ground do you hope to stop potential cases of a general nature? After all, the rationale behind all the arguments and concerns that many show for the Constitutional and procedural niceties is to save people, including our people. Do you not think that if you ignore our people in favour of those niceties, you will have been acting contrary to your own purpose? We ask you to see our case not simply as a component of the war but as a dreadful case of chemical war which all of us wish to prevent. Please take constructive advantage of this case in order actually to experiment in such matters as verification of production and stockpiling."

Let the United Nations have a complete record of experience on how to conduct verification, if members are at all interested in any verification. Let the United Nations see the practical problems of verification and the possible ways and means of conducting such verification. Let us learn the general from experiencing the specific, instead of discussing hypothetical matters up in the air. This means that we should not politicize or contaminate our work with political considerations if we hope to achieve honest and successful results. Those who may hide their faces behind instructions from their Governments, instructions that they either await or have received, should ask any man in the street of any country, ask any people they wish, whether chemical warfare should be used or not. The answer will be quite clear.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

We need the help of this Committee, not for or against anybody but for stopping chemical warfare against us. That is all.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations made an appeal to both parties to make a solemn commitment not to use chemical weapons. We should have been annoyed at that time because, contrary to our expectations as the victims of Iraqi mustard gas and nerve gas attacks, the appeal addressed us with the same language as it addressed the criminal. Nevertheless we maintained our full self-restraint and did not mention anything, either implicitly or explicitly, regarding this injustice. Instead, we simply responded immediately and positively to the appeal of the Secretary-General. But the other party, according to the Secretary-General's letter to my mission, has not yet given any formal response to that appeal.

However, and very sadly indeed, unofficial indications have convinced the Secretariat that it should not anticipate a positive response from the Government of President Saddam Hussein. I am therefore speaking of a real and serious danger of further crimes.

We therefore expect all members of this Committee to stand against crime. Our officials have been consulted as to whether we should start producing our own stocks in order to convince the enemy of the danger of retaliation. Up to now the religious authorities in the Islamic Republic of Iran have given a definite negative answer. We are not permitted to produce prohibited weapons. I appeal to the Committee not to make retaliation our only solution. We hate such a solution and we do not wish to have it imposed upon us. We appeal to members of the Committee to use their influence and at least to use their votes to end this danger. Only in that way can other cases of threat be stopped. If the Committee is able to justify this and only make future cases the aim of its effort, I am afraid it will always have to ignore the present dangerous cases and keep itself amused with hypothetical ones. We therefore expect the Committee to support a draft resolution which we have submitted to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker on the items on the agenda for today's meeting and I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I do not wish to take much of the time of this Committee in replying to the statement just made by the Permanent Representative of Iran. However, I feel impelled to correct the record.

(Mr. Al-Qaysi, Iraq)

The Permanent Representative of Iran came to this Committee with an appeal to law and justice, with a request for help and assistance, forgetting that these concepts are indivisible and cannot be treated in a dissected manner. He has omitted any reference to the reply of my Government to the report of the Secretary-General in document S/16438 of 27 March 1984. He has elected, as he has done in the past on numerous occasions, to conduct some theatrics by showing photographs and documentation.

The fact remains that The Washington Post, which the representative of Iran quotes here, has been described by him on other occasions and in press releases of his mission as an imperialist newspaper. He asked the question, if one went on to the streets and asked everybody whether they wanted chemical warfare the answer would be, "No, we do not want that"; but he forgets to say if the question were addressed to the people in the streets of Iran whether they wanted the continuation of the war, what sort of answer he would get.

He counsels the non-politicization of our work in order that honest results may be achieved; yet he has done exactly that in the statement we have just heard today.

I am sorry to have to refer to the letter of the Secretary-General which the representative of Iran referred to. I am bound to reveal what is obvious in that letter, for the benefit of my colleagues. The letter was a confidential one, addressed to the two countries on 29 June 1984. The fact that it was published on 6 July 1984 in document S/16663 was because the Iranian reply contained in document S/16664 of 6 July, the very date, sent on 2 July, was circulated upon the request of the permanent mission of Iran.

So the picture is clear. The question of the allegations of the representative of Iran were dealt with by the Security Council, a report was issued, a presidential statement was adopted by the Council and the moment it was adopted it was attacked by the Iranian authorities.

Only two months later we have the circulation of the same report on a request from Iran under agenda item 64 in order to repeat the same theatrics as we have seen on television, in newspapers and around the United Nations.

If the Iranian representative does not have any intention but - as he put it - to seek honest results, why did his delegation prevent my delegation from at least making a statement on the issue in the Conference on Disarmament?

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I think there were only two points in the statement just made by the representative of Iraq. One was that my delegation holds that The Washington Post is an imperialist newspaper. That might be so, but even some imperialist papers cannot ignore some of the facts. All delegations here will remember that it was only after the international media, representatives of which visited our injured people in hospitals in Europe, disseminated the dreadful information on chemical warfare - only then - that this international body was forced to take action; and even at that time it was not generous enough to make it a resolution. It just confined itself to a simple statement. That is one point.

Regarding the second point raised by the representative of Iraq, no one can at this stage yet fail to appreciate the contribution of the representative of Iraq in two ways: first, he never mentioned that Iraq had not used chemical weapons; secondly, he provided some further time for my delegation in order to show the Committee some further evidence of the use of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani, Islamic
Republic of Iran)

The Committee may not have time to look at what we have produced for its consideration. Some of the officers of the Secretariat of the United Nations have actually seen these bodies. I have seen them too, and I have seen some of them die. I do not say anything for or against any war. Wars might take place again. I am speaking of chemical warfare. In the same pamphlets, if one goes through them carefully, one will find photographs of women which indicate that chemical warfare was used even against civilians.

What the Committee is deliberating and debating is not whether the continuation of any war or some wars is possible or justified; the Committee is debating weapons of mass destruction. We do not know whether the representative of Iraq is prepared simply to commit his country to refrain from using chemical weapons any more. That would be greatly appreciated in this Committee.

Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): If the Ambassador of Iran will bother to look at document S/16438, he will see there that my Government has categorically denied the use of any chemical weapons.

Secondly, if the Ambassador of Iran is against wars, I wish that he would state here for the record that his Government is so inclined because certainly it is not in favour of stopping a war which it started.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Again I appreciate the statement made by the representative of Iraq in that it concerned mainly lack of continuation. It seems that to wage a war against a neighbouring country creates no problem from the Iraqi point of view. It is only in some stages of the war that the representative of Iraq shows some interest in the matter of continuation.

Everybody knows that to launch a war of aggression against others is a unilateral decision, but to end the war means to end many problems resulting from the war and in at least a bilateral way. Therefore, those who started the war and those who defined their own interest in launching a deadly war against a neighbouring country, a non-aligned country, should not hide their faces behind the fact that, when they are defeated, they automatically show interest in stopping the continuation of the war. All representatives would agree that, if Mr. Hitler had produced a peace offer in the final days of his reign, nobody would have accepted that from him.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary to make some announcements to the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Mr. Chairman, as you announced the deadline of 6 p.m. for the submission of draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items, I wish to inform representatives that, if there are any further draft resolutions to be submitted by 6 p.m., they should be handed to the Secretariat in room 3170 E of the Secretariat building.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded the second phase of the consideration of disarmament items on our agenda, that is, the general debate and statements on specific items. We shall start a new phase of our work on Wednesday which will be devoted to the introduction of draft resolutions and comments on them.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.