



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (WVRR)

FIRST COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 2 November 1982
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 22ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

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

General debate

Statements were made by:

- Mr. Ataul Karim (Bangladesh)
- Mr. Fields (United States of America)
- Mr. Jeichande (Mozambique)
- Mr. Bhatt (Nepal)
- Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan)

UN LIBRARY

NOV 10 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room 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 3.25 p.m.

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


GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ATAUL KARIM (Bangladesh): First of all, Sir, may I ask you to convey to the Chairman, on behalf of my delegation and myself, our most sincere felicitations on his well-deserved election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. We are confident that under his able and proven leadership we shall be able to achieve important and concrete results during the course of our work in the next few weeks. I should like also to congratulate you and the other officers of the Committee on your election to your posts.

The continued deterioration of the political and security situation in the world has lent greater importance to the deliberations of the Committee this year. My delegation pledges its full co-operation and support to the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee in the discharge of your onerous responsibilities.

I should like to join with preceding speakers in extending our sincere and warm congratulations to Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden and Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico, the two well-known disciples of peace who were recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. This high honour is indeed a recognition of their long-standing and constructive efforts to promote a more peaceful world and, above all, to rid the world of the nuclear threat. The presence of Mr. Garcia Robles in this Committee is undoubtedly a source of inspiration and encouragement to all of us gathered here in the cause of peace and disarmament.

The Bangladesh delegation also wishes to express its deep grief at the loss of an outstanding British personality, Lord Noel-Baker, whose exemplary devotion and work for international understanding and peace is well known.

The preceding speakers have underlined the sombre state of affairs which prevails in the world today. The escalation of the arms race and the feverish accumulation of the most sophisticated and lethal weapons in the arsenals of the two super-Powers and other militarily significant States have reatened not only international peace and security but also the very existence of mankind. The massive military expenditure stands out

(Mr. Ataul Karim, Bangladesh)

in sharp contrast to the effects of the critical world economic situation which have afflicted both North and South alike. The social opportunity costs resulting from the diversion of scarce resources for military use are writ large both in the developed and developing countries.

It is a matter for deep regret that, contrary to the expectations of the overwhelming majority of the international community, the second special session devoted to disarmament ended inconclusively. It is obvious that heightened international tensions prevented substantive agreements on issues of vital importance in the field of disarmament. The spirit of détente had pervaded the better part of the 1970s. We had quite reasonably expected a relaxation of tension, a greater respect for the Charter of the United Nations and more universal compliance with the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States; the reality unfortunately was different. What we have witnessed since the first special session on disarmament has been a further deterioration in the international situation and a sharp escalation in the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. At the same time, new strategic perceptions have entered into the field of international security. These activities are contrary to the letter and spirit of the Programme of Action of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We have also noted that whereas the super-Powers and other militarily significant States are engaged in an unprecedented arms race, there is a growing awareness among the peoples of the world of the impending threat of a nuclear war and the deleterious impact of the arms race on the world economy and ecology. There is a greater realization of the heavy price the world is paying in terms of social opportunity costs as a result of the arms race. The anti-nuclear and anti-war demonstrations in countries in both the East and the West have underlined the universal awareness of the harmful effects of the arms race. This growing public awareness, demonstrated during the second special session on disarmament should be further encouraged with a view to promoting the international disarmament campaign.



(Mr. Ataul Karim, Bangladesh)

Bangladesh's commitment to the cause of general and complete disarmament is firm and total. Our participation, at the highest level, at the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament demonstrated the importance we attach to the question of disarmament and international security. The Head of Government of Bangladesh, His Excellency Lieutenant-General Hussain Muhammad Ershad, in his address to the second special session, said:

"... there are three major challenges to mankind's continued progress and ultimate survival. They are: first, the arms race; second, under-development; and third, the unlawful use of force for solving international disputes." (A/S-12/PV.17, p. 7)

The Head of Government of Bangladesh also stated:

"... to ensure peace and security which would preserve our planet for succeeding generations we must put an end to the continuing escalation of the arms race. Since only a fraction of the weaponry that we have in our possession could destroy our civilization many times over, such an exercise is one of illogical redundancy. We must therefore strive towards the goal of achieving total and complete disarmament, with nuclear disarmament as our immediate and central objective. The goal must be pursued by substantive means. The role of the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission should be enhanced and encouraged. (ibid., pp. 7 and 8-10)

While expenditure on armaments continues to rise sharply, a large segment of the world remains deprived and underprivileged. Bangladesh believes that peace is meaningless if it is not accompanied by development, that the right to development is a human right and that equality of opportunity for development is as much a prerogative of nations as of individuals within nations. The present inequities in the world economic order, together with the accelerated arms race, are therefore at the core of all world problems and constitute a significant obstacle to the realization of both the right to development and the right to peace.

It is indeed a great pity that, despite our pledges to abjure the use of force or the threat of the use of force as a means of settling



(Mr. Ataul Karim, Bangladesh)

international disputes, such acts continue to be committed with impunity all around the globe. We would like to stress that without faithful and sincere adherence to the principles of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-use of force, the peaceful settlement of all disputes and non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, there can be no durable and just peace in this world.

Bangladesh strictly adheres to the principles and purposes of the Charter of United Nations in its total commitment to the concept of general and complete disarmament. It was in pursuance of that commitment that we acceded to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We are, however, dismayed and distressed to see that despite over hundred States, having acceded to that Treaty, nuclear proliferation continues unabated. We are convinced that any use of nuclear weapons, whether or not limited in scale, would inevitably escalate and the security of non-nuclear-weapon States, even when they were not remotely involved, would be equally threatened. It is our common duty, therefore, to adopt concrete measures aimed at the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

Bangladesh believes in peace, peace in the region and in the world, through strict adherence to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. At the second special session devoted to disarmament Bangladesh took an active part in the negotiations leading to the adoption of the decision on the World Disarmament Campaign. We also made a token contribution towards the success of the Campaign.

Bangladesh holds the view that peace and security would be promoted through the creation of zones of peace in areas such as the Indian Ocean, South and South East Asia, the Mediterranean and other regions. In the creation of such zones account would have to be taken of the interrelated aspects of eliminating the military presence of, and threat from, external Powers, and the maintenance of security among the regional States. As a member of the



(Mr. Ataul Karim, Bangladesh)

Ad hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, we have actively supported the convening of a conference in Sri Lanka next year as a step towards the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

Bangladesh has also been making unrelenting efforts to promote peace and stability in the South Asian region through the creation of a climate of trust, understanding and co-operation on the basis of mutual respect for sovereign equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Taking into account our friendly relations within our own region with India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka and Maldives, Bangladesh initiated a proposal in 1980 for the creation of a regional forum for co-operation among these countries. Substantial progress has already been made towards the implementation of this proposal. Next year a meeting at the level of Foreign Ministers is expected to establish the forum.

Bangladesh believes that there is a close relation between disarmament and development. The colossal financial and other resources consumed by the armaments race ought to be directed towards eliminating world poverty. While we appeal to the East and the West to work out a viable basis for achieving effective disarmament, we also emphasize the need for the forging of a new consensus between the North and the South, with a view to bridging both the economic and the security gap between them. In the second special session on disarmament, Bangladesh was elected Chairman of the Co-ordinating Group on Disarmament and Development and in that capacity tried to harmonize the views of various groups. As the Chairman of the Group of 77 and as a member of the group of least developed countries, Bangladesh will continue to do all it can to bring about de-escalation of the arms race and the optimum utilization of the available resources for the social and economic development of the developing countries.

It is evident that the complex and interrelated issues connected with the question of disarmament can best be addressed in a multilateral context. We therefore firmly believe that the United Nations has a central role to play in the field of disarmament, and have consistently supported



(Mr. Ataul Karim, Bangladesh)

the strengthening of the United Nations machinery to help the Secretary-General in his disarmament efforts as well as in the Organization's peace-keeping role. In this context we have supported the proposal to expand the Committee on Disarmament, which in our view would enhance its effectiveness. In keeping with our abiding commitment to disarmament efforts, Bangladesh has applied for membership of the Committee on Disarmament and is ready to contribute to all future disarmament negotiations to be undertaken in the Committee.

That Committee has a very heavy agenda, although the time at its disposal is extremely short. I urge upon all concerned to negotiate the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament in earnest without further delay. In negotiating the Programme, priority consideration should be given to a complete prohibition of the use or threat of use of force as a means of settling disputes. Efforts should also be undertaken to ensure that all States refrain from the testing of nuclear weapons pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Simultaneously, there should be a total freeze on the production, deployment and research and development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. The legitimate concern of non-nuclear-weapon States and neutral countries as regards threats to their security needs to be allayed. The nuclear-weapon States should provide them with a negative security guarantee. Similarly, the production, deployment, research and development of new chemical weapons should be suspended pending the conclusion of a chemical-weapons treaty. The attempts to use outer space for military purposes should be halted and it should be declared the common heritage of mankind, to be used for humanity at large.

At the same time, practical efforts should be made to ensure the proper utilization for the development purposes of all countries of the world of the surplus resources which would be released as a result of disarmament efforts.



(Mr. Ataul Karim, Bangladesh)

I should like also to urge the United Nations to publicize the main elements of the Expert Group studies: "Study on the relationship between disarmament and international security"; "Relationship between disarmament and development" and "Economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures", in order to create greater public awareness of the need for the adoption of effective universal disarmament measures.

In conclusion, Bangladesh believes that, given the necessary political will, the priorities I have enumerated are not beyond the possibility of realization. We are meeting at a crucial juncture in the history of mankind. Never before has the human race been so dangerously close to the precipice of total self-destruction. Our awareness of the great dangers posed by this mad race for armament and our consensus about taking urgent practical steps towards disarmament must be translated into reality, to usher in an era of global peace and security. It is our sincere hope and desire that all States, particularly the most powerful and militarily significant, will display self-restraint and moderation and enter into serious negotiations on disarmament. Let us all join together in earnest in this noble endeavour, which will set us on the path of real and meaningful disarmament negotiations.

In my statement I have indicated the general views of the delegation of Bangladesh on the agenda items before us. We hope to make further observations on specific issues later.




Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself and the members of my delegation with the remarks of Mr. Eugene Rostow in congratulating Ambassador Gbeho on his election as our Chairman and you, Ambassador Vraalsen, and the other officers of the Committee as well and in expressing the commitment of my delegation to work closely with you and the officers of the Committee for the success of the Committee's efforts.

I should like to speak today on the agenda item on chemical and biological weapons and particularly on the question of developing a convention on the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. This is a matter of great concern to the United States Government and to me personally, since a part of my responsibilities as the United States representative to the Committee on Disarmament is to press forward with efforts to elaborate such a convention.

Contrary to some allegations we heard in this Committee, my Government clearly and unequivocally supports the goal of banning these weapons and has been working with determination to achieve that aim. On 8 February 1982, President Reagan stated that: "The ultimate goal of United States policy is to eliminate the threat of chemical warfare by achieving a complete and verifiable ban on chemical weapons." The focus of the world's attention and efforts to ban these weapons is in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, where the United States, along with many other members of the Committee, has made a concerted effort to contribute to progress towards that objective.

We are gratified that those efforts have borne some fruit. In the course of this year the Committee's Working Group on Chemical Weapons was able to bring into even sharper focus a number of issues vital to the elaboration of an effective convention. Members of the First Committee have before them the report of the Committee on Disarmament, which also contains the report of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons.

Nevertheless, I should like to set forth briefly the views of my Government on the general points which should serve as the basis for a convention banning chemical weapons. First, with regard to the scope of the convention, our view is that it should prohibit the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition, retention or transfer of chemicals, munitions and equipment for chemical-weapon purpose.  It should also prohibit any assistance or encouragement to others to

(Mr. Fields, United States)

obtain or produce chemicals or munitions for chemical-weapon purposes. There are some who argue that a new convention should also include a ban on the use of chemical weapons. On this point, we believe that care must be taken to avoid undermining the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which already contains a ban on such use. Thus we believe that the new convention should reaffirm the 1925 Protocol and preclude the use of chemical weapons in situations not covered by that Protocol.

The second major element of a convention should be the declaration and destruction of all existing stockpiles of chemical weapons and of facilities for their production and filling. The convention should require a prompt and detailed declaration by each party of any chemicals, munitions and specially designed equipment in chemical-weapon stockpiles which it possesses. In addition, there should be a requirement for a prompt and detailed declaration of any facilities designed or used for the production of any chemical which is primarily used for chemical-weapon purposes or for filling chemical munitions. Such facilities must be declared, even if they are designed or used in part for other purposes, such as civilian production. It is also important that the convention should include arrangements for providing confidence in the accuracy of those declarations. Next, the convention should provide for immediate and verifiable closure of production and filling facilities and for a ban on construction of any new facilities. Finally, the convention should provide for the destruction of stockpiles and facilities according to an agreed schedule and on the basis of agreed procedures. In the view of the United States the period for the accomplishment of this destruction should be 10 years.

Thirdly, and in the view of my delegation of particular importance, there must be effective verification provisions in a convention. The aim of these verification provisions is quite simple: to provide confidence that all parties are complying with all provisions of the convention. It is our strong conviction that verification of a chemical-weapon convention must rest on a combination of national and international measures. Moreover, international measures must contain provisions for systematic international on-site inspection. I should like to expand somewhat on the types of international on-site inspection which we believe will be required in a chemical-weapon convention.



First, the destruction of the stockpiles of chemical weapons declared by each party to the convention should be monitored on-site on a continuous basis until destruction is completed. Secondly, there should be systematic on-site verification of the disposition of declared production and filling facilities until they have been destroyed. Finally, if the convention allows for production of super-toxic lethal chemicals for protective purposes, such production must be subject to agreed procedures and to verification through systematic on-site inspection for any period that such a facility is maintained for that purpose.

There is one other particularly important point on this score which deserves to be underlined. There must be effective provisions for dealing with the possibility of undeclared stockpiles or facilities. This necessity arises from the fact, lamentable as it may be, that some might be tempted to conceal either stocks or facilities and it must be noted that such concealment might easily escape detection. A facility for the production of chemical weapons could well look like any commercial chemical or pharmaceutical factory and a storage facility for undeclared munitions could be hidden almost anywhere.



(Mr. Fields, United States)

An integral part of verification provisions of a convention must be procedures for a fact-finding investigation under the auspices of the parties to the convention, in the event that suspicious activities are reported. There should be provisions for prompt initiation of such an investigation and for an obligation by the parties concerned to co-operate in resolving issues arising over compliance. These provisions should include an appropriate right of on-site inspection at sites where suspicious activity may have occurred. Moreover, there should be some means of redress if a complaint is not satisfactorily resolved.

Finally, we believe that the convention should provide for the creation of a consultative committee with verification responsibilities, made up of parties to the convention.

In the course of this year some progress was made in the chemical weapons Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament. Especially in the summer part of the Committee's session this year there was particularly intensive work which resulted in a degree of progress towards the elaboration of such a convention. The work on verification provisions of a possible convention was the object of intense scrutiny by many delegations, including our own.

It might be worth noting at this point the proposals of the Soviet Union submitted to the General Assembly's second special session on disarmament which were subsequently advanced in the Committee. We welcomed the fact that these proposals suggested a certain degree of flexibility on some issues related to verification. In all candour, however, we were disappointed at the failure of Soviet representatives to amplify to any meaningful degree upon their new proposals. I should note that, while their proposals do not provide an adequate treatment of the verification problem, particularly in the area of systematic international on-site verification, they are of some interest. We are therefore hopeful that when the Committee meets again next year the Soviet Union will be prepared to answer the questions which my delegation and many others have put to it about its proposals.

This leads me to an observation about the prospects for further work in the Committee on Disarmament on chemical weapons, in particular our forthcoming session next spring. Quite frankly, we feel that the only way to move forward



(Mr. Fields, United States)

is to tackle the hard but vital outstanding problems in the area of verification and related issues.

I have dealt with the issue of a chemical weapon convention at some length because it remains an important but unresolved problem - one on which a concerted effort must be made in the Committee on Disarmament if we are to move towards the goal of an effective ban of these weapons for all time. Much hard work remains to be done, as I have indicated in my remarks today. But I can assure representatives that my Government will do its full share in the Committee to advance this important cause.

Everyone here is aware of the dangers to mankind if we do not effectively block off this form of warfare. There have already been enough reports of the use of these deadly weapons - in violation of international law - to convince all of us that an effective chemical-weapon ban is now an imperative for us all. The conclusion of my Government - which we are confident is shared by most, if not all, members of this body - is that any new convention dealing with chemical weapons must have effective provisions for ensuring compliance.

While the elaboration of a chemical-weapon convention must proceed in the Committee on Disarmament in accordance with its own procedures, my delegation would welcome an appropriately worded resolution from the General Assembly that would strengthen the resolve of Member Governments to advance that important work. I must say that it was a keen disappointment to us last year that, as a result of an amendment to the traditional resolution on this subject, adoption of the resolution by consensus was not possible. We hope that at this session a resolution capable of enjoying consensus will be developed, and we look forward to working closely with other delegations on that task. Such a resolution would be a reflection of our common determination to work towards a complete and verifiable prohibition of chemical weapons for all time.



Mr. JEICHANDE (Mozambique)(interpretation from French): On behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, I should like to congratulate Ambassador Gbeho on his election as Chairman of this Committee. In him, I greet the representative of Ghana, an anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist country, which at the time of the proclamation of its independence declared that there would be no freedom in Ghana until the whole of Africa was freed from colonialism. For his country peace will always be closely linked to the freedom of peoples.

My delegation wishes also to extend its congratulations to the other officers of the Committee. They can all count on the co-operation of my delegation in performing their difficult duties.

I cannot fail to associate myself with those who have congratulated Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico on the award to him of the 1982 Nobel Peace Prize. It was very fitting that Ambassador Garcia Robles should have received the Nobel Peace Prize because for many years he has dedicated himself to the struggle for peace. We wish Ambassador Garcia Robles the fullest success in his tireless work in the cause of peace.

My congratulations go also to Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden, the other Nobel Peace Prize winner.

Several representatives who have spoken before me have emphasized the need to establish a climate of confidence among nations. My delegation agrees with this view. We are also disturbed at the erosion of relations between Member States.

The United Nations, whose role should be that of creating harmony and understanding among States and finding peaceful solutions for the problems of mankind, has increasingly become a forum for confrontation, and the Charter signed at San Francisco on 26 June 1945 is no longer the fundamental instrument governing relations between States. Political, economic and military pressures are being used, not to serve the principles and objectives of the United Nations but solely to advance the selfish interests of certain countries. In Africa, those political and economic pressures are designed to perpetuate the illegal occupation of Namibia and the régime of apartheid and to preserve famine, disease and ignorance. In Asia and in Central and South America, economic and military pressures are being exerted to help keep corrupt and dictatorial régimes in power and to impede the process of the liberation of peoples.

(Mr. Jeichande, Mozambique)

Some countries act in total disregard of the legitimate aspirations of the peoples as enshrined in the Charter, that is, aspirations to social progress and better living conditions in more universal freedom. As the Secretary-General emphasized in his report (A/37/1), there are contradictions between national objectives and those of the Charter. That is why we are now witnessing a tendency to have recourse to confrontation, violence and war to satisfy so-called vital interests and aspirations.

In the name of national security and the defence of geo-strategic interests, some countries have been accumulating in their arsenals considerable stocks of nuclear weapons; those weapons pose a threat not only to the lives of the citizens of those countries but to all mankind.

In this explosive situation how can we believe countries which refuse to work with the United Nations to demand the eradication of colonialism and of apartheid? How can we trust countries which allow the International Monetary Fund to grant racist South Africa a \$1 billion credit, most of which will doubtless go the nuclear programme of the apartheid régime? None the less, those same countries block the granting of modest credits when these are requested by developing countries in which many thousands of children are dying of hunger.

How can we believe countries which reduce their contributions to programmes of assistance to developing countries while at the same time they are building up to astronomical levels their military budgets?

Trust can be created when we act in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the peoples. Clearly there will be no peace while constant support is being provided to colonialist, racist, fascist and expansionist régimes. There will never be disarmament so long as hunger, disease and unemployment continue to affect the majority of mankind. The provision and accumulation on a massive scale of armaments and related technology, including the acquisition of nuclear weapons by the colonialist and racist forces, is an obstacle to the process of disarmament and a grave threat to international peace and security.



(Mr. Jeichande, Mozambique)

The establishment of economic, scientific and cultural relations among States, regardless of their social and economic systems, is an important contribution to peace. When we have succeeded in establishing mutually advantageous co-operation, we shall have obtained what the peoples want, that is, the elimination of the abyss between the rich and the poor and a world free of the terror of war, in particular of nuclear war.


We believe that the essential elements for the establishment of trust between States are not committees or satellites for verification and the control of weapons. The key to the disappearance of mistrust lies precisely in scrupulous respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter because it will always be possible to find technical or human means to carry out all kinds of verification when there is disagreement concerning supervision.

The present arms race is the clearest proof of what I have just been saying. Nowadays each new type of weapon produces a response in the form of a more deadly and more sophisticated weapon.

The struggle for peace has become the principal concern of our age. The struggle for peace means putting an end to the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race.

In this respect we welcome the solemn commitment by the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China not to be the first Powers to use nuclear weapons. We believe those declarations are important contributions to détente, which is a sine qua non of true disarmament. We urge all the other nuclear Powers to enter into the same commitment. We also support the new proposals designed to halt the nuclear arms race, because a nuclear war, once started, would without any doubt attain world-wide dimensions, regardless of where the outbreak took place.

We vigorously denounce doctrines which contend that a limited nuclear war is viable. We condemn those doctrines not only because they are a threat to mankind, to life itself, but also because we reject the very idea of a repetition of the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, even on a small scale.

The proponents of limited nuclear war wish to establish a peace without life. This is not at all the kind of peace we advocate. That is why we were concerned when the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was pre-sented from adopting concrete measures to put an end to the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Jeichande, Mozambique)

In keeping with the Final Document adopted by the first special session devoted to disarmament, the People's Republic of Mozambique feels that to eradicate the danger of a nuclear war and the use of nuclear weapons nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons are indispensable.

In this context, and in keeping with paragraph 63 (c) of the 1978 Final Document, we demand that Africa become a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

It is with great disquiet and indignation that we behold the development of military co-operation, inter alia in the nuclear sphere, between certain Western Powers and the apartheid régime. The South African régime is irresponsible and criminal. It systematically violates the Charter of the United Nations. Making nuclear weapons available to racist South Africa is like giving fire to a madman. The nuclearization of South Africa would result in an increase in the aggressiveness of the apartheid régime, not only towards the Namibian and South African peoples but also towards sovereign States of the region. If we do not want to see a repetition in southern Africa of the Sharpeville and Kassinga massacres, if we do not want a repetition of the recent massacres at Sabra and Shatila, let us put an end to any sort of military co-operation with the apartheid régime. History has already given sufficient proof that co-operation with racist régimes, far from restraining their warlike nature, encourages them to spread death and aggression.

Peace continues to be troubled in the Indian Ocean area, where there is an even more alarming intensification of the military and nuclear presence of various Powers, a development that is rightly of concern to the coastal States of the region. In disregard of the will of the peoples and all peace-loving forces and in violation of the spirit and letter of resolution 2832 (XXVI) of the General Assembly, whereby the Indian Ocean was declared a zone of peace, certain Powers are in the process of building up their presence in the area. Rapid deployment forces are being sent there and a nuclear capacity is being developed in the Diego Garcia base and in other military bases.



(Mr. Jeichande, Mozambique)

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is being prevented from carrying out its mandate from the General Assembly because of the lack of political will on the part of certain Western countries members of the Ad Hoc Committee. Attempts are being made to sidetrack the Committee's mandate by the submission of unacceptable arguments, which are imposed on us because of the power of certain Western countries to block progress.

We regret that resolution 36/90, which we adopted by consensus last year, may well be ignored, in disregard of the overwhelming will of the Members of the United Nations.

My country once again calls for the dismantling of all military and nuclear bases established in the Indian Ocean and for scrupulous respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States of the region. Such action could not fail to contribute to the process of disarmament.

In conclusion, the delegation of the People's Republic of Mozambique hopes that the lack of political will which was so obvious at the last special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be replaced in this Committee by a spirit of moderation, flexibility and co-operation, because our destiny as human beings is at stake. The possibility of putting an end to massacres and genocide is within our reach. The establishment of peace and progress depends on man himself.

If all men are to be able to enjoy the scientific and technological progress which is now open to us, it is essential to reduce military budgets and to destroy chemical and biological weapons; it is essential to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones and to put an end to the frantic nuclear and other arms races, which unfortunately are now extending to the sea-bed and outer space.

The struggle continues.



Mr. BHATT (Nepal): I should like to begin by congratulating Ambassador Gbeho on his election as Chairman of this important Committee. Knowing his vast experience, we feel confident that he will guide the work of the First Committee to a fruitful conclusion. I should also like to extend our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee.

I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to extend our warm congratulations to Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico and Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to these distinguished personalities is a well-deserved recognition of their lifelong dedication of the cause of peace and disarmament.

Developments in the field of disarmament and international security over the past year have been less than reassuring. Despite universal concern, the competition in nuclear weapons continues uncontrolled. The elimination of the danger of nuclear war has become the single most pressing issue today. We reiterate our belief that the nuclear-weapon States, particularly the most heavily armed among them, bear a special responsibility for the creation of this situation. These States have to take the necessary steps to ensure the substantial reduction and the eventual elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. We welcome the reconvening of the talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on strategic nuclear weapons. We trust that both sides intend to work for a substantial cut in their strategic arsenals.

We welcome the Soviet declaration on non-first use of nuclear weapons and the assurance given by the People's Republic of China in this regard. Similar forthright declarations by other nuclear Powers could greatly help alleviate the fear of a nuclear war.

The lack of progress towards a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests continues to be a matter of deep concern. The major nuclear Powers have undertaken a solemn commitment under the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty and the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to work for a comprehensive test ban. Therefore, we regret the decision not to continue the trilateral negotiations and appeal to the parties concerned to reconsider their positions. The NPT continues to be one of the most important instruments devised to check the proliferation of nuclear weapons. A comprehensive test ban could greatly enhance the status of the NPT by demonstrating that the nuclear-weapon States are being true



(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

to their obligations under the NPT. While welcoming the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban by the Committee on Disarmament, we feel that the technical ground for such a ban has already been prepared. Therefore, the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty should not be further delayed.

My delegation fully supports the extension and development of the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Such a step alone would enable the Agency to play an effective role as an instrument of international verification arrangement.

Nepal reiterates its stand that the 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 subject to nuclear attack. My delegation expresses regret at the lack of progress on this issue in the Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of freely arrived at agreements between the States of the regions can be an important step towards the goal of disarmament. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America has provided a model for the establishment of similar zones in other regions of the world. We support the efforts to bring about the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia. Nepal fully supports the African States in their efforts to counter the designs of South Africa to introduce nuclear weapons in that region against the will of the entire continent.

As a hinterland State of the Indian Ocean, Nepal continues to believe that the present trend of military build-up can only aggravate the already difficult situation in the region. The lack of progress in the implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace is indeed unfortunate. We fully support the early convening of the Conference on the Indian Ocean to pave the way for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean.

Nepal renews its appeal for the early conclusion of a binding and verifiable convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the destruction of present arsenals. To that end, we urge the member Powers to co-operate fully with the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

The increasing use of outer space for military purposes has become a matter of great concern. Such use is in total contravention of the spirit of the 1967 outer space Treaty and other relevant instruments. Nepal supports the further elaboration of legislative measures to prevent the escalation of the arms race in outer space.

We subscribe to the view that the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament are of highest importance in the disarmament process. However, we also continue to support the call for an effective measure to curb the race in conventional arms. As we have stated many times, the process has to begin with the most heavily armed States. The creation of a climate of confidence among them can greatly promote the relaxation of tension at the global level. We hope that the Group of Experts established to study conventional disarmament will help to create grounds for concrete action in this regard.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament have been working within the present framework for four years now. A review of the outcome of these bodies fails to satisfy my delegation. This session must make an analysis of the situation in order to make these multilateral deliberating and negotiating forums more action-oriented. My delegation reiterates its support for a gradual expansion in the structure and function of the Centre for Disarmament, which has a vital role in promoting well-informed public opinion in favour of disarmament.

Nepal regrets that the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament fell far short of the hopes it had generated. We hope that the Committee on Disarmament will continue its serious negotiations on the elaboration of a time-bound comprehensive programme for disarmament. The second special session aroused overwhelming public support for disarmament. My delegation believes that a well-balanced and objective disarmament campaign under United Nations auspices will enhance public understanding of the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

There can be no enduring peace and security in the world as long as widespread poverty and economic injustice prevail. The growing military expenditures are rapidly draining away resources desperately needed for development. The



(Mr. Bhatt, Nepal)

United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development has focused on the triangular relationship between disarmament, development and security in the global context. The problems of unemployment and social needs in the developed countries and the problem of increasing misery in the developing countries demand immediate restraint on military spending.

The present state of international relations can in no way help the cause of disarmament. Relations between the two super-Powers have further deteriorated, affecting a whole range of issues. Narrow strategic considerations of the big Powers have only served to reinforce the fear of a major war. The lack of substantial progress in the Committee on Disarmament, the failure of the second special session devoted to disarmament and the steady erosion of the authority of the Security Council are all symptoms of what the Secretary-General in his annual report calls "a new international anarchy". Nepal fully subscribes to the view that measures for the achievement of disarmament and international peace and security can be effective only when the Charter of the United Nations becomes effective. And this will come about only when the solemn obligation undertaken by each Member State under the Charter is carried out and not evaded.



Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): Since this is the first time I have spoken in this Committee, I should like at the outset to extend to Mr. Gbeho the warmest felicitations of the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on his well-deserved unanimous election to the very important post of Chairman of the political and security Committee. I have personally had ample opportunity to witness the outstanding professional qualities he has acquired during his distinguished political and diplomatic career. As the representative of a friendly non-aligned country, he enjoys the full trust and confidence of our delegation, and we are certain that under his wise and competent leadership the task entrusted to this Committee will be tackled with the utmost mastery and patience. I assure him of the full co-operation of my delegation in the fulfilment of his responsible duties.

I would also like to proffer my congratulations to you, Sir, and to Mr. Julio Carasales on your election as Vice-Chairmen of our Committee. My sincere congratulations go also to Mr. Luvsangiin Erdenechuluun on his election to the post of Rapporteur.

I should also like to join the other delegations which have spoken earlier in congratulating two distinguished personalities, Mrs. Alva Myrdal and Mr. Alfonso Garcia Robles of Mexico, on the award they have received in recognition of their tireless efforts in preserving peace and promoting disarmament.

Every twelfth month or so this Committee is convened during the regular session of the General Assembly to evaluate the international political and security climate and to adopt measures that could block negative trends in international relations and pave the way for a better and safer world.

The tense and acute character of the present relationship between the two major tendencies of our era has acquired sharper and more dangerous dimensions. The louder the voices of war and aggression grow, the more vigorous the response of the peoples becomes. The struggle between the forces of aggression, domination and exploitation on the one hand and those of peace, détente and co-operation on the other has gained momentum during the past few years.



(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The 1970s witnessed a very healthy development in the relations between the two major military blocs which opened new prospects of hope and optimism for the future. A number of very important agreements were signed that widely contributed to the reduction of tension and the promotion of co-operation. The signing of the Helsinki accords on peace and security in Europe and the conclusion of a Treaty on the limitation of strategic arms between the United States and the Soviet Union were major achievements of that era which in turn had a positive effect on the whole international political climate. Different political, social and economic systems were once again given a chance to compete peacefully for the betterment of their nations. It was, however, the militarist warmongering forces that went back on their earlier commitments, and adopted decisions that would not only disturb the delicate balance of forces in Europe and elsewhere in the world, but also be tantamount to the revival of the cold war and of the arms race.

The notable decision by the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in September 1979 on the drastic increase of the military budgets of its members, the unilateral suspension by the United States of its negotiations with the Soviet Union on the Indian Ocean, the suspension of the trilateral negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union on the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and other similar developments marked the turning-point away from détente and co-operation.

In circumstances in which man is armed with weapons that would suffice to destroy his planet a thousand times over, these developments further intensified, in quantity as well as in quality, the already alarming pace of the arms race.

Those in imperialist and hegemonist circles have staked their all on the policy of the use of force and of acting from a position of strength. They have blocked all negotiations on the most acute problems of our time with their unrealistic and rigid positions. They have turned a deaf ear to humanity's voice of concern over its very survival. Not only that, but they have started to preach



(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

certain inhuman ideas such as the admissibility of a limited or protracted nuclear war. Closing their minds to the incalculable consequences of such a war, which would undoubtedly develop into an all-out nuclear confrontation, the warmongering factions have embarked upon the course of a qualitatively new spiral of the arms race, which has not only brought the world closer to the brink of a final catastrophe but also put an enormous amount of pressure on the world economy.

That policy has manifested itself in various corners of the globe. There are more imperialist forces now deployed in those areas than there were in the recent past. There are more military bases and installations of the United States and its allies in different regions than there were before. Increasing attempts are being made to drag countries into the imperialist orbit and make them part of the imperialist military designs. An increasing number of independent States are becoming targets of imperialist plots and intrigues.

Asia, the region to which the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan belongs, has been a victim of that chain of conspiracies against peoples. There, as in any other part of the world, the peoples raise the most fundamental question of our time with the utmost emphasis: can the destiny of man's civilization be safeguarded from the threat of total extermination? The task of doing away with those weapons that represent the gravest potential danger thus acquires the utmost priority in dealing with disarmament questions.

There is no less concern about the immediate consequences of the present situation. In a world in which hundreds of billions of dollars are being so senselessly squandered on the arms race, people die in tens of thousands because of hunger and disease. Statistics reveal that if a portion of the sums allocated to producing the means of war and destruction could be diverted to alleviating the hardships of the developing countries, humanity would soon rid itself of the negative effects of natural calamities. For that reason, it is the earnest desire of all peoples of the world, and particularly



(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

the vast majority living in developing countries, that the militarily powerful nations of the world may soon arrive at mutually acceptable measures on curbing the arms race and on reducing and even totally destroying their stockpiles of weapons. That would release enormous resources that could be used for the good of mankind and to provide a satisfactory life.

As one of the non-aligned and least-developed countries, faced with multifaceted problems, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is endeavouring to play its part with a full sense of responsibility in order to avoid our region's being plunged into the bleak prospects of the arms race. What is discouraging, however, is the policy adopted by the United States of using every possible pretext to drag the reactionary régimes of the region into heavy militarization of their countries. Because of their legitimate concern, other countries of our region would inevitably have to spend larger amounts of their scarce resources on appropriate means of defence in order to maintain the necessary balance of power. It is our earnest hope that the solution of some of the outstanding political disputes among the countries concerned will help to create an atmosphere in which all those nations, large and small, powerful or weak, can live in security and in which no country's independence, territorial integrity and national sovereignty will be threatened by others.



(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

Afghanistan has been one of the staunch supporters of the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. If agreements such as the one on preserving Latin American as a nuclear-weapon free zone could be reached in other parts of the world, that would strengthen the security of the non-nuclear weapon States.

In full conformity with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we have extended our full support to the proposals for the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of those countries where there are no such weapons at present. We shall support any treaty which contains provisions to that end.

In our view, the Non-Proliferation Treaty should also be extended to outer space. Events during the last two years have revealed the intention of some quarters to introduce highly sophisticated weapons of mass destruction into outer space. The number of this kind of weapon already accumulated on earth seems inadequate for the dirty deeds of the military circles that are now trying to deploy them in outer space. We call for a complete halt to all attempts to militarize outer space.

We also favour the signing of treaties on the prohibition of the use of weapons of mass destruction in all their different variants, such as neutron, radiological and chemical weapons. While hailing the signing of the Conventions on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Have Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, together with their annexed Protocols, concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1980, we hope that all those nations have not yet done so will sign that Convention..

Another type of weapon of mass destruction which has to be banned from the arsenals of all States is chemical weapons. In our view, negotiations must be stepped up on the working out of appropriate agreements on the prohibition of the production or use of such weapons and their final elimination. During the United States aggression against the peoples of Indo-China, large quantities of those inhuman weapons were used to subdue the people of that region. Those weapons wrought widespread destruction and had countless after-effects, including the loss of many lives and the ecological devastation of vast areas.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

In a separate statement in this Committee my delegation will endeavour to expose the false accusations by the United States Administration on the use of chemical weapons in certain areas. These accusations are being used as a cover-up for the United States plans to boost the production of conventional and new types of chemical weapons, such as binary weapons.

As a country belonging to the area adjacent to the Indian Ocean zone, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is vitally interested in the realization of the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We look forward with high hopes to the convening in Colombo, in May 1983, of the United Nations conference on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We believe that all foreign military bases in that region should be dismantled and that the people of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean should be allowed to live in peace, free from any threat to their security.

In this context, we have extended our support to the proposal of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar on the convening in Antananarivo of a conference on the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean.

Last year, as we were approaching the convening of the second special session on disarmament, most of us were optimistic about its outcome. Our expectations of that session were not mere illusion, nor were they unrealistic: they were based on the common sense of every one of us, on the desire to strengthen the security guarantees of our countries and on our readiness to give similar and equal guarantees to others. Failure to achieve tangible results was due neither to any lack of effort on our part, nor to any lack of required impetus.

Having committed themselves to the militaristic monopolies, imperialist circles failed to display the necessary political will. Common people in developing and developed countries had every reason to believe that their trust in that session was betrayed.

Every effort must be made to ensure that the opportunity that will be provided by the convening of the World Disarmament Conference will not be missed.



(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)


This session of the General Assembly should endeavour to overcome the shortcomings that crippled the second special session on disarmament. Previous initiatives of the non-aligned and socialist countries should be utilized as a basis for agreements. In this context, we highly welcome the two new proposals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which were put forward by its Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko. Those proposals, together with other initiatives of the Soviet Union, the socialist community and the Non-Aligned Movement, provide for a sufficient system of security through implementation of progressive measures on disarmament.

I wish to conclude by recalling part of a speech of Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, delivered during his trip last month to the People's Republic of Hungary:

"The problem of securing peace is a pressing need of our time. We are deeply convinced that the struggle for ensuring international peace and security, disarmament, the deepening of détente and the lessening of international tension, opposition to war, imperialism, zionism and hegemonism constitutes the worldwide front of struggle of the camp of peace and social progress."

The CHAIRMAN: There are no more names on my list of speakers. Before calling on those representatives wishing to speak in exercise of their right of reply I wish to draw the Committee's attention to the decision of the General Assembly taken at its thirty-fourth session:

Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item. The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item. The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to 5 minutes.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of ply.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): I should have preferred not to have to exercise my right of reply. The delegation of Israel believes that the task of this Committee is to try and contribute to the solution of the global problems relating to disarmament. The litany of partisan accusations, defamatory statements, demagogic extravagance and verbal violence is in conflict with the aims of our Assembly and makes it even more difficult to find means of restoring the understanding and confidence without which the way to disarmament can never open. In addition, it is a waste of this Committee's time and resources, which could certainly have been put to better use, as well as an offence to decorum and to the Committee's spirit of tolerance.



(Mr. Tari, Israel)

I shall not take up the time or try the patience of the First Committee by systematically refuting the statements that have been made, in particular by the representative of Iraq, about the State of Israel. However, concern for historical truth makes it necessary for me to make the following brief comments.

Once again this morning, the words of the representative of Iraq enveloped in a number of general considerations a violent diatribe against Israel, for which country Iraq appears to have a hatred that amounts to an obsession. Suffice it to recall that ever since the creation of Israel more than three decades ago Iraq has worked to bring about its destruction. Directly after the independence of Israel, Iraqi troops, with other Arab armies, invaded it, in flagrant violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. After the fighting, the other Arab countries, Syria, Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon, signed an armistice agreement with Israel. To this day Iraq has refused to do that and considers itself to be in a state of war with Israel. Iraq took part in the wars against Israel in 1967 and 1973. It has rejected all United Nations efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East; and it has rejected all international instruments implying, even indirectly, recognition of the State of Israel. Iraq has neglected no opportunity of repeating that it will not bow to international law in relation to Israel and that in all circumstances it reserves its freedom of action regarding that country. Iraq publicly opposes Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). It opposes the Camp David agreements. It is constantly in the front line of opposition to any peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

Iraq's hostility towards Israel has played a decisive part in its creation of an ever growing arsenal and in its nuclear ambitions. No hypocritical indignation can conceal those facts. In addition, it is strange, to say the least, that the Iraqi representative, in the course of his virtuous statement, so anxious for restraint and for progress at the international level and so concerned about the use of force, represents a Government which for more than two years has been waging a devastating and costly war, which it initiated, against Iran, a country which shares Iraq's bloody ambitions and experiences.



(Mr. Tari, Israel)

Some of the statements in this Committee in the past few days have reminded us that other countries in this area continue to join in these assaults on Israel. Israel, for its part, wants to live in peace and security, to share in the progress of the Middle East, to see the reduction of military budgets - the curbing of the arms race and the encouragement of economic and social development. Israel has taken constructive action along these lines, and has proposed the establishment of regional commissions and the transformation of the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

My delegation reserves the right to revert to this subject within the framework of the general debate.

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The Iraqi delegation spoke this morning on the essential items on the agenda of this Committee. In that statement we reiterated the content of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions denouncing the aggressive Israeli action against the Iraqi nuclear installation, which is designed for peaceful purposes.

In its statement Iraq quoted from the resolutions of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and I leave it to the members of the Committee to evaluate the statement by the representative of the Zionist entity that the Iraqi representative used demagogic languages. I believe that all the members of the Committee would agree with me that the representative of that entity views the language of the resolutions of the IAEA, the General Assembly and the Security Council denouncing the aggressive and barbaric Israeli action against the Iraqi nuclear installations, which are for solely peaceful purposes, as demagogic. I believe that he was speaking the truth, because Israel disregards and scorns this Organization and holds the international community in contempt. When the United Nations adopts a resolution denouncing criminal acts of aggression against nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes, the representative of the Zionist entity regards those resolutions as demagogic because they denounce the aggressive schemes of Israel in the region, which will lead to the destruction of the region.



(Mr. AL-Sahaf, Iraq)

The basis of the work of this Committee is the discussion of acts of aggression against nuclear installations. Iraq has dealt with this matter and I leave it to the wisdom of representatives to evaluate the statements of the representative of the Zionist entity.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): The latest remarks of the representative of Iraq reflect almost in the form of a caricature the analysis which I attempted in the exercise of my right of reply. I doubt whether this additional demonstration indicates any desire for co-operation on the part of the representative of Iraq.

We think it necessary to draw attention to one particular phenomenon. Each failure by Iraq in the recent history of its attempts to obliterate Israel increases its resentment and its hatred of those that have the arrogance - this is a constant Iraqi theme - to resist those that seek their destruction. I hope that we shall succeed in supporting that state of affairs.

Mr. AL-SAHAF (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): In addressing the Committee this morning we said that it is Israel's official doctrine that it will repeat its attack on Iraqi nuclear installations. Can the representative of Israel deny that statement? It shows how lightly the Zionist entity takes the words of this international Organization and the international community. The repetition of insults by the Israeli representative will convince no one. On the contrary, it will further strengthen the international community's conviction of the dangers of the aggressive Israeli policy in the region and also of the policy it carries out in collaboration with the racist entity in South Africa.

This morning the Iraqi representative quoted from a United Nations document showing the co-operation between the racist régimes in Israel and South Africa in the development of nuclear and neutron weapons and in intercontinental ballistic missiles with a range of 1,500 miles. The representative of Israel will not deceive anyone by heaping insults on Iraq.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.

