

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOCHUBEY (Ukrainian SSR)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 30 TO 45, 120 AND 121 (continued)

- General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Khan (Bangladesh)
Mr. Ngare (Chad)
Mr. Bedjaoui (Algeria)
Mr. Eilan (Israel)
Mr. Charles (Haiti)
Mr. Bishara (Kuwait)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/34/PV.30
7 November 1979

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 30 to 45, 120 and 121 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KHAN (Bangladesh): Throughout history, men have sought peace but suffered war. All too often deliberate decisions or miscalculations have brought violence and destruction to a world yearning for peace and tranquillity. Tragic as the consequence of violence may have been in the past, the issue of war and peace takes on unprecedented urgency when, for the first time in history, we witness a massive growth in the machinery of war which if unleashed could threaten the very survival of mankind. We therefore fully agree with the United Nations Secretary-General that the United Nations cannot hope to function effectively on the basis of the Charter unless there is major progress in the field of disarmament.

As we review the situation of this decade, which was once declared a decade of both disarmament and development, we find that the relentless arms race continues unabated. It is ironical that in 1978, the year of the special session devoted to disarmament, there were 48 nuclear explosions. While in 1970 military expenditures were about \$250 billion, today they are nearing an all-time high of \$450 billion. The gigantic military expenditures have distorted all priorities, rendering all but impossible the achievement of the targets set forth in the Second United Nations Development Decade. More than half a billion people of the world are suffering from malnutrition or starvation, nearly half of the world's school-age children remain illiterate, and more than two thirds of the world population are in desperate need of shelter and medical care. It is a sad commentary on us, and a serious indictment of the States Members of the world Organization, that there are more soldiers in the world today than there are teachers to educate the children or doctors to nurse the sick.

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

While therefore dismayed by the unprecedented threat of self-extinction arising from the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced, Bangladesh is, however, encouraged by the recent awareness of the need for a comprehensive programme of disarmament, as evidenced at the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament. Although no concrete results have yet been achieved with respect to implementation of the priority tasks delineated in the Programme of Action which was unanimously adopted at the tenth special session, Bangladesh has noted with satisfaction the progress made by the two super-Powers towards the conclusion of a SALT II agreement. It is hoped that these negotiations will lead to genuine and significant disarmament measures. It is, furthermore, of the utmost importance that the two super-Powers, after the ratification of SALT II, should move on to the next stage leading to the negotiation of a SALT III agreement. It is the view of my delegation that a Treaty on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons should also be concluded at the earliest possible time.

The corner-stone of Bangladesh's policy on disarmament is our constitutional commitment according to which we are wedded to the concept of general and complete disarmament. It is this dedication to the cause of disarmament that undergirds not only the principles we espouse in this field but the concrete and tangible action that we are prepared to take in the appropriate context. As but one example of such a motivation, I am happy to inform the Committee that Bangladesh recently acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In our view, under the present circumstances, this is the main international instrument available for the prevention of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. Bangladesh has taken this momentous decision both in the interest of global peace and in its own larger national interest. It reflects our firm conviction that there can be peace only through the elimination of all weapons of war, including nuclear weapons. Moves towards the limitation of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction are important steps in creating an atmosphere of trust and the relaxation of tension.

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

Bangladesh believes that progress towards disarmament is the responsibility of all States individually and collectively, and attempts should be made to strengthen efforts towards disarmament globally, as well as through regional and sub-regional co-operation and agreement.

But, whereas the menace of arms is a world-wide phenomenon and while it is incumbent upon each individual State to contribute its share in alleviating that condition, it is nevertheless self-evident that the primary responsibility in this field rests upon the two major nuclear Powers, possessing, as they do, the largest arsenals of weapons ever assembled in the history of mankind. We believe that the two super-Powers should take immediate steps to reduce their nuclear arsenals; they should do so unilaterally. We would commend this course of action to all the nuclear Powers. My delegation is of the view that such unilateral action is incumbent on the nuclear weapon States to provide the necessary inducement to those that have not acceded to the NPT to do so, and as a necessary gesture to those that have acceded to it. Moreover, we are confident that should even one nuclear Power embark on this course of independent reduction of its nuclear stockpiles, it would set off a chain reaction by compelling others to follow suit. The international community would give its full support to any such action on the part of one State and do its best to ensure that others do likewise.

In any case, prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons beyond countries already having them is considered by my delegation as only an interim measure. The ultimate goal should be the destruction of all nuclear weapons. The arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspects, runs counter to efforts to achieve further relaxation of international tension., The present arms race goes against the establishment of international relations based on peace, co-existence and trust among all States. It militates against the spirit of peaceful settlement of disputes and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. For this reason, the elimination of nuclear weapons as part of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is essential if a nuclear holocaust is to be avoided.

While the problems of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons continue to be our predominant concerns, Bangladesh's

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

particular interest will lie in the measures directed towards the protection of the interest of the non-nuclear countries, including security guarantees and positive action towards the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of peace, freedom and neutrality in South and South-East Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean, as well as in other parts of the world.

Bangladesh attaches great importance to the recommendations which emerged from the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean which was held in July of this year. We are particularly gratified to note the recommendation of the Meeting regarding the expansion of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and the proposed invitation to the great Powers and the maritime users to serve on the expanded Committee, which is requested to undertake the preparatory work for a conference on the Indian Ocean, including consideration of appropriate arrangements for any international agreement that may ultimately be reached for the maintenance of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. We sincerely hope that the General Assembly will endorse the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean that the conference on the Indian Ocean take place in Sri Lanka in 1981. The proposal to hold that conference in Colombo has been warmly welcomed by Bangladesh in view of Sri Lanka's unique role in initiating the idea of such a conference. We further urge that the great Powers and the major maritime users involved consider positively the invitation to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee and that they do so as full members.

Bangladesh is gratified to note that the Sixth Summit of the Non-Aligned Countries has called attention to the problem of disarmament in its entirety. The Final Declaration has reiterated the determination of the Non-Aligned countries for the implementation of the decisions of the tenth special session, devoted to Disarmament, in which special mention has been made of the role of the United Nations in its realization.

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

We believe that the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, devoted to Disarmament, convened on the initiative of the non-aligned countries, constitutes a good basis towards the realization of a process to deliver mankind from the scourge of war and to remove the growing threat to man's survival. The Final Document of the tenth special session accords the highest priority to nuclear disarmament, together with certain measures for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. Although the adoption of the Final Document is a positive step forward, it falls far short of immediate measures that can be taken in conventional disarmament and in strengthening the non-proliferation régime. The recent meeting of the Disarmament Commission, which adopted on a consensus basis the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament, is, however, a positive step forward. We hope that this will create the necessary atmosphere which will compel the super-Powers to negotiate with the non-aligned group of countries for achieving general and complete disarmament.

In the context of Bangladesh's pre-occupation with general and complete disarmament, we welcome all steps leading towards relaxation of tension, halting of the arms race and the building of confidence. This is why we view President Brezhnev's declaration that the Soviet Union will withdraw 20,000 troops and 1,000 tanks from the German Democratic Republic as a salutary development, especially if it is done in a manner that will link the action to the overall context of enhancing peace and security.

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

The revival of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its successful deliberations have gone some distance towards justifying the expectations of the non-aligned countries. The work of the Disarmament Commission is a further testimony to the fact that, given the will and determination, the United Nations is able to tackle complex and difficult problems. My delegation hopes that the Disarmament Commission will continue its valuable work in contributing to the resolution of various problems in the field of disarmament and thereby to the eventual implementation of the decisions of the tenth special session, devoted to disarmament.

My delegation also expresses its satisfaction that the first session of the Committee on Disarmament, established by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, has been held in Geneva. Although it is too early to comment on the possible success or failure of the Committee, we are gratified that the Committee has succeeded ab initio in dealing with questions relating to procedure and the organization of its work. Although progress on substantive matters of disarmament negotiations has been rather slow, we call upon the Member States to inject more political vigour into the proceedings of the Committee on Disarmament in order to make it more effective and viable. In this regard, the recent expression of intention by China to participate directly in the Committee's work next year is particularly welcomed as a positive development. As the principal multilateral negotiating body on disarmament matters, the Committee on Disarmament should also proceed promptly to conducting negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on a comprehensive test ban, with a view to achieving suitable agreements in those areas.

In this connexion, I wish to state that Bangladesh has consistently favoured the idea of concluding a comprehensive test ban treaty as an instrument for halting the nuclear arms race and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. The tripartite negotiations which have been going on for quite some time without any definitive results should be reinvigorated and the results submitted to the Committee on Disarmament so that negotiations in a multilateral setting may not be subjected to any further delays.

Although over 100 countries have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the failure to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty is jeopardizing the results achieved so far. The idea of preventing further proliferation

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

of nuclear weapons without a comprehensive test ban treaty seems unrealistic. If we want the Non-Proliferation Treaty to be effective and successful, there must be a series of comprehensive measures like the comprehensive test ban, directed not merely at the stabilization of armaments but at substantive reduction and elimination of such arms through a graduated and phased programme.

It is the belief of my delegation that the second Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which will be held in Geneva next year, will provide an opportunity for all of us to examine these questions in depth and to recommend such measures as will be found appropriate.

We have heard with great concern of the reported detonation of an atomic device by the racist régime of South Africa. We fully endorse the proposal of Nigeria that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should make arrangements to conduct a thorough investigation into this matter and report to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. In this regard, my delegation also fully endorses the declaration of the Non-Aligned Movement, adopted recently, that a working group should be held to discuss the question in depth.

We have noted with satisfaction that the Committee on Disarmament has considered in its first session the question of assuring the non-nuclear weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We are hopeful that the decision of the Sixth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement regarding the adoption of an international convention in the Committee's 1980 session will lend further momentum to the deliberations on the matter.

Bangladesh believes that peace and prosperity are indivisible. Acceleration of military expenditures not only absorbs considerable resources, but constitutes a basic destabilizing element in the entire world economy. Recurring economic crises in recent years have served to highlight this fact. It is our belief that a viable international system must be based on the establishment of a link between disarmament and development. In this context we may consider the various proposals advanced during this session for reduction in military expenditure and redeployment of funds released to the development efforts worldwide, perhaps through the creation of a development fund. The developed countries of the world can set an example in this field.

(Mr. Khan, Bangladesh)

These are some of the preliminary thoughts my delegation wanted to share on a number of issues being discussed in the First Committee. In due course my delegation will contribute to the discussion on other items on the agenda in order further to highlight the fact that for the achievement of peace there is no alternative to the gradual de-escalation of the arms race and the eventual realization of the goal of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. NGARE (Chad) (interpretation from French): Two months from now the Disarmament Decade will come to an end. Is it time to draw up the balance-sheet, is it the moment to determine whether that Decade met the world's expectations and, more specifically, those of the man who proposed it, the late Secretary-General U Thant? It would be presumptuous to attempt to make an accurate reply to such a question, but certain acts, certain events deserve to be mentioned. This is why we think it useful first of all to enumerate the main points scored against armaments.

The first point that strikes us concerns the degree of sensitivity of States to this question. In fact, in the course of this Decade not a single month has passed without our hearing of the holding of a bilateral meeting on the subject, not a single year without our hearing of the work of a committee or the convening of a conference on disarmament. A few years ago, many delegations failed to understand why the First Committee devoted almost all its work to that question. With the tenth special session, the level of awareness reached its peak.

Today one can say that it is not the peoples alone who are concerned about the dangers of armaments. Governments as well, whether or not they are powerfully armed, whether or not they possess nuclear weapons, seem to be saying, "Where are we headed? It is time to slow down and take a look at the road map".

The second positive point is the repeatedly expressed will of the two nuclear super-Powers to struggle against armaments. The items communicated jointly to the appropriate bodies with a view to the elaboration of subsequent treaties suffice to bear out this goodwill. On 18 October last did we not hear in this very hall the reaffirmation of that will, preceded each time with a reference to the destructive capacity of these weapons?

(Mr. Ngare, Chad)

The representative of the Soviet Union told us that

"... the world long ago passed the line at which the arms race became truly insane. If somebody were to use the stockpiles of weapons that have been accumulated, it would be a catastrophe for mankind ...

"For its part, the Soviet Union is resolutely determined systematically to conduct matters in such a way that, together with other countries, it might be possible to stop the arms race, to proceed to dismantling part by part the military machine, and to reduce the armaments of States until there is genuine total and complete disarmament." (A/C.1/34/PV.8, p. 2)

The representative of the United States expressed the same views and wishes, but with slight variations and in more legal terms, when he said that:

"We cannot be satisfied with the security of the world as it is. The weapons we have within our collective hands are too numerous and too awesome for us to entrust our common destiny to good fortune and chance. We must therefore actively seek a safer world and never falter in that search.

"... My Government is firmly committed to arms control agreements based on principles of equity and improved security for all."

(A/C.1/34/PV.8, p. 26)

No one can deny the cogency of such statements.

(Mr. Ngare, Chad)

The third reason for satisfaction is an attempt to establish what I would refer to as disarmament law in the form of some nine international conventions on arms control, among which are the two SALT agreements, the Treaty on the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the convention prohibiting biological and toxin weapons and the sea-bed treaty. They represent the progress achieved, the victories scored by the forces of peace.

But all our hopes are dashed when we look at the reverse side of the coin, the graph representing the actions of the forces of evil. I need merely give as an example the increase in budgetary expenditures which rose from \$250 billion in 1970 to the present figure of over \$400 billion. Thus, the task before us is indeed immense.

Of the various items before this Committee relating to arms controls, I wish to deal with three which, in my opinion, have not received the attention they deserve. I begin with the subject of conventional weapons. The world is afraid of nuclear weapons. Well and good. But since the unfortunate events of 1945 nobody has had truly to deplore the results of their actual use. On the other hand, since that date conventional weapons continue to kill, to kill by the hundreds of thousands each year, in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Improvements in their precision and destructive capacity enable them to administer ever stronger and deadlier blows and to do so indiscriminately. Coups d'état, by remote control, the landing of mercenaries, the seizure of peoples to place them under the yoke of colonialism, continuation of the policy of apartheid, the occupation of territories of certain States by others, and so on - these are so many attacks on the law of nations which can only be carried out with conventional weapons. In addition, we are told that four fifths of military expenditures are devoted to conventional weapons. We were told that an armoured division would cost half-a-billion dollars, that a squadron of twelve F-5 fighter-bombers would cost \$120 million. We are also told that the cost of a prototype bomber is equivalent to the annual salaries of 250,000 teachers, 30 science faculties of 1,000 students each or 75 hospitals.

(Mr. Ngare, Chad)

We must do something about all these costs. My delegation is aware of the fact that every State is in need of minimum conditions of security, but when certain countries accumulate such a stock of weapons, they instinctively shift towards a gunboat policy and we must do something about it.

My delegation appeals to the General Assembly to invite all countries that manufacture conventional weapons to enter into the necessary consultations to impose limits on the transfer of such weapons. The recent United Nations conference on the prohibition of the use of certain conventional weapons, particularly inhumane weapons, arose great hopes, especially concerning the protection of civilian populations from the effects of inhumane conventional weapons. The General Assembly should decide to hold another conference in the near future, and this time should broaden its agenda to cover all aspects of conventional weapons.

The second point of my intervention relates to the fundamental and priority aspects of nuclear disarmament. My delegation believes that at this stage any approach should begin with the testing of such weapons. We know that any process for building nuclear weapons begins with testing. Hence, it is useless to speak of nuclear disarmament while States continue to test weapons. We can only express the hope that the tripartite negotiations at present being held in Geneva will be successful, and we should invite the other two principal nuclear Powers to participate in the negotiations. Pending the elaboration of a treaty, we believe that it would be desirable to encourage the work of the special group of scientific experts, who are entrusted with establishing a system for the exchange of seismic data, since such a system is the principal prerequisite for the implementation of such a treaty.

I turn to the second most important aspect of nuclear disarmament. We must tackle decisively the question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is to be held in August 1980, will make it possible to review the progress achieved. However one failure must be mentioned: the level of proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, is infinitely greater than it was at the time of the first conference.

(Mr. Ngare, Chad)

This state of affairs was encouraged by, among other things, the refusal of certain countries to accede to the Treaty, thus disregarding the existence of an international non-proliferation régime. This, of course, leaves them full freedom of action.

With regard to horizontal proliferation, a trend at variance with the will of the General Assembly to create demilitarized zones is developing. I refer to the possession and development of nuclear technology by Israel and South Africa.

While Israel's capabilities may not be fully known, South Africa's are to the last detail. We know that the racist country possesses three principal nuclear installations: the first in the Kalahari desert made it possible as early as 1977 to proceed to tests; the second is at Pelindaba, and includes two nuclear reactors and two uranium plants. The third, which is under construction at Koeberg In Duynefontein comprises two reactors, each of 1,000 megawatts.

All these installations were made possible thanks to the co-operation of the Western Powers. It is no secret that the Safari reactor at Pelindaba was provided by the United States, that the enriched uranium plant used the jet technology established and developed by a West German scientist, Mr. Erwin Becker, and that the construction of two reactors that is now taking place at Koeberg has been underwritten by a French consortium, Framatom, to a value of \$2 billion. Whatever reasons the Western countries may have to help South Africa's nuclear development, the facts are there.

My delegation believes that in respect of nuclear weapons, primary responsibility lies with the major nuclear Powers themselves. As we pointed out at the beginning of our statement, the will to accept that responsibility was established when drafts were prepared and the competent bodies of the United Nations received a joint communication on the elements relating to treaties concerning the prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling and use of certain weapons, such as chemical, radiological and neutron weapons. Such contributions are far too important to be neglected. We therefore request the General Assembly to ask those bodies to submit their conclusions forthwith.

(Mr. Ngare, Chad)

I wish to touch briefly on the peaceful use of nuclear energy, the last point in my statement. One of the positive aspects of disarmament is the place it gives to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. We note that little progress has been made in this area. We must trust in the future, but we should now tackle the current concept and machinery mechanism relating to the transfer of such technologies.

My delegation believes that the dangers inherent in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes are far too great to be left to the whim of any one country. It is true that the technical means are being established through the International Nuclear Fuel Evaluation Cycle in order to reconcile the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, on the one hand and, on the other, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. But regardless of the development and improvement of such techniques, it will be difficult to prevent a State from using these products for purposes other than peaceful ones. That is why we still have time to think of supplementary measures to fill these gaps. For instance, we could create legal techniques designed to prevent transfers to belligerent countries, countries which do not respect fundamental human rights and which violate the United Nations Charter by adopting the role of invader and conqueror and occupying the territories of other countries.

In conclusion my delegation wishes to recall the role of the United Nations in the harmonization and practical implementation of the efforts and proposals of peoples to rid themselves of armaments. Besides arousing an awareness among States and attempting to establish a propitious climate, the United Nations should marshal all the forces of peace and progress against those who possess such weapons. We in Chad are ready to support any action or measure designed to promote disarmament.

Mr. BEDJAOUI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): Many of the speakers who have preceded me have cited well-known figures and brought up lesser known facts. This already points to a broadly shared disquiet before a phenomenon which has all the appearances of being irreversible: namely, the arms race, which is becoming more and more unbridled and less and less controllable. This is a reality which, it must be emphasized, is in danger of becoming trite; the triteness would come from the annual repetition in our Committee of an incantatory ritual tending to conjure up the threat of the destruction of our planet and to exorcise those evil forces from the modern world which are called weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons or long-range missiles. Nevertheless, incantation is not sufficient. Concrete measures have to be contemplated, which would be the result of the political will to act and of the conviction of the urgent need to succeed without which one cannot go beyond proclamations of good intentions, pious hopes and sterile professions of faith.

One and a half years ago, a hope was born: for the first time in its history, the General Assembly of the United Nations was going to devote a session entirely to disarmament problems. This hope was not to be allowed to die, because the session breathed new life into the disarmament effort in that it stimulated participation on the part of States in the solution to the problems of the arms race by reactivating the negotiating and deliberative machinery. After one year of activity of that machinery, the time has come to examine the results of its work.

First of all, I should like to speak about the Committee on Disarmament. The Committee on Disarmament, for which my country had the honour of providing the first Chairman, held its first session this year with the changes introduced by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, namely, an expanded membership and a chairmanship based on monthly rotation in order to meet the desire for democratization. At the end of its first session, it is comforting to observe that it succeeded in adopting its rules of procedure, its agenda, and a time-table for its work. On the other hand, there is cause for concern in that it has not made significant progress in respect to questions of substance. Thus, as regards the question of the comprehensive nuclear test ban, the urgency of which was stressed in resolution 33/60, the work of the Committee is marking time. The three nuclear Powers, which were requested rapidly to work out a treaty, have so far given only a vague report on the progress of

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

their negotiations. Still within the sphere of nuclear weapons, we should like to emphasize that the question of safeguards to be given to States not possessing nuclear weapons has likewise not made substantial progress. Nevertheless, the Committee was able to set up a working group which was instructed to draft an international instrument in that area.

In this connexion, I should like to recall the position of my Government which is based on the principle that the only complete and genuine guarantee against the nuclear threat involves the cessation of the manufacture of all nuclear weapons and the destruction of all the existing stockpiles. In the meantime, it is urgent to bring about prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. As for chemical weapons, the two Powers entrusted with negotiating the elements of a convention have not yet been able to come to an agreement by reason, as it seems, of the complexity of monitoring of the implementation of such a convention. There is nevertheless cause for satisfaction in the agreement which has been reached between the United States and the Soviet Union on the major elements of a treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons. Such a result is the best demonstration of the fact that progress can be made in the field of disarmament. And we hope that it will act as a catalyst in the discussions that are taking place in other fields, in particular those on the prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests and on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

We are also happy that China will soon be joining the Committee on Disarmament. Such a decision seems to us to be such as to strengthen the capacities of the Committee to adopt concrete measures the application of which would thus be facilitated by the adherence of all nuclear Powers.

The Disarmament Commission, a deliberative organ open to all States which was reactivated by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, has shown in its first substantive session the useful action it could take and the validity of the reasons which prevailed in its reactivation since it was able to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament. However, we must regret the fact that some important measures could not be incorporated in that programme. Indeed, it would have been at least desirable to include therein the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons,

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

a concern which is shared by the overwhelming majority of States Members of our Organization as stated in resolution 33/71 B adopted last year.

Moreover, the question of the dissolution of military alliances and the dismantling of foreign military bases should quite naturally have found its place there as well, within the context of general and complete disarmament under effective international controls.

This brief recapitulation of the activities of the negotiating and deliberative machinery on disarmament leads me to reaffirm the special role that should be played by our Organization, which must be associated with all negotiations on disarmament.

The United Nations Conference on the Prohibition or Restriction of Use of Specific Conventional Weapons which are Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or Indiscriminate in Effect was held at Geneva last September. The work of that Conference unfortunately did not lead to any agreements. Nevertheless we should be gratified that the results of its work leave hope for genuine possibilities of agreement which, we trust, will be achieved at its next session. Still in the field of conventional weapons, we wish to recall that the need to encourage initiatives which could contribute to a reduction of stockpiles and of the transfer of such weapons should, in no circumstances, affect adversely the right of States to defend their security and the right of peoples to fight for their self-determination and independence.

(Mr. Bedjacui, Algeria)

The year 1979 has seen the conclusion of negotiations on SALT II. The treaty is one we shall welcome with satisfaction if it serves to pave the way to agreements that would provide for effective measures for the reduction of strategic weapons and not just for the control of the race on which they are centred. It is to be hoped, also, that future negotiations on such weapons will be conducted with more diligence.

My delegation wishes to reaffirm once again its endorsement of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones throughout the world; this should be an intermediate stage that would lead to a totally denuclearized world. In this respect the will of the African States to make their continent a zone from which nuclear weapons would be banned has been solemnly proclaimed by the Organization of African Unity. This will was also expressed in the same fashion by the countries of the Middle East with respect to their region. It is significant that in these two regions of the world Israel and South Africa - which have made themselves conspicuous by their policies of aggression and by the constant threat they pose to international peace and security - alone have chosen the nuclear option as a military means. These two countries having been condemned on numerous occasions by the international community, it is fitting that we question ourselves about the assistance and the technological co-operation that has been afforded to them. We have been provided with a reason for serious concern by the news of a nuclear explosion that may have been carried out by South Africa. This alarming news leads us to recall resolution 33/63 of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, which:

"Requests the Security Council to exercise a close watch on South Africa and to take appropriate effective steps to prevent South Africa from developing and acquiring nuclear weapons, thereby endangering international peace and security." (resolution 33/63, para. 4)

It does not really matter much whether South Africa has actually conducted that explosion. It was to be foreseen from the time that the apartheid régime began benefiting from all the complicity it needed to facilitate its access to the mastery of nuclear technology for military purposes. Does one have to be as sensitive as a seismograph to need to wait for confirmation of the event before reacting vigorously to the shock of a nuclear explosion which was long

(Mr. Bedjaoui, Algeria)

since foreseeable? It is urgent today more than ever for our Organization, and in particular for the Security Council, to consider concrete measures to remove the danger to international peace and security represented by a racist régime which is already brandishing the nuclear threat.

It was paradoxical that a régime which has raised aggression to an institutionalized policy should be able to benefit from nuclear technological assistance for military purposes.

It is therefore discriminatory and unjust, to say the least, to refuse to grant nuclear assistance to developing countries for purposes of economic and social development. And that is why the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones ought not to be a barrier to the free access of States to nuclear technology for economic and social development purposes. My country, as in past years, will this year again be a co-sponsor of a draft resolution concerning the holding under the aegis of the United Nations of an international conference for the promotion of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The second United Nations Disarmament Decade - and this is the last point I wish to make - will be starting in 1980, next year, and will coincide with the third United Nations Development Decade. We hope that this happy coincidence will produce concrete measures and fruitful actions whereby the reallocation of resources liberated by disarmament measures to the economic and social development of the developing countries might become a reality. Need we recall that \$450 billion has been spent this year on weapons while a large part of the population of our planet is still struggling with the prehistoric triad of hunger, disease and ignorance? This is indeed damning evidence of the moral failure of an international political and economic order which must be replaced by the just and necessary balance between the abysmal poverty of the peoples of the third world and the supreme alienation which has led to the manufacture of the instruments of our own destruction.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): My delegation would like to address itself to item 121 and also items 45 and 42 of our agenda.

The First Committee is seized this year of 21 items on its agenda. Nineteen items deal with disarmament or disarmament-related matters and two with international security. One item and one item alone relates to one country's allegations against another, and so, this year as was the case at the special session and last year, breaks with an honourable tradition and a tacit understanding which permitted this Committee to deal with disarmament and international security as world problems.

It should be noted that this tradition has continued throughout the years in spite of several military conflicts that have broken out among States Members of the United Nations. In none of these conflict situations did either side demand a debate in the First Committee. This Committee's reluctance to break with this tradition was recorded on page 507 of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Yearbook of 1979, where it was noted that the overwhelming feeling among representatives was that the highly controversial Iraqi resolution

"... would diffuse the focus of the session and undermine the consensus on the Final Document".

The various procedural and substantive votes taken last year on the Iraqi draft resolution showed that the usual majority at the disposal of the Arab States and Soviet supporters had either vanished or been greatly reduced.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

The Iraqi persistence in pursuing a course so palpably unpopular in the United Nations can therefore only be understood if viewed against the background not only of Iraq's maniacal hostility towards Israel but also against the flux of inter-Arab rivalry and of Iraq's ambition for dominance in the Arab world.

I should first like to recall briefly Iraq's record in the Israel-Arab dispute. Although Iraq has no common borders with Israel, Iraqi troops invaded Israel together with 5 other Arab armies in 1948, in clear violation of decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. However, unlike Syria, Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon, Iraq did not participate in the Rhodes negotiations that led to the signing of the Armistice Agreements of 1949. It should be noted that each preamble recites that parties to the Agreement have responded to the Security Council resolution of 16 November 1948:

"Calling upon them, as a further provisional measure under Article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations and in order to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine ..."

It was permanent peace to which Iraq objected, as it objected later to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Iraq continued for three decades openly to espouse the cause of the annihilation of Israel. Unlike some other Arab States, Iraq never felt the need to camouflage its real intentions by pretending merely to demand Israel's withdrawal from Judea and Samaria.

Recently, the Iraqi Ambassador in Delhi had the following to say at a press conference:

"Iraq does not accept the existence of a Zionist state in Palestine ... the only solution is war" (MEMA Agency, 24 October 1978). On 3 July 1979, Saddam Hussein, the new President of Iraq, announced that: "Iraq is preparing itself in the economic, political, social, intellectual and military fields for the liberation of Jerusalem and all the lands of Palestine." (Iraq News Agency, Baghdad, 3 July 1979)

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Iraq's determination to continue a policy of military hostility towards Israel runs parallel with Iraq's ambition for primacy in the Arab world. I shall have to explain the state of Iraq's relationship with other Arab States during the last two years, because it has direct bearing on the Iraqi attempt to have the General Assembly discuss its item at the special session on disarmament, last year's Iraqi draft resolution and the inscription on the agenda of this Committee of item 121. Iraq's quest for leadership has frequently brought it into collision with both Egypt and Syria. To the latter, Iraq is now formally tied in a proposed union which, however, is marked by constant dissent and tension. To quote The Washington Post of 1 November 1979:

"Only a year ago Iraq reversed a decade of isolation by offering to end its feud with Syria and co-operate with other Arab Governments in an effort to offset a separate peace between Egypt and Israel."

Iraq's natural field of hegemony, therefore, points toward the Persian Gulf and the smaller Arab States in that area. Because of its strategic location and the availability of manpower reserves, Iraq sees itself in a position to dominate those States, smaller in size and population. Iraq's ambitions are directed particularly towards the waterways of the Persian Gulf and its littoral, controlling, as it does, 65 per cent of the world's export of oil.

The beginning of the peace-making process in the Middle East in December 1977 brought Iraq out of its isolation. Iraq thought it could establish its leadership among the Arab States by leading the so-called Rejectionist Front. The "Rejectionist Front" was formed at Tripoli on 5 December 1977; it was then called the "Front for Resistance and Confrontation."

It was, as I have pointed out, during this period of inter-Arab political manoeuvring that Iraq decided to submit to the special session on disarmament -

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): I wish to apologize to the representative of Israel, but we are having a discussion on questions of disarmament. You have stated that you intend particularly to speak on item 121. You can speak on all the other items as well, but your remarks must after all relate to disarmament matters. As for the question of the situation in the Middle East, that is a separate item on the agenda of the General Assembly. I would request you to adhere more closely to our agenda.

Please continue, Sir.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Mr. Chairman, if you had allowed me to continue with the sentence that I was reading I think you would have agreed with me that what I am saying bears directly on item 121.

It was, as I have pointed out, during this period of inter-Arab political manoeuvring that Iraq decided to submit to the special session on disarmament an anti-Israel, Iraqi-sponsored item to demonstrate Iraq's leadership in the political war against Israel. Having failed to have the General Assembly consider its item at the special session on disarmament - and I am still referring to this item - Iraq was determined that the General Assembly should discuss and vote on its draft resolution at the thirty-third regular session before the convening of the Baghdad conference. The First Committee was, therefore, subjected to incessant Iraqi demands to have its draft resolution voted on at the beginning of the session. The First Committee rejected the Iraqi move by a decisive majority.

I am recalling the political background to the original Iraqi initiative in detail, because item 121 on our agenda is the continuation of this same Iraqi attempt to use the United Nations, and this Committee, for the attainment of its political aims in the power struggle among some Arab States.

To add muscle to its ambitions, Iraq has set out to become the strongest military power in Western Asia.

Since 1973 Iraq has embarked on a road of arms acquisition on a scale affordable only by countries which can barter oil for arms. The military balance report of 1978-79 records a 25 per cent increase in Iraq's military

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

budget. As I have had occasion to state in this Committee, according to the 1979 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Iraq has become the greatest importer of arms in the third world.

Iraq, as reported in The New York Times of 4 March 1979, has doubled its ground forces and air force and increased its surface-to-air missile batteries from 3 to 50. Moreover, the Iraqi helicopter fleet has nearly tripled since 1973, from 80 to 225. Many of the sophisticated helicopters can be used in an anti-tank role.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

According to a Reuter's report of 31 October 1979:

"Viet Nam is to send 75 combat pilots to Iraq to strengthen its air force in return for an Iraqi loan of \$US 70 million, the South China Morning Post reported today.

"The Hong Kong paper said the agreement was reached when Vietnamese Prime Minister Pham Van Dong visited Baghdad recently after a trip to Moscow.

"Mr. Dong and Soviet officials discussed an Iraqi request to the Soviet Union for aid to strengthen the air force, the paper said."

Among the modern arms at Iraq's disposal are combat aircraft: MIG-23, Sukhoi-20, Mirage F-1C, F-1B fighter planes, the Ilyushin-76 transport aircraft and the advanced bomber TU-22. The Iraqi armoured divisions are going to be supplied with T-62, T-72 tanks and anti-tank missiles HOT and MILAN. The ground-to-ground SCUD and FROG missiles at the disposal of the Iraqi army have an optimum range of 450 and 70 kilometres, respectively, which brings civilian centres in Israel within their effective range. Super Frelon helicopters are to be armed with air-to-sea missiles. At the disposal of the Iraqi army are also the Gazelle helicopter armed with HOT missiles. The Iraqi navy has similarly undergone considerable expansion, and today's Christian Science Monitor reports that Iraq is determined to assert itself as a dominant power in the oil-rich Gulf and is starting to double the size of its navy. According to reliable European diplomatic sources here, the Iraqis have presented shopping lists for naval equipment to suppliers ranging from the Soviet Union to France, Britain and Spain. Their equipment resources requested would roughly double the size of the navy, reflecting Iraq's desire to become the leader in the Gulf. A very large number of Soviet military instructors have been training the Iraqi army in assisting with the integration of novel Soviet equipment down to battalion level.

Let us consider the allegations upon which Iraq, in its explanatory memoranda and in its statements in this Committee rests its case for censuring Israel.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Foremost is the charge that Israel, by as yet not having signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty, is endangering the peace and security of the region. Israel is one of 50 countries -- that is, about one third of the membership of the United Nations -- that has either signed and not ratified, or not signed, the Non-Proliferation Treaty. These countries, in alphabetical order, are as follows:

Countries that have signed and not ratified the Treaty: Barbados, Colombia, Egypt, Kuwait, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Democratic Yemen, and Yemen;

Countries that have not signed the Treaty -- I believe there have been a few changes over the last few days, and I therefore ask the Committee's indulgence -- are: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain -- I believe Bangladesh has just announced that it is going to sign -- Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Comoros, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, France, Guinea, Guyana, India, Israel, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, Tanzania and Zambia.

Among States that either have not signed or not ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty, there are countries from every region of the world, States of all political persuasions, belonging to the developed and developing world alike. Some of those countries have been involved in military conflicts in the recent past.

A few of these 50 Member States either possess nuclear capability or are known to have what has come to be known as the nuclear option. Why is Israel alone singled out for censure, with no shred of factual evidence to substantiate any of the charges contained in the Iraqi explanatory memorandum? Surely not for objective reasons, but merely to satisfy the political ambitions of Iraq and to have one more anti-Israel resolution railroaded through the General Assembly by the listless, automatic majority invariably at the disposal of the Arab States, regardless of subject matter and the restraints of truth.

(Mr. Milan, Israel)

High on the list of accusations against Israel is the charge of nuclear collaboration with South Africa, even though, after years of investigation by many different United Nations bodies, no proof whatsoever has been unearthed even remotely to justify these accusations. My Government has repeatedly stated that no collaboration exists except in the minds of people who wish to associate Israel with South Africa for transparent political reasons. Last Friday, the deputy Permanent Representative of Israel, on the instructions of his Government, rejected the allegations that Israel might have played any role in the alleged development of nuclear weapons capability by South Africa. By charging that Israel is in league with South Africa on these or other matters, the same Arab States are making an obvious play for African sympathy and support by trying to grab a hand-hold on the African bandwagon in this Assembly.

Although deliberations in the United Nations frequently abandon any semblance of political reality, it does not mean that they have to enter the world, beloved by fiction writers, of plot and counter-plot, of piracy on the high seas and cloak-and-dagger co-operation between two Governments.

With no proof of mutual assistance between Israel and South Africa in these matters, this Committee should refuse to consider such allegations as are made in the Iraqi memorandum and Iraq's statements.

Iraq also charges that Israel does not support the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. This is palpably untrue. What is true is that Israel abstained on a number of occasions on a draft resolution submitted in this Committee on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East because Israel had reservations with regard to the wording of that resolution. In this Israel was not alone, and anyone consulting the records of this Committee will find that more than one dozen other Member States have, in various ways, expressed their reservations by abstaining on certain paragraphs of that same resolution.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

However, unlike any other State of the region, Israel has formally proposed, from the rostrum of the plenary General Assembly, a constructive solution which, if adopted, would surely lead to the establishment of such a zone. As so often before, the representative of Israel has to repeat in this Committee that Israel supports the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East through a formal, contractual and multilateral convention freely negotiated among all the States of the region.

How can a nuclear-weapon-free zone be established anywhere in the world except through voluntary and mutual agreement and the reciprocal commitment of all States of the region, and how can such agreements be reached, except through direct negotiations? Iraq and other Arab States reject this constructive proposal because it involves negotiation, and they will not negotiate with Israel. A country such as Iraq obviously sees no need to negotiate with a fellow Member of the United Nations it seeks to destroy. Thus the real obstacle to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East is not a matter of United Nations semantics - whether Israel is justified or not in having reservations about the wording of a certain draft resolution - but of the crude fact that Iraq does not wish to negotiate with Israel but wants to destroy it. No rhetoric and no churning out of prefabricated resolutions through the United Nations voting machinery can obscure this stark fact.

The Iraqi memorandum, in accusing Israel, relies heavily on cloak-and-dagger accounts of the sensationalist press about nuclear thievery. Since these same accusations were made last year and two years ago, I have no alternative but to repeat word for word the statement of the representative of Israel in this Committee on 7 November 1977. He said:

"As for the fantastic stories about nuclear theft, they were denied by the Embassy of Israel in Washington on 26 October and again yesterday by the Prime Minister of Israel. This James Bond type of story appeared for the first time, appropriately enough, in a magazine that calls itself Rolling Stone. The veracity of the statement can best be judged by the journalistic level of the original source." (A/C.1/32/PV.27, p. 58-60)

There is nothing that I can add to that statement, made two years ago, except to note that the representative of Iraq, speaking in this Committee last Friday, again recalled Rolling Stone to substantiate his allegation.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

In the lengthy statement of the Iraqi representative before this Committee on 2 November, no new evidence whatsoever was brought to light that even remotely justifies the singling out of Israel for censure in the United Nations. He repeated, word by word, the old allegations based on hearsay, rumour and speculative articles in the Israeli and world press. It must be difficult for a representative of a country whose press is muzzled to understand that in democratic countries the media can, and do, hypothesize, sometimes exaggerate and sometimes simply guess - without fear of governmental stricture.

The representative of Iraq quoted the first President of Israel, Mr. Chaim Weizmann, as saying that science was a very effective weapon, to be used by Israel with skill, in order to attain the objectives of Zionism. The representative of Israel in this Committee proudly recalls the prophecy made by Chaim Weizmann, which has been vindicated for all the world to see. The Zionist dream was to turn the swamps of the lowlands, the sands of the desert and the rocky hills into fertile fields, vineyards, orchards and forests. Israel did all this by developing local scientific skills and applying them in a manner which has earned the admiration of the world.

Originally one of the poorest countries in the region, Israel has shown the world, in a most practical manner, that science in the service of man means progress. The Weizmann Institute of Science at Rehovot is a monument to Mr. Weizmann's vision of Zionism and science in the service of mankind. Several international conferences have been held at Rehovot, dedicated to the application of science to the practical needs of the developing world. These conferences have been attended by the representatives of many developing countries whose delegates are now sitting in this Committee.

I completely agree with the representative of Iraq that we recognized the importance of atomic research early on in the history of Israel. In the absence of black gold in our soil, we had to plan how best to harness atomic energy in the service of society. Atomic research at the Weizmann Institute is still fulfilling an important function in Israel's nuclear research programme, and our findings are available to scientists the world over.

Unlike Iraq and some other Middle Eastern oil-producing countries, Israel could not import foreign scientists and foreign skills for the price of oil. Yes, we had to develop local scientific talents and technological skills, and we

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

continue to do so. I understand that self-reliance is being preached by some socialist-oriented countries in the developing world; we are practising it.

The representative of Iraq is also correct in quoting the former Minister of Defence, Mr. Shimon Peres, as saying that, unfortunately, Israel is forced to direct a part of its scientific effort into defence. Outnumbered and outgunned as we are, we can hope to survive only by matching our adversaries' quantitative superiority in men and weapons with the quality of our defence, which may indeed include novel, locally-produced conventional weapons. In a Committee such as this, I need not explain that this does not mean atomic weapons and that, unfortunately for mankind, the field of innovation in the development of conventional weapons is far from being exhausted.

If Iraq wishes Israel to curtail its research on and development of conventional weapons, it can easily join the peace process. As long as Iraq and some other Arab States continue to plan for the destruction of Israel, Israel's scientists will continue their task of matching Israeli brains against the petro-dollars of Iraq.

As this is a Committee that deals with disarmament and security, and since various aspects of the Arab-Israel dispute have unfortunately been introduced into the agenda and the debate, I shall have to refer to the general relation of military forces in the Middle East.

The Permanent Representative of Israel had occasion to say the following at the tenth special session:

"... the Arab States have today 500,000 more men under arms and three times the artillery of the combined NATO forces. They also have 3,000 more tanks and several hundred more combat aircraft than NATO. The Eastern front alone - Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Saudi Arabia - is alone currently equivalent to NATO in manpower and tanks, and already has twice as much artillery. By 1980 the air power of the Arab States will equal the combined Warsaw Pact forces and constitute double the air power of NATO and three times that of the People's Republic of China. In terms of ground forces, the Arab States have almost as many tanks as the United States of America and more artillery than the United States of America." (A/S-10/PV.12, pp. 62 and 63)

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

And last year, when the Iraqi initiative was being discussed, the Permanent Representative of Israel, addressing this Committee, noted:

"It can, therefore, be said that over the past five years the arms acquisition by Arab States has outstripped both NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries in the ratio of their arms build-up." (A/C.1/33/PV.51, p. 17)

I have described in some detail the enormous superiority in manpower and weapons which the Arab States enjoy over Israel. The submission of item 121 on the agenda of this Committee must be viewed as part of the incessant political warfare that accompanies this military power projection.

The delegation of Israel believes that the task of this Committee is not to adjudicate the contentious claims of parties to a dispute, but to help all Member States to find a way which allows for the restoration of confidence and the introduction of arms control.

It is the view of the Government of Israel that no truly comprehensive programme for confidence-building measures can be entertained without a concomitant process of reduction of political tension. At the same time, the employment of purely military confidence-building measures, as recommended in General Assembly resolution 33/91 B, can greatly contribute to a reduction of tension, thereby leading ultimately to peace and security.

The resolution draws inspiration from the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, a regional agreement applicable to the States of Europe. This serves to illustrate that agreements on confidence-building measures in the military field are feasible first and foremost among States with a common border or belonging to the same region.

Such agreements can be arrived at only by direct negotiations between States of a region. Moreover, adherence to it can be brought about only by way of voluntary association and on a basis of non-discriminatory participation.

(Mr. Bilan, Israel)

To be effective, confidence-building measures need to be gradual and reciprocal, to allow all sides to a dispute to test the intentions and sincerity of one another.

Israel therefore regrets the rejection of this initiative by Syria, another member of the Rejectionist Front, expressed in its reply to the Secretary-General (A/34/416) of 5 October 1979.

Israel, for its part, has already sought to provide a propitious setting for arms control in the Middle East region in a variety of ways, such as the unilateral reduction of its military budget in 1978 by 23 per cent. A reciprocal reduction of military budgets of certain Arab States would have served to reduce tension in the Middle East. Israel will continue to support suitable initiatives, in the United Nations and elsewhere, aimed at the reduction of international tension through confidence-building measures.

Finally, it should be noted that the Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt of 26 March 1979 incorporated the principle that agreed security arrangements would be established in order to provide maximum security for both parties on the basis of reciprocity. The Peace Treaty is therefore a significant contribution to confidence-building in the Middle East.

If the First Committee is to help Member-States to find a way to the reduction of tension, it should take note of this statement of the Israel delegation and try to endorse it in a resolution which commends the Camp David Agreement and the Israel-Egyptian Peace Treaty to the favourable consideration of all countries in the Middle East. It should do this, rather than deal with an item which was born in an inter-Arab power struggle and submitted to this Committee not to further, but to impede, the achievement of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. CHARLES (Haiti) (interpretation from French): My delegation is pleased to have this opportunity to take part in this debate, which is meant to be the logical continuation of the highly useful and most constructive dialogue in progress since the tenth special session of the General Assembly, itself an important stage in the efforts of the international community to establish a peaceful world order free of the spectre of a holocaust on a planetary scale.

Indeed, that tenth special session had the merit, through its resolutions and decisions, of raising great hopes in a world split between anguish and fear occasioned by the unbridled arms race which, were it to continue, would endanger not only international peace and security but the very survival of mankind.

That is why our task must be to do everything we can to ensure the speediest possible implementation of the Final Document, which enunciates in comprehensive fashion fundamental principles, goals and priorities and a whole series of measures designed to put an end to the dangerous arms race and to set in motion the process of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

This requires, on the one hand, the concerted efforts of all States, large and small, rich and poor, in a surge of universal solidarity in order to spare humanity from collective self-destruction and, on the other hand, the commitment of those same States to do nothing at the negotiating table or elsewhere that might endanger the goals that we have assigned ourselves.

In this connexion, we should like to say how encouraged we have been, despite the lack of tangible results in the Committee on Disarmament, by the Commission's adoption of "elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme". We are well aware that by reason of its complexity general and complete disarmament cannot be achieved overnight.

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

Similarly, we must recognize that the legitimate aspirations of mankind have come up against the practical realities of government policies in the sphere of armaments. Indeed, at the very time when an effort is being made to give new impetus to the disarmament negotiations, we are witnessing the development and ever more rapid accumulation of highly sophisticated nuclear devices by the super-Powers. This takes the form of a considerable increase in arms expenditures, of the order of \$50 billion, as compared to last year. We are very much concerned by these developments, and the contradictions which they entail can in no way promote mutual confidence, which is the only guarantee of success in the negotiations.

It is against this background that we have examined the Soviet-American SALT II agreements, which could have been a decisive step towards nuclear disarmament if, instead of permitting the two parties to attain an unprecedented level of armaments, they had limited their respective arsenals to the currently existing stockpiles. In any event, we do favour ratification, in the hope that it will be followed by SALT III accords, from which we expect considerable reductions, which alone are likely to induce the other nuclear Powers to join the disarmament process.

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

In so doing, the two super-Powers, by opening up the way, would have acted in accordance with their role in the field of nuclear disarmament. This would greatly contribute to a diminution of the hotbeds of tension, particularly in Europe, and could not fail to have positive repercussions on international relations as a whole, in view of the danger posed to all nations by the development, manufacture and stockpiling of increasingly powerful and sophisticated nuclear weapons.

This is why we insist that the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the disarmament which would follow it should have pride of place among the questions included in the comprehensive programme of disarmament. It is understood that this disarmament will have to be effected in such a way that the legitimate security demands of all States and regions are not endangered.

The question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons has for long been a constant concern of the international community, which has made considerable efforts to contain it. Unfortunately, nothing that has been done so far, specifically the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has succeeded in preventing the Pretoria régime from acquiring nuclear weapons. It was with no surprise whatsoever that my delegation received, about two weeks ago, the news of a nuclear explosion by the apartheid régime. This was even to be expected once it had been established that there was active participation by the main Western Powers in the South African nuclear programme, in violation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This is an extremely grave situation which must be treated with all the urgency it deserves. Everyone is aware of the motives of the South African régime in resorting to nuclear weapons for only last Friday it was condemned by the Security Council for its aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. Those who deliberately and unlawfully provided it with the capability should bear the responsibility.

For our part, we expect the Security Council, pursuant to the Declaration adopted at the tenth special session, will take effective measures to prevent the frustration of the objective of the denuclearization of Africa. We would further like to see all nuclear-weapon States take appropriate steps to help create nuclear-weapon-free zones, thus guaranteeing all non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of such weapons.

(Mr. Charles, Haiti)

It is also with the greatest satisfaction that we have welcomed the signing and ratification of the second additional protocol to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, France, the People's Republic of China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We shall welcome with equal satisfaction any initiative to make of our continent a zone of peace, free from conflicts and rivalries among the great Powers.

A question intimately linked with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is that of the complete prohibition of nuclear tests. We deplore the fact that the recommendations of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly relating to a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests have not been followed up. We hope that proposals along these lines will soon be considered by the Committee on Disarmament.

In the same context, we offer our warmest congratulations and thanks to all delegations which have already made their contribution to the Committee on Disarmament by submitting concrete proposals. Of particular note is the Soviet-American proposal on a treaty prohibiting the development, manufacture, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

With regard to other weapons of mass destruction, there is no doubt that the question of chemical disarmament is, to our eyes, of prime importance. It is to be hoped that at its next session the Committee on Disarmament will be seized with the proposal which the Soviet Union and the United States of America plan to submit jointly.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its commitment to continue to make its contribution to the efforts of the peoples eager to build a peaceful and safe world through disarmament.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I should like to be brief and to confine my observations to agenda item 121 on the nuclear capability of Israel. Notwithstanding the lengthy statement by the representative of Israel, the facts remain as solid as the rocks of an ocean. I speak on this item not as a propagandist who wants to score political points here in this chamber, but truly to express genuine concern about the danger of the acquisition of nuclear weapons by

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

Israel. We do not come to this chamber with the aim of obtaining a resolution for local political consumption, but we come to express grave concern over the monstrous possibility with its monstrous implications to the area and the peoples of the area. Israel's argument, as we have just heard, is the Israel will not be the first to introduce nuclear arms into the area. This statement, like many other statements made in the course of the proceedings of the United Nations, does not cut much ice as far as the facts are concerned.

We should bear in mind Israel's nature and its record in the conduct of its war and foreign policy. This conduct and this nature do not yield to the logical norms of relationships among States, but borrow their logic from an anachronistic concept of colonization of the territories of others, from the displacement of indigenous populations, from the building of foreign Jewish settlements on Palestinian land -

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): I call upon the representative of Israel on a point of order.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Mr. Chairman, I should like to recall that you spoke in the course of this afternoon, when I was making my statement, about the importance of relevance to the items under discussion. I respectfully suggest that what the representative of Kuwait is now saying has no relation at all to any of the items under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): I would say to the representative of Israel that the representative of Kuwait has the same right to make a statement as he himself. I call again on the representative of Kuwait.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): I would assure the representative of Israel that I am observing the rules of procedure more strictly than he did. I had just begun my statement, and I ask him, for heaven's sake, to be patient.

The policy to which I was referring borrows its logic from the displacement of the indigenous populations, from the building of foreign Jewish settlements on Palestinian land, and from an expansionist doctrine based on an aggressive military ideology that negates the rights of others to security and self-determination. The Israeli concept is based on military superiority, including nuclear arms for Israel, regardless of the consequences of such a concept. Hence the fears of Arab States and others, whose independence and security is bound to be threatened and held hostage by the introduction of nuclear arms by Israel.

Some may treat this item with incredulity as though we were debating the theme of an old movie in which a dinosaur invades Tokyo or Moscow. Those were the movies of the 1940s and 1950s. It may sound far-fetched to some, but definitely not to those who know the determination of Israel to acquire nuclear weapons.

We do not come here to cry "wolf" in a desert in which there are no wolves. We come here to say that what may sound like fiction has already taken place in reality. But there is no point in over-quoting from public sources - and they are chiefly Western public sources - that speak of the nuclear capability of Israel. But it is certain that many Governments, including those that have the technological capacity for verification, know the truth.

Stories of the James Bond type were referred to by the representative of Israel, and we do read about these things with fascination and sometimes with incredulity. However, they are reported from authentic sources - public sources, certainly, but well substantiated. The Sunday Times of London of 25 June 1978 reported on what it described as "Operation Plumboat" in which, it said, 200 tons of uranium were lost in 1968. The newspaper reported that

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

"Behind Israel's current posture towards President Sadat of Egypt and towards Washington is the secret knowledge that Israel has, in the last resort, an unassailable defence and nuclear weapons."

The article then continued:

"The raw material for those weapons was 200 tons of uranium-oxide which Israel extracted from a stockpile in Belgium in an ingenious secret operation in November 1968. The uranium was processed into weapons-grade plutonium at Israel's Daimona reactor in the Negev desert."

And what about American public sources? The New York Times of 25 October 1977 had the following to say on this subject:

"Israel secretly assembled a nuclear arsenal nearly a decade ago with enriched uranium stolen in the United States and Europe and purchased from West Germany and France under the cover of staged hijackings, Rolling Stone magazine reported yesterday."

The report continued:

"The authors of the article, Howard Kohn, the magazine's associate editor, and Barbara Newman, a Washington correspondent for National Public Radio, said at a news conference here yesterday that a Central Intelligence Agency estimate that Israel had 15 nuclear bombs was conservative and that they had unconfirmed reports of up to 150 bombs."

On 6 November 1977, The New York Times published an article in which it reported that:

"two classified documents written in 1976 and made public today show that the nation's intelligence agencies suspected that Israel might have obtained up to 200 pounds of uranium missing from Pennsylvania factory in the mid-1960s and used it to produce nuclear weapons."

Hence, Israel established the pattern of terrorism involving the hijacking of nuclear material from various countries for the acquisition of nuclear weapons. Some of the stories reported in public sources may seem fantastic, but there is always a fantastic reality in the field of the search for nuclear weapons. Fiction sometimes serves as an eye-opener to the fiction-like reality of the underground activities of States. Israel certainly is unique in this field. In June 1976, the West German semi-official military monthly Wehrtechnik wrote:

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

"What until now had often been regarded as pure speculation turned out to be a hard fact. Israel possesses an atomic bomb, more precisely, thirteen bombs, each of them having an explosive capacity of 20KT, which is equivalent to one of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

"These bombs can be delivered to the targets by the Israeli Kfir and phantom fighters which had been specially equipped for this purpose."

"And what about Israel's collaboration with South Africa? Both have racist régimes with similar designs against defenceless indigenous populations. Both are engaged in territorial domination, political hegemony and aggrandisement. Israel also needed South Africa for the acquisition of material necessary to manufacture nuclear weapons. Israel was lacking the supply of plutonium 239 or enriched uranium 235. South Africa, which was the third largest producer of uranium, could therefore satisfy Israel's need.

The United Nations Seminar on Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa held in London in February 1979 reaffirmed the existence of nuclear collaboration between Israel and South Africa, especially in the scientific field, notwithstanding the denial which we have just heard.

The representative of the Anti-Apartheid Movement of the Netherlands stated before the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977), that Israeli companies such as Tadiran were significant exporters of military electronic equipment to South Africa.

Thus, Israel is not content to produce nuclear weapons for its own expansionist purposes, but seems to be equally determined to arm other racist regimes with these deadly weapons. When South Africa was ready to test its first atomic bomb in the Kalahari desert, Newsweek wrote:

"Some United States intelligence analysts concluded that the bomb the South Africans had planned to set off actually had been made in Israel. A high-ranking Washington official was reported as saying, 'I know some intelligence people who are convinced with near certainty that it was an Israeli nuclear device'."

/...

(Mr. Bishara, Kuwait)

Thus, Israel's nuclear policy is ominous in its wide implications for the people of the Middle East and Africa. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) summed up the matter neatly in its year book for 1979 when it said:

"As Israel and South Africa have known, there are other ways of drawing attention to the potential existence of nuclear weapons and more subtle ways of reaping the political advantages of advanced nuclear status."

For these reasons my delegation has joined other delegations in co-sponsoring a draft resolution on Israel's nuclear capability. We hope that that draft resolution will command overwhelming acceptance.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): It would appear that we have heard the last speaker in the general debate on questions of disarmament. I now call upon the representative of Israel who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should like to exercise my right of reply to the statement made by the representative of Syria who, this morning, paid his dues to the annual Arab anti-Israel quarrel in a statement which contained the prescribed dosage of calumny and acrimony so as to allow Syria to hold its own against Iraq.

Syria is a deeply troubled country, torn by sectarian and factional violence at home, which maintains a 30,000-man army of occupation in a neighbouring country in the hope of realizing its dream of a greater Syria. The Syrian outburst this morning will not help the Syrian Government, at home or abroad. Before coming to this Committee to propagate its version of disarmament, Syria would have been well advised to set its own house in order and to learn how to live at peace with its neighbours, Israeli and Arab alike.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): I now call upon the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): I think that the representatives who preceded me in the consideration of this item have provided the Committee with enough evidence about the nuclear capabilities of Israel. They have thus saved me from having to repeat all that evidence.

There is one little detail which I should like to mention here, which was reported in the Christian Science Monitor of 29 October after the nuclear blast in or around South Africa. The Christian Science Monitor suggested that since South Africa may not be involved in the business of manufacturing nuclear arms, South Africa could have been used as a testing ground for Israeli nuclear bombs. But that is not really the issue about which I wanted to speak. In fact, I wanted to respond to certain allegations - since

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, PLO)

I do not want to use the term lies - which were included in the statement made by the representative of Israel this afternoon.

One of the lies which has been repeated over and over again, and which we have heard from Israeli representatives here and elsewhere for the last 31 years, is that Palestine was a desert which was converted into a Garden of Eden by superhuman beings, the Zionists.

In the 1920s, Palestine was one of the most developed parts of the Middle Eastern region. Palestine used to export to Europe over 20 million boxes of oranges from Palestinian farms. There were millions of Palestinians living in Palestine before the establishment of the State Of Israel in 1948 by an act of aggression against the Palestinian people and against humanity in general. Palestine is a land that produced culture, science and art which are known all over the world. It was not an empty land.

I thought that by this time, by 1979, the Israelis would at least realize that their lies do not work any longer, that the international community is not going to listen to them and that they should stop repeating those lies.

The representative of Israel reminds me of the child who kills both his parents and then goes to the judge asking for mercy because he is an orphan. He says that Israel is outnumbered in the Arab world. It will certainly be outnumbered because anyone who brings people as alien settlers from all over the world and implants them in the heart of another area will be outnumbered. I am sure that the whites in South Africa are outnumbered. The whites in Rhodesia are also outnumbered. The colonial settlers in Algeria were outnumbered. Any colonial settlers will be outnumbered by the indigenous population: I have never heard of any colonial settlers who outnumbered the indigenous population. It is therefore obvious that the Zionists would be outnumbered in Palestine.

He says that Israel must qualitatively develop its defence capability since it does not have the petrodollars to buy or import it and must therefore develop it. The first import by the Israelis were the people who are living in Palestine: 65 per cent of the total population of Israel are people who were not born there. They were imported into the area after bombing the Palestinian people from their homes and properties.

The representative of Israel prides himself on being a Zionist, loyal to the Zionist dream. I wonder what any Zionist can be proud of. Is he proud of expelling the Palestinian people from their homes and properties in Palestine? Is he proud of converting a whole nation of Palestinians into a nation of refugees, a nation under occupation? Is he proud of the daily violation of the human rights of Palestinians under military occupation? Is he proud of the thousands of Palestinians who are in Israeli gaols? Is he proud of the destruction of 385 Palestinian villages and cities? Is he proud of having Palestinians living in refugee camps while Jews are brought from all over the world to live in houses that they did not build, and to cultivate land that they did not plant?

(Mr. Abdel Rahman, PLO)

I wonder how any decent human being, any decent society or any decent Government can be proud of inflicting damage on people and violating their human and political rights. And then he calls on everyone to participate in this magic, tremendous process of peace that has been initiated in the Middle East. What kind of peace is it? Is it the Camp David accords that offer the Palestinian people the option to become either Jordanian or Israeli but not to choose to be Palestinians?

I have never heard of any settlement -- peaceful or otherwise -- for any people that would deny them the right to self-determination, and which those people would accept. What has been offered to the Palestinians at Camp David is the option to surrender, to lose their identity and to accept dispersion. And that is why the Palestinians, the Arabs and the international community in general -- including the United States of America, which is the architect of the Camp David accords -- believe that the Camp David accords are inadequate as a basis for the solution of the Palestinian problem and thus for peace in the Middle East.

We have thus had enough of this kind of distortion and misleading information about something which has been still-born. I refer to the Camp David accords. If there is anyone who is interested in peace it is we the Palestinian peoples because nobody in the Middle East has suffered more often and to the extent that we the Palestinians have...

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I would apologize to the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, but I must remind him that, under a decision adopted by the General Assembly, statements in exercise of the right of reply must be confined to ten minutes. You still have one minute left to conclude your statement.

Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Palestine Liberation Organization): Peace is our goal. We are struggling for peace and we want peace, but a peace that will secure our basic human rights to self-determination, to national independence and to sovereignty in our homeland.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): Several other delegations have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply, and I shall now call on them.

Mr. AL-ALI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): With respect to the discussion on nuclear weapons, it has been diverted to internal political questions which are not connected with the subject under discussion, and this is an attempt which we categorically reject. I believe that the Chairman was quite right to interrupt the representative of Israel.

Since I do not have too much time I should like merely to mention a few points by way of comment on what was said by the Zionist representative. We heard the Zionist representative and listened to him with great patience when he spoke at great length on the agenda item having to do with Israeli nuclear armament. But I regret to have to say that that representative avoided addressing himself to the substance of the question, which relates to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Israel or to its research aimed at the acquisition of such weapons.

The question is, does Israel possess such weapons or not? Is Israel taking measures to manufacture an atomic weapon or not? Will Israel use nuclear weapons as a military option in the region of the Middle East or not? These are the questions which relate to the substance of the item on the agenda under discussion, and I challenge the representative of Israel to reply specifically to these questions here before this Committee.

Secondly, the Israeli representative spoke of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and attempted to justify the fact that Israel has neither signed nor ratified that Treaty. He said that over 40 States have failed to ratify the Treaty. But the substance of the matter is that the Arab States adjacent to Israel such as Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Iran have all signed and ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Even Egypt,

(Mr. Ali-Ali, Iraq)

which has signed that Treaty, has predicated its ratification of that Treaty on Israel's taking the same step. Therefore, Israel's true aim is neither to sign nor to ratify the Treaty, in order to retain a nuclear option with a view to perpetuating its occupation of the Palestinian Territories and even to expanding that occupation.

Thirdly, despite the fact that the question of conventional weapons does not relate to Israel's nuclear armaments, as everyone knows except perhaps the Zionist representative, he none the less chose to quote figures taken from the press about the Arabs' conventional armaments, but he neglected to mention - or to remember - the fact that Israel is an aggressor State which is occupying the territory of three States, besides the whole of the Palestinian territory. Israel continues to arm and its armaments have become a true danger to international peace and security. This is a fact which clearly explains why Israel arrogantly refuses to implement United Nations resolutions on the Palestinian question and on the Middle East.

(Mr. Al-Ali, Iraq)

The armament acquired by certain Arab countries whose territories are occupied, or which are united by mutual defence pacts, is a means of self-defence of the occupied Arab territories, not of occupying or annexing the territory of other countries. But it would appear that the Israeli arsenal is so large that Israel today - as we have seen from the yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) - has become the tenth arms-exporting State in the world.

In conclusion, the representative of Israel mentioned the Camp David agreements. He asked repeatedly that we accede to them in order to guarantee peace and security in the region. I simply wish to say here that the fact that Israel, even after the signature of those agreements, not only is continuing to increase its armament - which now is \$4,500 million provided by the United States in arms aid - but is continuing its policy of nuclear armament, proves to us beyond doubt that the Camp David agreements represent the road to the capitulation which the leaders of the Israeli occupation seek to impose upon the Palestinian people and upon the Arab territories.

It suffices for me to say that those agreements have been rejected not only by the countries of the Arab Group, but also by the Group of Islamic States of the Non-Aligned Movement, as well as by a number of other important international groupings which have condemned them as being a means of imposing capitulation on the Arab nation.

Mr. EL-CHOUFI (Syrian Arab Republic): I spoke at some length this morning to provide this august Committee with information relating to the Israeli nuclear armament, to Israeli collaboration with the South African régime and to the danger inherent in such an aggressive policy. In doing so, I limited myself to quotations only from Western and Israeli sources, including a statement by a former President of Israel.

(Mr. El-Choufi, Syrian Arab Republic)

While pretending to be exercising the right of reply, the Israeli representative has tried to provoke me and mislead this Committee by speaking about difficulties facing my country. I would just remind this Committee that what the Israeli representative called "difficulties facing Syria" is not included among the items under consideration.

All I can say at this stage is that his reply was just irrelevant. At a later stage my delegation may have the opportunity to expose all the lies, distortions and provocations contained in the statement which we have just heard from him.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker wishing to exercise the right of reply.

Thus, the general debate on disarmament items is concluded.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Russian): In accordance with our time-table, tomorrow we shall begin consideration of draft resolutions, and at the moment we have only two speakers who will be ready then to introduce their proposals. Therefore, on behalf of the officers of the Committee, I would appeal to all representatives who wish to introduce or discuss draft resolutions to inscribe their names as soon as possible so that we may make each day a full working day. At the moment it appears that that would be very difficult to achieve tomorrow, and we shall accordingly hold a meeting in the afternoon only.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.