

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION
*Official Records**



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (NY/FRN)

FIRST COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
Friday, 5 November 1982
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 28TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

UN LIBRARY

CONTENTS

NOV 16 1982

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

UN/SA COLLECTION

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

- Mr. Mongbe (Benin)
- Mr. Karuhije (Rwanda)
- Mr. Adan (Somalia)
- Mr. García Moreno (Colombia)

* 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/37/PV.28
13 November 1982

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 57, 133, 136, 138 AND 139 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) (interpretation from French): I should like first, Mr. Chairman, to express the satisfaction of the delegation of the People's Republic of Benin at your taking the chair of this important United Nations Committee, you being a son of Ghana and thus of a pioneer State in the emancipation of the peoples of Africa, and a State bound by ties of blood to my own country.

I also wish to offer my sincere congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, whom I assure of the confident co-operation of the delegation of Benin. At the same time, I should like to express my admiration of Ambassador Golob of Yugoslavia, who presided over the last session with competence and great distinction.

My delegation has more than one reason, Sir, to be convinced that thanks to your talent and the wisdom that is characteristic of you, our work will achieve the successful results that the international community expects.

My delegation associates itself with the well-deserved tributes that have been paid by many other delegations to the Nobel Peace Prize winners, two of the most zealous defenders of disarmament:

Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden.

Three months ago, during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the representative of Benin hoped that the debates then going on would not prove to be:

"a mere series of brilliant rhetorical exercises or choice morsels of futile propaganda. For, when the time comes to take stock, we shall all of us, great and small, be held accountable for the destinies of our peoples, for which any new or gigantic Hiroshima will bring everything but eternal happiness." (A/S-12/PV.23, p. 12)

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

But what do we find today? While the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, aroused great hopes in all the peoples of the world, we regret that the second special session devoted to disarmament joined certain other conferences in the annals of the United Nations which further enriched the history of our Organization with well-drafted, eloquent speeches, but produced little of value to meet the hopes of the peoples, because of the selfishness of the great Powers, the desire to dominate, cold strategic calculations and the frantic quest for a balance of forces.

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

No one can doubt the regrettable fact that mankind is now facing an unprecedented threat of self-destruction because of the diabolical accumulation of weapons of mass destruction. The arms race is continuing cynically and could well lead this world to its disappearance.

In the Preamble of the United Nations Charter we read:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind ...".

Those are the words, imbued with nobility and hope, that open the Charter, thus proclaiming to the human race that it is unique and that it can and must distinguish itself from the other living things of the earth.

But in this second half of the twentieth century man has turned his back on this ideal of the human race and has tragically allowed his inventive genius to produce and stockpile the most sophisticated technology of destruction and death.

I have not come here to revert to a description or an enumeration of modern doomsday devices but to deplore and condemn their existence and to utter the plea of the weak of the world, those who still believe that the earth belongs to mankind.

It is high time that the great of this world heeded the voice of conscience by resolutely setting aside pressures of national pride, the spirit of hegemony and the greed of the enterprises of the military-industrial complex, because in today's circumstances it is clear, as the Palme Commission has pointed out, that

"no nation can achieve absolute security through any kind of military superiority."

If one were to believe otherwise, one would, whether one realized it or not, be serving the madness of the sordid interests and financial gains of the inventors of all these armaments which lie strewn along the depressing path which for some time now has become a gloomy avenue leading to the edge of the abyss.

The great majority of Member States have frequently expressed here and elsewhere their determination to achieve general and complete disarmament.

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

An impressive number of suggestions have been made, and many disarmament plans have been proposed. It might therefore seem unnecessary to add other plans or suggestions to the long list of proposals that have been mouldering for decades in the various reports on disarmament.

The delegation of Benin does not claim to be making any new proposals, but it renews its hope that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will be drawn up and will have the coherence and support to make it credible and realistic, and that in terms of its machinery it will not be burdened with ponderous bureaucratic structures that would be extra obstacles to positive action.

The second special session on disarmament, although disappointing in its final results, witnessed the unilateral declaration of one of the great nuclear Powers, the Soviet Union, that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. My delegation welcomes that declaration, and hopes that it will open the way for the other nuclear Powers to follow suit so as that this Organization and the Committee on Disarmament can complete the drafting and subsequent application of a genuine comprehensive programme of disarmament.

My delegation therefore reiterates in this political Committee the appeal that our Minister for Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, Comrade Tiamiou Adjibade, made in the General Assembly on 15 October last, addressing himself to the conscience of the peoples of the world, and in particular to the conscience of the Soviet and American peoples, calling on them to persuade their respective Governments to enter into sincere and decisive negotiations in order to halt the arms race and achieve general and complete disarmament.

While awaiting the attainment of such general and complete disarmament, which we very much look forward to, my delegation endorses the idea of the establishment of nuclear-weapons-free zones and zones of peace on the basis of arrangements, conventions or agreements freely negotiated by the countries of the various regions involved. The establishment of such zones cannot fail to strengthen peace and security regionally and internationally.

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

Israeli bombs, which destroyed the Tammuz nuclear reactor in Iraq, have been spreading death, desolation and hatred in Lebanon, and are still doing so.

Periodically South African weapons exact a heavy toll from the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and other countries of the region by means of their crimes and threats. There is every reason to believe that the South African racists now possess nuclear technology, acquired with the complicity of outside sources of valuable assistance. That is why Benin reaffirms the relevance and necessity of imposing the rapid and effective denuclearization of the African continent, as requested in resolutions of the Organization of African Unity and the General Assembly.

The nuclear armaments of the Pretoria régime and Tel Aviv are a threat to the peace and security of the world.

As for the Indian Ocean, of which South Africa is a coastal State, it must become a zone of peace free of military bases, which are increasing in number there, and free of the powerful navies which content with each other in the area. The courageous proposals made by the President of the Malagasy Republic, His Excellency Mr. Didier Ratsiraka, must be taken into account and given concrete form.

My delegation will not indulge in a long and tedious academic demonstration before affirming what is a self-evident fact: that there is an organic link between expenditures on armaments and economic and social development.

The arms race not only heightens the risk of a general conflagration: without a doubt it also constitutes a senseless burden for the great Powers, which causes them to neglect or even abandon their international responsibilities.

The Benin delegation is at one with many other delegations in believing that the arms race is extremely harmful to the economic development of the world. The scandalous amount spent on armaments and the valuable resources so incredibly squandered could have been used to furnish funds to assist development and improve the living conditions of peoples, including the peoples of the developed countries.

(Mr. Mongbe, Benin)

The United Nations must through its various bodies continue tirelessly to perform its central role and discharge its onerous but noble responsibilities in the sphere of disarmament despite certain setbacks and the resulting legitimate frustration.

The peoples of the world want to live in peace. They deserve peace, which they know can be achieved through their demands and through the dialogue and the tolerance that must henceforth be the rules of the game in this noble venture of general and complete disarmament.

This is the modest contribution that the delegation of Benin wished to make to the work of the First Committee at this stage of the general debate. We reserve our right to speak on individual agenda items in due course.

Mr. KARUHIJE (Rwanda) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for me to extend to you the heartfelt congratulations of my delegation on seeing you presiding over the debates of the First Committee. I am all the happier because you belong to an African country which struggled for an independent, pacified and united Africa, a country with which my own shares the same ideals of peace and unity. From the outset of our work you have given proof of your competence by the manner in which you have guided our debates. My delegation wishes to assure you of its full co-operation, I wish also to extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, men devoted to the cause of the United Nations and its objective of peace.

After the regrettable failure of the second special session devoted to disarmament, it was desirable to make clear to the people of the world that, despite that failure, the United Nations remained the privileged forum where the problems of peace would be negotiated. That has happened through the award of the 1982 Nobel Peace Prize to Mrs. Myrdal and Mr. Garcia Robles, to whom I address the congratulations of my country for the signal honour conferred upon them. That honour also reflects on the United Nations, whose ideals of peace they have both upheld, and in particular on our Committee, where they have always expressed their determination to take up the challenge posed by the dictatorship of weapons of every kind.

Last year at this time we nourished the secret hope that when we met again this year we should have the satisfaction of noting progress in the field of disarmament and, above all, we expected a specific, sound and comprehensive disarmament programme as was envisaged by the second special session devoted to disarmament. However, today frustration and despair have overtaken us as we are confronted with the danger of war and particularly nuclear war. The present international crisis and the state of insecurity we are all in can only leave us in a state of shock. For those generations that have known the traumatic experience of two world wars and for those others, younger ones, that are living through daily local but equally deadly conflicts, which succeeded the Second World War, fear and despair are not new sentiments. However, everyone is entitled to wonder what the outcome of this nuclear adventure in which the great Powers are involving us in spite of ourselves.

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

The great Powers treat us, especially the small countries which have no voice in nuclear matters, as if the risks we denounce were imaginary or academic. This is not a mere academic hypothesis lacking in realism: rather the people of the world have been made aware of the scope of the danger that threatens mankind. Do the great Powers think that our attitude should be one of complete disinterest or resignation? Should mankind remain the powerless witness and resigned victim of this situation? The movement towards greater awareness on the part of mankind about the fate in store for it is becoming clearer. The peoples of the world are using the only weapon available to them: that is, large demonstrations occurring spontaneously in many developed countries testify to their refusal to walk consciously towards the abyss. The world leaders should bear this in mind.

What we are asking of the great Powers, we small countries without hegemonistic ambitions, is that they, together with us, draw up a plan for a new international community free from fear and from the danger of destruction, because what is at stake is the actual future of mankind. We can no longer be satisfied with high-sounding statements exchanged between the great Powers alone. We are posing the problem in terms of survival.

What are the factors leading to the acceleration of this unbridled and senseless production of weapons, especially nuclear weapons? In the opinion of my delegation, there are political and perhaps economic factors involved and, why not, sentimental ones as well. Fundamentally, there is the political sense of fear that each of the super-Powers has for the other, the undisguised fear of being overtaken by him. Doubtful extrapolations over-estimate the other's capacity and are used to justify the intensification and acceleration of the production of arms quantitatively and qualitatively in order to dissuade him.

To dramatize the debate and make the threat of the other side credible, perhaps exaggerated statements are made about progress and developments on the other side. Then theories are elaborated about "first strike" systems of the other side which would paralyse the reprisal possibilities and lead to the possibility of a nuclear war.

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

In reports and public statements, the truth is deliberately ignored so as to render the threat from the other side more credible on the basis of conjectures rather than actual facts. We witness accusations and counter-accusations between the great Powers, each one seeking to absolve itself before national and international opinion, by condemning what it judges to be the harmful activities of the other side, with the aid of its allies or its satellites, in order to discredit the activities of its adversary. We witness also the struggle between the morality of some and the opportunism of others, or between righteousness and Machiavellianism. In short, the arms race becomes the primary target to be won in order to create the assurance that comes from strength.

Everyone is aware that the rivalry between the great Powers is and remains the first concern of their leaders and has been for several decades. I would even say that many of their initiatives in the international arena, which we can only deplore in Africa and even in other continents, come within that context. However, the question we must ask is: what will be the outcome of this struggle between the great Powers? For my part, I cannot see too clearly the moment of reconciliation. One can only think with terror of the possibility of a war to the finish, because it is difficult to believe that the problem will forever be left pending by the balance of power. The cold war of words could well lead one day to a hot war of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

Each of the great Powers may well try to defend its intentions to the bitter end, but we remain unconvinced and still less reassured.

In short, we are moving towards war, a nuclear holocaust without national motivation, but started for the simple pleasure of achieving national credibility. Let us remember the rivalry between Rome and Carthage, with the difference here that there will be no victor or vanquished because the two will be dragged into the abyss together with the rest of the world.

But all is not yet lost, because diplomatic action properly prepared could draw us back from that abyss by substituting for this unsavoury triumphalism the chances of sincere negotiations with the other side without mistrust or resentment, free of propaganda and the political subversion of world public opinion.

With respect precisely to the disarmament negotiations, which are of vital interest even to the small countries, we sometimes do not quite know where we stand as a result of the contradictory statements made by the parties involved. We can do nothing business-like on the basis of data which is hidden from us or on which we have very little information.

While it is true that the data concerning this question are very complex, it would be desirable if the progress of existing negotiations were better known. International opinion is not well informed about all the data, but nevertheless, is aware of the impact that that information can have on the negotiations as a whole.

On the other hand, failure to disseminate accurately the content of armament programmes confirms the trend of the militarily strongest Powers to avoid any changes. Doubts will not be dispelled so long as States are unable to participate in and contribute to the efforts made in the negotiations on disarmament.

Although nuclear weapons are of the greatest concern to mankind because of the serious dangers which they represent for its survival, the ever more sophisticated development of conventional weapons is equally cause for concern. The untold suffering which so many peoples are enduring at this time is due to the latter. Insecurity reigns today in various parts of the world and it is connected with the accumulation and irrational distribution of conventional weapons which go far beyond national security requirements.

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

Among these new types of weapons we must particularly mention chemical and biological weapons whose use, if confirmed, would be a crime against humanity.

While the powerful perfect their techniques of annihilation of the human species, cries of distress due to hunger, disease and problems of every kind are being heard from the mouths of millions of human beings. People listen to them with compassion, but nothing more. In the meantime, military budgets whose size we, the poor countries, are unable even to visualise, are being voted to be swallowed up in armaments programmes at the expense of the well-being of populations and this in order to be able to win this war whose true name is supremacy. It would be more moral and much more honourable and humane to win the war of development of peoples. Thus, the resources released by disarmament would allow a new type of political, economic and social development.

The proposal by France for the establishment of a disarmament fund for development needs to be spelled out in clear terms and this on the basis of the remarkable report of the Group of Governmental Experts under the chairmanship of Mrs. Thorsson contained in document A/36/356.

My Government has always encouraged the view that disarmament measures would release resources which could be devoted to the economic and social development of all countries, thus filling the economic gap between developed and developing countries.

Our continent, which has not escaped the competition or rivalry of the great Powers in every field, has spoken out resolutely against the introduction of nuclear weapons. However, the Government of the racist South African régime has embarked on the manufacture of nuclear weapons, thus flouting the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the assurances given by nuclear-weapon States. These States should dissuade racist South Africa from the blackmail it seeks to continue to exercise over the independent States of Africa in order better to consolidate its inhuman and repressive policy towards the black majority.

(Mr. Karuhije, Rwanda)

Similarly, the nuclear-weapon-free zone status of the Indian Ocean should be respected precisely by those who have penetrated into that area and who fight their ideological battles away from home.

The struggle for disarmament should be the collective endeavour of all those who share the same perception of the world situation today, which is gloomy because of the insecurity everyone feels. The debates which have taken place in this body testify to a realistic view which should induce us to act so that we do not have to continue to accept the diktats of the engines of death which are based on megalomania alone.

We together are all responsible for our fate and our survival. The road is long and rocky, but all of us bear responsibility for creating a world community free from the spectre of a nuclear apocalypse.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): Let me first of all express my satisfaction, Sir, over your election to the chairmanship of this Committee, a choice which recognizes your own accomplishments as a diplomat and the regard and respect in which your country is held by the international community.

I am happy also to take this opportunity to extend the warm congratulations of my delegation to Mr. Garcia Robles and Mrs. Alva Myrdal on the honour that has been accorded them as Nobel Prize recipients. They richly deserve this recognition of their work for the promotion of disarmament measures.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

It is a much less happy task to turn to the items on our agenda, since the major theme which connects most of these items is the lack of progress towards their implementation. This is particularly true of the disarmament measures identified as having the highest priority by the first special session on disarmament. In the view of my delegation, the general failure of disarmament efforts must be seen as one aspect of the breakdown of the principle of collective security - a principle exemplified by the existence of the United Nations.

It is hardly surprising that the second special session had such a disappointing outcome when its background was a world scene characterized by the failure of détente and by an alarming increase in the number and intensity of conflict situations.

These conflicts have been engendered by a widespread lack of respect for the principles which govern national sovereignty, territorial integrity, friendly relations between States and the right of peoples to self-determination and national independence. In consequence, the climate of confidence and security necessary for significant progress towards disarmament has been seriously damaged.

My delegation is of course gratified that the Final Document of the 1978 special session has been reaffirmed as a valid body of principles governing the whole field of disarmament. It is our earnest hope that the Committee on Disarmament will succeed in 1983 in achieving the vital task of drawing up a comprehensive programme of disarmament acceptable to all States.

My delegation also welcomes the initiation of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on the reduction of intercontinental strategic weapons and on intermediate nuclear forces. It seems to us, however, that the outlook for these talks is clouded by the fact that even while they are being carried on, the nuclear arsenals of the two super-Powers continue to grow qualitatively and quantitatively and in ways which add new dimensions of instability to the already nightmarish balance of terror.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

Regrettably, the nuclear Powers have not responded with the necessary sense of urgency to the hope of people everywhere that the threat of nuclear annihilation which hangs over the world will be removed. The cessation of all test explosions of nuclear weapons and the implementation of General Assembly resolution 36/85 are items on the agenda of this Committee which reflect a strong international consensus of long standing and the high priority placed by the General Assembly on the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Since the ending of nuclear-weapon tests is such a basic requirement of nuclear disarmament, we urge the Committee on Disarmament to give its ad hoc Working Group on the nuclear test ban a clear and unequivocal mandate to work on drafting a test-ban treaty.

My delegation is gratified by the widespread conviction among members of the Committee on Disarmament that the available means of verification provide reasonable assurance of compliance with a nuclear test-ban treaty. In this context, we believe it is of paramount importance that an impartial international system of verification be established under United Nations auspices.

A matter of grave concern to us is the fact that the ad hoc committees in Geneva dealing with disarmament issues of the highest priority seem to be bogged down in procedural questions and sterile debate. Of course, the work of these committees is made exceedingly difficult by the need for consensus in bodies where sharply conflicting views are represented. It is certainly a frustrating state of affairs when the non-nuclear-weapon States, representing the majority of the world's people, are held hostage to the interests and power struggles of the nuclear and militarily significant States. It is also frustrating when United Nations bodies in effect play a peripheral rather than a central role in negotiations on the most crucial disarmament issues.

We particularly deplore the lack of progress towards outlawing chemical weapons, radiological weapons, new weapons of mass destruction and the use of outer space for military purposes. The use of barbarous chemical weapons against freedom

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

fighters in West and South-East Asia and in the Horn of Africa and the new competition in the development and stockpiling of these abhorrent weapons must be universally condemned. With regard to other weapons of mass destruction and the adaptation of satellites and anti-satellite weapons for hostile purposes, it seems that nothing has been learned from the present nuclear dilemma, where it has proved impossible to put the nuclear genie back into its bottle. Instead, preparations are being made to let loose new destructive forces and methods of warfare. Somalia appeals to the nuclear-weapon Powers to exercise their inescapable responsibility to provide security from nuclear and other disasters not only for their own people but also for the peoples of the world.

A modest but important step towards fulfilling that responsibility would be the energetic promotion of a legally binding international instrument assuring non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The establishment of a number of non-nuclear-weapon zones, on the admirable Latin American plan, also demands the co-operation of the nuclear Powers, as well as agreement among the States of such areas, and would undoubtedly enhance the non-proliferation régime and contribute to world disarmament.

In this context, it is a matter of profound regret to us that the military collaboration of nuclear-weapon States with South Africa and Israel, and the collaboration between those two pariah nations, is seriously imperilling the goals of the denuclearization of Africa and the Middle East. Israel's paranoid desire to be a nuclear-weapon Power in the Middle East has already been demonstrated by its wanton destruction of Iraq's nuclear facility, which was operating for peaceful purposes under international safeguards. South Africa, as is well known, has the capacity to enforce its racist hegemony in southern Africa through nuclear blackmail.

Hand in hand with the military and nuclear support these nations receive is the political support which helps to entrench their racist and genocidal policies. It would seem to be self-evident that the cause of disarmament is seriously

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

set back when such belligerent and persistent violators of international law as South Africa and Israel are allowed to acquire nuclear-weapon capabilities and are supplied with deadly and sophisticated conventional weapons. The brutal and inhuman use of such weapons against civilian populations in Lebanon clearly illustrates the necessity of an arms embargo against Israel.

With regard to the Indian Ocean, efforts to implement the General Assembly's Declaration of that area as a Zone of Peace have unfortunately been undermined by destabilizing developments. The occupation by forces of a super-Power of the territory of a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, and the introduction of the military presence of the same super-Power and its surrogate forces into the Horn of Africa by an African State in furtherance of its colonialist policies, have greatly contributed to great Power military presence and confrontation in the Indian Ocean in the context of those Powers' global rivalry.

Ethiopia's current unprovoked aggression against the territory and people of Somalia - an aggression which is supported by foreign surrogate forces - further violates the principles of the Indian Ocean Declaration, particularly the obligation upon Indian Ocean States to promote regional security through acceptance of the principles of the non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

There can be little progress towards implementing the provisions of that Declaration while external forces are being directed against legitimate liberation movements, while the right of peoples to self-determination is denied and while the peaceful settlement of disputes on the basis of Charter principles is discounted.

While my delegation recognizes the fact that the issues related to the Indian Ocean are many and complex, we believe that the situation in the area points to the urgent need for practical measures to be taken to resolve those issues and indicates that the holding of a conference on the Indian Ocean would be a useful step towards that end.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

We have for some time been aware of the tragic discrepancy between the billions of dollars spent on armaments and the steadily declining investment in development - a trend which continues while millions of the world's people suffer unnecessarily from hunger and from disease. The up-dated report of the Secretary-General's group of experts on the economic and social consequences of the arms race reminds us once again of the far-reaching and many-sided effects of escalating militarism and, particularly, of the arms race in nuclear weapons.

The report rightly emphasizes the links between swollen military budgets, the distortion of international economic relationships, world inflation and the failure of efforts to establish a new international economic order.

(Mr. Adan, Somalia)

The report also gives a timely warning about the depletion of the world's mineral and other resources through their direction to military use. Furthermore it calls attention to the grim prospect of conflicts generated by competition for scarce natural resources. These are findings that must not be ignored.

It seems unarguable that there would be immediate, practical benefits from the reduction of military budgets and the application of such savings to the promotion of peace, security and prosperity for all. Unfortunately, the nuclear-weapon and militarily significant Powers seem locked into positions of mutual suspicion and mistrust, ensuring a steady escalation of the race in nuclear and other weapons.

One encouraging development on the disarmament horizon is the strong international response at the grass roots level to the United Nations Disarmament Campaign. My delegation believes that the Centre for Disarmament should be given the financial and administrative means to deal effectively with its increasingly important tasks of disseminating information and educating public opinion on disarmament issues.

Disarmament, and in particular nuclear disarmament, is an issue which affects both large and small nations; both militarily significant and militarily insignificant countries. Indeed, it presents mankind with the greatest challenge it has ever faced. No other international issue is as pressing as this one. It concerns global survival.

The best efforts of United Nations bodies, of Governments, of non-governmental organizations and of concerned people everywhere must continue to be directed towards meeting this challenge successfully.

Mr. GARCIA MORENO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish):

Permit me to express to you, Sir, the satisfaction of my delegation at seeing in the Chair of this important Committee a personality of your qualities and experience. We would also like to extend our congratulations to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. We pledge to the officers of the Committee our fullest collaboration in ensuring the success of its work.

(Mr. Garcia Moreno, Colombia)

All those who have spoken so brilliantly and eloquently in this debate have agreed in saying that disarmament is fundamental not only to the benefit of détente, peace and international security, but also to the economic, social and cultural development of peoples. It is obvious that this is so, because if the present definition of peace is economic development, only by achieving disarmament will it be possible to redistribute existing resources which, if devoted to the destructive ends of weaponry, seriously delay the balanced development of all countries, and in particular the developing countries.

There is no doubt that the situation in the world has deteriorated greatly. Nations are unable to cross the barriers of mistrust and mutual suspicion. Dialogue between East and West is fragile. The gap between North and South is becoming wider and the seeds of discord fall on soil where the inevitable harvest will be ignorance, disease, poverty, hunger and endless neglect.

How then can we speak unanimously of the reduction and control of weapons, the reduction of military budgets, or zones free of nuclear or conventional weapons, when each day the pernicious arms race becomes more intense, when there is no morality or true human justice leading those bearing the prime responsibility to understand that what has priority is life and not the destruction of the human species, that what is essential is the elimination of poverty, and that the central task in an interdependent world is the promotion of the human and material development of mankind.

In fact, compliance with the purposes of the United Nations Charter has become more and more linked with each passing day to progress in the field of disarmament. Without disarmament there is no possibility of restoring to health a world economy that is suffering from serious ills, nor are there prospects for the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

The situation is paradoxical. The ambition of generations has been to use technological progress as a bridge towards social progress. Mankind, however, which has achieved goals, which only a few powerful minds had been able to imagine, is using those conquests not for his wellbeing but for preparations to exterminate every living thing on our planet. Instead of using those conquests of science to solve world problems whose solution cannot wait, the progress of technology and science are being used for the most ominous purposes, for military and warlike purposes. I shall refrain from giving the appalling figures which are familiar to all the representatives here.

(Mr. Garcia Moreno, Colombia)

My delegation shares the view expressed in this Committee that the annual report of the Secretary-General is a businesslike and realistic document. In his laudable report the Secretary-General states that we now take the Charter far less seriously than did its authors. That is certainly true. In general its principles, in particular Article 2, which is essential for peace, especially paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, are openly violated or ignored.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the world should present a constant scene of escalations of violence and continued aggressions. The Secretary-General also says that the Security Council is unable to take decisive action to resolve international conflicts if those that feel themselves strong enough to do so defy or ignore its resolutions.

We all know and agree that measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, which lays down action with respect to threats to peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression, have no prospect of being adopted in our divided international community, and here we are perilously near to a new international anarchy, or, as stated by a representative of my country, "on the brink of the abyss".

As a corollary to his observations, the Secretary-General suggests the establishment of a workable system of collective security which will engender confidence, limit to a minimum the need to arm, and discourage military adventures and the escalation of conflicts. He also counsels vigilance and the preventive treatment of dangerous situations through a more timely and systematic use of the Security Council, thus preventing such conflicts from degenerating into violence.

The Secretary-General's observations clearly show the close links between an effective system of collective security and the progress which can be achieved in the sphere of disarmament, both nuclear and conventional.

In other words, those are two complementary processes which should be developed simultaneously; strengthening the system of international security will facilitate agreements in the sphere of disarmament while those agreements will contribute to building confidence in the effectiveness of the system of collective security.

As has been stated by a distinguished Colombian Foreign Minister, none of our nations - and thus none of us - wants war. The invariable answer to the question of whether we would be ready to start a war intentionally is an eloquent plea for peace. Unfortunately the distance between our deeds and our words is growing, and the former appear to more in keeping with our dangerous inclinations than the latter. With an unheard-of lack of responsibility, as though we were not aware of our folly and our frivolousness, we accumulate weapons, we applaud those who produce them, we enrich those who traffic in them, and we set up a fatal competition for the possession of the greatest number of the most lethal of them, without understanding the obvious fact that this unbridled and costly race can only result in our destruction, or, at best, in our ruin.

It is obvious that the question of the prevention of nuclear war is the fundamental task of our time.

In the view of my delegation, the most urgent goal for international efforts to curb in the arms race is to conclude a treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. As we all know, this question has been under consideration by the United Nations for over a quarter of a century and the General Assembly has adopted dozens of resolutions on it in which it has strongly condemned all nuclear-weapon tests because of their harmful consequences regarding the intensification of the arms race and for the well-being of present and future generations.

In the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a document whose validity was reaffirmed by all Member States at the second special session devoted to disarmament, it is

affirmed that the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests would make a significant contribution to the aim of putting an end to the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and to the development of new types of such weapons, while preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The prevention of a nuclear holocaust continues to be the primary objective in the field of disarmament. The complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, as virtually all members of this Committee have recognized, would be a very important step towards that objective. Thus, we are pleased to note that the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, on whose agenda the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests appears as the top priority item, decided last April, in response to a request originally put forward by the Group of 21 of that Committee, to set up an ad hoc working group on this subject with a mandate to discuss and define, through substantive examination, issues relating to verification and compliance and to the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, bearing in mind "all existing proposals and future initiatives". (A/37/27, p. 19, para. 39)

While, indeed, it is not very clear whether the ad hoc working group is empowered, in the event, to initiate negotiations on the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons parallel to the trilateral negotiations on this question which are under way among the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, my delegation considers that the establishment of the working group and the general exchange of views it had in the course of its ten meetings held between 13 August and 13 September 1982 constitute a significant step which we hope will lead to a positive contribution by the negotiating body towards agreement on a treaty on this priority question.

We are fully aware of the difficulties involved in reaching agreement on so delicate a subject as this one, especially regarding the problem of verification and compliance. However, we are firmly convinced that the crucial factor in the negotiations, at both the trilateral and multilateral levels, is the political will of States and, above all, the political determination of the two nuclear super-Powers, which bear the major responsibility in the field of nuclear disarmament.

I have dwelt on this subject because my delegation considers that any progress in the field of nuclear disarmament would not only reduce the threat of a nuclear war and strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime, but would also create an international climate of confidence, which is necessary to give impetus to the quest for measures or agreements to control the conventional arms race. This question has been considered in this Committee during the last few years.

At its thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 36/97 A, in which it requested the Secretary-General to establish a group of qualified experts to carry out a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces.

With this Danish initiative, which we supported, an attempt is made to tackle the complex and alarming phenomenon of the arms race, both in the nuclear sphere and in what is called the conventional weapons sphere, while respecting existing priorities.

We cannot disregard the fact that 80 per cent of world military expenditures is earmarked for conventional weapons and armed forces. In recent years, conventional weapons systems have been consistently and rapidly improved as regards size, speed, precision, destructive potential, and so forth.

The continued increase of this type of weapon in the arsenals both of the industrialized countries and of the less developed countries, and the problems connected with the transfer of such weapons, whether through sale or gift, have become legitimate cause for concern on the part of the international community, since the existence of these weapons and their use in armed conflicts represent a considerable threat to the peoples of the world. In fact, this year alone we have seen the tremendous destruction caused by this type of weapon in the loss of human lives and of economic resources.

(Mr. Garcia Moreno, Colombia)

My delegation trusts that the study on the various aspects of the question of conventional disarmament, in keeping with the guidelines set for the Group by the Disarmament Commission and conceived in terms of the principles laid down in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, will represent a serious objective and fruitful contribution to the future consideration and conclusion of measures aimed at controlling the conventional arms race, parallel with those that may be taken in the field of nuclear disarmament. There is no doubt that we have to make progress on the two fronts in order to achieve the fundamental objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

We all agree that the results of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, held only a few months ago, were most disappointing. No progress was made with respect to some of the substantive aspects of disarmament, in spite of the efforts made by Working Group I, chaired by our distinguished and indefatigable promoter of disarmament, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, to achieve agreement on the text of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, on the basis of the draft referred to the General Assembly by the Committee on Disarmament, and which was, so to speak, the central core of the programme of the special session.

It has been said that the prevailing international situation was not propitious for the conclusion of agreements with a view to the implementation of the Programme of Action as agreed in the Final Document of the first special session on the subject. Of course, there is a close relationship between the state of international relations - in particular between the two nuclear super-Powers - and the achievement, or lack of it, in the field of disarmament. However, we believe that in the last analysis the decisive factor was the lack of political will on the part of those Powers which, because of their nuclear might, have a predominant influence on the solution or quest for solutions to the serious nuclear danger confronting mankind today.

(Mr. Garcia Moreno, Colombia)

The absence of decisions in the General Assembly was in marked contrast with the extraordinary expression of support for the disarmament cause, and in particular for nuclear disarmament, by hundreds of thousands of persons who congregated in this city and in other parts of the world. The peoples of the world are aware of the moral imperative of disarmament, and the force of that world public opinion which becomes more active and articulate as time goes by will compel Governments to reexamine their policies in the field of disarmament from a different angle.

My delegation attaches special importance to the World Disarmament Campaign under the auspices of the United Nations. A world public opinion well informed about the dangers of the continued arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, may well help to find the means that will lead to a reduction of such weapons.

My delegation has been especially interested in the adoption of effective agreements aimed at prohibiting all weapons of mass destruction. I am referring in particular to chemical and bacteriological weapons, and we see with satisfaction that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons in the Committee on Disarmament has made progress in this complex field. We hope that in the near future the Committee will submit a draft treaty completely and effectively banning the manufacture and stockpiling of such weapons, and calling for the total destruction of existing weapons of this kind.

Another matter to which my delegation attaches the greatest importance is the prevention of the arms race in outer space. We have read with profound concern press reports and publications which talk about the activities of the super-Powers aimed at using outer space for military purposes.

Recently there was held in Vienna the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, UNISPACE 82. The countries attending that Conference agreed on a statement by the President, drawing attention to the dangers represented by increased weaponry in outer space.

(Mr. Garcia Moreno, Colombia)

Unfortunately, it was a compromise statement. My country, like all the other third world countries, would have wished for a more specific condemnation of any activities aimed at extending the arms race to outer space.

My delegation, like other delegations from developing countries, considers space to be the common heritage of mankind which should remain outside any military confrontation between the super-Powers and should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. We agree with those delegations which, in the course of this debate, have emphasized the importance of having the Committee on Disarmament, entrusted with studying these matters following recommendations by the General Assembly, continue its substantive discussions of this subject with a view to negotiating an agreement, or whatever agreements may be necessary, to prevent the arms race in outer space. Similarly, my delegation supports the creation of an ad hoc working group on this question in the Committee on Disarmament.

My delegation wishes to associate itself with those who have advocated the ratification and deposit of the corresponding ratification instrument of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco by the missing State among the nuclear-weapon States to whom it is addressed, a State which signed that instrument over three years ago.

When we accept as an irrevocable truth that peace is the most desirable asset we can find in our passage through earth, we cannot but admire those who, with exemplary tenacity and enthusiasm, have devoted themselves to the noble task of creating and establishing between nations and peoples an awareness of peace. Because of their generous dedication to that noble task, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden have been most deservedly awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Their efforts in favour of peace in a threatened world in conflict is satisfactory for them and their countries, as it is for all of us, who express to them our sincere appreciation.

(Mr. Garcia Moreno, Colombia)

The Peace Prize award was a way also of highlighting the importance of the work which the First Committee and the Committee on Disarmament are doing together with other non-governmental organizations and movements in their quest for peace.

The stated purpose expressed in the definition of the Nobel Committee is revealing: "to open the eyes of the world to the threat that the nuclear arms race represents for mankind".

The CHAIRMAN: Having heard the last speaker on the list for this afternoon's meeting, the Committee thus concludes its general debate on all disarmament items.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I remind them that they should do so in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401.

Mr. AMIRY (Jordan): Yesterday morning the Committee listened, not without interest, to the statement by the Israeli delegate, in which he expanded on Israel's concern for the well-being of the discussion on disarmament.

My delegation does not intend to waste the Committee's valuable time by dwelling on the many irrelevant issues which the Israeli delegate expanded on in a hopeless cosmetic attempt to give himself the air of respectability which rightly belongs to the genuinely concerned members of this international body. However, my delegation will respond to two points made by the Israeli delegate which happen to be relevant to this Committee's work and to my country. I refer to Israel's claims that it favours, first, the issue of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East being addressed regionally through dialogue between the States of that region, and, secondly, regional disarmament being addressed in the same fashion.

I shall deal with the first point first. Israel was the first country in the region to usher in nuclear facilities. It is the only country in the region which has the capability to develop and deliver nuclear warheads. Israel is the only country in the region which did not sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty or submit its nuclear facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Israel neither wants to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty nor to submit its nuclear facilities to inspection by the IAEA, and there is a good reason for that. Israel does not care for, or have the least respect for, the international community. It has another well-thought-out reason: it wants to continue to hold the countries of the region to ransom, just as it has since it was conceived.

(Mr. Amiry, Jordan)

But yesterday there was a seemingly benevolent desire on Israel's part to have the issue of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons settled regionally, without external intervention - not even the intervention of the United Nations. The explanation is simple: Israel seeks to extract acceptance from its victims, and it seeks the stamp of legality for its acts of occupation, annexation and war-mongering. So Israel continues to hold a gun to the heads of the States of the region in a now well-conceived plan, and tells them in a well-rehearsed announcement "I am ready when you are", or, rather, when someone is listening or watching, "I am ready when you are, Sir."

If Israel is really serious, it will first sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as have all other peace-loving countries, including my own, and secondly, subject its nuclear facilities to inspection by the IAEA.

So much for the first point made by the Israeli delegate. The second relevant point, regarding Israel's preference for regional talks on disarmament, is best answered by pointing to the prevailing Israeli tactic and philosophy - its claim that a mighty Israel will be more ready to negotiate peace with its victims.

On this point, I would add that Israel has a race against time. Israel knows that in the course of time the facts about its claims may be discovered by many who are still deceived and that when more of the human conscience awakens, as we hope it will, something may be done about those claims. So Israel finds it not only desirable but absolutely imperative that its victims sign over to it the deeds of ownership of their lands and homes, and as soon as possible. It would make things look genuinely better, and talk would be less necessary.

Let me tell this Committee a parable which I improvised to make easier the task of exposing the real menace which our region has been putting up with for the past 35 years. A heavily-armed bandit comes across a heavenly, peaceful village, remotely located, where the inhabitants are engaged in farming and raising cattle. He decides to settle there. In order to do so in style, he steals 100 cows from the farmers. When his action is condemned and he is told that it violates all the civic norms and values, he claims that he is no stranger

to those norms and values, and that he is ready to show his good will. He suggests giving 20 cows back to the original owners, provided they sign documents handing over the remaining 80 cows to him. But when the farmers see no justice in his proposition he asks them for time to think things over. Next day, by force of arms, he steals another 50 cows and suggests that he is now ready to give back not only 20 cows, as he suggested the day before, but 40, and that he is ready to agree keeping for himself only the remaining 110. What further generosity can anyone expect? "There is no need to seek a judge from the city to settle this dispute", he claims. "We can talk about it ourselves in a civil and decent manner." I have one more thing to say about that armed bandit. He complains that the high-pitched voices of complaint of those farmers offend his sensibilities.

Mr. CLARK (United States of America): Yesterday in this Committee the representative of Nicaragua charged that the United States was a destabilizing force in Central America, that it engaged in activities hostile to States of the region and that it constituted a threat to Nicaragua.

Those charges are not new. Rather, they are a broken record endlessly repeated by Sandinista representatives in nearly every available forum.

The United States supports those Governments and peoples that are committed to the principles of the United Nations Charter - self-determination, territorial integrity and national independence. We have given, and will continue to give, assistance to the Government of Honduras and other Governments in that troubled region, when requested to do so by those Governments themselves.

The leaders of Nicaragua, like totalitarian Governments everywhere which have seized power by force of arms, live in fear that they, too, will become victims of violence. Their repeated accusations against the United States conform to the standard totalitarian practice of accusing others of precisely their own crimes.

The Nicaraguan representative asked rhetorically yesterday what was the location of clandestine arms and training sites in Nicaragua which were used to destabilize neighbouring countries. The location inside Nicaragua of the overall command and control centre of the Salvadorian guerrillas is well known. In fact, on 3 July this year the United States offered to supply a team to assist in locating and closing down this operation, so deeply engaged in efforts to destabilize and overthrow the freely-elected Government of El Salvador.

(Mr. Clark, United States)

Needless to say, the Nicaraguan Government has not responded to our offer, and yet yesterday they had the temerity to maintain before this Committee that they had no knowledge of such a site. By seeking yesterday also to misrepresent Nicaragua as the victim of foreign-backed threats from neighbouring Honduras, the Sandinista representative has, as usual, precisely reversed the facts.

What are these facts?

The Sandinistas are expanding the limited 6,000-man army of the Somoza era to a 25,000-man fighting force and have augmented the militia to 50,000 men. Two thousand Cuban military personnel are in Nicaragua in addition to about 6,000 Cuban advisors. This massive military build-up, far in excess of any defensive need, constitutes a clear threat to Honduras, El Salvador and other countries of Central America.

An intricate logistic network operated by Nicaragua and Cuba throughout Central America funnels weaponry to terrorists in El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica and Guatemala. The expansion of conflict into Honduras by Nicaragua and its Salvadoran guerrilla allies threatens the peace and well-being of Honduras. Until this year Honduras was involved in the wider Central American arena, mainly as a place of shelter for more than 30,000 refugees, and is now a willing staging area and supply route for various guerrilla movements. As the Honduran Government has taken steps to reassert its sovereignty and control its border regions and frontiers, it too has become a target of externally supported terrorism. During 1982 terrorist incidents have increased dramatically; border incidents with Nicaragua have escalated, and tensions have increased.

Honduras's dilemma is clear: passively to accept abuse of its territory by foreign guerrillas, or to defend itself and incur new costs in terrorism and destruction.

In the past few months Honduras has been struck by a wave of Nicaragua-backed kidnappings, aircraft hijackings, bank robberies and bombings of police buildings. To date in 1982 we are aware of 39 terrorist incidents which have occurred in Honduras or were directed at Honduran facilities outside that country. These include the placement of more than 30 bombs and

(Mr. Clark, United States)

attacks on at least three major United States corporations - Texaco, IBM and Air Florida. The most notable occurrences were as follows.

On 10 March the Texaco office was bombed; on 5 April there was a shooting attack on the United States Embassy; on 20 April the Argentinian and Chilean Embassies were bombed; on 28 April there was an attempt to hijack a domestic airliner, on 3 July the Honduran Airlines office in San José was bombed; on 4 July an electric power substation was bombed, temporarily blacking out Tegucigalpa; on 23 July the Honduran Airlines office in Guatemala City was bombed; and on 4 August Air Florida, IBM and TACA Airlines offices were bombed.

These attacks, their timing, their targets and their accompanying propaganda have made it obvious that they were not motivated by internal Honduran issues. Rather they were orchestrated by Nicaragua and the Salvadorean FMNL to intimidate Honduras.

An intense series of terrorist attacks immediately followed the Honduran army's deployment to defend its border zones against incursions by FMNL guerrillas. Nicaragua has chosen with Cuban support to try to take advantage of Honduras's economic and security problems. The continued success of Honduras's democratic experiment is clearly viewed as a threat by the Sandinista régime in Nicaragua. Along with Havana, the Sandinistas are training, supplying and bankrolling terrorists in Honduras. Honduras has also become a major thoroughfare for leftist armed traffic in support of the insurgent movements in El Salvador and Guatemala. Terrorist operatives of the Sandinista Government exploit Honduras's weakness to stage attacks on Honduras itself.

Nor is Honduras alone in feeling the pressure from Nicaragua. Democratic and armyless Costa Rica has also found Nicaragua to be a dangerous neighbour. On 4 July, coincident with the bombing that day of the electric power substation which blacked out Tegucigalpa, a terrorist bomb shattered the office of Honduran Airlines in downtown San Jose. Investigation by Costa Rican authorities revealed that the bomb was placed there by a member of the Colombian M-19 terrorist group acting on instructions from the Nicaraguan Embassy. The Costa Ricans actually tape-recorded an incriminating conversation

(Mr. Clark, United States)

between a Nicaraguan diplomat and a Colombian terrorist. As a direct result three Nicaraguan diplomats were expelled by the Costa Rican Government in early August. Just a month later Honduras expelled Nicaragua's economic attaché on national-security grounds. The Costa Rican Foreign Ministry has formally kept a record of continuing Nicaraguan abuses, support for terrorism and subversions, incursions and other activity inside Costa Rican territory by armed Nicaraguan troops and the harassment of Costa Rican commercial and tourist traffic on the San Jose River, which divides the two countries.

I cite these many facts to set the record straight in this Committee and to remind the Committee that in Nicaragua we are dealing not with a reasonable and sovereign Government open to negotiation but with a repressive, totalitarian régime maintained by force of arms and committed to the use of force against all opposition and already reliant on foreign military support.

Mr. SHEIKH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (interpretation from Arabic):

In exercising my delegation's right of reply, I wish to address myself to the representative of the United States, who yesterday morning referred to my country. The last person entitled to speak of armaments and the use of force is precisely the representative of the United States Government. The United States military budget exceeds one third of the world outlay on armaments. It has also manufactured the neutron bomb and has stockpiled nuclear and other weapons. The United States is the country that used weapons of mass destruction in Viet Nam in a war which it fought and lost. It is the United States fleet that committed aggression against my country. It is the United States that has been acting to undermine régimes that are not its satellites. It uses every means for that purpose, including its intelligence services, economic blockade, and disinformation campaigns.

We are therefore surprised to hear the representative of the United States speak of freedom of opinion, self-determination and equality of means. These are noble principles but do they apply to the links between the United States and the racist régime of South Africa, which violates the most elementary principles of democracy? Does the United States encourage government by the majority instead of the Fascist white minority? The same applies to occupied Palestine where the United States Government supports a racist régime. We wonder whether the United States Government's support of the Shah of Iran and Somoza in Nicaragua

(Mr. Sheikh, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

denote support for freedom of opinion and human rights? And can it be said that United States Government support of dictatorial Fascist régimes in many areas of the world promotes democracy?

We should like to point out that the reason for the American attack on my country is that Libya refuses to bow to American pressure to stop it from criticizing America's unjust and immoral policy in the Middle East and to prevent Libya from pursuing a non-aligned policy and to rid its oil economy of American hegemony.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): I listened a while ago to the statement in this Committee by the Ambassador of Somalia, who once again referred to a phantom aggression being committed against his country by Ethiopia. I wish merely to reject categorically the baseless allegations levelled against my country. My delegation also protests against the cynical innuendoes and fictitious assertions which have become characteristic of any statements by representatives of Somalia at any time in any forum.

The Foreign Minister of Ethiopia in his statement during the general debate at this session informed the General Assembly in detail of the nature of this unfounded allegation against Ethiopia, as well as of the situation of turmoil and chaos now prevailing inside Somalia. To say more now would be to denigrate the proceedings of this Committee. My delegation will therefore refrain from subjecting the members of this Committee to yet another round of sterile exchanges, of which the representative of Somalia appears to be very fond.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): I had hoped that the general debate would end on a less discordant and polemical note than that of the statement made, rather late, by the representative of Jordan. As for the matters of substance raised by the representative of Jordan, the regional disarmament commission, denuclearized zones and non-proliferation, we shall revert to them gladly in the further exchange of views that will take place in this Committee as from next week. I hope that in those various fields we shall also receive answers that go beyond politics and demagoguery, so that we shall be able to make some real progress in connection with matters that we regard as being vital.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Today we are ending the general debate on disarmament questions, and among the bitter memories we take from it is the fact that a nuclear-weapon State, a great Power, the United States made, if I remember rightly, five statements in this Committee but not a single constructive proposal on disarmament.

(Mr. Nunez Mosquera, Cuba)

There have only been attacks, falsehoods, pressure on sovereign States, merely attempts to prevent us from doing serious and businesslike work in this Committee. This is something we are already accustomed to.

The United States speaks of destabilization, and indeed it is so keen on destabilizing that it tries to destabilize even the work of the First Committee. The only one that destabilizes anything in the world is the United States - that is well known. Recently, on 1 October, it created the Special Forces Command, the main purpose of which, according to the United States press itself, was to destabilize the socialist countries and eliminate the national liberation movements. According to the press of that country, that Command will be composed of elite forces, the famous Green Berets, whom we all remember for the crimes they committed in Viet Nam, where they were given a sound beating.

With regard to Central America, recently the United States Congress approved an amendment to a bill on general budgets, the so-called Symms Amendment, which, in a way, reminds us of another amendment it approved at the beginning of the century, by virtue of which we now have in Guantanamo, Cuba, a military base imposed on us against the will of our people. The Symms Amendment authorizes the United States to use force, including weapons, against Cuba, but its scope is even broader. Indeed, it seeks to legalize the interventionist United States adventure in Latin American territory and particularly in Central America and the Caribbean.

Now the United States delegation is trying to create in this Committee a climate propitious for pursuing its aggressive ends. I should like to give a quotation from the free press, the Cuban international publication Gramma, of a paragraph relating to the Symms Amendment, which could also be applied to the statement made by the representative of the United States. It states:

"The contents of the Symms Amendment clearly show that some politicians in the United States are still unable to understand that United States imperialism has no right to set itself up as an international policeman, less still to insult the dignity of our peoples. How long will Washington continue to attempt to trample

(Mr. Nunez Mosquera, Cuba)

under foot the sovereignty and independence of Latin Americans? It would be a good thing for peace in this part of the world if certain politicians in the north were to understand and accept once and for all that the time when the Yankee boot could be planted on our soil whenever the President felt like it is long gone, to be found only in the pages of an out-dated calendar and in the pages of American pre-history, as a disgraceful testimony to the criminal actions of a powerful country, where the selfish and narrow interests of monopolies seek to increasingly to destroy democratic sentiments of the North American people."

We regret that the United States delegation should feel itself compelled here to defend the aggressive political positions of an Administration which came to power with the support of 26 per cent of the electorate.

As far as my country is concerned, the history of Cuba and its relations with the United States clearly show that in the face of imperialism one must not yield a single inch. The Cuban people is a people that loves its history and preaches it by giving the example. The people my delegation represents loves peace and works for it but it is prepared for any eventuality and to defend its revolution or to fall with it.

(Mr. Nunez Mosquera, Cuba)

The attitude of the United States with respect to disarmament, as has been clearly shown in that delegation's five interventions in this Committee, does not allow for progress in this field and does not permit businesslike discussion, and this has been stated in one way or another by many delegations at this thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

However, we must have faith in the future. We must have confidence in the future. We must be optimistic. This is not the first and I hope it will not be the last United States Administration.

Mr. ADAN (Somalia): I can understand the agitated reaction of the representative of Ethiopia because of my statement a little while ago concerning Ethiopia's aggression against my country. It was true, and the truth hurts. But I think the Committee has every right to know of the breach of the peace which has taken place in our region through Ethiopia's aggression against the territory and people of Somalia, an aggression which is continuing to this day.

This is an undeniable fact; in August the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which met in Rome, strongly condemned the military invasion carried out by Ethiopia and its allies in violation of the sovereign territorial integrity and political independence of the Somali Democratic Republic. In addition, the Arab States at their summit in Fez condemned Ethiopia's aggression against Somalia and called on it to withdraw its troops. Furthermore, the Islamic Conference, when it met in Niamey, reaffirmed its solidarity with and commitment to the people of the Somali Democratic Republic and, in condemning Ethiopia, called upon it to withdraw its troops from Somalia. All this evidence points to the fact that this act of aggression has indeed taken place, because all those very important international bodies would not have come out so clearly against Ethiopia's aggression unless it had indeed taken place.

Ethiopia cannot alter these facts by resorting to denigrating language and making allegations of turmoil in Somalia, and I think Ethiopia should heed the call of the international community to withdraw its troops from Somalia and to desist from committing further acts of aggression against my country.

Mr. CANDA MORALES (Nicaragua) (interpretation from Spanish): Yesterday we asked to speak in reply to direct accusations against my country made by Mr. Adelman of the United States delegation and in doing so we tried to avoid getting involved in sterile polemics. However, a few moments ago, the United States representative in his statement gratuitously and recklessly launched a number of unfounded charges against my country, in keeping with the attitude which the United States Administration has had towards Nicaragua for some time.

However, we shall not respond in detail to all of these charges, out of basic respect for this Committee, and in line with the attitude of maturity and responsibility which the revolutionary Government of Nicaragua has shown ever since it came to power in July 1979, maturity and responsibility to which all countries which cherish peace and democracy in the comity of nations can bear witness.

However, we should like to deal briefly with a number of points. We wish to submit to delegations for consideration something which we touched on very briefly yesterday, and that is the serious involvement of the United States Administration in specific plans for the destabilization of my country. What are we to think of a Government whose Ambassador in Honduras is responsible for the direct supervision of the destabilization plans being carried out by the Central Intelligence Agency? And that is not all. Officers of the State Department in Washington on Tuesday 1 November 1982 quite openly stated in reply to New York Times journalists that Mr. John Negroponte, United States Ambassador in Honduras, was supervising the destabilization activities being carried out against Nicaragua, but that he did not have the last word. However strange it may seem, he sometimes has to refer back to Washington so that the last word can be said there and they can give him the green light. So we can see what concrete form these destabilization plans take, and that all this is very different from the series of unfounded allegations so recklessly and passionately hurled at us now by the United States representative.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

Unfortunately, our people has already lost many lives - what a curious coincidence - about 300 people have been killed, including soldiers, frontier guards, peasants and workers assassinated by those counter-revolutionary bands based on the territory of Honduras which the State Department of the United States now publicly and officially acknowledges that they are financing, training and equipping, with all the resources which are of course available to that Government.

Note that the United States has not confined itself to trying to strangle us economically. For example, on 28 July 1982 the United States vetoed a vote in the American Development Bank on a loan of half a million dollars which my Government was seeking solely for the development of medium and small-scale fisheries on the Atlantic coast. Only a week ago the Standard Fruit Company broke off a contract for the marketing of Nicaraguan bananas, a contract which had been signed for five years with our Government. But only three years had gone by when the contract was broken off a week ago. Of course we are not taken in: there are obvious political motives at work here. Yesterday a vast plan of sabotage against my country was unmasked, involving the blowing up of the largest sugar mill in Central America, which is situated in my country. Our authorities discovered industrial quantities of explosives which had been brought in from Honduras, and a number of persons directly involved in this sabotage campaign were captured.

(Mr. Canda Morales, Nicaragua)

We shall not press the point. Everyone now knows more clearly than before that the United States is directly, absolutely and totally involved in serious plans for the destabilization of Nicaragua. However, Nicaragua is not going to be deflected from its serious proposals for talks or negotiations, without preconditions of any sort, with the United States on the one hand and with the Government of Honduras, in order to avoid being drawn into a broader conflict which can only bring pain and bloodshed to our people. Obviously, it would not be the United States which would suffer bloodshed, but rather the people of Honduras, the people of Nicaragua and other peoples of the Central American region.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Actually, rather than speaking in exercise of the right of reply, I should like to offer some clarifications in connection with certain assertions that have been made in the course of the afternoon meeting.

One delegation spoke about an episode that took place in the Argentine Embassy in Honduras some months ago. I simply wish to explain that the investigation into what happened on that occasion was carried out by the Honduran authorities and my Government has had no official information from those authorities which would attribute responsibility for that event to any foreign Government.

Secondly, another delegation said this afternoon that States which had not acceded to a particular international instrument, specifically the Non-Proliferation Treaty, were not peace-loving States. My delegation cannot accept such an assertion, all the more so since there are a number of Governments that have not acceded to that instrument for very well-founded reasons which were explained on many occasions and which I do not wish to repeat at this time.

Mr. AMIRY (Jordan): In my statement in exercise of the right of reply earlier today, Jordan was responding to the seemingly great concern that Israel had shown regarding the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In that respect, I mentioned peace-loving countries with regard to countries having signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

It is an established fact that the Israeli state philosophy is one of racism and has its roots in racism, namely, zionism. In that respect, I mentioned that Israel should sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and it was also in that respect that I meant they were not a peace-loving nation. That statement was made in regard to the Middle East area.

The CHAIRMAN: What a vibrant coda to our disarmament symphony.

As the Committee will recall, the Ambassador of Mexico this morning made a statement in which he outlined a draft resolution which his delegation would like to submit. He requested that the Committee take a decision on that draft resolution not later than 10 November and then transmit the draft resolution to the General Assembly for early action by that body.

I should like to inform representatives that it is my intention to put that draft resolution to the Committee on Wednesday, 10 November for action.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.