



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 20th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Penazka (Czechoslovakia)
Mr. Issraelyan (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Mr. Icaza Gallard (Nicaragua)
Mr. Samudio (Panama)
Mr. Rossides (Cyprus)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

*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 IX 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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN: On this auspicious occasion, United Nations Day, the forty-first anniversary of the founding of the United Nation, I should like to extend my congratulations and best wishes to all Members. In his message on this important day the Secretary-General stressed, inter alia, the fact that

"More than ever before, there is need for the just and peaceful settlement of regional disputes, the joint effort to reduce armaments, overcome underdevelopment, combat threats to the civility of international life and advance human rights for which the United Nations provides an organized structure." (SG/SM/3925, p. 1)

It is opportune at this moment to rededicate our common efforts to contribute to the attainment of the noble goals and objectives enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 to 65 and 144 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

The CHAIRMAN: In keeping with the programme of work and timetable, this morning the Committee will proceed to its second phase of work, namely, statements on specific disarmament agenda items and continuation of the general debate, as necessary.

Mr. PENAZKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The Czechoslovak delegation would like to express its views today on a number of particularly timely questions, items on our agenda, and we wish especially to stress the importance that we attach to regional measures for limiting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We should like to highlight once again the overall constructive and businesslike nature of the general debate in our Committee. Many important ideas have been expressed in the course of our debate and new, valuable proposals have been put forward. The results from Reykjavik have made an important impression in that they have created a qualitatively new situation in the approach to key problems of nuclear disarmament. All this, in our view, creates a very good point of departure for taking an entirely new approach to the practical solution of urgent issues and the adoption of concrete measures.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We can achieve this end if, by our concerted efforts and with understanding of our joint responsibility, we draw on the positive capital accumulated in the first stage of our work.

One of the characteristic features of the discussion this year was the formation of a new, practical approach to disarmament as the essential basis for the security of all States. That fundamental idea was accurately and concisely reflected in the statement of Ambassador Olu Adeniji of Nigeria, when he said:

"We are convinced that the safe route to the preservation of global ... security is through nuclear disarmament effectively verified to allay the fear of cheating." (A/C.1/41/PV.7, p. 28)

Many other representatives spoke in the same spirit. We welcome this trend in the discussion, which wholly vindicates the idea of establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security built particularly on concrete disarmament measures, the reduction of military expenditures and other political and military guarantees of peace.

We also believe that a major contribution to consolidating the basis of universal peace and security would be made by limiting armaments and lowering the level of military confrontation in those parts of the world where it is reaching dangerous heights. As a European country situated at the interface of the two major military-political groupings, Czechoslovakia naturally attaches paramount importance to the adoption of such measures in Europe. Progress in efforts in Europe to limit the arms race would undoubtedly promote progress towards the global solution of these problems. Here we see the common responsibility of the countries members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to ensure a peaceful future.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

A solid basis for progress has been laid by the constructive results of the first stage of the Stockholm Conference. The agreements reached will undoubtedly help to strengthen confidence and security and reduce the threat of war in Europe, and hence lead to an overall improvement in the international climate. All the countries in the all-European dialogue took part in reaching those important decisions, which testifies to the dialogue's vitality and promise. The Foreign Ministers of the parties to the Warsaw Treaty, meeting in Bucharest in the middle of this month, made it absolutely clear that precisely at this time we must give fresh momentum to the Helsinki process in the form of practical steps to reduce the danger of military confrontation and, particularly, to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons from the continent. This is one of the most important areas for the work of the forthcoming Vienna meeting of the participants in the all-European process, which begins on 4 November.

We consider the creation of a chemical-weapon free zone in Central Europe and the Balkans a matter of great urgency. Now that nearly all of us welcome the progress in work towards a convention on the comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons, we must take fully into account the fact that the prospects for concluding the convention might be destroyed if plans were put into effect to deploy binary chemical weapons in Europe. The very fact that that possibility is coming closer to reality is creating a serious obstacle to the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons. In our view, that obstacle can and must be removed and we propose that it be done swiftly and simply. The creation of a chemical-weapon-free zone embracing the territory of Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and possibly other European States would have a two-fold effect: it would be an important measure for building trust and stability in the European context and it would provide a powerful momentum to efforts to

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

bring about a comprehensive prohibition of that weapon. Of course, we are putting forward the idea of the zone not as a pre-condition of a comprehensive solution, but exclusively as a measure to promote the attainment of that end.

We are unequivocally in favour of a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, and we understand that the high-priority problems of nuclear disarmament must be resolved within the context of a general reduction of the military potentials of States, reducing them to a level of reasonable adequacy. The parties to the Warsaw Treaty, at the meeting of their Political Consultative Committee in Budapest in June this year, put forward a large-scale programme for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals under strict international control.

Our approach to consolidating security and disarmament in Europe also includes the complete elimination on a reciprocal basis of Soviet and United States European-based medium-range missiles. In addition, Soviet long-range tactical missiles would be eliminated from the territories of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. Thus, we are putting forward a whole series of concrete and responsible proposals to consolidate peace, security and disarmament in Europe. This is entirely in keeping with the decisions of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which stressed that efforts to that end must be continued with the utmost energy. It would be very useful if the NATO countries responded to those proposals in a clearer and more practical way than they have so far.

An important category of items on the Committee's agenda is that concerning the creation of nuclear-weapon zones in various parts of the world. Czechoslovakia has consistently supported the creation of such zones on a democratic basis and with the consent of all the States of the region concerned. We regard this as an important contribution to strengthening international peace and security and as a

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

useful measure for preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, which would promote efforts to curb the arms race.

We continue to favour the idea of creating a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in Central Europe, and we support initiatives to that end. The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic views the recent joint initiative of the Socialist Unity Party of the German Democratic Republic and the Social Democratic Party of the Federal Republic of Germany to create a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in Central Europe as an important step towards the elimination of that weapon from our continent. As I said earlier, Czechoslovakia is ready to join in establishing that corridor and to take part in negotiations to this end.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

We would also like to see the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of Europe, such as the Balkans and the north of our continent.

An important step towards strengthening security would be the creation of such a zone in the Korean peninsula, as proposed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and also in South-East Asia. We welcome the decision of the States of the South Pacific Forum to conclude the Roratonga Treaty to create a nuclear-free zone in that region and believe that it should be guaranteed by all nuclear Powers. We also find useful the new Brazilian proposals for the creation of a zone of peace and co-operation in the South Atlantic and its declaration as a nuclear-free zone.

Reports about South Africa's nuclear preparation continue to arouse alarm. This goes hand in hand with the growing aggressiveness of the racist régime against neighbouring African States and the indigenous population of that country and of the occupied Territory of Namibia. Pretoria's nuclear ambitions make even more dangerous the already explosive situation in southern Africa.

We profoundly regret that once again this year the Disarmament Commission was unable, for reasons which are clear to everyone, to agree on the necessary conclusions and recommendations. In essence that has been encouraged by the South African régime's policy of force and co-operation with it in, among others, the nuclear field. Czechoslovakia is firmly in favour of the full implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and supports the adoption of binding and effective measures to halt Pretoria's nuclear designs.

We take a similar position on the question of Israel's nuclear weapons, which will create a new extremely dangerous destabilizing factor and heighten tension in the Middle East.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

The important question of creating a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean in implementation of the United Nations Declaration adopted 15 years ago is making very slow progress. We regret the delays in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and express our support for the efforts of States in the area which want to see the Colombo Conference on this subject held as soon as possible, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council.

We would like to refer to the new constructive proposals which have appeared this year, designed to reduce the activities of naval forces in the Pacific Ocean and the creation of a zone of stable peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean.

We take a favourable view of a series of substantial conclusions and recommendations adopted by the Disarmament Commission with regard to the problem of curbing the naval arms race and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans. We hope that they will become a point of departure for practical negotiations on these subjects, on both the global and regional levels.

In expressing our views on the urgent disarmament problems, narrowing down the sphere of military preparations and the prevention of nuclear war, we have always borne in mind the need for stepping up collective efforts, strengthening co-operation among States and the thrust towards achieving concrete decisions. Here lies precisely the irreplaceable role of the United Nations. We support all rational proposals aimed at strengthening that role, enhancing the effectiveness of United Nations machinery in the disarmament field, and respect for and compliance with its resolutions.

Our delegation has already stressed in the debate the great importance that we attach to the task of comprehensively strengthening the legal basis for the process of limiting the arms race and disarmament. We do so in the belief that, at a moment of particular responsibility when the question of concluding new important

(Mr. Panaska, Czechoslovakia)

agreements has become a high priority and a genuinely historical possibility has emerged for making a breakthrough towards reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons and preventing the arms race in outer space, it is unpardonable to discard what has already been achieved. Above all, there must be unswerving compliance by States with existing treaties and agreements in this sphere and total certainty that such compliance will be forthcoming. Here we see a very important element of trust so essential for making progress in the disarmament process in the circumstances of the nuclear space age.

Motivated by those considerations, we are presenting for discussion in the First Committee a draft resolution on the subject in document A/C.1/41/L.2 which, in our view, deals with the major aspects of this problem. We are sure that adoption by the General Assembly of a broad, constructive and just multilateral approach to the question of observance and compliance will be a step towards consolidating the ground work for the disarmament process. In this spirit we are ready - and I stress this - to co-operate with other delegations.

We also believe that United Nations participation in efforts to resolve disarmament questions should be broadened, so as not to curb but rather to encourage the use of all the Organization's existing possibilities and resources in the interests of progress. The multifaceted nature of the disarmament problem requires nothing less. In this regard, we should like to express our appreciation of the thorough report by the United Nations Secretary-General in document A/41/491, which testifies to serious work and valuable contributions by the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes within the United Nations system to the task of limiting the arms race and disarmament within the spheres of their competence. In our view, this positive experience should be used in the future.

(Mr. Penazka, Czechoslovakia)

In conclusion, I express my conviction that the work of the First Committee will be responsible and purposeful and that its results will reflect the readiness of States to take action for purposes of disarmament. We are determined to take such action.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In my statement today the Soviet delegation intends to refer to the activities of the Conference on Disarmament in 1986. Nearly all delegations have in one way or another referred to the work of that multilateral forum, more often than not expressing disappointment and frustration at the results of that work. At the same time, for a correct assessment of the work of the Conference on Disarmament during 1986 black and white alone are not enough to colour the picture.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

On the whole, a proper picture of the world today, which is reflected in a concentrated form both in the United Nations and at the Conference on Disarmament, is made up of approaches and trends that are parallel - sometimes convergent - and which frequently intersect at different levels and on different planes.

The indivisibility of this world and, at the same time, the complexity of the challenges facing it, never make themselves felt so strongly anywhere as in bodies of multilateral diplomacy.

The general debate on disarmament issues has been going on for two weeks now. The recurrent theme of virtually all the statements we have heard is the need to remove the danger of a nuclear conflict which is looming over mankind, as well as the need to proceed to real disarmament. Disarmament has now become - if I may put it in this way - the challenge of challenges facing mankind, a global problem of paramount importance today. What concerns mankind most of all and alarms it most about its future is the continuing arms race. Consequently, all States of the world - large or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, socialist or capitalist, members of military alliances or non-aligned and neutral - have a vital stake in solving this problem.

If we are to prevent mankind from drifting towards the nuclear abyss, we must set in motion the entire existing system of negotiations and ensure the greatest possible efficiency of all disarmament machinery, both bilateral and multilateral.

Special responsibility for producing effective measures to avert nuclear war and to limit nuclear armaments rests with the Soviet Union and the United States. The USSR is well aware of that. This has been demonstrated by the bold and radical proposals covering the entire range of disarmament, which have been put forward by the Soviet Union during the past year and, most recently, in Reykjavik.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In his speech on Soviet television on 22 October, Mikhail Gorbachev said:

"The Soviet Union has invested maximum good will in its proposals. Everything that has been said to rationalize and develop them remains valid."

Yet it would be a mistake to assume that other States can stand aloof from active involvement in the elaboration of concrete measures designed to limit weapons, including nuclear weapons. To look at the solution of the vitally important problem of preventing a nuclear catastrophe through the prism of Soviet-American talks is clearly to underestimate their own responsibility and their own possibilities. Let each political leader, invested with high authority, ask himself this question: what specific contribution has his country made to the preservation of human civilization and the elaboration of practical measures to limit armaments.

Perhaps there are some people who are satisfied with a situation where a significant number of States - representing the overwhelming majority of mankind - would be excluded from active participation in solving the issues of war and peace, nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We strongly oppose such an approach. Today, no one - I repeat, no one - has the right to be a mere spectator of what is going on in our very troubled world.

This is precisely the stand of the Soviet Union in evaluating the place and role of multilateral diplomacy in the disarmament process. In this, we have been guided by the principles of Leninist foreign policy, which advanced the concept of global arms reductions as far back as the Genoa conference of 1922 and fought for its implementation in Geneva in 1927 within the preparatory commission of the Disarmament Conference established by the League of Nations. Today, we continue to operate on the basis of those principles.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Within the negotiating mechanism today, a special place belongs to the Conference on Disarmament, which, according to the definition contained in the relevant United Nations documents, is the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. We wish to stress that it is multilateral and therefore has considerable negotiating and legal potential for dealing with the problems before it.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the Conference on Disarmament. In his message to the Conference last February, Mikhail Gorbachev noted:

"The Soviet Union views its participation in the Conference on Disarmament with a full sense of responsibility deriving from the realization that disarmament is the main road leading to the establishment of a new and just international order and to the building of a safe world. It is disarmament which, by releasing vast material and intellectual resources, will make it possible to reallocate them for the purposes of creation, economic development and prosperity."

In assessing the role of the Conference on Disarmament as a forum of multilateral diplomacy, one cannot fail to see that its possibilities, in terms of achieving real agreements to limit the race in all types of arms, are far from being fully utilized as yet.

The positive political capital accumulated by the Conference on Disarmament in the 1960s and 1970s shows that whenever its members have worked from a basis of realism and recognition of the community and indivisibility of the world, this particular body has proved itself capable of serving the interests of peace. Good will, a desire for co-operation and a constructive approach by different States have enabled the Conference to reach reasonable compromises and to produce useful solutions for arms limitation and disarmament.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Unfortunately, in the past 10 years the Conference has perceptibly slowed down its performance in terms of finding concrete solutions to disarmament problems. The cause of its inadequate effectiveness and malfunctions in its work does not lie in the imperfection of Conference machinery but rather in the lack of political will on the part of some of its participants.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

It should be said very frankly that during this period, particularly in the 1980s, the United States ignored the Conference on Disarmament as a negotiating body. The only item on its agenda on which the United States finally agreed to enter into negotiations, even then only after long delays and procrastination, was the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Why is it that the Conference on Disarmament is not negotiating on the prohibition of nuclear testing, nuclear disarmament, the prevention of nuclear war, the preparation of a convention on strengthening the security of non-nuclear States and the prevention of an arms race in outer space? The answer in every case is because the United States is opposed to it, despite the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, and the tenacious desire and willingness of socialist, non-aligned, neutral and - we wish to say it explicitly - many Western countries, to engage in such negotiations.

The other day, at a meeting of this Committee, the United States representative, Ambassador Okun, made a statement which was devoted to multilateral aspects of the disarmament problem. If we dismiss the anti-Soviet baloney which is the traditional rotten ingredient of all American statements it becomes clear that the United States still intends to oppose the participation of the States of the world in negotiations on major disarmament problems.

Let us take, for instance, the question of the prohibition of nuclear tests. Having spoken once more against conducting multilateral negotiations with a view to concluding a treaty on the banning of nuclear tests, the United States representative stated, in a way that amounted almost to an ultimatum, that the Conference on Disarmament must agree, without any further delay, to the mandate of the relevant Committee on the basis of the Western proposal, even though - as we know and I am sure Mr. Okun also knows - this proposal does not enjoy the support

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

of the overwhelming majority of the member States of the Conference, or indeed of the United Nations as a whole.

As to the other top priority problem - the prevention of an arms race in outer space - here, too, contrary to the negotiating mandate of the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Okun magnanimously permitted the Conference to continue with the discussion of this question, but not to conduct actual negotiations. As for the participation of the States of the world community in the negotiations on nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war, the United States representative did not even find it necessary to mention it.

So this, in brief, is the main cause of the "infertility", so to speak, of the Conference on Disarmament in recent years. At the same time, it cannot be asserted that during all these years, when the Conference has been getting nowhere, nothing has altered. The winds of change have begun to blow also towards the Palais des Nations where the Conference on Disarmament holds its meetings; they have injected a breath of fresh air into the routine course of its work. The latest proposals, advanced by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries this year, have resulted in a new outlook, compared with the traditional concepts of and approaches to such notions as international and national security.

In a situation where the examination in political maturity which must be taken by all mankind asks the question "to be or not to be" as regards civilization on Earth, many participants in the Conference on Disarmament have understood that urgent and vigorous actions are required to save mankind from a nuclear catastrophe. They have called for a decisive renunciation of old stereotypes of thinking, which have come into conflict with reality, and with notions of security and ways and means of ensuring it.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

The session of the Conference on Disarmament that ended recently brought to light some specific signs and promising shoots of new approaches to disarmament issues. Where do we see these positive changes? There has been a dramatic increase in the interest and activities of States, above all the non-aligned States, in questions pertaining to nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in space. States have become immeasurably more aware of the jeopardy in which the world now finds itself; they now feel a stronger need for immediate solutions and, what is most important, recognize that the removal of the nuclear threat is a realistic possibility. This has been reflected in the decisions adopted at various important international forums, in distant Harare, and in the Mexican city of Ixtapa. It has also been demonstrated by the results of meetings of socialist countries in Budapest and Bucharest. The wide-ranging decisions adopted at those forums also have a direct impact on the state of affairs at the Conference on Disarmament.

The result has been not merely a greater interest on the part of a great number of countries in nuclear and space problems, but also the presenting of specific proposals and initiatives, both at plenary meetings and in special committees of the Conference on Disarmament. A significant number of specific position papers, proposals and working documents on the main issues included in the agenda of the Conference have been submitted by a wide range of countries. For example, the issues of nuclear disarmament were addressed by non-aligned countries and China, the question of banning space-strike weapons was dealt with in the proposals and drafts worked out by the delegations of Bulgaria, Venezuela and Sri Lanka; and there were also some interesting proposals on banning nuclear explosions, particularly by the delegation of Sweden. In fact it may fairly be said that over the entire range of problems concerning nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space there was a more substantive discussion

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

this year, which can be regarded as an introduction to negotiation, as it were, a kind of negotiating overture. One cannot help but express satisfaction at the results of the work of the seismic experts group.

There are also grounds for believing that willingness to reach more practical agreements at the Conference emerged in most tangible form in the course of negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

However, these seedlings are still weak; they are just a sign of changes for the better. We also have another criterion for assessing the results of the Conference - that is, the verification of the sincerity of the statements by the delegations in favour of strengthening security and peace.

Matching declarations by concrete deeds is one of the essential components of the new political thinking. The people of our planet, as has already been said, are weary of empty rhetoric. And since time immemorial, intentions have been judged not by words, but by deeds. The great Goethe, paraphrasing the words of the Bible, said through Faust that, in the beginning, there was the deed.

Willingness to eliminate nuclear, chemical and other types of weapons of mass destruction is being professed by virtually everyone, including countries which are either torpedoing negotiations on these subjects or are objecting to negotiations on these matters within the context of the Conference on Disarmament. But when it comes to concrete steps, the picture changes drastically. The situation looks particularly absurd - I cannot find any other word for it - when some Western countries submitted for consideration at the Conference on Disarmament working papers on specific items on its agenda, including some quite interesting ones, and then essentially blocked the possibility of consideration of them within the framework of the negotiations of relevant disarmament problems. It is incredible but true. So what is revealed here is a pattern of thinking lagging dangerously behind a pattern of action; there is a kind of gap between words and deeds.

We propose that this gap, this abyss be closed at one fell swoop. Those who oppose negotiations favour a series of timorous attempts in the form of consideration, study and so forth. References have already been made here to the words of Lloyd George who was quoted as saying that one can only leap over the abyss in a single jump, not in two or three. This is exactly what we suggest: to

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

begin work, at last, on concrete agreements on the problems of arms limitation and disarmament which confront us.

It is altogether inadmissible for the Conference on Disarmament not to conduct negotiations on such issues as banning nuclear tests, limiting the nuclear-weapon race and nuclear disarmament, preventing nuclear war and an arms race in outer space. Those who oppose negotiations are attempting to drive these problems into the background of the Conference. However, our experience makes it quite clear that these problems are the very focal point of world political issues. The entire range of problems of nuclear disarmament and prevention of an arms race in outer space must lie, as I am sure they will, at the very heart of all the activities at the Conference. To indulge in wishful thinking that these questions can be solved somewhere outside the framework of the Conference on Disarmament is a failure to understand the universal nature of the problems of nuclear disarmament.

There is one more point I should like to make. As you know, 40 States are members of the Conference on Disarmament. However, their activities are not equal. Year after year a number of States participating in the Conference on Disarmament as observers make a much greater contribution to the work being done than some of its members.

We welcome the wish on the part of any State to promote progress in negotiations on disarmament, regardless of its official status. The doors of the Conference should be open to them. The work of the Conference is, so to speak, replete with various organizational and procedural discussions and arguments. At times the Conference spends more time settling these questions than conducting negotiations on matters of substance.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries resolutely oppose this squandering of the time of the Conference, especially in the present situation, where urgent and effective action is needed. We call for flexibility and constructivism in resolving organizational and procedural questions, and for giving them the modest place that they deserve.

Let me summarize what I have said. An ever-greater number of States of the Conference on Disarmament are pinning their increasing hopes for a nuclear-free world on positive trends, which are taking shape in international life, under the influence of the new, bold and large-scale proposals designed to remove the threat of nuclear war and to eliminate nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction from the face of the Earth before the end of the century. It is precisely this circumstance that largely explains a certain positive shift in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in 1986.

To exploit its potential capabilities, the Conference on Disarmament should concentrate on holding productive negotiations, as it is required to do by the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, as well as the annual injunctions, orders and instructions by States Members of the Organization, which are laid down in decisions adopted by the General Assembly.

Successful work of the negotiating machinery will become possible if all States participating in the Conference express clearly and explicitly their will and readiness to work for and adopt concrete measures in the field of disarmament. We hope that next year the Conference on Disarmament will succeed in achieving progress in all the items on its agenda.

Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): My

delegation wishes to congratulate you, Sir, on having been elected Chairman of this Committee of the Assembly which is responsible for security and disarmament items. We are certain that your ability, impartiality and diplomatic experience guarantee the success of the work of this Committee. We also extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

The current session of the General Assembly began under a promising sign, based on the Reykjavik summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. The work of the First Committee, dealing with security and disarmament items, has unfortunately not been able to derive benefit from the results which were about to be reached at that meeting. The logic of security through nuclear and strategic predominance once again prevailed. However, we should not like to think nor have we the right to, that all is lost. The dialogue must continue between the two super-Powers, and the voice of peoples calling for the elimination of the threat of nuclear weapons and the releasing for purposes of development and co-operation of the enormous resources now devoted to the arms build-up should make itself heard more loudly.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

As stated in the General Assembly repeatedly, and in the Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at their recent meeting in Harare, Zimbabwe, the super-Powers in their discussions must at all times take into account not only their national interests but also the vital interests of all the peoples of the world. This is the only approach that can make the nuclear-weapon States see reason and the only factor that could become an element of persuasion more powerful than all the existing nuclear arsenals.

It is because of this conviction that my country has consistently supported the efforts of the Governments of Argentina, Mexico, India, Greece, Sweden and Tanzania to promote peace and disarmament. The purpose of this initiative is to make known the vital interests of the peoples of four continents and contribute through practical realistic and specific initiatives to the process leading to the complete elimination from the face of the Earth of all nuclear weapons. We therefore feel that the proposals made by this group of countries in the Mexico Declaration, adopted in Ixtapa on 7 August this year, which includes a specific proposal on verification measures with the aim of putting an end to nuclear-weapon tests, deserve thorough consideration by the super-Powers. This specific coherent and scientific proposal once again shows that the problems related to verification cannot and should not be used as an excuse to continue to prolong negotiations on a treaty on the permanent prohibition of all nuclear tests by all States in all environments, which is a matter of the highest priority.

While it is true that, as stated in the Ixtapa Declaration,

"no issue is more urgent and crucial today than of bringing to an end all nuclear tests" (A/41/518, p. 4),

it is important, especially at this time, to highlight and reiterate the demand in that Declaration that an arms race in outer space be prevented, that the

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

development of anti-satellite weapons be halted and that existing treaties safeguarding the peaceful uses of outer space and limiting anti-ballistic missile systems be respected.

We believe it necessary to repeat our well-known position on this matter. Space is the heritage of all mankind. Any strategic defence system - or star wars, as it has come to be known - constitutes the beginning of the militarization of outer space and further escalation of the arms race. Space must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Developing countries lacking in human, material and scientific resources have a right to participate in such peaceful exploration and share in and benefit from knowledge derived therefrom as a means of ensuring that such activities will be used to bring not destruction and death but development and progress to all peoples.

Therefore, the Conference on Disarmament must undertake without delay negotiations leading to the conclusion of an agreement or agreements, as the case may be, to prevent the extension of the arms race in all its aspects to outer space and thus promote possibilities for co-operation in the sphere of the peaceful use of outer space. Furthermore, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, can demonstrate their willingness to compromise by making a genuine effort towards achievement of the objective set forth in the joint statement issued in Geneva on 21 November 1985, namely, "to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth" (A/40/1070, p. 3).

We have noted recently growing concern regarding the question of conventional disarmament. This concern is legitimate since approximately 80 per cent of annual military expenditure world wide goes on conventional weapons and armed forces. However, we view with similar concern the tendency to consider conventional disarmament in the wrong context and from the wrong perspective. That is why I

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

consider it important to recall that the study on conventional disarmament, prepared by a Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General under resolution 36/97 A of the General Assembly, and issued last year, states inter alia:

"Progress towards conventional disarmament cannot proceed very far in the absence of substantial progress in nuclear disarmament. Conventional disarmament in isolation would perpetuate existing asymmetries in the security of States in favour of those States which possess nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. In certain areas limitations and reductions in conventional weapons and armed forces without accompanying reductions or elimination of nuclear capabilities in the region would leave non-nuclear-weapon States at a disadvantage. The conventional disarmament process should not jeopardize the security of any State and it should be aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament." (A/39/348, para. 39)

This is in keeping with the priorities established for disarmament negotiations in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, which was adopted by consensus by the Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament and formally reaffirmed at its twelfth special session. Those priorities are the following: nuclear weapons; other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reductions of armed forces.

The item on conventional disarmament is unjustly and incorrectly taken out of the context of general and complete disarmament and discussed from the standpoint of expenditure on conventional weapons by developing countries. We must not lose sight of the fact that by far the highest percentage of military expenditure on conventional weapons and armed forces world-wide is by those States with the

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

biggest military arsenals and other militarily important States. We must never forget that the cessation of the arms race is closely related to the strengthening of international security, mutual confidence between States and the willingness of States to settle their disputes by peaceful means. The study on conventional disarmament, to which I have already referred, also states:

"The interference of those States with the largest military arsenals can greatly deepen local conflicts and plunge regions into protracted turmoil. In regions which may be regarded as strategically or economically sensitive, such turmoil can be a source of considerable threat to international security."

(para. 45)

That is why the adoption of disarmament measures in the conventional field must be based, as affirmed in the Declaration of the summit meeting of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement in Harare, on

"full respect for the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the peaceful settlement of disputes in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations".

Strict respect for those principles is also at the root of disarmament efforts at the regional level. Similarly, regional disarmament must be approached in the right way. We agree that, far from being incompatible with world-wide activities, regional initiatives that may be taken in this area or that are already under way could supplement or contribute to them if they are carried out with the broadest possible objectives in view. In this context, we must therefore recall the need to take into account world-wide priorities and, once again, the special responsibility of the States with the biggest military arsenals with regard to the process of the reduction of conventional weapons.

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

My country strongly supports the security and disarmament efforts of the Contadora Group and its Support Group in the Central American situation. We are in favour of turning Central America into a zone of peace, free of all foreign military presence. Without clear concepts such as these we cannot deal with an item of particular importance such as that of the relationship between disarmament and development.

In 1981 alone, military expenditure world-wide reached \$600 billion. If we take into account the fact that the upward trend in the last four years is estimated to have been 3 per cent per year in volume, the level of expenditure by the end of the century, assuming the same rate of growth, will exceed the \$1.02 trillion mark. Obviously, these military expenditures are the most important source of funds available for possible transfers throughout the world to benefit developing countries.

These levels of military expenditures are in contrast with the meagre results of the last Development Decade. The target which was set by the International Development Strategy was that developed countries should provide 0.7 per cent of their gross national product as official assistance to developing countries. It is estimated that official development assistance levels by developed countries have since 1970 been maintained at half that amount, and for the moment there is no indication that they will even come close to the target.

This is all part of an international economic situation which becomes increasingly critical, affecting mainly the developing countries, and places the political and social stability of the poor nations in serious jeopardy.

Possibilities for adopting concrete measures, after serious and constructive consideration of these problems, still exist in spite of the fact that the Paris International conference on the relationship between disarmament and development

(Mr. Icaza Gallard, Nicaragua)

was not held in July 1986 as scheduled. It should be convened in 1987 and not be further postponed.

The present international situation is marked by an alarming trend in favour of the use of force in international relations. Progress in disarmament is impossible in such a climate. Conflict situations must be resolved exclusively by peaceful means and non-resort to the threat or use of force must become a basic norm in international relations. As recognized in the Ixtapa Declaration to which I referred at the the beginning of my statement:

"In recent times respect for international law has unfortunately reached one of its lowest points. The rights of the weakest nations are flouted with impunity. Treaties are violated at the whim of countries, particularly the strongest."

The principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, recognized today by the International Court of Justice as part of international customary law, must be respected, as also the right of all countries freely to choose the political, economic and social system most in keeping with the interests of their peoples. The principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes must also be respected. Lastly, we need to respect the Charter of the United Nations and to strengthen the mechanisms of the Organization, in particular the Security Council, and to eliminate abuses of the right of veto, so that the Council may play its primary role of monitoring and keeping international peace and security. Initiatives aimed at strengthening international security will therefore receive the enthusiastic support of our delegation.

Mr. SAMUDIO (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): Permit me first to express the sorrow of the people and Government of Panama over the irreparable loss of the leader of the Mozambican people, President Samora Machel. The death of that illustrious African leader is a loss not only for his own nation but for all peoples who, like those of Mozambique,, love freedom and peace.

Today, when we are celebrating United Nations Day throughout the world, we consider it appropriate to mention those leaders who gave their lives for peace and those who continue along the path which those illustrious leaders first trod.

At the opening of the general debate in this Committee you, Mr. Chairman, said in describing the task ahead of the First Committee that:

"... the world is confronted with extremely difficult problems, including, first of all, the problem of averting the danger of nuclear war, preventing an arms race in outer space and ending the arms race on earth". (A/C.1/41/PV.3, p. 2)

We are therefore faced with an important task, the success of which can only lead to an affirmation of the supreme willingness of the vast majority of the human race for its survival and of the wisdom of their leaders, especially the leaders of the nuclear Powers who should give a positive response to mankind crying out with one voice for the elimination once and for all of the danger of a nuclear holocaust.

Questions relating to international security and disarmament have since the foundation of the United Nations led to many efforts and initiatives. While, as has already been stated, the attention that the drafters of the Charter attached to the role of disarmament in attaining the objectives of the Organization seems to have been limited in scope, it is also true that the final overriding goal embodied in that instrument was that of "saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war". That transcendental purpose continues to be as valid today as it was

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

41 years ago. We were pleased to note that the world leaders who gathered here at the opening of the general debate at this forty-first session of the General Assembly renewed their commitment to the principles and purposes of the Charter. Their statements and their commitments towards the international community must be reflected in the adoption of practical measures to halt and reverse the arms race and to begin a determined move towards general and complete disarmament.

We are shocked to see however, that in contradiction with those statements the international situation is deteriorating more rapidly because of the rivalry between the major Powers and a reactivation of their policies based on spheres of influence, which may well extend to all areas of the world. The planet becomes more insecure and unstable and the risk of a nuclear holocaust increases; but not satisfied with that, they try to justify the extension of their rivalry into outer space.

My delegation shares the view expressed by many delegations in the general debate that the arms race, in all its aspects, is at variance with efforts to build a stable and secure international environment, just as international tension, and a lack of frank and constructive dialogue between the nuclear-weapon States increase the danger of nuclear war.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

My delegation is alarmed at the fact that, while large numbers of the people of the world are living in extreme poverty, the vertiginous increase in the economic, technical and human resources squandered on military activities continues. According to the 1986 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), during the first five years of this decade the world military expenditure grew by over 3 per cent, thus exceeding the expenditure for the last five years of the previous decade.

According to the same source, the countries that are members of the two major military alliances account for 75 per cent of the total world military expenditure. Therefore, those countries, particularly the two Powers that head those alliances, bear the main responsibility to reverse that trend through halting the arms race, putting confidence-building measures into effect and concluding agreements on the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and armaments, nuclear as well as conventional.

My delegation again expresses its firm support for actions and initiatives to reverse these trends and facilitate the reaching of bilateral and multilateral disarmament agreements, in the context of a process of general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

For that reason, last year we welcomed the agreement reached in Geneva on 8 January 1985 between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Soviet Union to start negotiations on various questions relating to space and nuclear weapons, strategic as well as intermediate-range and to find interrelated solutions to all these questions. We were also pleased to note that the purpose of those negotiations was to prepare effective agreements to prevent an arms race in space and to halt it on earth, and that their final aim was the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. But we must note with concern that our hopes for rapid and effective agreements remain unfulfilled.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

The recent meeting at Reykjavik between President Reagan and General-Secretary Gorbachev - which is still being carefully assessed - demonstrated once again that mistrust between the Powers can hamper the concrete possibility of reaching specific arms reduction agreements - because of the fear, justified or unjustified, of possible future violations of such agreements.

We are, however, encouraged by the continued efforts to bring the diverging positions of the two countries closer together and by the fact that leading figures of the two Governments have expressed their commitment to maintaining the agreements in principle reached at Reykjavik.

My delegation believes that the fact that bilateral negotiations are held by the two Powers does not make it any less urgent to pursue multilateral disarmament efforts. In that connection, we firmly support all initiatives to strengthen the role of the United Nations system in the sphere of disarmament, in particular by improving the functioning of the Disarmament Commission, by recognizing the role of the Conference on Disarmament as a negotiating body, and by making the work of the First Committee more effective. In that connection, my delegation shares the view that while the main responsibility for preventing war, in particular nuclear war, and for halting the arms race must be shouldered by the nuclear-weapon States, it is no less true that the security interests of all the peoples of the world are involved in that process, and those interests must therefore be taken duly into account.

My country repeats its conviction that the final goal set by the international community continues to be general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control; that is set forth in the Final Document agreed upon at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Until that goal is attained, the immediate purpose of our work on disarmament and international security must be to guarantee the survival of mankind and eliminate the danger of war, especially nuclear war, to ensure that war ceases to be used as a means of settling disputes, and to rule out the use or the threat of the use of force in international relations. Very little progress has been made within the United Nations system towards the fulfilment of those goals.

The Disarmament Commission, as we see from its report, hardly moved forward on its agenda items; indeed we can say that - except for the "Draft guidelines on appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for their implementation" at the international or regional levels - no progress was made this year.

We have heard a similar assessment from authoritative participants in the Conference on Disarmament, which continues to make only minimal progress in its work, despite many appeals by the General Assembly.

In my delegation's view, we must without further delay engage in consultations and constructive deliberations on the situation obtaining in the Disarmament Commission. It must be given a clear and specific mandate that will enable it to do all the work it was established to do.

With regard to the Conference on Disarmament, we once again appeal to its member States, in particular the nuclear Powers and the militarily significant States, to show the wisdom to recognize the seriousness of the situation confronting the world today and to demonstrate the necessary flexibility and political will to begin promptly negotiations on the whole range of questions assigned to it.

The halting of all activities related to the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons is an extremely urgent measure that would promote a rapid start of negotiations that could lead to broad agreement on the complete

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. A measure of that kind would be a concrete indication of the political will of the nuclear Powers to halt the modernization of their nuclear arsenals and to begin a process of reduction and balanced and verifiable disarmament that would culminate in general and complete disarmament.

We enthusiastically support the initiative of the six Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania designed to make a valuable contribution to the reaching of agreements among the nuclear-weapon States, and we firmly adhere to the "Mexico Declaration" issued on 7 August 1986 as well as the proposals contained in the "Document on verification measures" adopted on that occasion.

Panama regrets that, despite significant progress in the preparation of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, the Conference could not be held this year as scheduled; that certainly was contrary to the wishes of an overwhelming majority of Member States. My delegation hopes that the First Committee will give due consideration to this unusual situation regarding the holding of the Conference and will adopt firm measures to ensure that the Conference will be held in 1987, in conformity with the recommendation of the Preparatory Committee.

The establishment of zones of peace and co-operation is another initiative that deserves careful consideration by the Committee. My country, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, follows that Committee's work with particular interest and is fully aware of the difficulties connected with the establishment of such zones. Nevertheless, we believe that impetus will be given to the efforts to prepare for the United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean if more flexible positions are adopted by the Powers that have interests in that region.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Panama, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, bases its foreign policy in the sphere of international security and disarmament on the purposes and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and on the fundamental principles contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is part of my country's tradition to attach importance to the observance of the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of any State, as well as the principles of the inviolability of international borders and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

The international conduct of my country is consistent with this position. Together with other countries of the region, we are joining in the peace-making effort now widely known as the Contadora process, and we shall continue to pursue such efforts with all our might, overcoming whatever pressures may be brought to bear.

We have joined in both international and regional efforts to strengthen international security, promote confidence and encourage the process of disarmament.

In the regional context, we share with other countries in the region positions of principle concerning the serious situation which threatens us with a conflict of unforeseeable consequences. As the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Contadora Group and its Support Group stated in the Declaration entitled, "Peace Is Still Possible in Central America", issued in New York on 1 October this year:

"The crisis in Central America is increasingly serious, and the risk of war greater. Those who believe in a military solution are ignorant of the true nature of the problem. We wish to give a warning as to what is at stake: the extension of the conflict, the sharpening of confrontation, and war."

We have followed closely the keen interest expressed by the leaders of the main world Powers in holding talks on various regional conflicts. My country hopes that in defining their conduct with regard to the Central American case, those Powers will bear in mind both the specific situations which lead to the problems in the region, and the recommendations of Contadora and, in particular, the permanent basis for peace in Central America established in the Caraballeda message.

My country, which has no ambitions in the military or strategic fields, which has long been traditionally peace-loving, and has welcomed in its midst a population of something over 2 million people from all parts of the globe, wishes only to go on living in peace, to have it recognized that its geographical position

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

should be regarded as a peaceful line of communication for the use of all nations of the world.

In the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, signed on 7 September 1977 with the United States, Panama, as the sovereign State over whose territory the Canal is built, in article II declares the neutrality of the Canal:

"... in order that both in time of peace and in time of war it shall remain secure and open to peaceful transit by the vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality, so that there will be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects, concerning the conditions or charges of transit, or for any other reason, so that the Canal, and therefore the Isthmus of Panama shall not be the target of reprisals in any armed conflict between other nations of the world".

This system of neutrality, which is the foundation stone of the universal and peaceful nature of this inter-ocean waterway can, of course, only be completed by the co-operation and commitment in observing it of neighbouring countries, the main users of the Canal, the major military Powers, and all the countries of the world.

Thus, my delegation is grateful to those countries which have acceded to the Protocol to Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal for their valuable support, and invites all members of the international community to join in our efforts to ensure the effective neutrality of this inter-ocean waterway and to make the Panama Canal a real instrument for serving peace and the development of world trade.

My delegation wishes to state emphatically that the temporary presence of military forces in the area adjacent to the Canal are there, as stated in article IV of the Treaty for the sole purpose of protecting and defending the Canal:

"... to meet the danger resulting from an armed attack or other actions which threaten the security of the Panama Canal or of ships transiting it".

(Mr. Samudio, Panama)

Therefore, any activity going beyond what was specifically agreed upon must be considered as a violation of the letter and spirit of the Treaty and as an illegal act outside international law.

It is now commonplace to hear the leaders of different countries and of all persuasions declare publicly that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. This Committee has an inescapable duty to safeguard present and future generations against any repetition of the holocausts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The purpose of my statement is to refer again to Article 26 of the Charter, which specifically provides that the Security Council shall deal with disarmament. It uses the word "shall". When the Charter speaks about the General Assembly dealing with disarmament, it says "may". It is mandatory for the Security Council to deal with disarmament.

Therefore, resolution 40/151 A was adopted overwhelmingly, calling on the Security Council to conform with the provisions of the Charter and deal with the question of disarmament, which it has never dealt with. A year has passed and nothing has happened, and therefore I wish to raise the question again this year. Article 26 remains there, and it is very important that it should be complied with.

The resolution requested the Secretary-General to report on this matter to the General Assembly. I hope that the Secretary-General has made or will make the requested report to the General Assembly with regard to the question of the Security Council becoming involved with the matter of disarmament. There are many reasons why it is very important that the Security Council should do this. If the General Assembly adopts a resolution on disarmament without unanimity - with even a single negative vote - it can be said that there was no consensus. But if the Security Council votes to act in accordance with the Charter's requirements regarding disarmament, a permanent member which is in disagreement can veto the proposal. A Security Council resolution on disarmament, which can be vetoed, is

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

thus a very different matter from a General Assembly resolution, which must be a consensus matter.

That is the problem raised in the resolution I proposed. I hope that the Secretary-General has made or will make a report that will strengthen the position that the Security Council must deal with disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind Members that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, the number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item. The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON (Fiji): That the representative of France chose to interpret my statement yesterday on French nuclear testing in the Pacific as a personal challenge is most regrettable. The statement of my delegation was in no way personally directed and I should like to make that quite clear. My delegation was merely responding to certain points which the French representative had made in his statement on 17 October.

The representative of France also stated that no one would be permitted to dictate to France, especially where its security interests were concerned. My delegation certainly would not want to give the impression of wanting to dictate to anyone, in the same way, as we assume that France does not try to dictate to us on what views we should hold on our own security and safety interests.

Finally, my delegation welcomes France's willingness to discuss the South Pacific nuclear-free-zone treaty. We hope that it will join other nuclear-weapon States and sign the protocols to the treaty.

Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to reply to charges made by the Zionist representative in this Committee and to recall that all the available information makes it clear that there is an organic link between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv. This link embraces all areas of co-operation - economic, political, military, information, and in particular in the nuclear field. Information is also available in documents published by the United Nations confirming the existence of that co-operation, which is aimed specifically against the Arab nation and the Arab peoples. The charges of the Zionist representative yesterday were designed to cover up that co-operation between the racist régimes. In the Fourth Committee, reference was made in a paragraph of a draft resolution to co-operation between the Zionist régime and the South African régime. With respect to that draft resolution, which was presented by the African Group, the representative of Israel requested a separate vote on that particular

(Mr. Mahmoud, Iraq)

paragraph. If there were no such co-operation between the two racist entities, I wonder why the countries of the world would mention Israel by name and condemn its co-operation with the South African régime?

In due course, my delegation will speak on the subject of the nuclear capacity of the South African régime and its collaboration with the Zionist entity in that field. I should like to state here that the position of Iraq is one of principle - namely, a total embargo on the South African régime - and no charges will serve the purposes of the Zionist régime.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform members of the Committee that on Tuesday, 28 October 1986, at 10.30 a.m., the First Committee will hold a special meeting in observance of Disarmament Week. I should also like to inform members that on that same day the meeting of the United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign will be convened at 3 p.m. in this conference room.

The following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for Monday morning's meeting: Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Afghanistan, the German Democratic Republic and Romania.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.