

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



COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY DO NOT
CIRCULATE

FIRST COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Thursday, 3 November 1983
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola)
Mr. Radrodro (Fiji)
Mr. Majood (Iraq)
Mr. Kor Bun Heng (Democratic Kampuchea)
Mr. Loeb (United States of America)
Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.23
14 November 1983

ENGLISH

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

AGENDA ITEMS 43 TO 63, 139 TO 141, 143 AND 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): As this is the first time my delegation has spoken during this session, Sir, please accept our best wishes on your election to the chairmanship.

The political, economic and social consequences of the arms race undergo regular annual assessment not only at the United Nations but also in regional organizations and among non-governmental groups. Noble sentiments are expressed and everyone agrees on the need for speedy disarmament; everyone agrees on the consequences of war, especially nuclear war. But what about the results of these interminable talks? As the President of the second special session on disarmament in 1982 warned on the opening day of the session:

"... what have the Governments of the world done to respond to the fervent demand of the people of the world that this insane arms race be stopped? We all know the answer, but I want to state it loudly and clearly for the world to hear. Nothing." (A/S-12/PV.1, p. 7)

And the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated on the same occasion that

"Apocalypse is today not merely a biblical depiction; it has become a very real possibility. Never before in human experience had we been placed on the narrow edge between catastrophe and survival." (Ibid, p. 17)

Life after a nuclear war would not be worth living for the survivors - who would largely be the sick and dying, suffering unspeakable agony in a living hell. And the mutation of the human species would change mankind and humanity as we know it.

It is not only nuclear war that threatens man's survival; conventional war also causes death, damage and destruction, to individuals, families, societies,

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

institutions - to entire nations. And does it really matter how a child dies - with a bullet or through fall-out - when it has not only no future but also no present? A child or youth who is sick, hungry and illiterate, crippled forever by malnutrition and disease, doomed to repeat an existence of oppression and exploitation, is also one of the first victims of the arms race, because the world military expenditure is more than US\$700 billion - more than US\$1 million per minute. Conventional armaments account for 80 per cent of the global military outlay. In 1979 the world's annual expenditure on arms was US\$40 billion. There are some other facts: In two days the world spends on arms the equivalent of one year's budget for the United Nations and its specialized agencies; one year's expenditure on international peace-keeping by the United Nations is equal to three hours of the world expenditure on national military forces; the megatonnage of the world's nuclear arsenal - 50,000 million tons TNT equivalent - which is still increasing, is now several million times the explosive force of the United States bomb that destroyed Hiroshima in 1945.

The major arms suppliers are from Western industrialized countries. And there would be no suppliers if there were no buyers. Therefore, we should not seek to fix blame as our prime strategy. But there are incontrovertible facts: about one third of the total value of transfers of military goods and services is traded among industrialized countries, while two thirds goes to the developing countries. The military expenditure of the industrialized countries is more than 20 times greater than their official assistance to developing countries.

Instead, we should ask ourselves: what of those who wage war? The world's military personnel totals about 24 million regular forces, 22 million paramilitary forces, 24 million reservists and almost 30 million civilians in military-related jobs. It is estimated that the number of military personnel in the world is today twice the number of teachers, doctors and nurses, and the cost of one United States

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

Trident submarine alone equals the cost of one year's schooling for 16 million children. There are at present millions of people in southern Angola who are victims of a war of occupation being waged against them by the racist armed forces of South Africa; millions of Palestinians and other Arabs who are subjected to war by the State of Israel; millions of innocent people in Central America who have been thrust into a situation of conflict by Western imperialist forces; and thousands of Grenadians who are still under imperialist invasion and occupation. Those are just a few examples. There are many more conflict and war situations around the world where fascism, imperialism and racism, exported from overseas, damages or destroys national life and institutions.

As the charter of a United Nations agency states, the minds of men must be disarmed. Otherwise, military arsenals will continue to grow. The line between tactical and strategic and between conventional and nuclear arsenals of the major Powers is very fine and is made increasingly obscure. As it is, technological advances in weapons systems and new types of warfare have made the problem of disarmament very difficult, and the possibility of disarmament remote. But the problem is not insurmountable or impossible.

There are already a number of relevant treaties: the 1961 Antarctic Treaty, the 1963 partial test ban Treaty, the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty, the 1972 sea-bed Treaty, the 1972 SALT-I Treaty and the 1979 SALT-II Treaty. However, these are all related to arms control. After more than 30 years of work for disarmament, only one agreement on disarmament has been achieved: the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention.

We must deglorify violence and its use, on an individual, national and international level. We must begin with those attitudes and institutions which glorify and breed war as survival and expansionist tactics: imperialism, colonialism and racism. Then there will not be the need for large arms

(Mr. de Figueiredo, Angola)

acquisitions for offensive purposes, and hence none will be needed for defensive purposes. And a struggling country like the People's Republic of Angola will be able to continue with the urgent task of national reconstruction instead of diverting precious national resources to facing imperialist and racist aggression.

A Luta Continua. A Vitoria E Certa.

Mr. RADRODRO (Fiji): Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to assure you and the other officers of the Committee of my delegation's confidence that under your experienced and skilful leadership our Committee will be able during this session to discharge its mandate successfully - a mandate, I would add, that it is growing more difficult from year to year to discharge.

No one can doubt the serious deterioration in international relations which confronts this thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. International relations have been aggravated by new focal points of aggression, in the form of military interventions or singularly inauspicious, inhuman acts on the part of some States that can only serve to thwart the hopes and aspirations of the international community, which has striven so long for world peace and stability. To say that the international community has thus far made little headway is to state the obvious; to say that its collective will continues to be frustrated by the recalcitrant few is to understate the evident.

The political and security Committee has as its task the appraisal of the most important dimension of these deteriorating international relations - namely, the arms race, and in particular its nuclear aspect.

(Mr. Radrodro, Fiji)

It is important at the outset to emphasize that the implementation of any measures the world community recommends - and many have already been recommended - with a view to easing international tensions, ultimately depends on the political will and resolve of the major Powers. The failure by the major Powers to exercise this option and work together for the creation of a climate conducive to the undertaking of negotiations cannot and will not bring us any closer to the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament. My delegation therefore joins the many others that have appealed to the major Powers, and especially the two super-Powers, to shoulder their primary responsibility to reduce world tension.

Of the many approaches to halting the arms race, my Government attaches priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. My Foreign Minister in his statement to this thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, reiterated our belief that such a treaty would effectively prevent both the horizontal and the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this regard, we wish to add our support for the urgent appeal being made to the Committee on Disarmament to expedite its negotiations, taking into account the latest draft presented to it by the Government of Sweden.

It is unfortunate that the interim regulatory measure on a nuclear test ban - namely, the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water - has not, in any appreciable way, limited the number of nuclear explosions conducted by the nuclear-weapon States. It is also unfortunate that not all the nuclear-weapon States have deemed it fit to support the Treaty. My delegation readily acknowledges the shortcomings of the partial test ban Treaty, since it does not include underground nuclear explosions. My Government and those of all the South Pacific nations have the greatest concern about this matter, as

(Mr. Radrodro, Fiji)

one of the major nuclear-weapon States continues to conduct its nuclear weapon tests underground, in one of the coral atolls of our region.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, regulating the transfer of nuclear weapon and other nuclear explosive devices, would have provided a satisfactory framework for stopping the spread of nuclear weapons but for the inability of two nuclear-weapon States to become parties to it and the reluctance of some non-nuclear-weapon States to enter into safeguard agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency. It is essential, in my delegation's view, that small, vulnerable countries like ours be given the assurance of, and have confidence in, international arrangements such as those envisaged under the Non-Proliferation Treaty that have as their purpose not only the curtailment of the spread of nuclear weapons but also, ultimately, the protection of the small and the weak. It was for those reasons that my Government, as a party to the Treaty, co-sponsored the request for the inclusion of item 139 in the agenda of this General Assembly session.

A nuclear freeze is another aspect of the arms race to which my Government attaches great importance. In its comprehensive form, its structure and scope should include, in addition to a comprehensive test ban, the complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, a ban on further deployments of the same weapons system and the complete cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. But a call for such an all-embracing measure is not, we all realize, realistic in the prevailing international climate. What we do hope for, however, is a freeze along the lines envisaged in resolution 37/85. At the very least, such a freeze would engender some measure of confidence between the super-Powers and give time for the negotiation of meaningful reductions. More importantly, my delegation feels, a nuclear arms freeze would make it credible

(Mr. Radrodro, Fiji)

that there indeed exists among the major Powers possessing these massive nuclear weapons arsenals some genuine regard for the universal concern about our future. Moreover, my delegation believes that control elements for such a freeze are already in existence - such as the limits which the two super-Powers agreed on under SALT-II. The present efforts in Geneva at the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) negotiations, if successfully concluded, would doubtless produce similar elements that, we believe, could form the necessary components of a freeze.

There are other components of the arms race, such as chemical and bacteriological weapons, whose alleged use and continuing refinement cannot but elicit our outright condemnation. Again, Member States' commitment to the strict observance of the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 is found to be sadly lacking. We can only echo the view expressed by the representative of Cyprus on the major Powers' commitment - or, more precisely, lack of commitment - to the various international agreements in the disarmament field. For while we believe that the greatest danger facing the world today is the threat of destruction as a result of nuclear war, we are also of the firm view that the use of other, non-nuclear classes of weapons such as chemical and bacteriological weapons only creates a further sense of insecurity and tension that could ultimately lead to an all-out nuclear confrontation. As the 1969 United Nations Group of Experts on Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons and the Effects of Their Possible Use observed in its general conclusion:

"The momentum of the arms race would clearly decrease if the production of these weapons were effectively and unconditionally banned." (A/7575, para. 376)

(Mr. Radrodro, Fiji)

Towards that end, my delegation will continue to support the renewal of the mandate of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons within the Committee on Disarmament.

There are many aspects of disarmament and equally as many views on how they are to be addressed. Indeed, it is quite clear that the inertia that characterizes our disarmament efforts is the result not so much of our lack of agreement on the former as of our differences on the latter. Overcoming these differences requires the active participation of the weak and the political will and resolve of the powerful. It requires the active participation of the individual and co-operation between nations. The report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues is one which we highly commend and support as illustrative of the individual's insight into the critical situation we all face. We are all familiar with that, but it is the urgings of this same group of individuals in regard to the ways and means of redressing our loss of anomic perception of the peril we live under that we exhort the powerful among us to take time to consider. We are particularly pleased to note that the Independent Commission's report will be a guiding light in the future deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Radrodro, Fiji)

Ours is a corporate world. It therefore demands of its members co-ordinated and complementary action conducive to the purposes of the Charter, by which all of us without exception are bound. Failure by any one of us to observe the Charter and to act accordingly demands that the others invoke their right to call for correction. Our right - which we have exercised - is our right to survive; it is the right of our children to inherit a safe and secure world. It is, unhappily, a right that is conditional on the whims and moods of the nuclear Powers and the militarily strong. It is the duty of those that hold sway to act in a manner that is in accordance with the rights of other Members and in harmony with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

Mr. MAJOOD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the First Committee, Sir, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate you, on behalf of the Iraqi delegation, on your election to the chairmanship of the Committee and to wish you and your fellow officers success in carrying out your tasks and in guiding the deliberations of this Committee. We are sure that, with your well-known knowledge and experience, we shall achieve positive results.

Iraq shares the concern of the other States and peoples of the world about the accelerating arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and, consequently, the danger of a nuclear war that could threaten mankind's survival. International developments during the past and previous years have resulted in an exacerbation of tensions. The policy of détente has been transformed into a climate of cold war. This has undermined the principles of peaceful coexistence and confidence-building that are so necessary to any serious progress towards the fulfilment of the world's aspirations to peace and prosperity.

(Mr. Majood, Iraq)

This situation has been reflected in the talks on stopping the arms race and on disarmament and has led to the failure by the two super-Powers to achieve any progress in that sphere, despite the fact that they bear the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security because they possess the largest nuclear-weapon arsenals, as well as arsenals of other weapons of mass destruction, and because they have the world's greatest technological, economic and scientific capacity, enabling them to continue to develop new weapons and new destructive war machines, the consequences of whose future use we cannot predict.

We therefore believe that the United Nations must play a more active and more effective role. Moreover, the Member States must work towards strengthening the United Nations and enabling it to take an active part in the achievement of positive measures on the questions before it, and in the implementation of agreements that have already been reached.

Iraq supports any international measures and efforts that would lead, directly or indirectly, to a limitation of the race in weapons of all types. It joins the overwhelming majority of the States of the world in calling on the two super-Powers to start serious negotiations for an acceptable and practicable formula to stop the arms race.

The Iraqi delegation wishes to stress the importance of setting up nuclear-weapon-free zones of peace in all the regions of the world. It calls on all States, and particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to respect the nuclear-weapon-free zones and to provide guarantees that they will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against those zones.

The Middle East is only one of the sensitive regions of the world. The already dangerous situation there is escalating because of the expansionist,

(Mr. Majood, Iraq)

aggressive, racist policies pursued by the Zionist entity against the Arab countries and the Palestinian people. The Zionist régime has been pursuing a dangerous military-nuclear policy. This is described by the Secretary-General in his report in document A/36/431, from which I should like to quote the following passage:

"... there is no doubt that Israel has the technical capability to manufacture nuclear weapons and possesses the means of delivery of such weapons to targets in the area. ... It has the technological skills and expertise as well as the technical infrastructure required to manufacture nuclear weapons. ... since 1964, when Dimona went into operation, Israel could have produced sufficient weapons-grade plutonium for a significant number of explosive devices."

(A/36/431, para. 78)

In a book published in London and entitled "Two Minutes Over Baghdad" we read that during the 1973 war there were

(continued in English)

"... indications that Dayan" -
the former Israeli Defence Minister -

"gave an order secretly to put in combat readiness, for the first time, Israeli-made Jericho SS missiles, carrying nuclear warheads, as well as Kfir and Phantom bomber-fighters equipped with nuclear devices. Altogether 13 Israeli-made nuclear weapons were put on alert."

(spoke in Arabic)

The authors of that book are well-known personalities in Israel. They have close relations with the Government and the Army. One of them is Mr. Amos Perlmutter, who worked for four years in the Israeli secret nuclear centre at Dimona. It was he who said that the Dimona reactor was made operative in the 1960s.

(Mr. Majood, Iraq)

In an article by George H. Quester, published in the Middle East Journal, volume 37, No. 4, we read the following:

(continued in English)

"Indicative of United States Government evaluations of Israel's nuclear status: in late 1981 a State Department official advised two Congressmen sponsoring an amendment to a foreign aid authorization bill that would cut off United States aid to any State manufacturing a nuclear bomb that Israel might fall into the vulnerable category, thereby causing the anti-proliferation Representatives to withdraw their proposals."

(spoke in Arabic)

Therefore, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East means nothing more or less than ridding the region of Israeli nuclear weapons and placing Israel's installations and reactors under effective international supervision - since Israel is the only State in the region for which there are indications of a nuclear capability and which has not subjected all its nuclear installations to international supervision. What is more, the Zionist entity has ignored all the appeals by international institutions, among them those of this Organization, and has unilaterally established very close military relations, including relations in the field of nuclear weapons, with the South African racist entity, which threatens the peace and security of Africa and the world.

(Mr. Majood, Iraq)

The Zionist aggression against the Iraqi peaceful nuclear installations is a dangerous precedent such as has never before been witnessed by the world. It presents the possibility of carrying out similar attacks in the future and is another example of the lack of respect for international rules and norms, including the norms of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). While speaking of that criminal act, I must quote the report of the Secretary-General, which states:

"The more general consequences of the attack - to which the Group attaches special importance - include its potentially serious damage to international norms and institutions. Thus, it involved Israel's direct disrespect for, and challenge to, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the IAEA safeguards system; undermined international legal constraints on acts of aggression, including those of the Charter of the United Nations; ..."

(A/38/337, para. 127)

I should also like to quote another paragraph of the same document, which reads:

"The Group felt that, if Israel became a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, accepted full-scope safeguards and complied with the General Assembly's demand that it should refrain from its threat to repeat its armed attacks against nuclear facilities, the situation would substantially improve. In reviewing possible constructive international responses to this incident, the Group expressed the hope that the incident would give new impetus to efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, free of loopholes, in the region of the Middle East; to the establishment of additional legal instruments against attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities; and to the improvement of international mechanisms for obtaining redress for damages."

(Ibid., para. 128)

(Mr. Majood, Iraq)

Despite all these international appeals and condemnations, the Zionist entity is continuing its threats to strike Iraqi nuclear installations, as well as those in other Arab States, wherever they may be, if it considers that action to be in its own interests. Thus, Zionist aggression against Iraq nuclear installations is continuing to this very day.

My delegation would like to stress, at the end of our statement, the following points. First, we should expedite the implementation of the necessary urgent steps to set up a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in accordance with General Assembly resolutions, with the condition that all nuclear installations in the region must be subjected to the supervision régimes of the IAEA and the NPT, including the nuclear installations of the Zionist entity. Secondly, we should call on the Zionist entity officially to renounce the possession, acquisition and development of nuclear weapons and on nuclear States and institutions to stop immediately all types of co-operation with that entity. Thirdly, we should call on nuclear-weapon States to conclude an international convention banning all nuclear tests. Fourthly, the deterioration of relations between the two super-Powers should be halted, since that deterioration of relations negatively affects the policy of disarmament and international détente. We stress the need to establish a solid basis for a renewal of confidence-building between the two military blocs and continuing serious negotiations to achieve disarmament. Lastly, we should call for the preservation of outer space for peaceful scientific purposes only and demand that it be kept free of all types of weapons.

Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): I wish to begin my statement by expressing the warm congratulations of my delegation to Mr. Goyen Alvez, who has just been unanimously elected Rapporteur of our Committee. I wish him every success in his task.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng,
Democratic Kampuchea)

I should like now to deal with item 61 of the agenda, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. This is the fourth year in succession that our Committee has examined measures to put an end to the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to make effective the application of the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925 and the Convention of 10 April 1972.

We all know that the General Assembly had occasion to consider this matter following the use of those prohibited weapons by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and by Viet Nam in Laos and Kampuchea, my own country. The Assembly adopted the relevant resolutions by an overwhelming majority. Nevertheless, in spite of the growing opposition of the international community, reflected last year in the adoption of resolutions 37/98 C, D and E, the Hanoi authorities have continued their chemical warfare in Kampuchea. Thus, from 23 December 1982 to 19 August 1983, the populations of several areas in the 10 following provinces were affected: Prey Veng in the east; Takeo and Kampot in the south-west; Kompong Speu, Koh Kong and Pursat in the west; Battambang in the north-west, where the frequency of attacks is higher than in other provinces; Preah Vihear in the north; and Stung Treng and Rattanakiri in the north-east. This resulted in more than 600 victims, including 64 dead.

As in previous years, the Vietnamese aggressors targeted their chemical attacks on regions under the control of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea and the areas under their provisional control, for example, the densely populated centre of Neak Loeung in the province of Prey Veng, which borders on Viet Nam.

General Assembly resolution 37/98 D spelt out the procedures for maintaining the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Paragraph 7 of that resolution requests, among other things, the assembling of documentation relating to the identification of signs and symptoms associated with the use of asphyxiating,

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng,
Democratic Kampuchea)

poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare. My delegation feels that it is necessary to bring to the attention of our Committee the clinical picture of the syndromes which were noted at the end of 1982 and the beginning of 1983 in the victims of chemical attacks, according to the communication dated 6 May 1983 from Professor Thiounn Thoeun, the Minister responsible for the Co-ordinating Committee for Health and Social Affairs, submitted to the thirty-sixth World Health Assembly. Those syndromes are:

"First, neurological syndrome, marked by giddiness, head-swelling, difficulty of intellectual concentration, loss of memory and, in serious cases, loss of consciousness.

"Second, thoracic syndrome, marked by thoracic constriction, making respiration difficult, and a feeling of pressure and retrosternal heat.

"Third, digestive syndrome, a sensation of unlocalized abdominal burning - the victim says that he has a burning sensation in the stomach and sometimes in the intestines. These signs are accompanied by repeated vomiting and often continuous diarrhoea and unbearable abdominal pain. In certain cases, the appearance of blisters in the mouth and over the whole body. These blisters burst and leave persistent lesions which are difficult to heal, and in cases where treatment yields results permanent scars remain.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

"Fourth, general bleeding syndrome: it seems that the poison causes troubles of the blood vessel and in particular coagulation, because in serious cases it is the bleeding syndrome which dominates, marked by vomiting blood, abundant epistaxis and rectal bleeding in very large quantities. All these haemorrhages are repeated and seem to show that the poison determines a syndrome of rapid blood loss which can lead to the death of the victim in a few minutes in serious cases."

The summary of the syndromes of the poisoning I have mentioned confirms in detail that already brought to the notice of the United Nations in 1981 in document A/36/254, and it shows these syndromes are characteristic of poisoning due to trichothecines, successively identified over the last three years by specialized laboratories in various countries on the basis of biomedical samples taken from the victims of chemical attacks in Kampuchea and on the basis of samples of plants and soils taken from the locations of those attacks.

This year again an American specialized laboratory has analysed blood taken from three victims of a chemical attack in the province of Battambang in the north-west of Kampuchea last March. Once again analysis confirmed that the toxic agent used by the Vietnamese army belonged to the trichothecine group. The blood of one of the victims in fact contained a sizeable concentration of T-2 toxin and its metabolite, HT-2.

My delegation would also like to state that in the view of the medical authorities of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea it is difficult to say when a victim of a chemical attack is really cured because, apart from cases which lead to rapid death there are cases where the victim feels better after a few days' treatment in hospital and sometimes believes he is cured. That person may

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

resume work, make a physical effort, suffer a recrudescence of the symptoms mentioned above and finally die. This case of recrudescence of symptoms is to be explained in the finding made by specialists that in the blood of victims taken several days after an attack, the content of toxin T-2 and not only its metabolite HT-2 remained at a high level, thus revealing a system of storage in the human body.

Apart from these cases of direct poisoning, there are cases of indirect poisoning by contagion, for example, among persons who are helping to transport victims or giving them treatment. After mild symptoms - nervous, respiratory, digestive - the state of these victims of indirect poisoning seems to improve during their stay in hospital, but when they resume work some of the symptoms return, particularly neurological symptoms and certain digestive symptoms.

Even more horrible are cases of residual contamination where women give birth to monsters, without jaws or cranium.

In the view of my delegation, this grim picture of the gravity of the tragic situation in which the Kampuchean population is suffering, victimized as it is by the genocidal war committed by the Hanoi authorities, makes it imperative to put into effect the those provisions of General Assembly resolution 37/98 D which relate to maintaining the authority of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. Equally imperative is the application of the relevant United Nations resolutions calling for the total withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea.

For four years now, proof of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and by Viet Nam in Laos and Kampuchea have constantly been accumulating. The results of scientific analyses carried out on samples in United States, Canadian and most recently French laboratories are irrefutable. These results have been disseminated in official documents of the

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

United Nations and widely reported in the press. Furthermore, there is increasing formal evidence and testimony on the part of victims as well as of scientists, research workers, humanitarian organizations and so on and even of deserters from the Vietnamese army of occupation in Kampuchea. I should like to mention just two pieces of evidence, which are striking in their sincerity and detail.

First, Mrs. Adelia Bernard, President of the Administrative Committee for Aid to Indo-China Refugees, stated in an Australian magazine, The Age, of 19 March 1983: (spoke in English)

"As to chemical warfare, Mrs. Bernard dismisses western doubts about its existence with a shrug. She has, she says, seen too much evidence herself. She tells of seeing 327 people reached Thailand across the Mekong River last March.

They were dying like flies from haemorrhaging and diarrhoea. They were bleeding from the eyes, their skin was peeling off them, their condition was atrocious. Their villages were attacked regularly with chemicals."

(continued in French)

Secondly, three weeks ago, on 12 October last, the Australian magazine, The Australian, published an article containing detailed testimony of a high officer of the Vietnamese chemical warfare unit, Nguyen Quan, who had deserted from the Vietnamese army of invasion in Kampuchea. The details of this testimony were given to Mr. Michael Ledeen, a research worker in the Georgetown Centre for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. I should like to quote some extracts from that article in English:

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

(spoke in English)

"We began receiving chemical weapons from the Soviet Union as early as 1970', said Quan. 'They included artillery shells, air-launched containers, small portable pumps for spraying and, as time passed, more and more of this stuff arrived.'

"The Soviet-supplied chemical warfare materials were usually marked "H". The air force uses the most potent, H-1, which destroys all forms of animal and vegetable life. In the artillery we used a somewhat less potent variety, H-2, fired in 155, 130 and 105 mm shells.

"For the mortars we had H-3 which is also produced in containers of 25 kg, which are carried on the shoulders of the troops for use by portable pumps. These are operated by special units with masks and uniforms designed especially for this work.

"Finally, there are chemical substances in powder form, in small 250 gm sacks, which are used to poison wells, fountains and water mains', said Quan.

"Asked how he knew all this, he replied: 'I was trained in chemical warfare, like many of my colleagues, in the school at Son Tay. In Vietnamese artillery schools one fifth of the time is devoted to training for chemical warfare.'

"Quan said he was trained by older officers who had attended 'special courses in the Soviet Union'.

"Quan said 'there were systematic attacks with chemical weapons in Laos and Kampuchea ...'

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

"Quan named deposits of stocks of chemical weapons as being 'famous' at Long Binh and Danang in Vietnam. In Kampuchea he said there were deposits at Kampong Cham, Siemreap, Svay Rieng and Battambang, that he knew of, although there were probably others.

"The artillery officer produced a written statement in which he said: 'All of the poisonous chemical substances are very dangerous to people. They can cruelly destroy animal, human and vegetable life. Each type has different effects. When the chemical artillery shells explode close by one can clearly see a dark yellow cloud. It is very light, lighter than air and therefore disappears rapidly. It smells like freshly cut raw garlic'.

"The written testimony claims 35 to 40 per cent of the population of the Xuan Loc district of Ban Ria province north-east of Saigon was officially reported killed by chemical artillery shells used to suppress an uprising."

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

My delegation believes that there is sufficient clear evidence of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in Kampuchea, Laos and Afghanistan to warrant, on the one hand, condemning the perpetrators and, on the other, taking effective measures to put an end to it. To wait for "proof", in the strict sense of the word, of the use of these prohibited weapons before issuing this condemnation and taking the necessary measures is to allow the perpetrators of chemical and bacteriological warfare to continue their crimes not only against the Kampuchean, Laotian and Afghan peoples but also against humanity. Mr. Ricardo Fraile, Secretary-General of the Centre for Disarmament Studies and Research, in an article on the legal aspect of the problem entitled, "The fate of a prohibition", published in Economica, Paris, 1982, stressed that:

"To have proof, it would be necessary for a competent and credible observer to be the direct victim of such an attack."

I would add that the victim would have to be sufficiently removed from the site of the attack so that he could remain alive and thus give his testimony to the international community. Nevertheless, Mr. Fraile added that he was personally convinced that in Kampuchea, Laos and Afghanistan

"we are dealing with new chemical weapons used precisely for experimental purposes".

Here in the Committee and in the General Assembly, the vehement and systematic opposition of the Soviet Union and Viet Nam to any positive United Nations resolution on the subject merely proves their guilt. We recall the harshness with which these two countries attacked resolutions 35/144 C and 36/96 C and did everything possible to prevent the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons from successfully concluding its work.

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

Now those two countries are vigorously opposing resolution 37/98 D, which was adopted last year, on the pretext that it is illegal because it broadens the obligations entered into by the States parties to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and they did not support it.

We may well wonder why those two countries, which have made themselves the champions of disarmament and of the banning of chemical and biological weapons, should be opposing so energetically any objective investigation on the charges made against them. If they are really innocent and have nothing to hide, this investigation would make it possible to clear them of every suspicion and would only enhance their credibility in the international community. The systematic activities of the Soviet Union and Viet Nam to prevent the taking of any positive measure to maintain the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol can only be interpreted as a confession of their guilt in the launching and continuation of chemical warfare in Afghanistan, Laos and my own country, Kampuchea.

My delegation believes that resolution 37/98 D is an important step for putting an end to the chemical and bacteriological warfare raging in these three countries. My delegation welcomes with great satisfaction the report of the Secretary-General in document A/38/435. We congratulate the Secretary-General and the Group of Consultant Experts on their excellent work. We are convinced that, guided by their noble sentiments in favour of international peace and security and respect for human rights, they will succeed in making progress in their work.

By their resolute struggle against the war of aggression and genocide launched by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam almost five years ago, the people of Kampuchea and its Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea have made their

(Mr. Kor Bun Heng, Democratic
Kampuchea)

contribution towards putting an end to the chemical and bacteriological war now being waged by Viet Nam in Kampuchea. This struggle has enjoyed considerable encouragement from the General Assembly, which last week adopted resolution 38/3 on "The situation in Kampuchea" by an overwhelming majority.

From a legal standpoint, and with regard to measures to be taken, my delegation is pleased to inform the Committee that my country, Democratic Kampuchea, on 28 January 1983 became a party to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and on 4 February 1983 a party to the 10 April 1972 Convention. Similarly, my delegation has lent its support to resolution 37/98 B, calling for the acceleration of work on a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical and bacteriological weapons and on their destruction. However, pending the elaboration of such a convention, my delegation is convinced that an international conference to find and take effective measures to prevent any chemical and bacteriological war would be appropriate action. In its letter of 1 December 1981 my Government proposed to all countries that such a conference be held. That is why my delegation has attached great importance to resolution 37/98 C and supported it. Similarly, we support the proposal of Sweden to the depositary Governments of the 10 April 1972 Convention that they proceed with the convening of the special conference provided for in resolution 37/98 C.

My delegation will support any draft resolution submitted to the Committee this year to that end.

Mr. LOEB (United States of America): Mr Chairman, I am pleased and honoured to address this Committee today on the subject of the prevention of nuclear war. As a former ambassador to Denmark who has had the opportunity to travel extensively in your beautiful country of Norway, I find it a particular pleasure to see you in the Chair. My delegation and Government look forward to continued close and harmonious relations between our two countries.

Few questions are as complex and surrounded by emotion as nuclear arms, a subject traditionally left to the specialists but which is now receiving wide public attention both in the United States and in Western Europe. This is certainly a healthy development, since the policies of democratic Governments depend on the support and understanding of the people they represent. Fortunately, in democratic societies we are reminded daily that no administration, no country, none of us, has a monopoly on virtue. Our policies, nuclear and otherwise, are freely and openly debated. One need only step out of these halls to experience the vitality of the debate and the fertility of the dialogue in an open society. We in the West hold our Governments accountable for their actions. Sadly, those who piously seek to exploit the genuine concerns of the people in free societies, ruthlessly crush even the most modest independent voices for peace in their own societies.

In debating the issues surrounding the prevention of nuclear war we should not allow the complexity of the problems and the gravity of the stakes to blind us to the common ground on which we all stand. No one wants nuclear war. No responsible voice has sought to minimize its horrors. We have no illusions about the catastrophic consequences of nuclear warfare and its implications for all mankind. Prevention of nuclear war is a moral and political imperative. No other issue is of greater concern to my Government.

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

As President Reagan said on 17 April:

"Those who governed America throughout the nuclear age and we who govern it today have had to recognize that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Like my predecessors, it is now my responsibility to do my utmost to prevent such a war. No one feels more than I the need for peace."

United States foreign policy, United States defence posture and United States arms control strategy have as their objective the preservation of a peace in which democratic values can flourish. To that end, we want to create a politically secure environment in which nuclear weapons, for as long as they exist, would not be used in war; and over the longer term we would like to create an environment in which the existence of such weapons becomes unnecessary.

We in this body are faced with a barrage of confusing and sometimes contradictory information and claims. We are told that all one has to do to prevent nuclear war is to support a lofty resolution or promote a pious platitude. I wish it were so simple. As the American writer, H. L. Mencken, aptly put it:

"For every problem there is a simple solution, quick, cheap and usually wrong."

So it is with arms control. The complex and difficult issues and great stakes involved require careful thought, profound knowledge and historical perspective.

One of the most important lessons history has taught us is that peace and security are not easily won or kept. Everyone wants peace but good intentions alone are not enough. We have all seen how the pious professions of peace that preceded the Second World War could not deter powerful and determined totalitarian States. Therefore, from the earliest days of the post-war era American leaders have recognized that the only strategy consistent with our values and our survival, our physical existence, and also what makes life worth living, is the parallel

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

policy of dialogue and deterrence. The massive destructive power of modern weapons precludes any other policy. The catastrophic consequences of another world war, with or without nuclear weapons, makes deterrence of conflict our highest objective and the maintenance of dialogue on nuclear weapons the only rational political strategy for the modern age. However, while my country considers deterrence to be essential in the present climate of unstable security, we do not view deterrence as an end in itself.

A perpetuation of the present situation, in which the United States is compelled to maintain a large strategic arsenal, is unacceptable to us. We must reduce our dependence on these dangerous weapons. We seek a more stable strategic balance at much lower levels of armaments.

On 20 October Ambassador Kenneth Adelman, the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, outlined here at the United Nations the fundamental principles which guide our approach to arms control and the prevention of nuclear war. Ambassador Adelman also underscored the fact that for over a decade there has been but one participant in the nuclear arms race, the Soviet Union. At the same time as the Soviet Union has engaged in an unprecedented build-up of nuclear arms, the United States has sought to limit its nuclear arsenal. For example, the number of weapons in the total United States nuclear stockpile is now at its lowest level in 20 years. Since the mid-1960s the number of nuclear weapons in our total inventory has declined by one third. The United States has reduced its deployment of nuclear weapons by some 8,000 and the total megatonnage of our nuclear weapons has been cut by 75 per cent from its level in 1960. We fervently hope that present negotiations on strategic forces will permit further reductions to be made.

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

The United States position in the strategic arms reduction talks (START) in seeking both substantial reductions and increased stability is based on the following central elements: first, reduction of the present nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States by almost 50 per cent to 5,000 ballistic missile warheads; secondly, a flexible approach to reducing the disparity and destructive capability and potential of ballistic missiles; thirdly, substantial reductions in deployed ballistic missiles; and, fourthly, effective verification.

The United States has followed and will continue to follow these basic principles in a flexible manner, in order to accommodate reasonable concerns of the Soviet Union. Successive proposals by the United States over the past year have reflected our willingness to continue the search for common ground. However, these principles do not preclude fresh efforts and ideas that could facilitate attempts to negotiate further substantial reductions in the context of increased stability. Such a fresh effort is embodied in the build-down proposal as enunciated by President Reagan last month in his instructions to the United States START delegation. This so-called build-down proposal includes the following: first, a provision which links modernization to reductions, using variable ratios which identify how many existing nuclear warheads must be withdrawn as new warheads of various types are deployed; secondly, a provision calling for a guaranteed annual percentage reduction. We have suggested as a minimum an annual reduction of 5 per cent.

In addition, we are prepared to discuss the build-down of strategic bombers. We are prepared to discuss additional limitations on air-launch cruise missiles carried by United States bombers. We are prepared to negotiate trade-offs, taking into account Soviet advantages in missiles and United States advantages in bombers, in ways that provide each side with maximum flexibility consistent with movement

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

towards a more stable balance of forces. We are prepared to establish a working group in START to discuss the United States build-down initiative in our next round of negotiations.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Ambassador in this forum has characterized the build-down proposal as by no means a step forward but at best a move sideways. With all due respect, we believe the proposal is deserving of a less cavalier response and of serious consideration at the bargaining table.

The United States has developed its proposals from the standpoint that the present strategic arsenals not only are too high in absolute quantity but also have elements of instability in their force structure. It is obvious that an important goal of strategic arms control negotiations is to reduce the possible incentives to consider a nuclear first strike. This goal can most effectively be achieved by negotiating concrete measures affecting both the means and the incentives to carry out a first strike. Such measures must be carefully negotiated to ensure that they are equitable to both sides, taking into account the asymmetries of the nuclear arsenals.

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

The build-down concept has particular value because it would allow a degree of latitude to both sides in determining how to carry out the reductions. If the means and incentives are objectively reduced, the threshold to nuclear conflict will have been raised by a significant margin. Such a goal should be at the heart of any programme for preventing nuclear war. The United States proposals go to the heart of the matter and can by no means be regarded as a move sideways.

International security and stability can be safeguarded only if there is a stable balance of forces on all levels. An imbalance of conventional forces may increase the risk of conflict and thus, of course, of nuclear conflict. Similarly, a longer-range intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) imbalance in Europe raises the risk of conflict in that region and thus of a general nuclear conflict.

Since 1979 the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has pursued the twin goals of restoring the INF balance in Europe, which has been increasingly disturbed as a result of the Soviet Union's SS-20 deployments, by preparing to deploy its own INF assets, if that is the only way to restore stability, and of conducting negotiations to eliminate the need for such deployments. The key objective, of course, is to restore a European balance, which does not at present exist, and also to do so at the lowest feasible force levels.

For the past several years the Soviet Union has periodically claimed that a balance already existed and then has proceeded with further SS-20 deployments. In 1979 the Soviet Union said there was a balance; in 1980 it said there was a balance; in 1981 it said there was a balance; in 1982 it said there was a balance; and in 1983. In each and every year the Soviet Union has said there was a balance. Yet during those years the number of Soviet long-range INF missile warheads increased from 800 to 1,300, and during that time NATO did not introduce

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

a single United States warhead of this category into Europe. A creative use of arithmetic by the Soviet Union does not contribute to the goal of negotiating a genuine balance of forces at reduced levels.

The United States has proposed in its zero-zero option that the longer-range INF balance be restored by the total elimination of forces. The Soviet Union has, to put it mildly, not welcomed that proposal. The United States has then proposed interim measures that might be more acceptable to the Soviet Union while achieving a balance at the lowest possible levels. As in the strategic arms reduction negotiations, the United States has sought a balance of forces in a series of proposals that demonstrate its flexibility and willingness to accommodate the concerns of the negotiating partner.

Our position with respect to the nuclear balance in Europe is shown not only in our negotiating record to date in Geneva; it is also shown by concrete deeds by the United States and its allies. At a NATO ministerial meeting in Canada only last week, the Defence Ministers of the alliance decided that, in addition to the 1,000 nuclear weapons withdrawn from Europe in 1980, the overall size of the NATO nuclear stockpile should be reduced by an additional 1,400 weapons over the next several years. When these additional 1,400 weapons have been withdrawn the United States will have reduced its nuclear weapons in Europe by over one third from 1979 levels and NATO will have the lowest number of nuclear weapons in 20 years.

If INF deployments should prove necessary to redress the balance, they will not affect these reductions, since longer-range theatre missiles are to be withdrawn as the newer missiles are deployed as a counter to the Soviet missile build-up that has proceeded apace since the mid-1970s. In announcing this draw-down, the NATO Defence Ministers noted the recent Soviet threats to deploy additional shorter-range missiles aimed at Western Europe. The Ministers urged

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

the Soviet Union to match NATO's restraint and to reduce, rather than increase, the level of its nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union's response has been to ignore our proposals and to misrepresent NATO's plans to restore the INF balance. Such an attitude cannot further the progress of the Geneva negotiations.

What, it may well be asked, is actually the Soviet record? The answer is plain: expansion of missile forces at all levels. The figures speak for themselves. In recent months the Soviet Union has continued construction of at least three new SS-20 bases east of the Ural Mountains, in addition to the already deployed 351 operational SS-20 launchers comprising 1,053 warheads. Furthermore, the Soviet Union's retention of a large number of SS-4 and SS-5 missiles magnifies its build-up at the INF level. As for the shorter-range missiles, a new generation of more accurate systems, namely, the SS-21, SS-22 and SS-23, is being deployed in support of Warsaw Pact preparations for tactical nuclear conflict.

A Soviet military spokesman recently admitted in public for the first time that shorter-range nuclear-armed missiles have been deployed in Eastern European countries within range of Western Europe for some years. One might interpret the timing of this admission as intended to soften the impact of the recent decision to begin preparations for the deployment of additional short-range missiles in East Germany and Czechoslovakia. These preparations have been characterized as countermeasures for the planned INF deployments of NATO. In fact, however, the expansion of Soviet short-range missile deployments in Eastern Europe has the effect of altering the balance in missiles of this category at a time when NATO has taken the decision to carry out a reduction of approximately 33 per cent.

It is worth emphasizing that the preparations to accelerate deployment of Soviet shorter-range missiles can in no way be regarded as a countermeasure to NATO's efforts to restore the balance in longer-range INF, but represent a widening

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

of the arms race to areas where NATO has already begun to lower force levels. The Soviet Union's missile deployment measures appear calculated to create an imbalance in all categories in shorter-range and longer-range theatre weapons.

The security situation in Europe today is indeed troubling in view of continued Soviet attempts to alter the balance of forces against the Western alliance. There does exist a more effective method of dealing with the risks of nuclear war than by threatening so-called countermeasures. Such a method would be to give due and serious consideration to the proposals introduced by the United States at the Geneva negotiations.

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

I have confined my remarks thus far to negotiations on nuclear forces. The risk of war, however, as we all know, is indivisible. Conflict can escalate from one stage to the next. We ignore at our own risk the real possibility that nuclear war may be the result of an escalation from a major conventional conflict. In this context, the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions (MBFR) in Vienna must be seen as an important adjunct to our efforts to seek the reduction of strategic and theatre nuclear forces in Geneva.

Last year the West proposed a new initiative to give momentum to the MBFR negotiations. The initiative would bind parties in the central European zone of reductions, in one agreement, to undertake substantial and immediate reductions to meet specified manpower ceilings, thereby meeting what the Soviet Union has alleged is a major concern of theirs. We are still awaiting a positive response from the Soviet Union and its allies.

The Conference on disarmament in Europe which is scheduled to convene in Stockholm early next year may provide an additional and valuable forum for coming to grips with security issues. The Conference on disarmament in Europe is of particular relevance to the cause of the prevention of nuclear war, since the risks of nuclear conflict lie to a great extent in the tensions attendant on the existence of two powerful military alliance systems in Europe. The specific brief of the Conference is to consider proposals to reduce the risk of military confrontation in Europe. While the Conference should not try to duplicate the work of our other security negotiations, it can make a valuable contribution towards increasing military stability and negotiating confidence and security building measures to decrease the risk of war. Such measures could be designed to decrease the possibility of a surprise attack in Europe, to reduce the risk of war by accident or miscalculation and to improve the channels of communication during times of crisis, thus increasing stability.

(Mr. Loeb, United States)

Related measures to improve communications between the United States and the USSR and for military-confidence building were proposed by the United States on the President's initiative. Those have been submitted in several forums, including START and MBFR. Moreover, last spring the President's representatives took those proposals to Moscow for Soviet consideration. In this instance as well, we are still awaiting a Soviet response.

Previous sessions of the First Committee have expressed support for such measures, as in General Assembly resolutions 37/99 G and 37/100 D in 1982. Continued support by the United Nations for such measures could significantly encourage and further the work of the Conference on disarmament in Europe.

Today I have briefly outlined my Government's proposals for achieving substantial reductions in the weapons of war. In this forum we have not and will not engage in vague and sterile polemics. We have not advanced and will not advance impractical proposals and rhetorical resolutions. What we have proposed and will propose are concrete and verifiable measures which would reduce the risk of war. The door for real arms control agreements is open. We are waiting for the Soviet Union to walk through. We remain at the bargaining table. We shall continue to show flexibility and sincerity in reaching an accord. I can assure the Committee that the United States will not walk away from this awesome task. Should the Soviet leadership decide to join us now in this good faith effort, the world may finally begin to breath a little easier.

Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish):

Mr. Chairman, I wish most warmly to congratulate you on behalf of the delegation of Bolivia. Your personal qualities and your professional experience are guarantees for the success of our work.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

The delegation of Bolivia has come to the First Committee with a feeling of concern shared by many countries as a result of the discouraging atmosphere of our time, which has been exacerbated by the lack of progress in the bilateral and multilateral negotiations to produce disarmament agreements. The campaign against nuclear disaster or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons is the fundamental task which our countries must undertake, seeking through the use of appropriate United Nations machinery the answers needed to achieve a proper climate of peace. The establishment of an international order based on law, justice and equity requires us to see that the basic principles of human existence prevail and to defend those values in this body. The dangerous stage through which the international community is going requires us to renew our rejection of the nuclear and conventional arms race.

My country, since the inception of the United Nations, has supported every initiative to check the nuclear arms race and to seek a reduction of military expenditures so that the resources in question could be used for more noble causes, such as social and economic development. The terror and revulsion which all mankind feels at the threat of a nuclear holocaust can be diminished only by appropriate action taken by the nuclear Powers, which are responsible for this state of concern. We are encouraged by the words that have been spoken by President Reagan to the General Assembly, as well as those of other United States representatives in this Committee. We also heard with interest the statements made by the representative of the Soviet Union. However, those two Powers must give evidence of the flexibility they are claiming in the form of the agreements which all Bolivians, together with millions of other people on this planet, are anxiously awaiting.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

In this regard, my delegation associates itself with, for example, the political declaration of the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries who met in New Delhi in March of this year, in which they once again called on those mainly responsible to realize that the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear war rises in proportion to the increase in nuclear weapons. Consequently, those instruments of mass destruction are more than mere weapons, and any theory or precept that attempts to justify the possession of nuclear weapons or their possible use in any circumstances must be rejected.

Another proposal that my delegation supports is the suggestion again put forward by the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, the Mexican diplomat, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, to the effect that the nuclear Powers in the West should solemnly commit themselves, in a unilateral declaration, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, so that, together with China and the Soviet Union, which have already made those promises, they could help bring about the improved psychological climate necessary for seeking the multilateral legal agreement that would complement those declarations.

From the beginning Bolivia has supported the ban on nuclear weapons in Latin America. The Tlatelolco Treaty is the contribution of our continent to the search for peace.

(Mr. Gumucio Granier, Bolivia)

In this regard we call upon France to ratify Additional Protocol I and we deplore the fact that it has not done so despite the many invitations repeatedly addressed to it by the General Assembly and by countries in our hemisphere.

Another aspect of deep concern to my country is the installation of military bases with sophisticated technology and potential nuclear capacity in the Malvinas Islands. We call upon those responsible to ensure that the islands remain within the proper framework of the search for peace in the Western hemisphere.

Another aspect of interest to my delegation is the conventional arms race among countries of the third world. Here I must recall what was said by President Hernan Siles Zuazo of Bolivia to the plenary Assembly last year:

"As if all this were not already enough, a considerable number of third-world countries have embarked upon an arms race which is enriching the countries that provide the arms and impoverishing those that buy them. The logical deplorable consequence of this absurd competition is that enormous resources are being used to purchase weapons, while increasingly meagre sums are devoted to economic and social development."

At the same time the President of Bolivia expressed the hope that the third-world countries could together decree a multilateral freeze on the purchase and manufacture of conventional weapons.

Although the present world climate causes profound concern, there are encouraging signs. The commitment of the United Nations to continue its efforts through the Committee on Disarmament and other complementary bodies, and the good will demonstrated and the good offices repeatedly offered by the Secretary-General are among these positive developments. We must reiterate our commitment to peace. The nuclear and conventional arms races run counter to this commitment. We small countries call upon the nuclear Powers to play their part in fulfilling this commitment, and we shall play ours.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those members of the Committee who have asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I draw the Committee's attention to the following decision of the General Assembly:

"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 five minutes." (decision 34/401, paras. 8-10)

Those are the ground rules. I shall not read them out every time but I thought it advisable to do so the first time we have had the right of reply exercised at this session.

Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): The false statements made by the representative of Cuba on the situation in Grenada during yesterday's meeting compel me to exercise my delegation's right of reply. It is ironic that the Cuban delegation should have introduced the Grenadian issue in this Committee during yesterday's meeting. As all delegations know, the situation in Grenada was the topic of discussion at yesterday's General Assembly plenary meeting. As I am sure most delegations also know, the General Assembly was scheduled to discuss the situation in Grenada as a result of efforts, supported by Cuba, to have that issue debated urgently in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The United States did not oppose the discussion of the question of Grenada in the plenary meeting, just as it did not oppose its discussion in the Security Council. We were prepared to discuss the situation in a plenary meeting, just as we presented our views in

(Mr. Sorzano, United States)

the Security Council debate. However, that was not to be the case. Unaccustomed to free, unfettered debate, a small coterie of so-called democratic States, Cuba included, utilized procedural manoeuvres arrogantly to close that debate. So much for democracy. Not one delegation could present its views, owing to those efforts.

Given this context, it is sheer cynicism first to demand that an urgent debate be scheduled in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly and, then to marshal a series of procedural moves to kill the debate urgently demanded just a few hours earlier - and then, adding injury to insult, to take everybody's time by simultaneously introducing the extraneous issue of Grenada not only in the First Committee but in other Committees as well. This manoeuvre demonstrates what many have long suspected - that Cuba is afraid of free expression, of debate and of public opinion. This also explains why, after close to a quarter of a century, the Cuban régime has yet to submit itself to the will of its people. It also explains Cuban reliance on force and violence, not only in its domestic affairs but also in its dealings with other countries.

The eloquent statements on Grenada made by representatives of the countries of the Eastern Caribbean, with which Grenada has close historical, economic, social and cultural bonds, have amply illustrated the basis of their concern at the demeaning and dangerous direction that Cuban intervention had imposed upon Grenada. They recognized that Cuba, with Soviet and Soviet bloc support, planned to use Grenada as a springboard for further interventions in the eastern Caribbean and on the mainland. They recognized that the tourists who were to utilize the Salines airport would not be bringing cameras and suntan lotion but grenades and AK-47s. They saw a military build-up which far exceeded any legitimate concern for the defence of that unhappy island and, consequently, they saw the need and requested assistance for what a distinguished Grenadian journalist has called a rescue operation.

(Mr. Sorzano, United States)

Turning more specifically to the charges brought against my country by the Cuban delegation, I note that scarcely 10 days after our forces entered Grenada my Government has announced that it is already withdrawing its troops and that it will completely finish this task in the very near future.

Our action dramatically contrasts with Cuban intentions, as revealed by captured documents indicating that the Cubans intended to develop a significant and indefinite military presence in Grenada. Our actions are in even sharper contrast with the long-standing and apparently long-to-continue Cuban military presence in Angola, Ethiopia and other places which are alien to Cuba and far removed from any conceivable Cuban national interests. Needless to say, the same can be said, and I wish to say it, about the Soviet presence in Afghanistan and the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia.

This brings me to a concluding comment: not only will we withdraw from Grenada but we will actively support the establishment of political machinery which will allow the Grenadian people the opportunity to translate their will into public policy. We challenge Cuba, the Soviet Union and Viet Nam to give the same opportunity not only to their respective peoples but also to the oppressed populations which are currently suffering from the weight of Cuban, Soviet and Vietnamese troops.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): The representative of Iraq this afternoon for the umpteenth time repeated, without, it seemed to me, changing so much as a comma, a series of rigmaroles with which we have been inundated for more than two years by various Iraqi representatives in this Committee and are now also getting in the General Assembly. The same statement will probably be made next year and the year after that.

Once again we have heard from the representative of Iraq a number of pseudo-arguments, quotations truncated or taken out of context, which must have left an increasing number of representatives convinced of the artificial and negative character of such litanies, quite apart from the fact that his extreme language and its demagogic character add nothing to the conduct of the Committee's work.

At this point I must make a few remarks, which I shall try to keep short. The first is one of both procedure and substance, and indeed of principle. Several times during his statement the representative of Iraq made reference to the State of Israel using the words "Zionist entity". I suppose he wanted to be biting. May I point out that Israel is proud to be a Zionist State; that is its historical mission. Zionism is the national liberation movement of the Jewish people. The slightly ambiguous, at times almost racist, character of certain attacks made here against the State of Israel means that, paradoxically, I am almost happy to have the opportunity to reply.

In any event, the tradition of the United Nations is for States Members to be referred to by their official name. I would add that, coming from Iraq this choice of words reflects a deep-seated phenomenon which sheds light on the spirit in which the representative of that country expressed himself, quite apart from the questions he claims to raise.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

Since the creation of the State of Israel more than three decades ago Iraq has shown an almost obsessional hostility against it, seeking its destruction and associating itself with all the wars waged against it. Iraq has rejected every international instrument implying, even indirectly, recognition of the State of Israel. Iraq has lost no opportunity of reaffirming that it will not abide by international law in anything concerning Israel and that in all circumstances it will reserve its own freedom of action vis-à-vis Israel. Iraq opposed Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1978) and rejected the Camp David accords. It has always been in the vanguard of the rejectionist front, whose aim is to sabotage any peaceful solution in the Middle East. Iraq has from the outset refused to accept the very principle of the existence of the State of Israel - and this has created a serious problem. Iraq's frustration resides in the fact that it cannot achieve its objectives. Everything else is but an attempt at justification a posteriori.

It is essential to restore the facts to their proper historical perspective. Except in its own press and text books, Iraq cannot rewrite history as it pleases in order to disguise its ambitions or camouflage its failures.

The question that now arises is this. What right has Iraq, which is bent on the destruction of another sovereign State Member of the United Nations, to invoke the Charter of this Organization, international morality or respect for collective security? There seems to be no limit to hypocrisy.

Furthermore, it is strange that the representative of Iraq, which is so concerned about disarmament, economic development and ecology purity and so disturbed by recourse to force has itself been waging for more than three years a costly and devastating war against Iran. This conflict, for which Iraq bears a large part of the responsibility, has already cost and continues to cost tens of thousands of lives on both sides and is costing more than \$1 billion a month.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

It would be only too easy to remove the virtuous mask behind which Iraq tries to hide its intentions regarding Israel, as well as the very nature of its own régime.

The 1980 and 1983 reports of Amnesty International have again established that arbitrary imprisonment, torture and political assassination are common practice in Iraq. Furthermore, censorship, authoritarianism, military dictatorship and hegemonism in the Middle East - to use a fashionable political term with which Iraq leaders are familiar - flourish in Iraq. I could give many other examples; there is abundant material, although it is true that it originates not in the Iraqi press, which is very well disciplined, but in that of sister countries. However, to do so would be an exercise in futility.

Israel's position concerning the Iraqi Tammuz reactor was clearly stated on 12 and 17 June 1981 in the Security Council, on 11 November 1981 in the General Assembly and in a detailed text published by the Government of Israel and distributed in the United Nations as an annex to document A/36/610, dated 20 October 1981. We see no point in reopening this discussion. Last year many delegations, regardless of their position on the substance of the problem, firmly declared that they would no longer support its perpetuation. The First Committee has before it too many serious and urgent problems to allow itself to be diverted from its objectives in order to discuss matters that are not on its agenda. For its part Israel, like every sovereign State, while protecting its fundamental interests, wishes to contribute to the search for peaceful solutions in the Middle East. It has said that it is in favour of regional disarmament commissions. On 31 October 1981 it submitted a draft resolution, in document A/C.1/35/L.8, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It has on many occasions here joined in a consensus on this matter.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

I have just quickly enumerated a number of questions, to which my delegation reserves the right to return when appropriate. Meanwhile, we express the hope that the Committee will be allowed to continue its work free from attempts to use it for partisan purposes.

Mr. NÚÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): A famous Cuban, one of the greatest thinkers of the western hemisphere of the past century, Jose Marti, said that true men seek to find not where they can live a better life but where their duty lies. I think that this could very well be applied to what has just been said by the gentleman who spoke from the place of the United States with regard to the Cuban people and what has been happening to the people of Grenada and what they have suffered.

Today the American delegation has treated us to a show in which first the wolf appeared disguised as grandma and then the wolf appeared in its true colours. It is interesting to note how for more than a century the Government of the United States has used the same arguments to justify its intervention in the affairs of the peoples of Latin America. We remember that what was said about the need to protect the lives of American citizens in Grenada - while subsequently it was acknowledged that they were in no danger - was the same as had been said at the end of the last century when the Government of the United States intervened in Cuba. Then, too, it was said that they were protecting the lives of American citizens living on the island. We remember what was said in a recent statement by President Reagan to the effect that the United States fourth frontier was in Central America because, for example, El Salvador was closer to Texas than Texas was to Massachusetts.

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

In 1912, President William Taft said, in so many words, that intervention was justified when it became necessary for safeguarding the United States capital and markets. He said further that the Monroe Doctrine - that is, "America for the Americans", but that means the Americans to the North - was obviously even more vital in the area of the Panama Canal and the Caribbean than elsewhere. So there is a sequence, and it is interesting to see how the arguments have remained unchanged in 100 years.

If what has been said and done by the Cuban delegation in the United Nations has served to unmask the hostile and aggressive policy of the United States against our people, then unmasked it must stand.

The will of the Cuban people, mentioned by the gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, is defended by the people of Cuba, weapons in hand, and they have shown that they are ready to defend that will and the revolution they won, or to perish with it. It is as well that the representative of the United States should realize this. The weapons the Cuban workers in Grenada used to defend themselves were handed out to them by the Bishop Government in view of the imminence of an attack against the island, an act of aggression which was condemned by us, and was also condemned in advance at the meetings of the non-aligned countries in recent years, and which unfortunately became a cruel fact.

The representative of the United States said that its forces are leaving Grenada. If they do not leave Grenada, the Grenadian revolutionaries will get them out of there. The time has passed when Yankee troops could take their ease south of the Rio Bravo. There probably exists nowhere in the world a group of peoples who have suffered more aggressions from one and the same country than the Latin American peoples have suffered at the hands of the United States. More than 100 large-scale military interventions have been suffered by our peoples at the hands of successive United States Governments since the last century. The history

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

of American aggression against Latin America is sufficient to show how specious are the arguments used by the gentleman who just spoke in trying to justify the current United States intervention in Grenada. At one time he referred to some defence organization or other that he even tried to compare with the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, when it is still fresh in our minds that the United States supported colonial aggression against the Malvinas islands, turning its back on Latin America and its organizations in favour of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

This is a new act of aggression being carried out by the United States against Latin America, and as such it has been condemned in this Assembly not only by the Cuban delegation but by many Latin American delegations. Let the representative of the United States tell this Committee whether or not it is true that as far back as the last century, when Grenada did not yet have the AKA weapons, which he says they found there, his country seized over half of Mexico's territory in a war of plunder recorded in the history of our peoples. Let the representative of the United States say whether or not it is true that, again in the last century, when Grenada did not yet have the AKA weapons he mentioned, his country carried out an armed intervention in Cuba and set up a military base against the will of the Cuban people, and imposed a colonial situation upon the people of Puerto Rico which it is still enduring today. Let the representative of the United States say whether or not it is true that while there were yet no AKA weapons in Grenada, his country carried out armed interventions in many of our countries and imposed various dictatorships on many of our peoples. The arguments put forward now by the gentleman who spoke for the United States are ridiculous.

As far back as 1904 Theodore Roosevelt said:

"Sooner or later it is inevitable that the United States will have to protect and regulate the life of the republics of the Caribbean."

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

That is precisely what it is seeking to do now.

In 1908 Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, said:

"It is only a question of time before Mexico, Central America and the islands that we do already possess in the Caribbean come under our flag."

Four years later he said:

"By about 1950 the frontiers of the United States will take in the whole continent."

I think I ought not to take up more than the 10 minutes granted me in order to hold up to ridicule the arguments that the United States delegation is seeking to use.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I must say that we were not surprised by the statement made by the representative of the United States in an attempt to justify the unjustifiable, the act of banditry undertaken against Grenada, the aggression against an independent Caribbean country. I repeat, we were not surprised. However, we were surprised by something else, the extent of the cynicism and hypocisy which had to be resorted to by the delegation of the United States, the country which has distorted the very concept of democracy, and by fire and the sword is imposing its way of life on other countries and trampling under foot their legitimate interests, in order to shout about democracy and teach other countries about democratic methods. This is absolutely the last word in demagoguery. I think the aggressive actions of the United States towards Grenada serve all of us here in the First Committee as a striking testimony to the fact that the United States is building up its armaments on the pretext of the Soviet threat, whereas in actual fact it is hoping to use the position of supremacy and military might for which it is aiming in order to impose its own will and its own régime on other countries and peoples and to subordinate them to United States diktats, acting on the very well-known principle of what is

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

good for America is good for all other peoples. But they are forgetting that those times have long passed into oblivion, and today it is no longer possible for them to enjoy a position of military supremacy.

The aggression against Grenada is a lesson in another respect, too. It demonstrates that we cannot believe the word of the United States. At the meeting of the Security Council very cogent testimony was offered, in statements of very senior United States representatives enjoying great credibility, to the effect that the United States has no aggressive designs on the countries of Central America. But yesterday we heard something quite different, and today we are seeing the reverse.

(Mr. Petrovsky, USSR)

We are seeing the treachery of the United States, its failure to abide by its own words. Such adventurist actions, which could lead the world to catastrophe, show to all of us here in this Committee, all of us who cherish international peace, who aspire to the security ensured by limiting armaments, that we must begin the specific work necessary to remove the threat hanging over us and to end the use of this important body for the purposes of dirty slander and demagoguery.

Mr. MAJOOD (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I will be very concise, unlike the representative of the Zionist entity, who tried to deal with all the subjects before the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly and referred to the work of all the Committees. That entity had the right only to reply to what I said.

The representative of the Zionist entity said that the representative of Iraq repeated what he said last year and will perhaps repeat it next year. We shall continue to remind the world of what the Zionist entity has done to obtain nuclear weapons. We shall remind the world that the Zionist entity is continuing to violate international law by occupying Arab territories in Palestine, Syria and Lebanon and we shall continue to remind the world that Israel, which destroyed the peaceful Iraqi nuclear installation illegally and criminally, acts in a manner for which there is no precedent and continues to threaten further such criminal acts.

The representative of so-called Israel cannot by his accusations concerning my country justify the activities of the Zionist entity. We do not need to repeat what the world well knows about these criminals - facts that were recalled yesterday in the general debate.

The attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor has not ended. Mr. Arens, the Defence Minister of the Zionist entity, declared during a brief visit to Paris that the Israelis would attack the reactor again as soon as it was rebuilt. The question of

(Mr. Majood, Iraq)

this aggression is within the mandate of the Committee, as has been mentioned by the Secretary-General in his report in document A/38/337.

It is only reasonable to say that Israel would not have undertaken this aggression unless it was sure it was going to be successful and would act as a deterrent. Therefore States must understand that in order to prevent such behaviour they must arm themselves, instead of bringing about disarmament. In other words, Israel's acts are in violation of the purposes of the United Nations.

As for the word "entity", it is a true word, because the Zionist entity knows no borders and no limits. Are its borders those of 1947, or 1967, or perhaps 1973? What about the expansionist policy being carried out now by that entity? As for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, the entity does have nuclear weapons in the region and it must submit its nuclear installations to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and respect the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Why does that entity fail to heed the United Nations resolutions? Obviously it has to talk about other subjects extraneous to the issue before us. The world has condemned Zionism as a form of racism, and we must not allow Zionism and racism to work together. As the United Nations declared in 1947, democracy and racism cannot coexist.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who have asked to exercise the right of reply a second time. I remind them that such statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. SORZANO (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, in deference to the obvious exhaustion of the members of the Committee as well as the friendship that my delegation feels for your delegation, I will be even briefer than last time.

The Soviet representative has indicated that there are a number of lessons to be learnt from Grenada. We whole-heartedly concur in that. I would merely suggest two lessons that we should keep in mind. The first lesson is the fate of those

(Mr. Sorzano, United States)

régimes that, willingly or otherwise, request builders, technicians and other technical assistance people - the fate of the freedom of their people, even the lives of their leaders. It is that type of assistance that comes from the Soviet bloc. The second lesson may be learnt from a comparison - one which we willingly and even enthusiastically ask everybody to make - of the future of Grenada, the freedom that the Grenadian people will henceforth begin to enjoy and the exercise of Grenadian sovereignty, with what other people that, unfortunately, are currently subjugated by the Soviet régime will enjoy. As I say, we encourage everybody to make those comparisons.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The second statement by the representative of the United States does not require any special comment. It is a striking illustration of the fact that the United States elevates the policy of diktat and terrorism towards other peoples to the status of an official doctrine. Members may judge for themselves. If anyone had any illusions about the possibility of a change for the better in the policy of the current Administration, the most recent events have totally destroyed any such illusions. Indeed, having listened to the representative of the United States, one can only realize finally that, for the sake of achieving its imperialist goals, that country goes so far that one might even doubt that there exist in Washington any brakes at all that would prevent its crossing the line at which any sober-minded person would stop. There is only one conclusion to be drawn from that. We must urgently undertake the most specific and practical steps to erect reliable barriers, political, moral and other, to the growing threat of war of which the United States is the source.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I simply want to say that in order properly to apply these lessons which have been drawn and so that the people of Grenada can again enjoy their sovereignty and independence without foreign interference and that we can contemplate that country's future, the invasion forces must be withdrawn from Grenada, as the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly requested yesterday. I think the Government of the United States should comply with that request and begin withdrawing from that country.

Mr. TARI (Israel) (interpretation from French): The latest statement of the representative of Iraq, in its style and its tone, makes clearer than I could have done myself the nature and the intentions of his main statement this afternoon. I shall therefore refrain, for the time being, from making any further comments. I can only express my regret that the First Committee should be condemned to suffer this kind of exchange.

Mr. MAJOOD (Iraq): The Zionist entity has a long history of condemnation by this body and I would just inform the majority of the Committee that the representative of the Zionist entity will not be honoured by any reply from me.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.