



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 24TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CARIAS (Honduras)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Bhatt (Nepal)
Mr. Shweiry (Lebanon)
Mr. Karuhije (Rwanda)
Mr. Medina (Portugal)
Mr. Jalali (Iran)
Mr. Eilan (Israel)
Mr. Jarif (Afghanistan)
Mr. Dabo (Guinea)
Mr. Erdembileg (Mongolia)

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

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

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. BHATT (Nepal): I should like to extend our felicitations to the Chairman on his unanimous election to preside over our deliberations in this important Committee. His election is a tribute to the significant efforts made by Yugoslavia in the field of disarmament. It is also a recognition of his personal skills as a diplomat and a negotiator. I am confident that he will guide the deliberations of our Committee to fruitful conclusions.

I should also like to take this opportunity to convey our congratulations to our two Vice-Chairmen, Ambassador Yango and Ambassador Carias, and to our Rapporteur, Mr. Makonnen.

The first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament unanimously adopted the priorities in disarmament negotiations and made some important institutional arrangements for negotiations and deliberations. The present state of affairs makes it obligatory for us to examine whether the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission have been fulfilling the task entrusted to them.

A study of the report of the Committee on Disarmament fails to assure us that it has been able to live up to its mandate. After the Committee adopted its rules of procedure and a programme of work in keeping with the Final Document of the first special session, we expected the Committee to get down to serious negotiations on substantive issues. Nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have been accorded highest priority among disarmament issues. An important step leading to these objectives would be the adoption of a treaty on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear-weapon tests. We deeply regret the suspension of the trilateral talks on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Equally disturbing is the fact that the Committee on Disarmament has failed even to establish a procedure to deal with this question. We reiterate our request to the Committee immediately to set up, with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, a working group with a firm mandate to take up this question as a matter of great urgency.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

We also appeal to the parties to the trilateral negotiations to co-operate fully with the Committee on Disarmament. Only such co-operation can ensure universal respect for and adherence to any comprehensive test-ban treaty.

No appreciable progress seems to have been made on the question of a draft international instrument to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. My delegation wishes to

reiterate its stand that non-nuclear-weapon States which are not party to any military alliance are entitled to a categorical and legally binding assurance that they will not be subjected to a nuclear attack. Pending the resolution of the deadlock in the Committee on Disarmament and the elaboration of an instrument by it, my delegation supports the common formula for a Security Council resolution covering common ground contained in the national statements of the nuclear-weapon States.

While the Committee seems to have made some progress in drafting a text of a convention prohibiting radiological weapons, intensive negotiations are obviously required to narrow down differences on important elements of the future convention. My delegation fully supports the recommendation of the Group of 21 in the Committee on Disarmament that the definition of such weapons should not include an exclusion clause with respect to nuclear weapons.

We also urge the Committee on Disarmament to take up negotiations on a text of a convention on chemical weapons, with adequate verification mechanism, at the beginning of its 1982 session as a matter of high priority and to report on the progress made to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The present state of the Committee on Disarmament calls for an urgent review of its working so as to prevent further damage to its credibility as the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating body. The prevailing deadlock in the Committee is basically the result of the projection of the prevailing state of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. These two Powers bear the biggest responsibility for the present lack of tangible progress and the failure to bring about any qualitative change in the Committee's work. My delegation views with scepticism any increase in the membership of the Committee as a sign of progress in this direction. The present composition of the Committee is fairly representative. However, we feel that the Committee devotes

too much of its time to procedural questions while insufficient time is devoted to substantial issues. It might be more useful if the Committee devoted more time to informal consultations and negotiations. Any improvement in the quality of the work of the Committee presupposes full co-operation in good faith by all nuclear Powers. It is, in the final analysis, the political will of the negotiating parties that alone can ensure progress. My delegation looks forward to a thorough examination of this issue at the forthcoming second special session on disarmament.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

My delegation feels that it is equally imperative to review the mandate of the deliberating forum created by the first special session devoted to disarmament - the Disarmament Commission. We feel that a mere repetition of the First Committee's debate in the Disarmament Commission serves no useful purpose. We hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will take concrete steps to help the Disarmament Commission to find its proper identity and direction.

Nepal fully supports the view that nuclear disarmament has the highest priority in the disarmament efforts. We can find no rational basis for the doctrine of a limited nuclear war, for the outbreak of a nuclear conflict on whatever scale will expose to extreme risk the very survival of mankind. Any meaningful effort to contain the nuclear-arms race is thus an effort in the interest of survival. We welcome the resumption of talks later this month between the United States and the Soviet Union on intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. Equally welcome is the intention of the two super-Powers to resume their strategic nuclear force reduction talks early next year. Continuing dialogue between them is necessary to open the way to the reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty remains the single most important international instrument of the non-proliferation régime. In spite of the failure of the Second Review Conference of the parties to that Treaty, my delegation calls for continued international co-operation to achieve better progress in non-proliferation. Such co-operation is particularly needed to bring to an immediate end the gradual undermining of the safeguard system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The Israeli bombing of the Iraqi nuclear installations has already seriously undermined the credibility of the International Atomic Energy Agency to act as an effective guardian of nuclear non-proliferation. While we welcome the ratification by Egypt of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we reiterate our appeal to the nuclear-weapon States to honour the commitment they have undertaken under article VI of the Treaty. Only strict adherence to the provisions of the Treaty by the nuclear-weapon States can induce States that are not parties to the Treaty to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of a freely arrived at agreement between the States of the region can be an important step towards nuclear disarmament. We welcome moves for the establishment of such zones on the basis of the principles laid down in the Final Document of the the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The lack of progress in the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace continues to cause us deep anxiety. The current trend of military-build-up and rivalry in and around the Indian Ocean can only worsen the situation in the area. As a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, Nepal continues to believe that the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean is a necessary step towards achieving the goal of the Declaration.

My delegation supports the move to halt the spread of the arms race in outer space, which, along with the oceans, constitutes the common heritage of mankind. It would indeed be painful if the wonders of science and technology in space research were nullified by developments that pose a threat to the very existence of man. We will support any proposal embracing an effective and verifiable control mechanism to stop the militarization of outer space.

While attaching the highest importance to nuclear disarmament, Nepal supports the move for effective international measures to control the problem of a conventional arms race. My delegation reiterates its support for a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race, for we believe that such a comprehensive study can form the basis for efforts to control the disquieting international transfer of conventional weapons.

My delegation also fully supports the development of an effective international instrument to monitor the reduction of military expenditure. We continue to believe that verifiability and comparability must form an essential part of such an instrument.

Only when we have an assurance that arms control agreements are being complied with can the cause of confidence, and thereby of peace, be furthered. My delegation favours the gradual increase of the United Nations capabilities to verify, monitor and enforce compliance of the parties with various arms control agreements.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

United Nations studies on various aspects of the arms race and disarmament have been valuable in clarifying difficult and complicated issues. Among the most recent of these studies I wish to make particular mention of the report of governmental experts on the relationship between disarmament and development. We commend the report as an important contribution to the process of establishing a triangular relationship between disarmament, development and international security. An important part of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament is that of creating a well-informed international public opinion in support of disarmament. With this in mind we support the proposal to launch a world disarmament campaign. I should also like to take this opportunity to express our continued support for the United Nations Programme of Fellowship on Disarmament in its laudable efforts to create specialized disarmament manpower, particularly in the developing countries. I should also like to express our appreciation of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament for its active role. We would support the proposal for a gradual expansion in the structure and function of the Centre.

I have outlined Nepal's perception on some of the issues on the agenda. These issues gain added significance year after year, as military expenditures continue to rise in adverse proportion to development, especially in the developing countries. The deliberations in this Committee this year have special significance as they contribute towards the preparation of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We expect the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be the centrepiece of the special session. We support the establishment of an order of priorities and a time-frame for the achievement of specific disarmament measures. The special session presents a unique opportunity to end the current disarmament stalemate, but the present impasse can also lead to the failure of the special session. Declarations without instruments to ensure their implementation cannot lead to disarmament. The success of the second special session will depend on the political will to implement the comprehensive programme of action, whose adoption we look forward to. The debate in the First Committee and subsequent exchange of views in the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session Devoted to Disarmament can help to promote resumption of a disarmament dialogue. We hope that the second special session not only will

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

reinforce the momentous consensus of the first special session, but will go beyond that by initiating concrete actions in implementing it.

Mr. SHWEIRY (Lebanon): Sir, at this late stage in our debate it gives me pleasure to express to you and to the other officers of the Committee the sentiments of our delegation. Will you also kindly convey to our Chairman our felicitations. I should like to say that we very much value our Chairman's contribution to our work and we recognize the important role played by his country in international relations through a policy of constructive moderation and enlightened purpose.

(Mr. Shweiry, Lebanon)

I wish to make some remarks concerning the items on our agenda for this session and the tasks which are before us in this Committee. I make them from the point of view of a small State with a legitimate feeling of insecurity in a world of unmitigated proliferation of weapons of all types.

First, we believe that disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, is not the preserve of the big Powers but a task to be undertaken by the world community as a whole. In this connexion, we should not limit our efforts to the activities of the various United Nations bodies, but should also take a direct and serious interest in all other disarmament negotiations, particularly negotiations on nuclear and strategic arms limitations, whether between the two super-Powers or between other parties. This should be done, in our opinion, through some form of close monitoring of these negotiations and through the publication of reliable information on the arms budgets and volume of armaments that each of the parties possesses.

Secondly, small and non-nuclear States should obtain sufficient guarantees against the use, testing and threat of nuclear weapons. The overwhelming majority of countries are non-nuclear States. They have no desire to acquire them, and in some cases no capability of doing so. We believe that an international convention on such assurances is the best way to reach agreement on an effective system of international guarantees.

Thirdly, we support the regional approach to nuclear disarmament, namely, through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace. We wish to reiterate our support, in particular, for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East and, in this connexion, we are in favour of the suggestion made here that an envoy of the Secretary-General be sent to the area to explore the modalities for the application of the above proposal.

However, our hopes for a nuclear-free zone in our area are compromised by the ominous development resulting from the emergence of nuclear-weapon States in the Middle East, as manifested by the Israeli capability, and by the Israeli attack on the nuclear reactor in Iraq, an attack which violated the sovereignty of a Member State and arouses our concern in the region over the possible fall-out from attacks on a nuclear facility.

(Mr. Shweiry, Lebanon)

Fourthly, the second special session on disarmament, now scheduled to begin on 7 June 1982, represents in the view of our delegation a unique opportunity. Two sessions of the Preparatory Committee have already been devoted to planning the work of the coming special session. The third session, in April next year, will complete these plans. We believe that we should seize this opportunity to arrive at a breakthrough on many of our goals which make up the comprehensive programme under negotiation in the Committee on Disarmament.

We have noted with satisfaction that the Preparatory Committee has urged that representation at the special session be on the highest possible political level. This is in conformity with our suggestion of last year that Heads of State be invited to share in an international summit meeting during the special session in order to give disarmament the priority it deserves from the international community. We realize that summit meetings are not a panacea for the problems facing us in the field of international security. However, we believe that our efforts so far have proved insufficient in the face of the realities of power prevailing in our times. Our aims in disarmament and international security could be given new momentum through a special session or a summit meeting. They constitute a necessary supplement to the conventional methods of negotiations at our disposal.

We hope also that the special session will consider the subject of the relationship between disarmament and development, as well as the relationship between international security and disarmament. In this connexion, we recognize the valuable work undertaken by the Group of Experts presided over by Mrs. Thorsson, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Sweden. Their report on the relationship between disarmament and development, introduced in this Committee, would constitute a good basis for the consideration of this topic during the special session.

The armaments race has greatly compromised the strategy of economic development of the developing countries, either through the diversion of great resources to weapons production, as is the case in the industrialized countries, or through the cutting of funds available for foreign aid, or through arms purchases by developing countries.

(Mr. Shweiry, Lebanon)

Another aspect relating to the special session is the role of public opinion. We have noted with satisfaction that since the first special session increasing attention has been paid to the participation in disarmament matters of representatives of world public opinion, including non-governmental organizations, research institutes, foundations and private individuals. We have taken note of the report of the Secretary-General on a world disarmament campaign and support the structure of activities proposed in the report. We believe that relations with representatives of world public opinion should be further strengthened, because understanding the intricacies of the arms race is crucial if public opinion is to influence policies regarding the arms race.

We have also noted the report of the Secretary-General on the Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament. We are pleased with the results of that Programme, which, in our view, has proved its usefulness.

Fifthly, as a small State we have a stake in arms control, which constitutes an integral part of our search for peace and security. A greater international effort should be made to eliminate the causes of tensions and instability within certain small States which are the result of external regional or super-Power rivalries. The number of small States in our Organization has been increasing steadily. Two such States have joined us during this session alone. Lebanon suggested during the first special session on disarmament, in 1978, that small States facing such problems should be given some form of special status with an internationally guaranteed neutrality under the aegis of the United Nations and protected by a permanent United Nations peace-keeping force. We hope that this suggestion will be among the topics considered during the coming special session. In preparation, we request, as we did last year, that the appropriate bodies conduct an expert study on this matter. This problem is gaining in importance, as some of the medium-sized Powers are emulating the bigger Powers by preying on small States, using the same arguments about geopolitical or strategic considerations.

Our country has been for a number of years the victim of the proliferation of weapons, even small weapons. Our traumatic experience makes us more anxious to join together with other States of the world community in the efforts to pursue the search for disarmament. We are, therefore, committed to work for the attainment of mankind's most urgent goal, namely, a system of international

Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda)(interpretation from French): My delegation is pleased to take this opportunity to extend to Ambassador Golob our sincere congratulations on his election as Chairman of this Committee. He belongs to a country with which Rwanda has strong relations of friendship and co-operation, both at the bilateral level and within the Non-Aligned Movement. It is particularly fitting that a son of Yugoslavia, the standard-bearer of non-alignment, is presiding over the First Committee's work that will certainly serve as the basis for the work of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. His personal qualities, his talents and his broad experience are a guarantee that our work will be successful.

I am also pleased that he is being supported by experienced officers of the Committee.

Today as people look at our world and its future they are far from being optimistic owing to the gloomy political, economic, social, ecological and other realities confronting them. If a public opinion survey were organized at a world-wide level today, the result, far from being encouraging, would be a cry of anguish from all of us as we face the obvious fact that a catastrophe is looming over mankind.

In the area of peace and international security particularly, the power and the ploys of the mighty of this world have taken the form of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of smaller countries, and an immoderate policy on their part has created political chaos in more than one country. In the area of disarmament, which is a precondition for peace and security in the world, the peoples of the world are greatly disappointed at the lack of real progress. The First United Nations Disarmament Decade has ended without any tangible results, and the proposals of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament - which represented the high point of the Decade - have been shunted aside owing to the Machiavellianism of the dominant Powers. On the other hand, arms production curves have soared dangerously in the major Powers, and one wonders whether the point at which they meet will not become the flash-point. For, indeed, the stockpile of weapons, nuclear

(Mr. Karuhiye, Rwanda)

weapons in particular, can easily go beyond what is reasonable. Strategic and balance-of-power considerations do not necessarily protect us from a confrontation. Call it what you will - limited warfare or preventive war - the not very reassuring fact remains that it could lead to a nuclear holocaust. We are not making an apocalyptic or fanciful prediction, for the war of words could easily lead to a war pure and simple - and that is no mere political fiction.

And to allay our anguish over the possibility of mankind's being annihilated in a nuclear exchange between the major Powers, on the one hand reference is being made today to a "more humane" nuclear weapon of a new kind. I refer to the neutron bomb, which would kill men and leave buildings and other material objects intact. One needs to be somewhat cynical to announce, without a tremor, the decision to produce by the thousands this fearful and lethal device. That weapon, regardless of its purpose and objective, must be banned like all others that have preceded it, because it is certainly no gift to mankind.

On the other hand, doubtless as a diversionary manoeuvre, we are being invited to declare as the greatest "criminal against humanity any man or State which would be the first to use or accept the possibility of using the nuclear weapon". First or last, he who laughs last may very well laugh best - as the saying goes. Judging people's intentions hardly gives us hope to continue to survive and emerge from the nightmare resulting from the overproduction of nuclear weapons. My delegation would be pleased at the next session were we to attack the roots of the evil, namely, the production, testing, stockpiling and placement of nuclear weapons in outer space and other zones of peace.

Today we are under the law of nuclear colonization and, unfortunately, we are unable to liberate ourselves from this law without the will of the dominant Powers.

The language regularly exchanged in this hall, following the words of wisdom and anguish from representatives of peoples and States, hardly encourage us and show that nations seem to be unable to avert the possibility of a cataclysm.

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

In this absurd game we seem to be reduced to impotence and to the feeling that we should just wait and see.

One wonders how we have reached this sorry state of affairs. If we were to delve into history we would reach the conclusion that human wisdom could have spared us the situation in which we find ourselves today. May I briefly go back to the time of the birth of the first atomic bomb and remind representatives of one fact. The atomic scientist Niels Bohr, one of the fathers of the atomic bomb, asked President Roosevelt in 1944 to stop production of the atomic bomb, for, as he said,

"... it incurred the risk of a 'later nuclear weapons race, which would surely lead to another war, which could mean the end of the world'... The experiment must be stopped and the manufacture of atomic weapons banned." (Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, The World Challenge, pp. 157 and 158)

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

We are all familiar with the horrors that followed the dropping of the atomic bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Instead of drawing the necessary moral conclusions, the major Powers saw development as a step towards the fulfilment of their desire for power and for military and political superiority. One representative has recently reminded us of the background to the arms race: neither of the major Powers wished to be inferior or even equal to the other, and so we have gone from escalation to escalation and have now reached the point of no return. It is no longer a question of ensuring one's own security or of settling possible conflicts through war; it is simply a desire for superiority, encouraged by the distrust by each Power of the other.

What will the future be like?

We know that dialogue and negotiation on safety measures have not been lacking, but there is no progress. We welcomed the signing of the SALT I accords, and we were enthusiastic about the conclusion of SALT II, but we are dismayed that the latter has not been signed. We have heard fine statements from the major Powers at their regular summit meetings, but these seem to be occasions for mutual deception that end in a war of words and only reveal distrust and a desire for revenge. Each side would be happy if only negotiations would lead to results at the expense of the other side. Thus our world is in danger of being the victim of a lack of awareness of the real interests and of a genuine desire for rapprochement. Conflicting interests make it impossible to pursue genuine negotiations because passions also confuse language. The spirit of negotiations must change; the good faith and readiness of the other side must be recognized, because all the evil is not on one side and all the virtue on the other.

We have spoken of the dangers and threats arising from the nuclear arms race because of the climate of terror it creates. But the race in conventional armaments - particularly chemical and biological weapons - is no less dangerous given the inhuman suffering that those weapons can cause. We say again that their use must be banned.

The secondary effect of the continuing production of these weapons on the developing countries is that it heightens their appetite for sophisticated weapons, the price of which is very high indeed when viewed in terms of their development needs. It is obvious that those countries need to ensure their

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

security, but the result may be self-destruction if they must pay higher and higher prices for those sophisticated weapons and hire the best technicians.

The arms producers and merchants have found a fertile field in exporting to the third world countries weapons far in excess of their needs. The result is the consumption of their meagre resources, which are already insufficient to cover the enormous needs resulting from hunger and health and education problems.

Why not put those potential resources at the service of life? The contrast between what is spent on armaments and the poverty in the world shows that there is inconsistency and indeed indifference to the problems of the poor countries. The technological lead of the major Powers and the other developed countries, which should have served to improve man's life, is but increasing fear of the future in view of the growing menace of a nuclear catastrophe. The study of the relationship between disarmament and development contained in document A/36/356, which was so brilliantly introduced by Mrs. Thorsson, Under-Secretary of State of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden and Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts, deserves more than cursory consideration. It is a clear appeal to our consciences in view of the scandal of the insane expenditures on death while the life of millions is endangered by the lack of vital necessities.

"My country has constantly expressed its grave concern about the growing danger inherent in the spiralling arms race and its damaging effects on the economic and social development of all countries, and particularly the poorest." (A/36/PV.21, p. 16)

The Minister of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation of the Republic of Rwanda said that at this session of the General Assembly, adding:

"It is scandalous that when two thirds of mankind live in abject poverty fabulous sums are spent each day on the manufacture of arms and on building up arsenals of weapons for the destruction of human life. The Rwandese Government repeats its appeal that those sums should rather be devoted to increasing assistance to the least developed countries to improve the standard of living of their peoples." (ibid.)

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

We hope that that appeal will be heeded. It is the appeal of millions of persons. And we hope that the disarmament for development fund proposed by France will soon become a reality.

Before concluding I should like to reiterate my Government's strong condemnation of the racist régime of South Africa. Although it has been banished from the international community because of its odious system of apartheid, it has involved itself in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, thereby violating the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, in order to intimidate the independent States of Africa and continue to oppress the black populations of South Africa and illegally to occupy Namibia. South Africa's friends - and unfortunately it does still have friends - have a moral duty to dissuade South Africa from its course of action and to refuse it all collaboration and assistance.

Finally, the continuing violation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is a source of major concern for my Government. The presence of a foreign military force in that area, which has promoted manoeuvres that have this year prevented the convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean, must be ended. If it is not, the coastal and hinterland non-aligned countries will continue to be threatened, as has already happened elsewhere.

What can we do to avert this threat which hangs over our world? We know that millions of voices cry out to the major Powers. Recently thousands of men, women and children have gone into the streets of the major cities of some countries to make their voices heard.

We continue here to launch appeals, appeals to the wisdom and will to survive of mankind. For, just as wars begin in the minds of men, so those same minds are capable of preventing war.

It is our cherished hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will provide the opportunity for deep collective thought regarding what concrete measures must be taken to ensure that the 1980s will be years of real progress along the path to disarmament and that they will be years of rebirth for our disordered world.

I shall revert to other matters on our agenda on a subsequent occasion.

Mr. MEDINA (Portugal) (interpretation from French): As this is my first statement in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, I should like, first and foremost, to take this opportunity to present you with my compliments and to ask you to convey to Ambassador Golob of Yugoslavia my warm congratulations on his election. The experience he has acquired in the exercise of his numerous political and diplomatic functions, and his widely-recognized personal qualities which I myself had occasion to admire in Madrid during the work of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe are an earnest of success in obtaining the results we all hope for.

I wish also to convey my congratulations to all the other officers of the Committee and, on behalf of my delegation, to assure them of our fullest co-operation.

During the general debate in this Committee last year, my delegation had occasion to reiterate our view that the conditions in which that meeting was taking place were even less favourable than the previous ones for achieving progress in the fields of disarmament and international security. Today the same assertion could be made, because international relations continue to be characterized by such a degree of tension that efforts to achieve the purposes of disarmament as contained in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly continue to be virtually thwarted. The arms race, at the world level, has shown no sign of slackening. Tremendous amounts of economic and financial resources continue to be diverted towards arms production, while millions of people are suffering all kinds of privation.

The stockpiling of conventional and nuclear weapons by certain States has reached such a level that other States which in recent years were following a policy of cutting back on military expenditures have been forced to envisage the need to increase them. Realizing their growing vulnerability to a possible outside attack, they had to make last-minute efforts themselves to restore the balance which had in the meantime been jeopardized.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

Regional and international sources of tension, some of which have taken on the form of armed conflicts, continue to endanger relations among States, and we cannot fail to regret and at the same time deplore the fact that the armed forces of a permanent member of the Security Council continue to occupy a non-aligned country and full-fledged member of the international community. This state of affairs cannot contribute to establishing a climate of trust conducive to effective efforts in the disarmament field.

On the contrary, because it gives rise to mistrust, it introduces an element of uncertainty in the security prospects of States and consequently induces them to increase the levels of their own military expenditures and to stockpile armaments. It follows, therefore, that it is precisely in a tense situation in international affairs, such as the one we are now witnessing, that courageous and bold efforts undertaken in all good faith will be necessary in order to restrict the insane accumulation of the means of destroying mankind.

Hence my delegation cannot refrain from appealing to all States - particularly those which possess the largest military forces - to give, in all good faith, new impetus to the negotiations on effective and verifiable disarmament measures acceptable to all parties concerned.

In point of fact, the results obtained to date in the field of disarmament and arms control are very far from what could be considered satisfactory. Some States tend to favour statements more acceptable to international public opinion, rather than objective and serious negotiations, which, although certainly more difficult than the former, have more beneficial effects upon international peace and security. My delegation is therefore unable to support any vague proposals of questionable worth in the process of negotiating on measures to ensure effective and internationally verifiable control over armaments, as in the case of proposals of a purely declaratory and unrealistic nature, such as those relating, inter alia, to non-first use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

My delegation believes that only serious negotiations undertaken in good faith can lead to the adoption of effective and verifiable measures for reducing and controlling armaments. We also feel that only such measures are likely to have any beneficial and lasting effect on international peace and security. In this context, my delegation will give its full support to any proposals likely to lead to the adoption of such measures. We hereby declare our willingness to contribute all we can to ensuring that they lead to fruitful results.

Pursuing the process of détente is a matter of prime importance for the maintenance of international peace and security, particularly in Europe. My delegation hopes that the States at present involved in the efforts in Madrid to try and advance the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will be able to give further evidence of the necessary political will to ensure that those negotiations are crowned with success, as required by the interests of international peace and security.

Nevertheless, despite the importance which Portugal attaches to détente, my country cannot agree that détente is an end in itself. We regard it, rather, as a tool to be used for maintaining and consolidating international peace and security by creating conditions that would make it possible for States to display their readiness to persevere in finding peaceful solutions to their conflicts of interest in their relations with other Members of the international community.

In our view, therefore, it is in the over-all context of their behaviour in international relations that States will be able to demonstrate their real commitment to détente. My country would find it difficult to agree that a State could behave in one way in Europe and behave quite differently in other parts of the world on the pretext that the geographical universe of the implementation of the Final Act of Helsinki is confined to the European continent; because such a duality of behaviour is contrary to the very concept of détente and would result in introducing an element of uncertainty in international relations. It would thus lead to heightened tension,

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

to a deterioration in those relations and, finally, to the creation of all the components of a state of affairs definitely not conducive to the pursuit of the goals of disarmament.

One of the aspects of disarmament that have claimed the greatest attention of the international community is that of nuclear disarmament. Portugal sympathizes with and shares that concern. Nevertheless we believe that any disarmament measure, if it is to be realistic, must take account of the structural differences in the armed forces of the major military Powers. But the differences in levels of technological development of States have led some to favour the nuclear element in their defence policies, whereas others have opted for the conventional element. Nevertheless it is essentially from the combination of these two factors that the potential of the militarily most important States derives. My delegation, therefore, considers that the proposals which attempt to concentrate on the nuclear element in disarmament efforts lack realism. In fact, such a selective approach, which leads to the creation of imbalance, to the extent that, on balance, it will weigh more heavily on some States than on others, may reach the point where it will threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

Such a selective approach, furthermore, is not in consonance with certain principles enunciated in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, and more specifically the principles which are affirmed in paragraphs 29 and 30.

In view of what I have just said, my delegation regrets that the Disarmament Commission was unsuccessful in reaching agreement on the general methodology to be used for the study in question and on its structure and its scope.

We believe that carrying out such a study will help to fill an important gap in the over-all process by contributing to the clarification of the possibility and the scope of disarmament measures in the field of conventional arms and armed forces.

My delegation therefore hopes that this Committee will find the means of continuing this study, the implementation of which was approved in General Assembly resolution 35/156 A. This study will provide a sort of corollary to the study of all aspects of nuclear weapons already drawn up pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/91 D.

Portuguese opinion understands and shares, as my delegation has already had occasion to note, the concerns of those who are particularly worried about the dangers of nuclear conflict, dangers which stem from two types of factors: the quantitative and qualitative growth of nuclear weapons and the ever-growing possibility of the horizontal proliferation of such weapons.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

That being so, efforts which have been undertaken to reduce the possibility of the outbreak of nuclear warfare should go in two different but mutually reinforcing directions. They should also be targeted on two general objectives which are also different but complementary. On the one hand, these efforts should seek to prevent the increase in existing arsenals, and in this field particular responsibility is borne by the nuclear Powers and particularly the two super-Powers. My delegation would therefore like to take this opportunity to express its satisfaction that the United States and the Soviet Union have finally agreed to begin talks on the limitation and reduction of theatre nuclear weapons. My delegation sincerely hopes that this initiative will be crowned with success. On the other hand, the efforts to which I have referred should also be designed to prevent the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, and here decisive responsibility falls not only on the nuclear Powers but, indeed, on all the members of the international community, whether or not they possess nuclear technology. In the context of such efforts, Portugal continues to believe that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which we are a party, remains an essential instrument. My delegation would therefore appeal to all States which have not yet fully acceded to this Treaty to do so as soon as possible.

The creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is another method which would help to prevent the proliferation of this type of armament and which could complement the machinery contained in the Treaty. Nevertheless, the creation of such zones, which is necessarily a regional step, has some impact on the security of States - not only those which belong to the zone in question but also those neighbouring on it. It should therefore be governed by certain principles; otherwise, the creation of such zones may have effects precisely contrary to those we hope for.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

The agreement of all countries of the zone, the fact that there would be no diminution of the security level either of those countries themselves or of other members of the international community, the co-operation of the major Powers; all these are principles which my delegation considers to be of primordial importance if we want the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones to contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.

Among the constituent elements in agreements to limit or reduce arms, my delegation attaches fundamental importance to the question of verification. Every disarmament measure is supposed in itself and in principle to contain the verification machinery which would make possible the timely investigation of deeds which may be suspected to have violated the agreements in force. This means that this verification machinery must come promptly into play with the necessary reliability and impartiality not only to prevent the delinquent party from improving its position through acts which are in violation of the obligations undertaken, but also to guarantee international confidence in the agreements of which they form an integral part.

The difficulties which were raised in this Committee during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in connexion with the draft resolution that became resolution 35/144 C, which was designed to verify information from different sources in connexion with the utilization of toxic weapons banned by the 1925 Geneva Protocol, give a striking illustration of the drawbacks and dangers inherent in omitting verification machinery that is sufficient to meet the aims and the scope of the respective agreements.

My delegation therefore believes that any initiative designed to remedy the lack of verification machinery in arms limitation agreements or in disarmament agreements deserves the interest of the international community so as to make it possible to find acceptable scenarios in order that all concerned parties can adhere to those agreements.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

In particular, my delegation attaches major importance to the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 35/144. We should therefore like to appeal to all States which possess the means to do so to co-operate with the investigation body and particularly to allow it to visit the areas where the use of toxic weapons in question is supposed to have taken place. The difficulties which have beset that body seem to militate in favour of beginning consultations as soon as possible between the States concerned with a view to creating effective verification machinery for the obligations entered into under the Protocol.

This Committee is meeting in the midst of preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which will be one of the most significant events of the Second Disarmament Decade.

My delegation hopes that the Members of this Organization will take advantage of this second special session to reflect together in a realistic, objective and constructive manner on the evolution of the disarmament process over the last few years so that the lessons of the past may serve as a guide to future actions by ensuring the continuity of a process which was renewed by the holding of the first special session devoted to disarmament, in 1978. One of the achievements of that first session, it should be recalled, was the redesigning of the disarmament machinery, particularly by the creation of a new deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission, and the enlargement and restructuring of the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament. With regard to the latter body, it was agreed that its membership could be periodically reviewed with a view to permitting other States concerned to be able to participate in disarmament negotiations.

(Mr. Medina, Portugal)

When the second special session takes place, four years will have elapsed since that revision was agreed upon. My delegation considers the second special session as the most appropriate time, if for only symbolic reasons, for the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament to be finalized in order thus to implement the recommendation of the first special session on disarmament.

My delegation believes that the doctrine underlying paragraph 28 of the Final Document of the tenth special session can be effectively implemented only if the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament takes place. My delegation would therefore favour the Committee on Disarmament's taking the necessary steps to implement the recommendations of the tenth special session and of General Assembly resolution 35/156. For it is an essential part of democracy that all States that so desire should be able to participate in those bodies which deal with the problems of disarmament.

Mr. JALALI (Iran): As this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee, I should like to extend the congratulations of my delegation to Mr. Golob on his election as Chairman. I am certain that under his leadership this Committee will accomplish most efficiently the task assigned to it.

Once again the participants in the general debate in this Committee have expressed their grave concern about the continuous expansion of the arms race and their disappointment at the ineffectiveness of the United Nations mechanism in helping to prepare the necessary atmosphere for the promotion of arms control and disarmament. My delegation associates itself with other delegations in those expressions of concern and disappointment.

Arms control and disarmament have been basic and urgent issues that international institutions have dealt with for years, publishing hundreds of thousands of pages of documents and passing hundreds of resolutions calling for restraint. Disarmament is an issue that affects the life of every member of the human race. It is very ironic that this crucial issue is discussed in closed chambers like this one, resulting in more documents and more resolutions, which are then kept in various libraries or archives of foreign ministries around the world, without the peoples of the world, who are most affected by the outcome of arms races, being a part of the process anywhere.

(Mr. Jalali, Iran)

Those peoples become aware of the consequences of arms races only when they are asked to endure the hardships of war after it has already erupted, and it is then too late for efforts to limit armaments.

In fact, peoples see themselves in a situation which they had no part in bringing about but which they would have prevented if they had been conscious of the issues in advance. It is one of the ironies of history that those who make the decisions that bring about the miseries of war never experience the hardships themselves.

My delegation attaches great significance to the recommendations of the tenth special session of the General Assembly concerning efforts to popularize the question of disarmament and hopes that the United Nations can provide the means for the rapid application of such recommendations. One possible step in that direction may be the publication by the United Nations of a series of books and documents emphasizing the negative effects of arms races on the everyday life of every human being. Those publications must be prepared by experts who understand the logic and language of the average man, and can think and express themselves in that context. The established decision-making monopoly of the homogeneous international elite class of diplomats and scholars with regard to the question of disarmament must be broken so that the issue can truly become a matter of international concern at the level of the masses. When that transformation is achieved, no power-crazy dictator will be able to impose war upon nations, destroying their human and material resources. A vivid example of such a situation exists today on our borders. A power-crazy dictator who thought that the post-revolutionary conditions within Iran were ripe for military adventurism and expansionism in the region imposed a fruitless war upon the Iranian people and placed his own army as well as his own people in an aimless war of attrition.

Our emphasis on the crucial nature of popular awareness is based on our belief that popular consciousness on a universal basis can once and for all terminate the carelessness of the international community of States towards the rights of peoples to live in peace. That becomes possible when international institutions like the United Nations, gaining inspiration from the true aspirations of peoples, refrain from compromising on the principles which constitute their *raison d'être*.

(Mr. Jalali, Iran)

The Islamic Republic of Iran has made it its policy to abide by such principles, even under the most difficult circumstances. Our position with regard to the Israeli act of aggression against the national wealth and installations of the Moslem nation of Iraq, at a time when we were victims of a blatant act of aggression by the régime of Iraq, provides a vivid example of our policy. That position was clearly expressed when the Group of 21 presented its draft statement on the issue in the Committee on Disarmament, as reflected in document A/36/27, page 106.

As we emphasized in the Committee on Disarmament, it is our belief that the international community should condemn the use of force and acts of aggression wherever and in whatever form they may occur and that such condemnation would discourage irresponsible and adventurous régimes from trying to achieve their illegitimate objectives by resorting to inhuman and unjust wars. And what better guarantee is there against arms races than minimizing the chances of military adventurism? The continuation of the war imposed upon us is a direct result of the fact that the Iranian people has been the victim of an international conspiracy of silence -

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt the representative of Iran, but the representative of Iraq has asked to speak on a point of order and I now call on him.

Mr. AWANIS (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I appologize to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Committee for interrupting the deliberations by raising a point of order. I have had to do so because our neighbour, the representative of Iran, has flagrantly digressed from the agenda items that we are supposed to consider here, namely, those relating to disarmament. It is very clear that the representative of Iran is confused. He thinks he is speaking in a mosque in Iran. He is resorting to threats against others, as is done in Iran.

(Mr. Awanis, Iraq)

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to you kindly to clear up this confusion and to ask the representative of Iran not to refer to my country, Iraq, or to speak of the so-called aggression against his country. This question has been dealt with by the Security Council as well as by the Islamic and non-aligned Conferences. These Conferences did not achieve any result because the Khomeini régime continued its aggression against Iraq and the Gulf States - and here I wish to refer to the recent attack against Kuwait.

Mr. Chairman, for the second time I appeal to you to ask the representative of Iran to direct his remarks to the topics on our agenda.

We reserve the right to speak in exercise of the right of reply at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the representative of Iran to proceed.

Mr. JALALI (Iran): I shall ask to speak in exercise of the right of reply in order to reply to the representative of Iraq in due time.

The continuation of the war imposed upon us is a direct result of the fact that the Iranian people has been the victim of an international conspiracy of silence and has therefore been compelled to fight its own war of liberation in the exercise of its legitimate right of self-defence against an outrageous act of aggression and occupation. This is not of course the first time that the international community of States has compromised its principles, and as a result this will not be the last time that adventurists are tempted to endanger the peace of the world. We hope that this trend can finally be reserved.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): As this is the first substantive statement of my delegation, I should like to offer you, Mr. Chairman, my personal congratulations on your election to your high office. I have no doubt that your long experience in United Nations affairs will stand you in good stead in conducting the business of this Committee. I should like to join other delegations in offering our best wishes to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

It has been the practice of the Israel delegation to the First Committee for a number of years to address itself to one particular item on the agenda or one aspect of disarmament or arms control. At this session we should like to discuss the study of the institutional arrangements relating to the process of disarmament, submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/36/392.

The Group of Governmental Experts responsible for the report and the Centre for Disarmament are to be congratulated on producing a lucid and comprehensive study which combines brevity with erudition.

Resolution 34/87 E asked for a comprehensive study assessing the current institutional requirements and future needs in the United Nations management of disarmament affairs.

This was what might be described colloquially as a tall order. As a United Nations publication correctly concluded: "From the beginning it was not the lack of machinery that stood in the way of disarmament agreements." One might also add that it was not the lack of juridical expertise which impeded the formulation of treaties. Even when a genuine desire existed on the part of the participatory Powers to reach an agreement there were often objective difficulties arising from the complexities of modern military technology, especially in the field of verification. Such problems cannot be solved by institutional arrangements.

In the light of the demonstrable failures of the world community to curb armaments, in spite of the awesome lessons of two world wars, one might justifiably ask whether or not the institutional aspect of disarmament is at all worth discussing.

There is perhaps only one answer to this question. All debates on disarmament which disregard the stark reality of a world-wide proliferation of conventional weapons on a scale previously unknown in the history of mankind, in spite of some 300 United Nations disarmament resolutions, are bound to be futile and perhaps even harmful to the cause of arms control. All discussions on this subject in the United Nations are perhaps no more than humanity's conscience money, paid in words voicing as yet unattainable ideals. If we wish to lend our discussion a minimal degree of verisimilitude we should

(Mr. Filan, Israel)

say frankly to ourselves and to the world that all we can do at this stage is to prepare a machinery of arms control for a time and a place when this becomes politically feasible.

It is little wonder that, in the absence of progress in the field of arms control, the United Nations has been engaged in an institutional parlour game in which United Nations bodies have from time to time changed their names or enlarged their membership. Sometimes new bodies have been added to join in participation in the make-believe ritual of adopting numerous resolutions intended to free the world from the horrors of war.

Thus the so-called negotiating forum has grown from its nucleus of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee of 1960 to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee and the twenty-six-nation Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the new Committee on Disarmament with a membership of 40 Member States. We all welcome the revival of the Disarmament Commission as a result of the tenth special session, but we doubt that the addition of a deliberative body at this particular stage will do much to advance the cause of arms control.

Indeed, in the light of the United Nations record in the field of machinery for disarmament, it can be argued that almost every possible structural and functional option has been explored and exhausted. Numerous bodies with a variety of functions and different procedures have been established, enlarged, merged, reformed, dismantled or revived. Composed of from two Members to the full United Nations membership, these bodies have held thousands of meetings and their proceedings are recorded in an immense body of United Nations documentation. It remains an open question whether or not organizational proliferation has influenced the substance of disarmament negotiations. It seems that sometimes bureaucratic reforms were initiated simply as cosmetic manoeuvres to compensate for the lack of real progress.

At this particular juncture the main task of the United Nations in matters related to arms control may be said to be threefold.

First, it must bring to a speedy conclusion the various international agreements at present on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament.

Secondly, it must further studies on the various aspects of the arms race. The Centre for Disarmament in the Secretariat has been very successful of late in facilitating the publication of objective reports and in furthering studies based on consensus decisions arrived at in the General Assembly. It is only through consensus that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament can provide the necessary framework and modalities for further deliberations and negotiations on multilateral agreements in the field of arms control and disarmament. Controversial studies are liable to affect its standing as an impartial organ of the United Nations and politicize the Centre.

Thirdly, it must make available to the United Nations as a whole, or to groups of member States, the necessary machinery for the conduct of negotiations on the limitation of arms, reduction of military budgets and introduction of military confidence-building measures.

This is the main task of this Organization and the purely institutional problems, such as the question of whether or not the Disarmament Centre should remain where it is or become an independent unit, are in reality of secondary importance.

In other words, the duty of this Committee is to recommend to the plenary Assembly the adoption of resolutions which would make available to member States the required institutional framework to apply the spirit of Article 33 of the Charter, in the pacific settlement of disputes, to the specific needs of negotiations on arms control.

The link between international tension and armament is somehow overlooked in the United Nations and the arms race is too often treated as if it were a natural disaster or plague which from time to time afflicts humanity. A more realistic attitude is obviously needed and perhaps has been found in the framework of a regional approach to arms control.

The institutional framework which could help parties to a dispute agree on a certain measure of arms control as a confidence-building measure must therefore be regional in character as most disputes or conflicts are regional and do not respond to global remedies.

From an institutional point of view this would necessitate the creation of United Nations bodies consisting only of members of various regions, which could, by common agreement, enter into negotiations to reduce the scale and speed of a regional arms race.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Arms control, however limited in scope, is in itself a measure intended to build confidence among parties to a dispute. I have had occasion in the past to refer to a technique called GRIT - graduated and reciprocal initiatives in tension reduction - prepared especially for the special session on disarmament by the Peace Research Institute. The GRIT technique involves a unilateral action by a nation which it believes will be perceived by the other side or sides to a conflict as a friendly act or a declaration by a nation that at a specific time it will take such action - an implicit invitation to other nations to make a similar move. Israel's step in reducing its military budget was exactly what the so-called GRIT technique prescribes. It is now up to the Arab States similarly to reduce their military budgets.

Israel's most important contributions to the reduction of tension in the Middle East in recent years was twofold: first, its scrupulous observance of the peace treaty with Egypt, in consequence of which Israel withdrew from large parts of the Sinai peninsula - the withdrawal involved the sacrifice of an oil resource which provided Israel with 60 per cent of its total needs; secondly, Israel's proposal last year in this Committee for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In spite of the flat refusal on the part of some Arab States in this Committee to accept Israel's offer to negotiate a treaty which would free the Middle East from the threat of nuclear disaster, Israel persists in its search for peace and declares here and now, as it has declared all along, that its offer still stands.

However, the application of such devices as GRIT on a regional level could be facilitated by the existence of appropriate regional institutional arrangements. The United Nations is largely to be blamed for being unable to provide parties to a dispute with the necessary machinery for negotiations on arms control. Had this Committee devoted its time to establishing the tools for peace and arms control rather than engaging in abstract discussion, it could at least have reduced the number of conflicts that have erupted in the past.

The Permanent Representative of Israel, in his communication to the Secretary-General of 16 April 1979, in expressing Israel's views on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, made the following proposals:

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

"With a view to promoting progress wherever possible on local and regional levels, it is suggested that the United Nations establish regional disarmament commissions, composed of all Member States in the region, the task of which would be to review ideas proposals for intergovernmental regional agreements in arms reduction and control. These commissions should address themselves, inter alia, to finding appropriate solutions to two specific problems related to a 'comprehensive programme for disarmament':

"(a) To create by common agreement of all Member States of the region the necessary modalities for the limitation of military budgets in conformity with resolution 33/67.

"(b) To implement within a regional basis the terms of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its tenth special session in paragraph 93 of the Final Document with reference to confidence-building measures." (A/CN.10/1, p.28)

If this Committee were to agree to the establishment of regional disarmament commissions, as suggested by the Permanent Representative of Israel, we would at least give Member States a viable alternative to hostilities and provide the institutional facilities for negotiations on arms control. We would then give practical substance to Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): May I at the outset, Sir, warmly congratulate you upon your election to the high office of Chairman of this very important Committee. The skill and experience so visibly gathered in your person will undoubtedly guide us towards a successful conclusion of our tasks. On behalf of the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and on my own behalf, I should like to assure you of our full co-operation in discharging your responsibilities.

May I also sincerely congratulate the other officers of the Committee on their election.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Another year has elapsed in the annual meetings of this Committee while the international situation has continued to deteriorate and while new additional efforts and measures are needed to prevent a further worsening of the world climate, to stop the drift towards the danger of war and to reverse the present perilous course of events. The origin and cause of the present aggravation of the international situation are to be found in the reckless war-mongering adventurist policies of United States imperialism and Peking's hegemonism. As a result of those policies, developments in the international arena have registered a sharp turn towards material and psychological preparation for war that has confronted the world with a bleak prospect of being rapidly pushed to the brink of a nuclear holocaust.

Looking back at the events of the past few months, we are quite convinced that the United States imperialists and Chinese hegemonists have staked their all on the use of force and rely on whipping up the arms race.

The White House and the Pentagon are brandishing nuclear weapons and working out plans to deploy them in various parts of the globe. They are arbitrarily declaring regions, one after the other, as spheres of their vital interest and dispatching to those areas so-called Rapid Deployment Forces and establishing at an ever increasing pace new military bases all over the world.

This is all being done in an attempt to undermine the process of détente and to ensure for themselves military superiority, to establish conditions for interfering in the internal affairs of other States and to force the peoples of the world into submission.

As an Asian country, Afghanistan has been particularly concerned over the dangerous manifestations of imperialist, hegemonist and Zionist policies in Asia. Those policies are definitely aimed at the revival of the post-war trends in Asia, crushing the will of the Asian nations for independence, dragging them into fratricidal conflicts and wars, plundering their natural resources, turning them into mere pawns in their imperialist and hegemonist games and making some of them the springboards of aggression against other peace-loving countries in Asia.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The stepped-up militaristic activities of the United States in the Indian Ocean and the Gulf are of particular danger to the peoples of Asia. The Pentagon is hurriedly building facilities there for the Rapid Deployment Forces and for permanently stationing in that area at least two aircraft carrier groups. This year alone, \$700 million have been allocated for the expansion and modernization of the United States naval and air force bases on Diego Garcia. There is evidence that the Pentagon is going to use those bases for stockpiling nuclear weapons, including the neutron weapon.

Thanks to the combined efforts of peace-loving countries, it has become possible to attain considerable success in the field of disarmament. Yet the paramount international problem still remains that of curbing the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race which has already seen the accumulation of an enormous amount of destructive potential. Therefore, there is no role more important than that of forestalling the nuclear confrontation that may wipe out hundreds of millions of human beings and even threaten the very existence of the human race. In this connexion, we fully support the new initiative of the Soviet Union that a declaration should be adopted solemnly proclaiming the first use of nuclear weapons as the gravest crime against humanity.

The people and Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan are totally aligned with the consistent struggle of those who want to save mankind from the greatest tragedy - another devastating war. Our support of the noble goals of that struggle follows from the fundamental principles of the foreign policy of my country as one of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement. As was stated by Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council:

"Afghanistan is a non-aligned country, enjoying a tradition of peace and friendship. In the international arena, our country strongly defends the process of détente and endeavours to prevent a new world war, to stop the arms race and to solve disputes through peaceful negotiations".

In the course of the general debate, some delegations have rightly attached great significance to the implementation of measures of real disarmament, aware of the fact that this would not only strengthen universal peace and security,

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

but would also allow much-needed resources to be diverted to the social and economic development of the developing countries, in particular of the least-developed countries.

In this regard, we regret that until now no progress has been achieved in reaching agreement on the reduction of the military budgets of States. It is totally inadmissible that more than \$500 billion should be squandered annually for military purposes while the most acute problems of the developing countries remain unresolved.

We support the Soviet proposal that as a first step the production of nuclear weapons should be stopped. According to that proposal, which was submitted to the Committee on Disarmament in 1979, the stockpiles of such weapons would be reduced until their complete destruction. Discussions on this vital problem are being blocked owing to the stubbornness of China and certain Western countries. We believe that the Committee on Disarmament should be called upon to expedite a practical discussion of this issue. Today more than ever before, urgent talks are needed to end the production of nuclear weapons, to reduce and totally destroy their stockpiles. No problem in our view is more pressing for mankind than that of doing away with the nuclear weapons which entail a serious and lethal threat to its very survival. This threat becomes all the more ominous in view of the adoption by the United States of doctrines justifying the acceptability and admissibility of the use of nuclear weapons within the concept of a "limited nuclear war". As I said last year in my statement before this Committee:

"Nobody will succeed in convincing peoples to get accustomed to those criminal inhuman concepts in order to weaken the struggle to prevent nuclear catastrophe". (A/C.1/35/PV.26, p. 7)

We learn daily that people everywhere by the millions are joining the ranks of this vigorous struggle.

Negotiations on some other aspects of checking the nuclear-arms race should also be speeded up. A more positive stand on the part of the United States Government on a vitally important issue such as the qualitative and quantitative limitation of strategic nuclear arms should be urged.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan attaches great significance to the need for entry into force of the SALT II treaty. The Soviet-United States talks on limiting medium-range nuclear missile systems in Europe and the United States forward-based nuclear system in that region should no doubt contribute to reducing the tension and danger of a nuclear war.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

We favour the earliest possible resumption of talks between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain on banning nuclear tests. There are no convincing reasons to postpone the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

While progress in that direction needs to be accelerated, agreement on a one-year moratorium on all nuclear explosions, embracing all nuclear Powers, and the creation of a special working group within the Committee on Disarmament would prove helpful.

Afghanistan, as a non-nuclear State, has been closely following the talks on strengthening security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of those weapons. We believe that the conclusion of a corresponding convention would serve as the most effective means of protecting the interests of non-nuclear States. Before an international consensus has been reached on such a convention it would be useful to consider provisional measures using the powers and responsibilities of the Security Council. Such measures and guarantees should be identical and binding in nature. In our opinion, the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear States and the working out of an agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of those States where there are no such weapons at present would make a positive contribution to ensuring the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Efforts towards universal accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and consolidation in every way of the régime of non-proliferation can help to block definitively the channels for spreading nuclear weapons and to check the nuclear-weapon ambitions of certain reactionary and aggressive régimes, including those of the Israeli Zionists and the Pretoria racists. May I warn the Committee that the threat and danger to regional and international peace and security will clearly become all the more real if the nuclear weapon ambitions of those two and other reactionary régimes are realized.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is opposed to any kind of expansion of the spheres of the arms race. We therefore welcome the initiatives aimed at preventing the use of outer space for military purposes and promoting international peaceful co-operation in space.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The conclusion of a treaty on the peaceful uses of outer space and the non-stationing of any kind of weapons there would be a great step in that direction. This treaty would be a reliable barrier to an arms race in outer space, which might have unpredictable consequences.

It is also necessary to expedite negotiations on a comprehensive agreement banning new kinds and new systems of weapons of mass destruction, as well as on agreements and conventions outlawing certain weapons, including neutron, radiological and chemical weapons.

The need for such agreements and conventions becomes all the more urgent in the light of the United States decision to begin large-scale production of the neutron weapon, the most sophisticated, barbaric and abhorrent means of annihilation of the human race. The Afghan people, together with other peace-loving peoples of the world, resolutely condemns this decision and demands that President Reagan reverse it. It is our view that this session of the General Assembly should urgently approve a resolution calling for a ban on the production and deployment of the neutron weapon.

We warmly welcome the successful conclusion of the United Nations Conference on the Prohibition and Restriction of the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. Afghanistan became the first signatory of the relevant Convention and its attached Protocols.

One of the most inhuman types of weapon of mass destruction is the chemical weapon, whose use was prohibited by the 1925 Geneva Protocol. After dumping millions of barrels of such weapons on the territories of Viet Nam and other countries of South-East Asia, the United States Government has allocated extra funds for the development and production of those weapons.

The total destruction of the stockpiles of chemical weapons is in the interest of all peoples. What is regrettable is the slow progress of the talks on this subject. My delegation strongly hopes that the participants in those negotiations will exert their utmost efforts to conclude a speedy agreement.

The facts about the provision of chemical ammunition of United States manufacture to the bands of mercenaries in Afghanistan will be brought to the attention of the Committee when we discuss the relevant item.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The international community has also learned with indignation of the reports about the use of bacteriological (biological) warfare by the United States in Cuba. If confirmed, this would mark the beginning of a new era in the war policy of the United States against small progressive countries.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan also attaches exceptionally great importance to the regional measures for the slowing down of the arms race and for regional disarmament. In this context, it has been closely following the plans of the United States to militarize certain countries in our region. Implementation of these plans will naturally result in further intensification of the regional arms race and aggravation of tension there.

We attach great hopes to the realization of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, so that all foreign military bases there would be dismantled and no one could threaten the security, independence and sovereignty of the coastal States. For a number of years now the United States, in the context of its policy of domination and diktat, has been building up its military presence in the Indian Ocean, the Arabian and Red Seas and the Gulf. Work has been stepped up to expand the United States military base at Diego Garcia, and new staging areas have been established for United States intervention in the internal affairs of African and Asian States. It is not surprising that the United States and its allies torpedoed the work of the last session of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. Apparently they are against the convening of a conference to work out an international agreement on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. It is the firm view of the Afghan delegation that this session of the General Assembly should take a decision to expedite the convening of such a conference no later than 1982. The intrigues of imperialists and hegemonists should not and cannot be allowed to block the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean.

A realistic programme of measures for limiting the arms race in all its aspects and for disarmament should be the essence of the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade. We feel that all problems related to curbing the arms race and to disarmament can be fruitfully and constructively discussed

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

and resolved at the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, scheduled for 1982. Exhaustive efforts should be made in all forums to reach agreement on those measures and on their implementation. In this connexion, the potential of the world disarmament conference advocated by Afghanistan should be tapped.

We call upon all States to multiply their efforts in order to make substantial progress in the field of disarmament and arms race limitation.

Now, that it is generally recognized that the international situation has dangerously deteriorated it is more urgent than ever to work out and conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. That would strengthen the security foundations of each and all nations and would contribute to a stronger peace and decreased international tension. The United Nations Special Committee is expected to speed up its work on a relevant draft.

Allow me to conclude by quoting part of a message from Babrak Karmal, President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which was delivered a week ago on the occasion of the thirty-sixth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations:

"The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will co-operate sincerely and fully with the efforts which the United Nations and the peace-loving countries of the world are making for the lessening of international tension, strengthening of peace and security in the world, complete, general and effective disarmament, and consolidation of the process of détente."

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from French): My delegation joins in the well-deserved tribute paid to you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of this Committee. It is an expression of our great appreciation for the immortal deeds of the great President Josip Broz Tito in support of the vast movement for the liberation of peoples, co-operation, equality and understanding among nations.

The same tokens of esteem are expressed to the Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the Rapporteur, the representatives of Honduras and of Socialist Ethiopia.

The debate that is taking place on the key question of disarmament has revealed a broad range of political opinions stemming from diverse and at times antagonistic ideologies. It is comforting to note, however, that in spite of those divergences there has been unanimity that disarmament is necessary to safeguard world peace.

Relations in today's world are marked by hostility and egotism between the East and the West, on the one hand, and the North and the South, on the other. An African saying goes:

"If you are not on good terms with your neighbour, do not go to bed because you will not sleep.

"Do not barricade yourself in your hut with your plate of rice if the hungry are waiting outside."

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the political force for peace and emancipation of peoples, having become aware of the danger, called in 1978 for the convening of the tenth special session, when the Disarmament Decade with its meagre results was coming to an end. That session was a forum for reflection by the international community, which in our view correctly diagnosed the disease by stating in the Final Document: first, that the stockpiling of weapons, especially nuclear weapons, far from contributing to strengthening international security, weakened it; secondly, that existing nuclear arsenals and the continuation of the arms race were a threat to mankind's survival; thirdly, that there is a close link between disarmament and development and that the resources released must be used as a matter of urgency:

(Mr. Dabo, Guinea)

"... present-day experience as well as our studies show that the military sector and the civilian sector compete for resources in every country notwithstanding differences in social and economic organization or in the levels of economic development." (A/36/356, annex, para. 187)

And, fourthly, that in accordance with the Charter, the United Nations has to play a central role and has primary responsibility, for which reason Member States must keep it informed of any measures taken outside the framework of the United Nations - be they unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral.

For this reason, my delegation believes that the 1982 session must in every respect deal with how to implement the decisions and recommendations in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

The greatest importance must be attached to paragraph 50 of that document, which defines a realistic approach to nuclear disarmament as requiring

"... urgent negotiation of agreements at appropriate stages and with adequate measures of verification satisfactory to the States concerned..."
(resolution S-10/2, para. 50)

Thus, any desire to subordinate political decisions to technical control or to subordinate technical control to political decisions would only reflect bad faith.

On page 9 of the report of the Group of Experts on the technical, legal and financial implications of establishing an international satellite monitoring agency, one reads:

"The Group fully recognized the valuable contribution which monitoring by satellites could make to the verification of certain parts or types of arms-control and disarmament agreements... The Group also appreciated the positive role that satellite monitoring could play in preventing or settling crises in various parts of the world... The Group considered the gradual approach to the establishment of an international satellite monitoring agency technically feasible..."
(A/34/540, annex, para. 23)

(Mr. Dabo, Guinea)

Therefore one is tempted to believe that the Powers concerned with this question can, if they sincerely so desire, reach a compromise solution.

At the present time, the Soviet Union and the United States contribution to the realization of such a project would be decisive.

Why not make this means available to the international community for its verification of the implementation of any agreements reached, even on a trial basis, thereby helping to prevent crises? And nowhere is it written that those two countries will indefinitely have to bear the burden, for in a few years other States will possess monitoring satellites.

We should like to stress, in this connexion, that the non-accession of certain countries to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) can only be ascribed to disrespect for nearly all the 115 States which have signed it, since the promoters of the Treaty have continued their nuclear arms race. Guinea would be prepared to accept that instrument when the nuclear-weapon Powers have shown their intention to act to stop all nuclear tests.

One wonders whether the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council which bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security have really fulfilled their commitments. Paradoxically, the answer is no; still worse, some members of the Security Council offer facilities to the odious apartheid régime and to Israel in equipment and technology to help them acquire the nuclear weapon. Those Powers must realize that just as they are determined to arm South Africa and Israel against the interests of the African and Arab peoples, so are the freedom fighters determined to resist with the firm support of all the forces of progress.

While waiting for the adoption of a legal instrument by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), similar to the Tlatelolco Treaty, which would formalize the decision to denuclearize Africa, the Security Council, in keeping with General Assembly resolution 33/63 and other relevant resolutions of the OAU, is required to take appropriate effective action to prevent the republic of official racism from developing or acquiring nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Dabo, Guinea)

We believe that the creation of denuclearized zones everywhere else, in Asia and the Middle East, would meet the security interests of the peoples of those regions and would represent a valuable contribution to the safeguarding of peace in an international situation, in which relations between the nuclear Powers are marked by distrust and defiance.

Now, when madness is transforming Europe, where two world wars started, into a nuclear shooting-ground, when increasing quantities of weapons are being introduced into areas of rivalry, especially the Indian Ocean, the Gulf and the Mediterranean, and when new military bases are being created and special facilities are being expanded, members of the Non-Aligned Movement, which are pledged to oppose the policies of blocs and the cold war, must more than ever abide by the fundamental principles of non-alignment and see to it that our countries are not extensions of the "security" or "vital interests" of any Power.

Such a wise and realistic policy is necessary for, should man's vanity lead to confrontation, then the Powers would at once try to eliminate the points of support represented by such bases as best they could.

We are aware that, as President Ahmed Sékou Touré has said,

"The unbridled race to acquire means of mass destruction only maintains differences and inequalities in the living standards of peoples and in relations between States."

While there is still time, we must conduct a vast campaign of information in our various countries to see to it that our peoples become aware of the dangers of nuclear arsenals, which have been built up by the destructive instincts of men. It is obvious that Powers which use policies of force and domination in their obstinate quest for a shaky supremacy cannot and will not ever disarm. The peoples of the world must help them to do so. They have everything to gain from détente, peace and concord. Mexico's proposal along those lines is one that my delegation fully supports.

Future meetings between the Soviet Union and the United States will be a test. If they could at all lessen the growing anxiety of the international community concerning the question of peace, that would be very welcome to us.

(Mr. Dabo, Guinea)

In conclusion, my delegation believes that at the present stage of the debate, when the development of military technology takes precedence over the implementation of measures designed to curb the arms race, it is necessary for this Committee to take bold political decisions. The stagnation that exists in the technical bodies is a reflection of the lack of political will on the part of the military Powers, and yet they are not the only ones concerned by the problem of peace.

It must be our Committee's role to induce those Powers to engage in a constructive dialogue by eliminating any hindrance to action by multilateral negotiating bodies. It is possible to bring about more efficient, constructive linkage between the multilateral negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and the separate negotiations pursued outside it.

We welcome the progress that a number of representatives have mentioned as regards the banning of chemical weapons. Efforts in this area must be supported free of any spirit of political self-interest.

As regards the peaceful uses of outer space, we believe that, following the adoption by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session of the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, there is nothing that should now stand in the way of the conclusion of a treaty banning the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. There are enough arsenals of every kind on land and in the oceans. The sound of weapons must not drown out the melodious voices of the first Soviet and American astronauts who showed us the beauty of our planet.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): In the general debates in both the plenary General Assembly and here in the First Committee, the delegations of many countries have expressed serious concern and alarm regarding the real danger of the arms race spreading to such an important and promising sphere of man's activity as outer space.

The danger of the creation and stationing in outer space of new types of weapons has been particularly in evidence in recent days. We must say at once that if resolute efforts are not made to prevent such a turn of events, then mankind may well have to face a situation in which the achievement of agreement

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

on limiting and halting the arms race in outer space may become immeasurably more difficult if not impossible. To prevent the turning of outer space into a new arena of the arms race and, first and foremost, to prevent the further qualitative evolution of the arms race is what we regard as the essence of the new proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a treaty banning the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. As we understand it, this new proposal is intended to block off all channels for any possible arms race in outer space - that is, to supplement already existing international legal instruments on this subject. We believe that all the necessary conditions exist for progress in this area.

Over the last 20 years there has arisen a whole system of treaties and agreements, both multilateral and bilateral, which rule out the stationing of nuclear weapons or any other forms of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. I should like merely to refer to the most important of them: the Moscow Treaty of 1963 banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water; the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies; the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which was approved by the General Assembly in 1979; and the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, which was adopted in 1977. Of major significance for the restriction of the possible use of outer space for military purposes are the bilateral Soviet-American Treaties restricting anti-missile defence systems, the interim agreement on some steps to reduce strategic weapons, SALT-I, and the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT-II, signed in June 1979.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

According to what we read in the press, particularly that of the United States, a far-reaching programme is being carried out in this country on the creation of a whole series of weapons systems for use in outer space, including anti-satellite weapons, the laying of anti-satellite mines, laser weapons, the manufacture of large-scale anti-missile defence systems based in outer space, and so on.

In this connexion, particular attention has been paid to multiple re-entry spacecraft of the shuttle type, flight tests of which took place in April of this year and are to be continued in a few days' time. In other words, there is a genuine danger that the arms race may well spill over into outer space.

Naturally, the world community cannot, nor should it, remain indifferent to that danger. We need hardly refer to the fact that the implementation of Washington's military and outer-space plans is aimed at changing the approximate balance of military power in favour of the United States. Such actions to undermine the existing strategic stability would start a new round of the arms race, even in varieties of outer space weapons. Of equal importance is the fact that the stationing of new types of weapons in outer space would have an extremely detrimental effect on States' co-operation in the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes, the fruits of which activities are of growing use to the world community.

In this connexion, I should like to lay particular stress on the importance of the efforts of the socialist States within the context of the Intercosmos Programme. A particularly noteworthy event in the life of the Mongolian people was the joint Mongolian-Soviet space flight in March of this year, during which a number of scientific experiments of extreme importance to the economy of Mongolia were completed.

In the light of the foregoing, the Mongolian delegation considers that the proposal of the Soviet Union is a timely and urgent one, in consonance with the requirements of the present situation. We believe that the draft treaty annexed to document A/36/192 represents an excellent basis for reaching agreement on this issue.

(Mr. Erdembileg, Mongolia)

As we have already had occasion to state, the most appropriate body to work on such a treaty would be the Committee on Disarmament. In our opinion, the General Assembly should at the present session support the adoption of effective measures to ban the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space by the conclusion of an international treaty, and we believe that the Committee on Disarmament should be requested to seek agreement as quickly as possible on such a text. We hope that this new proposal of the Soviet Union will win broad support in the General Assembly.

For its part, the Mongolian delegation will make every effort to promote the adoption by the General Assembly of a positive resolution on this issue at this session.

The CHAIRMAN: There being no other names on the list of speakers for this afternoon, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I am speaking in exercise of my right of reply to the statement made by the representative of Iraq this morning.

The representative of Iraq devoted much of his speech to the report of the Group of Experts. The resolution under which that Group was set up was in itself discriminatory because it selected Israel alone as a subject for study, and not other countries.

Not only was the resolution discriminatory, but the terms of reference of the Group of Experts were clearly prejudicial. The Group was not asked to investigate whether or not Israel possesses nuclear arms but was instructed to study "Israeli nuclear armament". Small wonder that under those terms reputable nuclear scientists, when approached, refused to participate in the work of the Group of Experts.

It is certainly interesting to note that the report, which dwells upon technological and scientific aspects of nuclear capability, was written by five experts, four of whom are political scientists, while the only nuclear physicist happens to be an Arab. It is also worth noting that the expert who submitted the report on behalf of the Group is a well-known proponent of the development

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

of a so-called Islamic bomb and has called several times for further proliferation of nuclear weapons. Ironically, this did not prevent the Group from expressing concern over the dangers of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. In the light of the composition of the Group of Experts and of its terms of reference, the conclusions of the report were not unexpected.

The representative of Iraq, in his very selective references to various paragraphs of the report, distorted their content. In another exercise in distortion the Iraqi representative deliberately misconstrued the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Tlatelolco by failing to mention that article 1 of the Treaty refers to "the Contracting Parties" to the Treaty - I repeat, "the Contracting Parties" to the Treaty. Parties cannot contract unless they negotiate. And Iraq rejects negotiations.

Iraq's initiative, which gave birth to the Committee of Experts, must be seen against the background of Iraq's own quest for nuclear capability and Iraq's maniacal hostility to Israel for the last three decades.

Ever since the establishment of the State of Israel over 33 years ago Iraq has been conspiring to destroy it. Iraq joined several other Arab States which attacked Israel the day after it had become independent in 1948. Yet, while other Arab States - Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria - signed armistice agreements with Israel in 1949, Iraq adamantly refused to do so. Instead, it fomented and supported unrelenting Arab belligerency and terrorism against Israel. It also took part in the Arab wars against Israel of 1967 and 1973. Furthermore, it has doggedly rejected any international measure or instrument which might imply even the most indirect recognition of Israel and its right to exist.

In sum, Iraq declares itself to have been in a state of war with Israel since 1948. Hence it has rejected all United Nations efforts to seek a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. It has publicly rejected Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and has taken a leading role in opposing the Camp David agreement.

MP/td

A/C.1/36/PV.24

74-75

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Iraq has missed no opportunity to make it clear that it will not abide by international law with respect to Israel, and it reserves its freedom of action with regard to Israel in every circumstance. This perverse doctrine found expression in the National Charter of Iraq proclaimed by its President, Saddam Hussein, in February of last year and distributed as document A/35/110-S/13816, at the request of the Permanent Representative of Iraq.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

The representative of Iraq referred to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. There can be no short-cut, no circumvention of two basic principles that govern the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all regions of the world. One, to quote paragraph 60 of the Final Document of the special session, is:

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned constitutes an important disarmament measure." (S-10/2, para. 60)

The second is that all obligations must be mutually binding and all parties to the agreement must have the contractual assurance of each other's compliance with the terms of the treaty. That is what Israel proposed last year. That is what Iraq rejected. I have no choice but to repeat what the representative of Israel said in this Committee last year with reference to the withdrawal by Israel of its draft resolution. He said:

This offer was turned down. No rhetoric, no explanations, no excuses, nor the repetition of odious and mendacious clichés can do away with that central fact. Israel said, 'Let us set aside, temporarily at least, our differences for the sake of saving the region from a nuclear calamity.' Most Arab States in this Committee said 'No'. (A/C.1/35/PV.36, p. 7)

And Iraq was foremost in its refusal. If Iraq is really so concerned about Israel's intentions there is a very simple way in which they can be tested. Why does Iraq not agree to the Israel proposal to convene a conference of all Member States of the Middle East to discuss together the modalities for creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East? If Iraq were to agree and other Arab States were to follow we could all engage now in a common constructive effort to free the Middle East from nuclear disaster instead of engaging in sterile debates in this Committee.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

I should like to conclude by saying that the spectacle of the representative of a country which invades a neighbouring Member State of the United Nations appearing here as a champion of disarmament and peace does little to enhance the prestige of this Committee. It would have been more to the point if the representative of Iraq were to come to this Committee to explain why Iraq decided to go to war and why Iraq still occupies territories it has conquered. After all, that is what the Charter is about.

Mr. AWANIS (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): In the Middle East we have two racist, aggressive and expansionist régimes which act at the expense of others, namely, the terrorist Begin régime and the Khomeini régime. So it is not surprising to hear in this Committee the same language, the same lies and the same claims and allegations maintained by the representatives of the two régimes. Of course, they have identical views, hence they support each other.

With regard to the representative of Iran, he mentioned in his statement: (spoke in English)

"A power-crazy dictator who thought that the post-revolutionary conditions within Iran were ripe for military adventurism". (supra, p. 37)

(continued in Arabic)

Before I discuss these lies and these misconceptions, which are familiar to all the representatives here, I should like to ask who the power-crazed person is. Is it the leader who is dedicating all his efforts, his time and his powers to the service of his fellowcountrymen in building his country and working out a development plan for his country? Or is the power-crazed person the leader who has turned his country into a bloodbath, murdered old and young alike, undermined the economy of his country and taken it back into the Middle Ages?

(Mr. Awanis, Iraq)

The Committee knows that the initiator of the aggression was Iran. This aggression was preceded by a number of declarations by many Iranian officials, notably Khomeini, who has more than once called for the occupation of Iraq and for the destruction of the Saddam Hussein régime, claiming that the Iraqi régime is not a Moslem régime. More than once Khomeini has declared that he believes in exporting the Iranian revolution, not only to Iraq but to all the neighbouring countries.

Finally, at the beginning of June 1980, we were surprised by an act of Iranian aggression against a number of frontier cities, which led the Iraqi Foreign Ministry to ask the Iranian envoy to report to the Ministry to be handed a note of protest calling on the Iranian authorities to exercise self-restraint and instead of using force resort to diplomatic channels and means in order to resolve any dispute between the two countries. However, that proved futile.

The Iranian authorities responded by intensifying their aggression, using heavy artillery and aircraft, shelling various parts of Iraq, including the city of Basra, which is the site of the most economically important oil installations.

Iraq resorted to all possible means to halt that aggression until 29 September 1980, when, all these peaceful measures having failed to stem the Persian aggression, the Iraqi national leaders had to respond to those attacks and acts of aggression. We wish to reiterate our position before this Committee.

We seek only to confront the aggression and to recover all our legitimate national rights. That is our objective.

As for the representative of the Zionist entity, we note that his reply concentrated on the Group of Experts appointed by the United Nations and on the report submitted by the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Kurt Waldheim. This is a deviation from the practice of this Organization, and we leave this matter to the Committee. The representative of the Zionist entity also referred to his defeated draft resolution, namely the draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East along the lines of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to point out a number of facts.

(Mr. Awanis, Iraq)

There are a number of countries in Latin America whose people speak one language and who share a common history. The countries of Latin America do not have an artificial entity among them, as is the case in the Middle East. The Zionist entity is an artificial entity which occupies the whole of the Palestinian territory in addition to territories of three Arab countries. It refuses to leave those territories despite all the resolutions adopted by the Security Council. In fact, it tries to consolidate its presence in those territories by establishing additional Zionist settlements, including those in the Golan Heights, Gaza and the West Bank. Furthermore, the Arab countries have respected their international commitments, in particular by signing and ratifying the Non-Proliferation Treaty and by placing their nuclear facilities under international control, including that of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Similar commitments are included in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, article 1 of which states that the contracting parties undertake to use the nuclear material and facilities under their jurisdiction exclusively for peaceful purposes and to prohibit and prevent in their respective territories the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition by any means whatsoever of any nuclear weapon, directly or indirectly.

The Zionist entity has produced nuclear weapons and has used its nuclear facilities for other than peaceful purposes, in particular the Dimona reactor, and has refused to place its other nuclear facilities under international control, including that of the IAEA.

Finally, is it likely that a representative of a régime which occupies Arab territories can shed tears over the occupation of the territory of other people, or perhaps there is a certain alliance between the two representatives which leads them to take a similar position on that matter.

Mr. HAYDAR (Syrian Arab Republic): The Committee has just heard a misleading and misinformed statement in the reply of the representative of Israel. He alleged that most Arab States rejected the so-called Israeli offer to prevent a nuclear catastrophe in the Middle East, without offering any explanations. In order to set the record straight, I should

(Mr. Haydar, Syrian Arab Republic)

like to refer the Committee to the statement I made last year in which I fully explained why that offer was not acceptable and did not meet the need to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

If the need arises, I shall be ready to repeat what I said last year and why that so-called offer is not acceptable. It simply overlooks the facts in the Middle East.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn, I should like to appeal to members of the Committee to inscribe their names on the list of speakers for the second phase of the Committee's deliberations. The officers of the Committee and the Secretariat would like to be able to plan our meetings and thus help the members of the Committee to organize their work.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.