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AGENDA ITEMS 45 TO 65 AND 142 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning, the First Committee will begin the third phase of its work, devoted to consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items.

Mr. GROOT (Denmark): A few days ago, the Chairman of the Group of Experts which assisted the Secretary-General in preparing the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces made a comprehensive statement in this Committee. It is not my intention to expand on that statement, to whose content my delegation, of course, fully subscribes.

I have asked to speak today in order to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.16, entitled "Study on conventional disarmament".

The study on conventional disarmament is annexed to the report of the Secretary-General (A/39/348), which has been transmitted to the General Assembly.
(Mr. Groot, Denmark)

The draft resolution invites all Member States to inform the Secretary-General, no later than 31 May 1985, of their views regarding the study. In the final paragraph of the study, the Group of Experts expresses the hope that the study will assist the international community in its search for effective measures of conventional arms limitations and disarmament.

By inviting all Member States to inform the Secretary-General of their views regarding the study, it is the hope of my Government that such views, together with the study, will constitute a useful basis for continued endeavours towards our goal, namely, effective measures of conventional arms limitation and disarmament.

I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that the question of conventional disarmament in no way - I repeat - in no way detracts from the paramount importance that must be given to the question of nuclear disarmament. The most acute and urgent task of the present day is to reduce and remove the threat of nuclear war. The elimination of the threat of all armed conflicts remains the ultimate goal of the international community. Hence the importance of conventional disarmament.

The study was adopted by consensus and no reservations were expressed. It is the hope of my delegation that the First Committee will also adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. NOETZEL (German Democratic Republic): On behalf of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic I am introducing today draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.9 under agenda item 59 (g) entitled "Obligation of States to contribute to effective disarmament negotiations", which was submitted on 1 November.

The draft resolution introduced this year is based on a similar resolution submitted last year. This reflects the continuing and deep interest of my delegation in the fundamental subject of serious and productive disarmament negotiations held in good faith. Today we believe it is more than ever necessary to share views on this issue in order to achieve progress on the most pressing task of our time: the prevention of nuclear war and bringing about practical measures for the cessation of the arms race and for disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field.

For this reason, the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution refer, in particular, to the growing threat of nuclear war, which can lead to the destruction of civilization on Earth; and the need to proceed to honest, business-like and constructive negotiations in good faith aimed at the achievement of early results,
in particular the prevention of nuclear war. It also expresses concern about attempts at using disarmament negotiations as a smokescreen for continuing the arms race.

The situation in the field of disarmament negotiations certainly is far from encouraging. Concern is expressed everywhere at this state of affairs. We share the view expressed by many delegations as to the reasons and responsibilities for that situation.

In this context, it seems appropriate to refer to the report of the Conference on Disarmament, which says:

"... since nuclear war would have catastrophic consequences for the whole of mankind, all nations [have] a vital interest in urgent negotiation of appropriate and practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war."

(A/39/27, para. 80)

The most important conclusion my delegation draws from the lively debate which has taken place in the Committee on this particular subject is that words must be matched by deeds, that clear signals must be given to substantiate the declared readiness for negotiations, particularly as regards the priority items of the Conference on Disarmament.

For this reason, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution submitted by the German Democratic Republic calls for negotiations to be held in the spirit of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, that is, serious negotiations in good faith on the basis of equality, reciprocity and the undiminished security of each side.

At the same time - and this we believe is a most important element - it contains an appeal to refrain from any actions which have or may have negative effects on the outcome of disarmament negotiations and to remove obstacles which stand in the way of such negotiations.

In another substantive paragraph the Conference on Disarmament is urged to start negotiations on agenda items 1, 2, 3 and 5 concerning the nuclear issues and outer space and to intensify negotiations on agenda item 4 concerning the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Finally, I should like to direct attention to operative paragraph 6, which underlines the need for preserving the existing system of bilateral, regional and global arms limitation and disarmament agreements.
The delegation of the German Democratic Republic expresses the hope that the basic concern of this draft resolution will be shared by member States. I should also like to inform the Committee that, as they did last year, talks are going on with the representative of Yugoslavia with a view to combining draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.9 and A/C.1/39/L.58.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary): On behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Hungary, I have the honour to introduce - and I do so with pleasure - draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.18 entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/72 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests".

During the debate in the General Assembly and the general discussion in the First Committee the overwhelming majority of delegations made it clear that the prevention of nuclear war and the halting of the nuclear-arms race constitute an absolute priority in their foreign policies and that they regard the immediate cessation and prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests as a major step in this direction. At this juncture, my delegation does not want to dwell on the importance of this issue, as we have done so in ample detail and, it seems to me, in a convincing manner, in our statements in both the General Assembly and the First Committee.
Suffice it to say that a number of delegations were prompted, by a full awareness of the importance of such a step, to submit at the last session of the General Assembly a similar resolution (38/72), which was adopted by the vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations.

On the basis of that resolution and for the purpose of implementing its provisions, the socialist States members of the Conference on Disarmament, proposed, at the last session of the Conference on Disarmament, the establishment of an ad hoc Committee of the Conference to carry out practical negotiations with a view to elaborating a corresponding treaty. A similar position was taken by the developing countries members of the Conference on Disarmament. Unfortunately, regardless of the wish of the great majority of States members of the Conference, the Conference on Disarmament was prevented from starting negotiations on a treaty on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

The timeliness of the task, as well as the profound conviction that the two draft treaties - in documents CD/346 and CD/381 - submitted at the Conference on Disarmament in 1983, then the Committee on Disarmament, together with the knowledge and experience accumulated in the multilateral negotiating body over the years, could serve as a sound basis for negotiations and eventual agreement on the subject. That awareness prompted the Member States enumerated before to submit the draft resolution I am introducing now.

The draft resolution before us is based on these main assumptions. Its preambular part reflects, in a very concise form, the concern felt over the intensification of the nuclear-arms race and the conviction that a nuclear-weapon-test ban would constitute an indispensable element in halting it. In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly resolutely urges all States to exert maximum efforts and to exercise political will for the elaboration and conclusion of a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests by all States, while in operative paragraph 2, it urges the Conference on Disarmament to proceed promptly to negotiations with a view to elaborating such a treaty. It is underscored once again that all existing proposals and future initiatives must be taken into account. The Conference on Disarmament is further advised to treat this subject as a matter of the highest priority and to establish an ad hoc committee with a negotiating mandate to deal effectively with this issue.

It is our impression that the said proposals duly reflect the feeling and wish of the great majority of delegations in the First Committee. Therefore, I should
like to express the hope of the co-sponsors that this draft resolution will be given favourable consideration by the Committee and will command the widest possible support.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): May I be permitted to introduce, on behalf of the delegations of Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany and Sweden, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.68, concerning radiological weapons. I introduce this draft in my capacity as this year's Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament dealing with this problem. The sponsors of the draft are countries which provided the chairmen of the Radiological Weapons Committee during the last three years. I already pointed out in my statement in the debate on the performance of the Conference on Disarmament this year that fairly good attention was paid to this issue. I may even say that the Conference on Disarmament succeeded in revitalizing interest in making real progress in dealing with it. Interesting suggestions have been forwarded, some in written form and even in the form of a draft document. Nevertheless, the mandate of the Committee has not yet been fulfilled. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.68 proposes, therefore, that the Conference on Disarmament should again establish, at the beginning of its deliberations next year, an ad hoc committee on radiological weapons.

It is requested that the Conference on Disarmament should continue its deliberations on that problem, with a view "to a prompt conclusion of its work, taking into account all proposals presented to the Conference to this end ...".

In this connection I should like to underline that the draft resolution demands a "prompt conclusion", thus reflecting the positions of many delegations which do not wish the problem of radiological weapons to become another routine item on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, on which resolutions would be adopted in the First Committee, while the substance of the problems would remain unsolved and the work on it in the Conference on Disarmament will be purely formal.

May I express the hope that this draft resolution will gain the support of all the members of the First Committee.

Now, I would like, on behalf of the group of co-sponsors, including the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syria, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and, of course, Czechoslovakia, to
introduce a draft resolution on international co-operation for disarmament which is contained in document A/C.1/39/L.53.

In the present complicated period of the development of international relations, it becomes increasingly important that the conclusion contained in the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament be appropriately implemented. Consequently, a more and more significant role is also being played by the United Nations Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament, adopted in 1979, as a result of an initiative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, since the primary purpose of the Declaration was to promote the implementation of the conclusions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The draft resolution presented by the Czechoslovak delegation, together with others which I named, aims at recalling this fact and demonstrating the continued topicality of the Declaration and also at advancing and updating the ideas embodied in the document with a view to the relevant resolutions adopted at the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly.

The draft resolution calls attention to the growing danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war, to the continued nuclear-arms race and to the menace that a new round of the arms race may be launched at a level unprecedented in both qualitative and quantitative terms. Emphasis is put on the necessity of having international co-operation for disarmament become instrumental in averting nuclear war through the gradual reduction and limitation of nuclear weapons up to their complete liquidation, on the basis of the principle of mutual security. The draft reflects the firm conviction that effective international co-operation for disarmament requires that the policy of States, primarily those possessing nuclear weapons, be concentrated on the prevention of a nuclear war.

As the central idea of the draft resolution is already expressed in its title, I am not going to elaborate on individual paragraphs of the draft. I should only like to point out that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is convinced that concrete results may be achieved in the field of disarmament only through negotiations conducted in a constructive manner and on the basis of the principle of equality and, as I have already stated, the undiminished security of all parties. We wish therefore to voice our conviction that the overwhelming majority of the United Nations Member States will reiterate their support for the idea of developing and strengthening international co-operation for disarmament.
The last draft resolution I should like to introduce today, on behalf of Czechoslovakia and Cuba, is the draft resolution on the contribution of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system to the cause of arms limitation and disarmament, contained in document A/C.1/39/L.34.
This draft is a direct follow-up to resolution 38/188 J, adopted at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly. I should therefore like to draw attention to its principal orientation. One of the ways of improving the efficiency of the international machinery would be a full utilization of the possibilities offered by the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes of the United Nations system with regard to studies and information on disarmament.

Each specialized agency and institution has its own priorities and purposes, which have a significant impact on various aspects of disarmament. The integration of these agencies and organizations, individually or collectively, into the disarmament efforts is therefore of considerable importance in increasing the efficiency of the United Nations, promoting the main goals of the Organization, primarily the safeguarding of peace and security, as well as encouraging economic and social development.

In view of the various activities carried out by United Nations agencies and organizations in implementation of resolution 38/188 J, as reflected in the Secretary-General's report A/39/544, the extensive activities of the specialized agencies and other organizations and programmes within the World Disarmament Campaign and during Disarmament Week, which are described in the relevant reports of the Secretary-General (A/39/492 and A/39/493), and considering also the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-fourth session (A/39/38), the resolution recommends that the programme of periodical meetings of the Secretary-General with the directors of the specialized agencies include the establishment of a plan designed to co-ordinate the activities of specialized agencies in the field of disarmament, requesting the Secretary-General to submit at the forty-first session of the General Assembly a report on the implementation of this resolution, including information on the relevant activities of specialized agencies and other institutions and programmes within the United Nations system.

It is clear that each specialized agency and international organization has its own programme related to the main field of its activity. The present resolution does not affect these fields. Nevertheless, these organizations can use the results of their specialized activities to contribute to a broader and deeper
understanding of the possible consequences of war, particularly nuclear war, of the
necessity for disarmament as well as of the avenues leading to the solution of the
problem.

We wish therefore to voice our conviction that the overwhelming majority of
the United Nations Member States will reaffirm their support of the idea and will
support the resolution I introduced.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on representative of Sri Lanka in his capacity as
Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the World Disarmament Conference.

Mr. WIJEWARADANE (Sri Lanka): I am privileged to introduce the report of
the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, in my capacity as
Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The report contained in document A/39/28 has been prepared pursuant to General
Assembly resolution 38/186 and covers the Committee's activities during its two
sessions in 1984.

As in previous years, the report consists of three chapters and in addition to
an introductory part, consists also of a chapter on the work of the Committee and
another on conclusions and recommendations. Chapter II, in addition to a
procedural part, incorporates the position of the nuclear-weapon States in updated
form presented to the Committee in the course of the close contacts maintained
through its Chairman with the representatives of those States, pursuant to
paragraph 3 of resolution 38/186.

In chapter III, entitled "Conclusions and recommendations", the Ad Hoc
Committee states, inter alia, that:

"Having regard for the important requirements of a world disarmament
conference to be convened at the earliest appropriate time, with universal
participation and with adequate preparation, the General Assembly should take
up the question at its thirty-ninth regular session for further consideration,
bearing in mind the relevant provisions of resolution 36/91, adopted by
consensus, in particular paragraph 1 of that resolution, and resolution
38/186, also adopted by consensus." (A/39/28, para. 14)

In the same chapter, the Committee recommends that:

"The General Assembly may wish to renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc
Committee and to request it to continue to maintain close contact with the
representatives of the nuclear-weapon States in order to remain currently
informed of their attitudes, as well as with all other States, and to consider any relevant comments and observations which might be made to the Committee."

(A/39/28, para. 15)

I wish to take this opportunity to convey the Committee's highest appreciation to the Rapporteur, Mr. Laclaustra, to the members of the Working Group, as well as to those who participated in its work, for their invaluable co-operation and assistance in fulfilling the task entrusted to them.

I would also like to introduce, on behalf of Burundi, Peru, Poland, Spain and Sri Lanka, the draft resolution entitled "World Disarmament Conference", contained in document A/C.1/39/L.23. The draft resolution which is now before the Committee is similar to that adopted by consensus last year. Minor changes have been incorporated in its operative paragraph 1. These reflect the conclusions and and recommendations contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee which I have already introduced.

In accordance with its operative paragraph 2, the General Assembly would once again renew the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The General Assembly would also request the Ad Hoc Committee to continue to maintain close contact with the representatives of States possessing nuclear weapons, in order to remain currently informed of their attitudes, as well as with all other States, and to consider any relevant comments and observations which might be made to the Committee, especially having in mind paragraph 122 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

Let me express the hope, on behalf of all the sponsors, that as in previous years, the Committee will adopt the draft resolution by consensus. Our hope is based on the fact that the idea of a world disarmament conference enjoys considerable support among the Members of the United Nations. The sponsors are, of course, well aware of the varying degrees of emphasis and nuances of opinion concerning conditions and certain aspects related to the question of the convening of such a conference. We must admit that, as reflected in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, no consensus has yet been reached on the convening of a conference under the present conditions. However, it appears to be a prevailing feeling among the international community that a world disarmament conference, adequately prepared and convened at an appropriate time, could be one useful forum that would work out ways and means leading towards a noble objective of mankind, which is the achievement of genuine and complete disarmament.
May I take this opportunity to thank Mr. S. W. Arthur de Silva, my predecessor as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, for his dedication and diligence in fulfilling the task entrusted to him by the members of the Committee.

I would like also to thank all the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their invaluable contribution to the fulfilment of the mandate given to them by the General Assembly and for the prevailing spirit of co-operation shown during the 1984 sessions.

May I also express my gratitude to the Secretary of the Committee and his colleagues for their valuable assistance.

I would, once again, like to recommend the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.23 for adoption by consensus.
Mr. ANDERSSON (Sweden): I have asked to speak to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.38 dated 9 November 1984 and entitled "Military research and development".

The military use of research and development is an important factor in the modernization process fuelling the arms race. In the current arms competition, qualitative improvement is the dominant objective. New scientific discoveries and technological advances are rapidly assimilated into new weapons systems. Today's research and development projects become tomorrow's ever more sophisticated weapons.

Together with a number of other countries Sweden introduced the proposal for a United Nations study of the military use of research and development in 1982. One of the reasons behind that proposal was to draw attention to the intensity of the qualitative arms race and its destabilizing effects for international peace and security. Through a United Nations study it would be possible to look into the fundamental questions of the causes of the qualitative arms race and the mechanisms involved in its continuous escalation.

Since that proposal was made the situation has not improved but has become even more serious. Vast resources are devoted to the development of new weapons systems, nuclear as well as conventional. Increasing efforts are made in the field of outer space.

The need to ask and to answer the basic questions has acquired added importance and urgency. The task of promoting a better understanding of the role of military research and development in the qualitative arms race must be seen as a continuing long-term concern of the United Nations.

The General Assembly decided in its resolution 37/99 J of 13 December 1982 that a comprehensive study should be carried out on the scope, role and direction of the military use of research and development. The Assembly felt that the study should cover the mechanisms involved and the role of military research and development in the overall arms race. In this context, special emphasis was put on the nuclear-arms race and its impact on arms limitation and disarmament, particularly in relation to major weapons systems, such as nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, the study was to be carried out with a view to preventing a qualitative arms race and to ensuring that scientific and technological achievements might ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes.
The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to carry out the study with the assistance of qualified governmental experts. The Secretary-General appointed a Group of Experts in early 1983, and it began its work in March of that year. Since then it has held five substantive sessions, in 1983 and 1984.

In a letter to the Secretary-General contained in document A/39/525 the Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts on Military Research and Development informed the Secretary-General that the Group had made substantial progress in the preparation of its report, but that certain issues remained to be resolved. After consultations with the experts, the Chairman had concluded that an extension of the Group's mandate could enable it to resolve those issues and to submit its final report in time for the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

What is envisaged is not a review of the entire draft report but an effort to resolve certain differences of opinion in a manner acceptable to all. In order to make this possible, my delegation has submitted draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.38, which requests the Secretary-General to continue the study and to submit the final report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

In introducing this draft resolution I should like to express the hope that the Committee will find no difficulty in supporting it in order to give the Group of Governmental Experts on Military Research and Development the time needed to complete its work. I therefore respectfully commend this draft resolution for adoption by the Committee at the appropriate time, without a vote.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.22, which I have the honour to submit to the First Committee, is sponsored by India, Pakistan, Sweden, Uruguay, Yugoslavia and Mexico.

Appropriately, the draft resolution begins by placing the theme of "Nuclear Winter" in its proper context, recalling the declaration of the General Assembly in the First Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, when it referred specifically to "the threat to the very survival of mankind" (S-10/2, preamble) posed by the existence of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution concludes with the very cogent recommendation that the report being requested from the Secretary-General be examined at the fortieth session of the General Assembly in connection with the item dealing with the prevention of a nuclear war.
The purpose of the draft resolution could not be simpler, nor, in our view, could it be more obviously useful. In operative paragraph 1 it requests the Secretary-General:

"to compile, classify and distribute as a document of the United Nations the essential parts of all national and international scientific studies on Nuclear Winter published so far or which may be published before 30 April 1985".

To facilitate that task, in operative paragraph 2 the draft resolution urges:

"all States and intergovernmental organizations as well as non-governmental organizations, through their intermediary, to transmit to the Secretary-General, prior to the above-mentioned date, the relevant material in their possession which may be useful for the above purpose".

For anyone with even a superficial familiarity with this question it will be obvious that it creates an:

"urgent need to continue and develop and scientific studies to increase the knowledge and understanding of the various elements and consequences of Nuclear Winter,"

as noted in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, particularly if account is taken of the second and fourth preambular paragraphs, which read:

"Noting that as a result of recent atmospheric and biological studies there have been new findings which indicate that in addition to blast, heat and radiation, nuclear war, even on a limited scale, would produce smoke, soot and dust of sufficient magnitude as to trigger an arctic Nuclear Winter which may transform the Earth into a darkened, frozen planet where conditions would be conducive to mass extinction".
(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

That is the text of the second preambular paragraph. The fourth preambular paragraph reads as follows:

"Recognizing that the prospect of Nuclear Winter poses an unprecedented peril to all nations, even those far removed from the nuclear explosions, which would add immeasurably to the previously known dangers of nuclear war."

(A/C.1/39/L.22)

In the light of the foregoing, it would be superfluous to try to emphasize the usefulness of a report such as the one requested in the draft, for an organ which has the human and technical resources that the United Nations Secretariat has, this would, furthermore, undoubtedly be very easy to undertake. We should bear in mind that the specialized studies to be carried out are not so numerous and their sources, in Sweden, where they were initiated in 1980, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia, are relatively few, well known and accessible. We should mention that perhaps the most important of them is the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment of the International Council of Scientific Unions, which is expressly mentioned in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

In view of what I have stated, the members of the co-sponsoring delegations I mentioned at the outset trust that the draft will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Mrkic (Yugoslavia): More than six years have elapsed since the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the implementation of its decisions and recommendations has never been more needed than today.

We agree with the assessment that no concrete results have been achieved in the past period, which should have seen the beginning of the process of implementation of the recommendations of the first special session on disarmament. This long period was characterized by a lack of political will on the part of those who bear greatest responsibility to respond in an adequate way to the numerous appeals of the majority of Member States to undertake urgently concrete measures aimed at halting the arms race and at launching disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. The arms race continues unabated in spite of the clear commitments of the entire international community contained in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. In other words, developments took a direction contrary to the one jointly adopted in the Programme of Action of the first special session on disarmament.
This assessment has been most strongly pronounced in the course of the debate in our Committee. The same conclusion was drawn by the Ministers of non-aligned countries at their last meeting in New York.

Of particular concern is the fact that even the limited talks on the reduction of armaments and on disarmament that had been under way were stalled. On the other hand, the nuclear arms race has assumed more intensity, and further deployment of nuclear weapons in some parts of the world has taken place. Mankind is facing a real danger of the spreading of the arms race into outer space. Regrettably, there are also numerous other examples that testify to the fact that much has been done to enhance the arms race and almost nothing to launch disarmament. Briefly, the world has become even more insecure, international security even more vulnerable and the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war even greater.

That is why the group of sponsors, consisting of Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burma, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire and Yugoslavia, has submitted draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.58, wishing to encourage the efforts aimed at halting the arms race and at launching disarmament.

The sponsors are firm in their belief that everything should be done to implement the decisions and recommendations of the first special session on disarmament, unanimously reaffirmed at the second special session on disarmament. To that end, a special appeal has been addressed to the great Powers to begin serious negotiations in a constructive spirit, taking into account the interest of the entire international community.

The sponsors would like to express their desire that the draft resolution receive general support, since it is motivated by the common objectives of all Members of the United Nations.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, Congo, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Romania, Sudan, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.64 on "Prevention of nuclear war".
It is completely unnecessary for me to speak at length concerning the need to take measures for the prevention of the outbreak of nuclear war, whose consequences for mankind have been repeatedly described. However, it is to be regretted that on a question on which everyone claims to be in agreement, on which everyone states that he recognizes the irrationality of the use of nuclear weapons, on which everyone states that he is in favour of taking actions for the elimination of the risk of nuclear war, specific measures to that end have not been adopted and in fact there has not even been a beginning of thorough consideration of the question.

It is difficult to believe that even the inscription of the item on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament was achieved only after lengthy and strenuous efforts; but it is even more difficult to believe that the Conference on Disarmament has so far been prevented from starting not only negotiations but even prior consideration of all the proposals related to the item in an ad hoc committee. The Group of 21 in Geneva displayed the greatest flexibility in order that a first step might be taken providing for the establishment of a committee with a non-negotiating mandate, despite the fact that this did not respond to its aspirations. It was not possible even to take that first step.
All of this is reflected in the relevant paragraphs of the report of the Conference on Disarmament, whose chapter on the agenda item "Prevention of nuclear war" closes as follows:

"The Group of 21 noted that despite the fact that the Conference on Disarmament had discussed this question for two years, it had been unable even to establish a subsidiary body to consider appropriate and practical measures for prevention of nuclear war. They were convinced that the General Assembly should take note of this deplorable failure of the Conference and, having regard to the urgency of this matter and the inadequacy of existing measures, devise other suitable steps to expedite effective action to remove the danger of nuclear war". (A/39/27, para. 95)

The draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce attempts to meet those concerns. It reiterates in the most emphatic terms the request made by the General Assembly in its resolutions 37/78 I and 38/183 G that the Conference on Disarmament, through a subsidiary body, undertake, as a matter of the highest priority, negotiations with a view to achieving agreement on appropriate and practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war.

The draft resolution also initiates a process intended to gather views, ideas and suggestions on possible measures which could expedite effective action on the question of the prevention of nuclear war. First of all, it invites Governments to submit to the Secretary-General their views on this matter. This should be done as a matter of urgency, no later than 1 February 1985, to enable the Secretary-General to prepare a report on this question in time to be transmitted to the Conference on Disarmament in April 1985. The report would subsequently be formally submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session, at which time the Assembly could decide, if it deemed it appropriate, what new steps could be taken with the basic priority objective of preventing nuclear war.

I would point out that in the view of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.64 the report requested of the Secretary-General should not be a recirculation of responses sent by Governments or an arrangement or analysis of those responses. It is our hope that the report will provide an overview of the question of the prevention of nuclear war, making use, of course, of the comments provided by Governments, but also containing its own points of view - the ideas the Secretary-General has developed on an item which is so important and which is the subject of continuous concern. I think that, since the item is such a broad one,
the Secretary-General may, in preparing the report, require the assistance of a consultant with knowledge and experience in the field.

In any event, it is hoped that the exercise which would begin with the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.64 will be useful and fruitful. The danger of the outbreak of nuclear war is constant, and it seems to increase with the passing of time. The international community has endeavoured to prevent that danger, but what has been done thus far has obviously not been enough. The question is open to new suggestions and proposals, both substantive and procedural, although it must be recognized that in this field the separation between the substantive and the procedural is tenuous and often non-existent. Ideas of both types should be the raw material of the report of the Secretary-General, study of which could, we hope, lead to the implementation of new measures most likely to contribute to preventing nuclear war.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have the honour now to introduce three draft resolutions.

I wish first to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.4, sponsored by the delegations of Austria, Ecuador, Egypt, Pakistan, Sweden and Mexico, concerning the study prepared by the Group of Governmental Experts on Unilateral Disarmament Measures designated by the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 38/183 J of 20 December 1983.

It will be recalled that that resolution stated that the study should consider: "ways and means that seem advisable for stimulating the adoption of unilateral nuclear disarmament measures which, without prejudice to the security of States, would come to promote and complement bilateral and multilateral negotiations in this sphere". (resolution 38/183 J)

In the introduction to that study prepared at the request of the Assembly, the authors began by stressing - rightly - that:

"The current international situation is characterized by fear, suspicion, tension and the steady growth of armaments." (A/39/516, annex, para. 1)

They draw several conclusions, set out in the final chapter of the report. Among them, I wish to note the following: The first is that:

"In an effective strategy to stop the arms race, unilateral disarmament measures have a role to play". (para. 66)

The second is that:
"A review of major unilateral nuclear disarmament measures provides evidence that unilateral measures of restraint and de-escalation may be feasible and useful, and that interacting unilateral measures could stimulate and advance arms limitation and disarmament negotiations". (para. 68)

The third is that there are four areas which require:

"priority attention in terms of unilateral measures, with a view to promoting and complementing disarmament negotiations" (para. 70)

and that those areas are: a nuclear-test-ban; prevention of nuclear war "including the questions of non-first-use of nuclear weapons and a nuclear freeze" (para. 70); security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States; and prevention of an arms race in outer space.
The contents of the study prepared by the Group of Governmental Experts were taken into account by the sponsors in preparing draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.4, which I am introducing and in which it is proposed that the Assembly, in addition to taking note of the study with satisfaction and expressing its appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the Group of Governmental Experts, take note of the conclusions of the study and trust that they:

"may encourage nuclear-weapon States to take the steps necessary to promote and orient adequately disarmament negotiations". (A/C.1/39/L.4)

The second draft resolution that I have the honour to introduce now is draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.35 on the World Disarmament Campaign. It is co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico. Its text is what is usually called self-explanatory.

The draft resolution begins by recalling that in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, the Assembly declared that it was essential that:

"not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation and stressed the importance of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament".

The second preambular paragraph recalls all the resolutions that have been adopted by the Assembly on this matter from the thirty-fifth to the thirty-eighth sessions and the reports of the Secretary-General from 1981 to 1983.

The third and fourth paragraphs mention the latest reports of the Secretary-General on this matter. The main report is undoubtedly the one dated 3 October 1984 covering the implementation of the programme of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign during 1984 and the activities contemplated for 1985, as well as its main financial aspects, in connection with which we should mention the final act of the second United Nations Pledging Conference for the Campaign, held on 24 October 1984.

I wish to state here in passing that I hope the Committee Secretariat will provide us with that final act either this afternoon or tomorrow. We wish to have it in full, or at least a summary of it.

In operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution I am explaining, the manner in which the World Disarmament Campaign has been geared by the Secretary-General is commended. Operative paragraph 2 recalls that, as it was agreed by consensus in the Concluding Document of the second special session devoted to disarmament, it is
"an essential requisite for the universality of the Campaign that it receive 'the co-operation and participation of all States'".

Operative paragraph 3 endorses the statement made by the Secretary-General on 24 October 1984 to the effect that such co-operation implies that adequate funds be made available and that consequently:

"'the criterion of universality also applies to pledges', since 'a Campaign without world-wide participation and funding will have difficulty in reflecting this principle in its implementation'."

As as result of the aforementioned, operative paragraph 4 regrets that "most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign".

(A/C.1/39/L.35)

Operative paragraph 5 decides that at the fortieth session of the General Assembly there should be a third United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign and:

"expresses the hope that on that occasion all those member States which have not yet announced any voluntary contribution may do so".

In the last four operative paragraphs of the draft resolution the Assembly, in operative paragraph 6, reiterates its recommendation that it is most desirable that the Secretary-General may enjoy full freedom to take the decisions he deems fit within the framework of the Campaign previously approved; it requests, in operative paragraph 7, the same high official to give permanent character to his instructions to the United Nations information centres and regional commissions to give wide publicity to the World Disarmament Campaign; it also requests, in operative paragraph 8, the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its fortieth session a report covering the activities of the World Disarmament Campaign during 1984 and 1985; finally, in operative paragraph 9, it decides to include the item in the provisional agenda of the fortieth session of the Assembly.

The sponsors of the draft resolution venture to hope that, given its absolute objectivity and the absence of controversial elements in it, it may be adopted by consensus.

The third and final draft resolution that I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors - the delegations of Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico - is draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.31 concerning the comprehensive programme of disarmament, under item 59 (i) of the Assembly's agenda.
As the Committee will recall, after the adoption of the Final Document of 1978, the United Nations made two attempts to adopt a comprehensive programme of disarmament: the first was when the General Assembly considered in 1982, at its second special session devoted to disarmament, the draft programme prepared by the Committee on Disarmament, and the second was when the Assembly, at its thirty-seventh session in 1983, once again received a revised draft programme from the same negotiating body. Both attempts, unfortunately, were unable to lead to the desired objective. That is why the Assembly adopted resolution 38/183 K on 20 December last, the immediate antecedent of the draft resolution I am introducing now.
This self-explanatory text begins by mentioning paragraph 109 of the Final Document, which should continue to be the overriding principle for the preparation of the programme, which, as stated there, should encompass:

"... all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated."

(S-10/2 para. 109)

The draft resolution also mentions the main provisions of resolution 38/183 K and the interim report of the Conference on Disarmament and urges the latter to make "all efforts" so as to be in a position to submit to the Assembly a complete draft programme at its forty-first session, pursuant to the express request of the Assembly contained in resolution 38/183 K of 20 December 1983.

The draft concludes, as is customary in these cases, by requesting the Conference on Disarmament:

"... to report on the progress of its work to the General Assembly at its fortieth session."

The sponsors of the draft resolution trust that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ERDENEGCHULUUN (Mongolia): The Mongolian delegation has asked to speak in order to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.39 entitled "Disarmament Week", under agenda item 59 (j).

I do so on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, the Ukrainian SSR, Viet Nam and Mongolia.

Disarmament Week, proclaimed by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, since then has become an integral part of the world-wide activities to mobilize world public opinion in support of halting and reversing the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, and averting the mounting danger of a nuclear war. Today it is widely observed, both in geographical scope and in the diversified involvement of a growing number of international and national non-governmental organizations all over the world. Disarmament Week has been the occasion of important functions in many countries and in the United Nations as well.
All this can be seen, in particular, from the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/39/493 and from the statements made at the annual ceremonial meeting of the First Committee held three weeks ago.

We believe that the need for further intensification of the world-wide campaign for disarmament at this critical juncture in international relations becomes more timely than ever before.

The draft resolution we are introducing today follows in the main last year's resolution and those adopted previously. Therefore, I will refer briefly to the new provisions and main points incorporated in the draft resolution.

The draft resolution, while expressing serious concern over the continued escalation of the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, stresses the vital importance of eliminating the threat of a nuclear war, ending the nuclear-arms race and bringing about disarmament for the maintenance of world peace.

It stresses the important role of the mass media in acquainting the world public with the aims of Disarmament Week and measures undertaken within that framework and invites the Secretary-General to use as widely as possible the United Nations mass media to promote better understanding of the disarmament problems and Disarmament Week objectives by world public opinion.

It further recommends to all States to observe Disarmament Week in 1985 in close connection with the celebrations of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, International Youth Year and other commemorative dates.

The draft resolution invites all States, international non-governmental organizations, relevant specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, within their areas of competence, to take an active part in Disarmament Week and to inform the Secretary-General accordingly.

Finally, it requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its fortieth session a report on the implementation of the provisions of this resolution.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that this draft resolution will receive, as before, broad support among the members of this Committee.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The draft resolution that is being introduced by Cyprus is, I believe, necessary in the circumstances to deal with a world situation in which we find in recent years a very serious and almost unprecedented deterioration in relations between East and West. The fact is that we are approaching the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and require a new approach to world problems. Considering that 39 years after the founding of the United Nations we have reached a stage of anarchy, insecurity and terrorism that has never before been thought of, something has to be done to deal more effectively with world problems, particularly with regard to disarmament and international security.

We cannot continue in this way, with an arms race that has reached unprecedented levels, to the point that the two super-Powers now produce at least four new nuclear weapons every day, adding to their quantity and quality. Where does that lead us?

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.67, which expresses our grave concern over the sharp deterioration in world affairs and the escalation of the arms race, particularly in new and more destructive nuclear weapons, reflects the need for the aforementioned new approach.
Considering that in these circumstances, coinciding as they do with the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the international community must cross the threshold and take a historical decision to bring the arms race to a halt before it is too late, my draft resolution:

"Calls on the Security Council, as the only organ of the United Nations whose decisions have the element of enforceability" - and which according to the Charter, is to deal with disarmament very directly and very seriously - "to hold a special session" - at a high level - "to give consideration to the escalating arms race with the view to bringing it to a halt;

"Requests the Secretary-General to report thereon to the General Assembly at its fortieth session" - which is the fortieth anniversary.

The international community cannot allow the fortieth anniversary to pass in the ordinary way, holding discussions on matters that have proved so ineffective over the years, so that while the arms race has been galloping, disarmament has been a stagnant pretence. We want effective action. Indeed, by its new approach, this draft resolution, coming from a small country, is intended to deal with these problems in breaking new ground towards effective Security Council decisions.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to speak in order to introduce draft resolutions, I shall now call on the Committee Secretary to make some announcements.


The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.
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STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. EMERY (United States of America): I am introducing today on behalf of the Government of the United States of America a draft resolution under agenda item 64, "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". It was submitted on 1 November and is numbered A/C.1/39/L.10.

When President Reagan addressed the Assembly in September he reaffirmed the American commitment to the two great goals of the United Nations - the cause of peace and the cause of human dignity. No problem facing this body better demonstrates how these two objectives - peace and human dignity - are conjoined than the problem of chemical weapons.

Since the First World War, when the people of the world were exposed to the terror of these weapons of mass destruction, the international community has sought to outlaw the use of chemical weapons. Following that horrible experience, which caused more than 1 million casualties, political, moral and legal barriers against the use of chemical weapons were erected. In 1925 in Geneva the international community took a principled and solemn stand against the destruction unleashed during the First World War and agreed that the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in war be banned. The Geneva Protocol is now one of the oldest existing arms control agreements in force. Although it was a beginning and did restrict their use, it did not, unfortunately, eliminate chemical weapons. Today the Protocol's prohibition on the use in war of chemical weapons is a corner-stone of international law. This agreement was followed up in 1972 with the signature of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. It prohibits the development, production, transfer and stockpiling of biological and toxin weapons. And today in Geneva efforts are continuing to reach agreement on a complete and effective ban of an entire class of weapons - chemical weapons.

Despite decades of international efforts events have reinforced the bitter lesson that chemical weapons remain a threat to peace. Notwithstanding the international legal prohibition and the universal condemnation of chemical weapons use, as long as chemical weapons have existed, in fact, they have been used. The unfortunate fact is that the threat of their use will also endure.
Over the past several years the United States has spoken in great detail in this hails and elsewhere on the question of chemical weapons use, has shared its concerns in this regard, has condemned such use and has called for it to stop. While I will not repeat the grim facts, some facts are worth noting. Since 1925 when chemical weapons have been used they have been employed surreptitiously in remote locations. Their use has always been denied, even in the face of hard and overwhelming evidence. Since 1925 the victims of chemical attacks have primarily been peoples and nations incapable of defending themselves against chemical warfare and without any credible or effective means to retaliate. This cruel experience has taught us that chemical weapons pose the gravest threat to the peace and security of all the nations of the world - developed and developing alike. Chemical weapons are a regional and a global danger, a common and a vital concern for all peoples. The urgent elimination of this danger world-wide, therefore, must become the common goal of all of us.

The United States believes that we must not miss the opportunity today to prevent the spread of these barbarous weapons and rid the world of them once and for all. Neither can we turn a blind eye to their use today, however, lest we also lose sight of the urgency of concluding an effective ban and abandon efforts to free mankind of this scourge. As reports of their use continue the world must act and must not become hardened to such inhumane acts. What shall happen to the cause of arms control and disarmament and to international law if some States persist in violating one of the oldest arms control agreements with impunity?

Chemical weapons constitute a unique assault on human dignity, the second of the two great goals of the United Nations. Anyone familiar with the reports of victims and eye-witnesses of chemical warfare will certainly understand why. Usually they have been used against defenceless people, often civilians simply caught in the way of war. They have been used precisely because of the terror they inspire not only to kill, but to kill in the most gruesome way imaginable. All decent and good people abhor the indiscriminate and horrible effects of chemical weapons. In this we can speak here only with one voice.
We must all act together to meet the challenge posed by chemical weapons to peace and human dignity. We should all rededicate our efforts to protect mankind from chemical and biological warfare. In order to meet our common objective, we must all work together to ensure strict adherence to existing political, legal and moral obligations, and we should act quickly to condemn actions that contravene these obligations. Only by such steps, joining together and speaking in one strong voice, can we hope to bring the necessary pressure of the world community to bear, thereby to ensure that such weapons are never used again. Alone we have little impact. Together we stand a chance of succeeding. We must not shy away from speaking our convictions firmly. We should also ensure that constraints on chemical and biological weapons are the most effective possible. And finally, we should accelerate our efforts to eliminate the threat altogether, by achieving as soon as possible a complete and effective ban on all chemical weapons.

The United States believes it necessary that the world community go on record in support of these objectives. Here in this hall we must meet the challenge that chemical weapons pose to peace and human dignity. To that end the United States has introduced draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.10. It is designed to complement some of the other important draft resolutions introduced under agenda item 64, and those resolutions will receive the full and unequivocal support of the United States. We believe our draft resolution will make the picture complete.

It is a simple, straightforward initiative. It calls for strict observance of existing legal constraints on chemical and biological weapons and condemns actions that contravene these constraints. It welcomes efforts to ensure the most effective possible constraints on chemical and biological weapons. It urges the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to accelerate its efforts aimed at banning these weapons altogether from the world's arsenals.

These are objectives that we all share. It is the firm hope of my Government that the General Assembly will speak in consensus with one voice on this important item through support of resolution A/C.1/39/L.10.

Mr. ALLAGANY (Saudi Arabia) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me first, Mr. Chairman, to convey to you our warmest congratulations on your election to preside over this Committee. We are confident that, by virtue of your well-known ability and experience, you will contribute to the success of this Committee's proceedings.
We are meeting in this Committee several weeks after this Organization marked World Disarmament Week. We are still anxious, owing to the fact that no progress has been achieved in the field of disarmament despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its last session as well as at all previous sessions since the United Nations was founded. On the contrary, it has become clear that the arms race, especially nuclear armaments, has assumed new and grave dimensions with the attendant spiralling of the cost of armaments to astronomical figures, so much so that this decade has been marked by pessimism, vis-à-vis the speedy achievement of peace and security as well as by the slow pace of the march of development and prosperity for the developing countries.

The Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia reaffirmed the following in his statement before the General Assembly on 28 September 1984:

"Disarmament has become a vital issue today for the security, safety and progress of the world. The arms race and the gigantic sums being spent to finance it have resulted in increasing tension in the world. This situation has forced many countries, especially the developing ones, to earmark a substantial part of their limited resources for defence, at the expense of their progress and social and economic development. In this context, I should like to express our appreciation of the initiatives and resolutions the United Nations has attempted to implement over the years. At the same time, we hope that the efforts by our international Organization... will achieve some progress in protecting humanity from the imminent dangers and safeguard the developing countries from being drawn into the conflicts and hazards of competitive influences which threaten all humanity." (A/39/PV.13, pp. 62-63)

A quarter of a century has elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959, in which it emphasized that general and complete disarmament is the most important question facing the world today. If that was the situation 25 years ago, today the question is all the more important. The arms race has worsened, especially in the field of nuclear armaments, and has now extended to outer space.

This arms race is taking place at a time when the forces hostile to the liberation of peoples and the march of history in the Middle East as well as in southern Africa continue to violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States as well as the right of peoples under colonial and foreign domination or subject to foreign occupation to self-determination and independence.
(Mr. Al-Iragany, Saudi Arabia)

The communiqué of the non-aligned countries issued in New Delhi recently asserted that nuclear weapons are more than just weapons of war. They are means of mass destruction. Therefore the Heads of State or Government maintain that it is inadmissible that, the security of the whole world - rather, the survival of mankind itself - should be hostage to the security interests of a handful of countries possessing nuclear weapons.

Our fears have not been lessened concerning the possibility of an outbreak of nuclear war as a result of the continued stockpiling in the arsenals of nuclear weapons as well as the dangerous doctrines based on the concept of a nuclear deterrence blitzkrieg and on a limited nuclear war, as well as other doctrines that would lead to an escalation of the arms race, heightening international tension and subjecting mankind to a nuclear conflagration whose limits only God Almighty knows.
Saudi Arabia wishes to confirm the major role of the United Nations, the international will and international public opinion in disarmament. In this respect, we welcome the constructive initiatives and proposals submitted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Conference on Disarmament. These are in keeping with the endeavours of the international community to halt the arms race and eliminate completely the threat of nuclear war.

The unfortunate situation of certain peoples because of the wastage of material and human resources on the arms race and its negative consequences for the economies of the developing countries, their development and their cultural projects confirms the close link between disarmament and development. This also results in increasing the debt burden of those States.

The information confirming the military nuclear collaboration between the racist régime in South Africa and the Zionist entity in Israel, despite the General Assembly resolution declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone and the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, is a cause of concern for the countries of the Middle East. The purpose of the reinforcement of the nuclear arsenals of those two racist Powers is to use those lethal weapons as a means of threatening hegemony and domination over neighbouring countries, whether in Africa or the Middle East.

We call on all countries, nuclear and non-nuclear, to support the United Nations stand in this matter and to cease forthwith all collaboration with those outlawed racist régimes, which flout all the principles, values, laws and norms observed by Members of the United Nations which adhere to the Charter and are committed to the implementation of the Organization's resolutions.

The issue of Israeli nuclear armament has become one of the perennial items on the Committee's agenda. This is in contradiction with Israel's claim that it supports declaring the Middle East a nuclear-weapon-free zone, at a time when Israel continues to refuse to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to subject its nuclear installations to control and inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Those are some of the most important observations that we wish to make at this stage of the Committee's work. We hope that the intensive efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General will make clear to all peoples and to the mass communication media the dangers of the nuclear arms race in all its aspects.
Mr. FONSECA (Angola) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time that our delegation has spoken in the First Committee at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, we should like to convey to you, Sir, our warmest congratulations on your election to the chairmanship of this important United Nations body.

We also wish to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Henning Wegener of the Federal Republic of Germany and Mr. Milos Vejvoda of Czechoslovakia, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Ngare Kessely of Chad.

At the present time the world is facing an extremely complex, delicate and dangerous situation caused by the unbridled arms race. The present deterioration in international relations clearly reflects the confrontation between the forces of democracy and national liberation on the one hand and the imperialist, colonialist and racist Powers on the other.

An increasing number of democratic régimes are being established in Africa, Asia and Latin America and there is an increasing awareness on the part of peoples which enables them to become masters of their own destiny and natural resources. At the same time, however, disregarding contemporary international law and the United Nations Charter, the imperialist Powers are adopting all possible measures to further their geo-strategic interests, in particular through acts of intervention and military manoeuvres of a provocative nature against non-aligned States, such as mining their ports, establishing military bases and returning to the old gun-boat policy within the framework of the policy of State terrorism aimed at undermining the political and social régimes of other independent sovereign States.

To maintain the situation that enables them to plunder oppressed peoples the imperialist Powers need constantly to foment hotbeds of tension in Africa, Asia and Latin America, bring about a continuous escalation of the arms race and thus impede détente and general and complete disarmament.

Angola supports all serious proposals aimed at a qualitative and quantitative freeze on nuclear arsenals, the cessation of all nuclear-weapon test explosions, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones of peace and the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. We also support all practical measures intended to ensure that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind.
We believe that the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa should in future be given more serious, thorough attention by the Committee.

In the report prepared by the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, we see that there are South African nuclear installations submitted and some not submitted to the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). On the one hand, it states that

"The International Atomic Energy Agency has been applying safeguards to the SAFARI-I research reactor since 1967 under a Safeguards Agreement between IAEA, the United States of America and the Republic of South Africa." (A/39/470, para. 55)

and that

"IAEA applies safeguards to the Koeberg nuclear power plant under a Safeguards Agreement of 5 January 1977 between IAEA, France and South Africa." (para. 56)
On the other hand, the same report states that
"The following facilities are not covered by IAEA safeguards:
"(a) The Pilot Enrichment Plant;
"(b) The Fuel Element Production Plant;
"(c) The Metallurgical Hot-Cell Complex." (para. 59)

At the same time, we see that certain Western States which possess nuclear
weapons, despite the arms embargo decided on by the Security Council, have
contributed to the rearming of the Pretoria racist régime and to the establishment
by racist South Africa of its present capability for manufacturing nuclear
weapons. This represents a real threat to international peace and security and in
particular jeopardizes the security of independent African States and adds to the
risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Faced with this alarming situation which obviously jeopardizes the security of
African States, we once again ask the Western Powers, allies of the minority racist
régime in Pretoria, to bring their influence to bear with the South African racists
so as to prevail upon the latter to bring all their nuclear installations under the
inspection of IAEA.

In that connection, we wish to recall to the enemies of the denuclearization
of Africa that that denuclearization has always been a concern of the Heads of
State and Government of Africa since the establishment of the Organization of
African Unity (OAU). In 1964, African Heads of State and Government appealed to
all States in the world to respect the African continent as a nuclear-weapon-free
zone. At that time they recognized that the denuclearization of Africa would be,
ter alia, a possible and practical measure to prevent the proliferation of
nuclear weapons in the world so as to arrive at general and complete disarmament,
thus realizing the objectives and principles of the United Nations.

With regard to the massive reinforcement of the military apparatus of racist
South Africa, particularly by the unbridled acquisition by that country of a
nuclear capability intended to be used for repressive and aggressive purposes and
as an instrument of blackmail, we consider it useful and necessary to emphasize
that, at its thirty-eighth session, the General Assembly in resolution 38/181 B of
20 December 1983 condemned all forms of nuclear collaboration by any State,
corporation, institution or individual with the racist régime of South Africa since
such collaboration enables it to frustrate the objective of the Declaration on the
Denuclearization of Africa, which seeks to keep the continent as a zone of peace, free from nuclear weapons.

As many representatives have stated, the credibility of any non-proliferation system essentially depends on the attitude of the nuclear-weapon States. Thus, in order to make progress in that field, the nuclear-weapon States must renounce the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

"In the southern part of our continent" - I am quoting His Excellency the President of the People's Republic of Angola, Jose Eduardo Dos Santos - "the People's Republic of Angola continues to be the main target of the global strategy of the imperialist Powers, which try to destabilize and strangle the legitimate and nationalist Governments of African countries struggling to assert their personality and their national sovereignty and independence".

And the international community does not ignore the fact that the racist troops which have committed and continue to commit crimes of war and genocide against the peoples of southern Africa are still occupying part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola in violation of national sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Resisting the policy of aggression, of blackmail, of subversion and of State terrorism waged in the name of "Western civilization" by the minority racist régime in Pretoria against our non-aligned State, we continue to demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory.

In that context and taking account of the seriousness of State terrorism as a means of conducting the foreign policy of certain States Members of the United Nations, the Government of the People's Republic of Angola has supported the proposal to include in the agenda of the First Committee item 143 on the inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States.

We attach great importance to the constructive and practical proposals of peace-loving States aimed at concluding a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Nevertheless, we regret to note that certain militarist circles in the West continue to affirm that they are ready to negotiate the prohibition of chemical weapons, in order to distract the attention of the international community
from their plans for the proliferation and increase of the arsenals of that type of weapon. There are even those who are not happy with the enormous arsenals of chemical weapons which they already possess, and which they have already renewed, but they wish to expand them and qualitatively renew them further. We are referring particularly to the binary chemical weapons which a Western Power for a long time has been preparing to stockpile throughout the world in order to bring about the chemical rearming of itself and its allies, obviously including the South African racists. That Machiavellian plan of the Western militarist circles to give the racist Republic of South Africa the capacity to produce that type of weapon as well will further increase the aggressive attitude of the minority racist régime in Pretoria. Such close military collaboration with the minority racist régime in Pretoria against the African peoples is one which we denounce and condemn. In view of the danger which chemical weapons pose to mankind, we demand the total prohibition of that type of weapon.

Lastly, we should like to refer to the serious threat to international peace and security posed by the existence of foreign military bases on the territory of other States.

The People's Republic of Angola, since its establishment, has been a non-aligned State. It is as such that our country is against foreign military bases on the territory of non-aligned States and in colonies.

That position on the part of Angola is embodied in our Constitution, in particular in article 16:

"The People's Republic of Angola shall not belong to any international military organization and shall not permit the establishment of foreign military bases on its national territory."

In conclusion, we should like to appeal to the States Members of the United Nations to respect the status of non-aligned States and to make a positive contribution to the elimination of all foreign military bases from their territory. Such action by States Members of the United Nations would have a beneficial effect on our common struggle for the creation of a world of peace and of peaceful co-existence.
Mr. MAHBOUB (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): The representatives who have already spoken have stressed that this Committee is meeting at this session in a world typified by concern and disillusionment and within the context of an international situation that is dangerous and complicated in comparison with our previous session. The situation is characterized by the escalation of the cold war, tension and intervention in the internal affairs of other States, which have had unfavourable consequences as regards implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence and confidence-building measures, along with the efforts to strengthen the policy of good-neighbourliness. This deterioration is a consequence of acts of aggression against the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of various countries. This state of affairs is particularly dangerous inasmuch as the arms race continues, especially the nuclear-arms race, resulting in mistrust, competition and the wasting of the resources and energy that could otherwise be devoted to remedying the economic and social conditions which have gone from bad to worse in most countries, especially the developing countries.

In this extremely dangerous context, the need for joint action and total adherence to the United Nations principles in the implementation of United Nations decisions has become more and more urgent, in order to achieve and guarantee international peace and security and general and complete disarmament with effective international controls.

Although the question of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests has been on the agenda of the United Nations for many years, and despite all the decisions that have been taken in this regard, the Conference on Disarmament was not able at its last session to achieve any progress on procedures that would have enabled it to establish an ad hoc committee with new terms of reference, thus promoting negotiations aimed at reaching an agreement. This failure was due to the exaggerated use of the consensus rule that prevented any progress, and showed that some nuclear-weapon States insist on developing their nuclear armaments qualitatively and quantitatively. My delegation will support any measure for the proclaiming of a moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests on the part of the nuclear-weapon States until such time as a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests can be signed.
(Mr. Mahboub, Iraq)

The worsening of international relations and the increase in tension between the two super-Powers go hand in hand with the escalation of the arms race at an unprecedented pace. International peace and security cannot be based on a balance of deterrence or a development of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, which now number more than 5,000 on each side and are capable of destroying our planet several times over. The Group of 21 at the Conference on Disarmament has often expressed its refusal to link the peace and security of the world with the state of relations between the nuclear Powers. That would be devoid of any political or moral justification. The outbreak of nuclear war could destroy all the participants and all the non-participants.

My delegation supports the appeal that the arms race be halted and reversed, and we should like to express our feeling of disappointment at noting that no progress was achieved at the last session of the Conference on Disarmament, since it was not able to reach a consensus concerning the establishment of an ad hoc committee in regard to item 2 of the Conference's agenda.

I should like to quote here from the Political Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March 1983, which expresses our point of view:

"the renewed escalation in the nuclear-arms race, both in its quantitative and qualitative dimensions, as well as reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations. Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass annihilation ... Measures for the prevention of nuclear war and of nuclear disarmament must take into account the security interests of nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike and ensure that the survival of mankind is not endangered. [The Heads of State] rejected all theories and concepts pertaining to the possession of nuclear weapons and their use under any circumstances." (A/38/132, para. 28, p. 14)

Despite the importance of item 3 of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, entitled "Prevention of nuclear war", the Conference did not succeed in making any progress on that matter, since it could not reach a consensus on the draft terms of reference for the establishment of an ad hoc committee which would promote multilateral negotiations.
The arms race is being pursued in outer space - which increases the danger of the nuclear-arms race. The General Assembly at its last session adopted a decision on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and stressed the need to take further effective measures in that regard. It reiterated that the Conference on Disarmament had a primary role in the negotiation of an appropriate agreement on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. I wish to express our feeling of disappointment at the fact that the Conference on Disarmament at its last session was not able to achieve the necessary progress, for the same reasons that prevented any progress in regard to the matters I mentioned previously.
In this regard, I should like to draw attention to paragraph 60 of the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, which states that the Group of 21:

"stressed its firm belief that the Conference on Disarmament, whose members included all the nuclear-weapon States, should be allowed to fulfil its task in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and certain nuclear-weapon States should not abuse the rule of consensus so as to prevent the Conference from dealing with the nuclear issues on its agenda." (A/39/27, para. 60)

If there is a field where it is possible to understand the evolution of the consensus rule as it has come to be applied, in the sense of requiring the total unanimity of all the members of the Conference on Disarmament, even on procedural matters such as the creation of an ad hoc committee to deal with a particular question, we cannot in any case agree with the way in which it is applied in the Conference on Disarmament since it has become an obstacle, depriving States that were founder Members of the United Nations but are not members of the Conference on Disarmament of the opportunity to make a declaration explaining their views on important points on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament.

In this regard, I wish to draw attention to paragraph 28 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, which says:

"All States have the right to participate in disarmament negotiations. They have the right to participate on an equal footing in ... multilateral disarmament negotiations ..." (S-10/2, para. 28)

I should also like to draw attention to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session entitled "International co-operation for disarmament", which states that it is the duty of States to co-operate in this field. In paragraph 8 the General Assembly:

"Calls upon the Governments of all States to contribute substantially ... to halting and reversing the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, and thus to reducing the danger of nuclear war." (38/183 F, para. 8)

That paragraph declares clearly and explicitly that all the peoples of the world have a vital interest in the success of the disarmament negotiations and have the right – indeed, the duty – in accordance with that paragraph, to contribute to efforts made in the field of disarmament, a matter that is vital to all countries of the world. However, it is deeply regrettable that the application of the
consensus rule has become an obstacle preventing any State member of the Conference on Disarmament - the only multilateral disarmament forum - from exercising its right or fulfilling its duty to take part in disarmament efforts and to provide information, opinions and answers.

Iraq stresses that the nuclear-weapon States must give the States that do not possess such arms the guarantee that they will not attack them or threaten them with nuclear weapons. Iraq supports the elaboration of a precise formula which may be included in an international legally binding document. Iraq also supports all efforts aimed at the conclusion of a treaty forbidding the development, production and stockpiling of all kinds of nuclear weapons. Similarly, we support the United Nations resolutions on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, including resolutions 37/99 C and 38/188 D.

We are firmly convinced that the bombing of nuclear installations, even with conventional weapons, has results similar to the effects of a nuclear strike, because of the emission of dangerous radioactive material that pollutes the environment. The Israeli aggression against the Iraqi reactor used for peaceful purposes was launched under the cover of the Israeli concept of security. However, this pretext is only a desperate attempt to prevent Iraq and the other Arab countries achieving the scientific and cultural progress to which the Arab nation aspires.

Iraq is absolutely convinced that it is urgently necessary to speed up the preparation of an international instrument forbidding attacks on nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes, for otherwise the international community will be exposed to grave dangers no less worrying than the use of nuclear weapons themselves.

Iraq advocates the creation of nuclear-free zones throughout the world. The declaration of the Middle East as a nuclear-free zone would require, first, the elimination of the Zionist nuclear threat and the withdrawal from the region of the nuclear weapons possessed by Israel, which is co-operating with the racist régime of South Africa in the military and nuclear fields.
Mr. Mahboub, Iraq

We should like to stress a passage in the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Group of Experts working on the study of Israeli nuclear weapons. The Group of Experts recommended to Israel that it "should renounce ... the possession of ... nuclear weapons, submitting all its nuclear activities to international safeguards ... in accordance with ... Assembly resolution 35/147 ... through accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, or by unilaterally accepting such safeguards." (A/36/431, annex, para. 83)

If that were done it would be an important step towards carrying out the decision to have the Middle East declared a nuclear-free zone.

The Indian Ocean area has witnessed a very serious worsening of the situation, not only for coastal States or States of the hinterland but also for the whole world because of the escalation of military activities of the super-Powers in the Middle East and their natural extension towards the Arabian Sea and the Arabian Gulf, which are an integral part of the Ocean.

Iraq fully supports the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and calls for an end to be put to all nuclear-weapons activities and all nuclear weapons existing in the area, to the competition between the nuclear Powers and to the military presence of those Powers. Iraq considers that the Conference on the Indian Ocean to be held in Colombo is a very urgent matter in order to guarantee peace and security in the area. The holding of that Conference should in no way be linked with the solution of some disputes which have nothing to do with that question.

While nuclear disarmament has priority, the question of conventional disarmament is also a most important matter, since conventional weapons are capable of an extremely high degree of destruction and are very dangerous for the rest of mankind and especially for the economies of the developing countries of the world, which confront economic crises and which sometimes fall prey to conventional warfare.

Those who have spoken before me have described very brilliantly the problems of our present-day world. Many of them have spoken of solutions to those problems and have submitted draft resolutions, as at previous sessions. All of this is very good. Problems come up and decisions have to be implemented; decisions without implementation will not lead to international peace and security. Many countries are still attached to the doctrine of force and want to continue the arms race.
Others do not. We suffer from armed conflicts in the world. We need political will, especially against countries which commit armed aggression and interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. We must see to it that those countries respect United Nations decisions. Other countries should, under the Charter, avoid thinking only of their own short-term interests. We must ask the countries which wage war to respect the decisions of the Security Council. Thus we should be able to achieve international peace and security and strengthen the credibility of the United Nations and its decisions, increasing factors of stability within the framework of international security.

I should like to recall paragraph 13 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly:

"... lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations ..." (S-10/2, para. 13)

In conclusion I should like to stress that the strengthening of an effective system of collective security through the United Nations would be the best remedy for the ills that have befallen our world through the arms race.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): In my present statement I would like to deal with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. I deliberately place my contribution under agenda item 59 (f) on the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters. In the view of my delegation, the viability and success of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the maintenance and further improvement of the non-proliferation régime are among the most significant strategies for the prevention of nuclear war.

We all know that the Third Review Conference relating to the Treaty is scheduled for 1985 and that the review exercise is of particular importance in view of the approaching expiration date of the treaty instrument and of the need for all parties to the Treaty to take joint action and to extend it.

The forthcoming Review Conference has prompted many delegations to go on record in this Committee and state their determined support for the Treaty. It has prompted others - countries that have not signed the Treaty - to reiterate the reasons for their abstention. The purpose of my statement is to reiterate briefly the reasons why the Federal Republic of Germany attaches priority importance to the continuation and further development of the Treaty, but also to discuss some arguments put forward against it.
In the opinion of the Federal Republic of Germany the conclusion, large-scale adoption and successful maintenance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty continue to be major achievements of the multilateral arms control process. No new nuclear-weapon State has been added to those in existence at the time of the conclusion of the Treaty. Rarely in the history of treaty-making have such a large number of States joined hands in a common endeavour, convinced of the stabilizing effect and long-term benefits which emanate from this singular treaty instrument. On the part of the non-nuclear weapon States, renouncing the option of nuclear weapons and accepting international control in a sensitive part of their national industrial establishment signify major sacrifices of rights of sovereignty. The Federal Republic of Germany, like more than 120 other non-nuclear-weapon States, has chosen to contribute its part to this solidarity effort of the world community to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

The Treaty thus possesses an overriding goal which all signatories, nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States alike, share and to which each of them contributes in the prescribed way. Part of the reward which the parties to the Treaty can expect from their adhesion - the enhancement of international stability - accrues, therefore, quite independently from the additional compensations that derive from the Treaty. For a non-nuclear-weapon State such as I represent, these latter benefits that can be demanded from the participating nuclear-weapon States are mainly contained in articles IV and VI of the Treaty. Article IV has helped to enhance peaceful nuclear co-operation, specifically with developing countries. On signing the Treaty in November 1969 the Federal Government stated its view that the Treaty lays the foundation for ever-growing co-operation among the parties to it in the nuclear field, especially with regard to negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Article VI provides the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty not only with a claim against nuclear-weapon States. Since the Article is addressed to all States parties, they share the responsibility in this field. But the major responsibility for nuclear disarmament lies with the nuclear-weapon States.

The Federal Government will continue to bring its full political weight to bear in order that article VI be fully implemented. The Federal Government is convinced that the one-sided withdrawal from nuclear arms-control negotiations does not correspond to the spirit of article VI and it therefore appeals to those concerned to return, early and without pre-conditions, to the negotiating table.
In this context the Federal Government would like to restate its view that the conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban would have great importance with regard to the implementation of article VI. The aim of a comprehensive test ban is explicitly mentioned in the tenth preambular paragraph, which relates to the Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water of 1963. Therefore, my delegation would wish to voice its regret about the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear-testing issues that could have generated gradual but steady progress towards the establishment of some of the essential prerequisites of a test-ban treaty.

Let me now turn to some critical questions being posed with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

One argument put forward against the Treaty is that the instrument establishes discriminatory obligations and responsibilities for the nuclear-weapon Powers on the one hand and for all other nations on the other. That argument is undoubtedly true in the sense that nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States by the very nature of the Treaty do not have identical obligations and responsibilities. However, eliminating this distinction would mean fostering horizontal proliferation by opening up the acquisition of nuclear weapons to all States on an equal level. Thus one of the objectives which led the majority of nations to accede to the Treaty, namely, to prevent the destabilizing effect of a spread of nuclear arms, would be frustrated. This may be a cause of regret in the eyes of some, but discrimination is thus a built-in feature of the Treaty and, indeed, of the principle of non-proliferation and no wistful exploration of its history and ramifications which will make it go away.

As to the question of equally valid alternatives to the Treaty, I do not wish to question the serious intention of States which have remained outside the Treaty and others that might join them to honour a national promise not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons. However, I should like to emphasize that in the view of the Federal Republic of Germany the universal acceptance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty has to remain the ultimate goal. Then any doubt, distrust or suspicion remaining as to the respect which national commitments would command in the future would be dispelled.
As far as the benefits of the Non-Proliferation Treaty are concerned, we should pay attention to the statistics of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which reveal the number of countries which, under the umbrella of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its system of safeguards, have made tremendous strides in building a nuclear-power base and in acquiring an infrastructure of nuclear research and technology of unprecedented proportions. These developments have taken place in the climate of mutual reassurance and stability which the Treaty has created.

Let me finally focus on another major question in this context, the implications of vertical nuclear proliferation for the Treaty. It is, indeed, a most regrettable fact that the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States which are within the Treaty system have grown considerably since the inception of the Treaty and continue to grow. Article VI is thus still awaiting its implementation, and the parties to the Treaty have been unable to invoke it to the necessary intent. However, the Treaty provides a legal synallagma between the undertakings by the non-nuclear-weapon States and the obligations which the nuclear-weapon States themselves have accepted. This is a legal relationship. All parties to the Treaty, therefore, have a legal claim against the nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their part of article VI.

In this context, we should not overlook the fact that it is only for the parties to the Treaty to invoke their right to nuclear disarmament as a legal premise. The States parties to the Treaty are therefore in a better position than those outside the Treaty system, being able to combine the political argument for nuclear disarmament with a fully grown legal claim. It is incumbent upon them to use the Treaty fully, working from within, to bring their weight as members to bear and to stress the fact that they have accomplished their part of the Treaty agreement.

Summing up, I should like to emphasize that my delegation shares with regret the opinion of those who state that the expectations of the non-nuclear-weapon States connected with article VI have not been met as yet. But we do not draw from this a negative conclusion with regard to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a whole. We rather demand that everything be done by the nuclear-weapon States in order to meet the obligations they have undertaken in article VI. An early resumption of nuclear negotiations is a first step towards this end.
The joint endeavour of the large majority of the States of the international community within the non-proliferation Treaty is a most persuasive and welcome demonstration of international solidarity for a common objective, for the common good. It is regrettable that a limited number of States have not yet joined in that exercise of solidarity. By acceding to the Treaty, they would create a strong momentum for all parties to the Treaty to abide fully by its standards and would thus make a contribution to international peace and stability.

Ms. MOSELE (Botswana): Allow me, as I am speaking here for the first time, to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. My delegation is convinced that under your able leadership this Committee will achieve concrete and constructive results in its quest for world peace and security during the current session.

My delegation wishes also to extend its congratulations to the other officers of the Committee, who will no doubt work equally hard to ensure that the ideals and goals of this body are attained.

As a matter of conscience to all who are concerned, my delegation wishes to comment briefly on items 55 and 57 (b), that is, the relationship between disarmament and development and the nuclear capability of South Africa. From the various statements delivered here it is quite apparent that one need not elaborate on the technical details concerning nuclear arms, their destructive capacity nor the costs of the nuclear-arms race.

The Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) says:

"The international community today finds itself at a crossroads. Two major challenges face it - on the one hand, an unchecked arms race which threatens to destroy human civilization and, on the other hand, the problems of underdevelopment in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, which threaten the quality of human civilization. In both these cases, the search for solutions appears to have reached a dead end, while the magnitude of problems increases steadily."

It is sad to see the emphasis placed on politics in an arena that is supposed to be seriously considering ways in which life - be it plants, animals or mankind - is to be made more secure. Neither Judas Iscariot nor Simon Peter ever wanted to be pointed out as people who would betray Jesus Christ in their different ways.
Yet both men did. Both super-Powers are willing to meet and seriously discuss methods of constructive disarmament; that means there is yet hope for mankind and for Mother Earth. Mushroom clouds will not clothe this world because, not being actors on a stage or part of a Shakespearean tragedy, we will continue to strive for world disarmament and for development.

It will be a pleasure to see the senseless nuclear-weapons arms race come to an end and to see the unimaginable amounts of money spent on the arms race give way to development. Hunger, poverty and the need for shelter are rampant in the third world. A lot of private organizations, as well as the United Nations through its various organs, are working hard trying to meet the needs of the third world and they would welcome receiving more funds to aid with development. Contained in the UNIDIR Director's statement is both the problem of the nuclear-arms race and its solution, namely, the need to reallocate funds from the arms race to the development of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean islands.

At the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1965, 35 African countries requested that an item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa" be included in the agenda. Since the intention was to promote peace and security and to keep Africa free from nuclear weapons, the General Assembly still has on its hands the difficult task of inspecting nuclear facilities of the régime of South Africa through its International Atomic Energy Agency. Since South Africa is just on Botswana's doorstep, my delegation feels that it is appropriate to show its appreciation of the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency, especially because there is no knowing how far the aggressive régime of South Africa would go in its determination to protect its abhorrent apartheid policy.

Mr. ROSE (German Democratic Republic): Particularly in recent days the issue of disarmament negotiations has received considerable attention in the debate. We appreciate that the necessity of such negotiations has been underlined, but we also see distinct differences regarding the practical approach. This induces us, in the spirit of a constructive dialogue, to make a few remarks on that issue.

Let us begin with the multilateral negotiations at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Work on the priority items on its agenda has been blocked for years. The Conference is in a crisis. Several delegations have pointed out the reasons and the responsibilities for that deplorable situation. Also the report submitted
by the Conference on Disarmament in document A/39/27 is quite clear in this respect. I need not repeat this.

There remains, however, the question: what is the way out?

It is from this angle that we have carefully studied the statement made by the representative of the United States on 8 November. Regrettably we do not find the slightest indication of a change in the position his country has adopted there over the past four years. The Conference on Disarmament is not even mentioned. Obviously this did not just happen by mistake. Furthermore, we looked in vain for any remark on agenda item 1 of the Conference regarding the nuclear-test ban. Negotiations on agenda item 2 regarding the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament are implicitly, but clearly, rejected.

The United States delegation turned with special emphasis against the most urgent measures for the prevention of nuclear war, that is, item 3 on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, even though practically all other participants in the Conference are in favour of relevant negotiations or discussions. Arguments that have been known for years were repeated. They have not become more convincing. Immediate measures for preventing nuclear war are artificially put in contradiction to the reduction of the nuclear arsenals, as if anybody said that, for instance, the prohibition of the first use of nuclear weapons would automatically lead to reductions.

The aforementioned statement names a number of basic criteria for what is called arms control agreements. However, the decisive one is unfortunately not mentioned. Paragraph 57 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to which the United States also once agreed, says:

"Pending the achievement of this goal" - that is, nuclear disarmament - "...the nuclear-weapon States have special responsibilities to undertake measures aimed at preventing the outbreak of nuclear war, and of the use of force in international relations, subject to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including the use of nuclear weapons." (resolution 5-10/2, para. 57)

And in paragraph 58 it is stated that:

"In this context all States, in particular nuclear-weapon States, should consider as soon as possible various proposals designed to secure the avoidance of the use of nuclear weapons". (Ibid., para. 58)
In conformity with the desire of the great majority of States, we propose that the obligation of the non-first use of nuclear weapons be undertaken as a relatively easy step for the nuclear-weapon States, since such a commitment would certainly have a strong confidence-building effect and a positive influence on the whole process of disarmament negotiations.

That is also true of the freeze on nuclear arsenals, which has become a world-wide demand. Such a measure above all offers the guarantee that numerical reductions of nuclear weapons are not cancelled or even reduced by the qualitative development and improvement of weapons systems. And that is the point: a nuclear-weapons freeze would leave no room for intentions to upset the existing military balance and achieve military supremacy. However, that will only be beneficial for international security and the striving for disarmament.

We are making these points out of concern for the continuation of the work of the Conference on Disarmament in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. There exist not only the security interests of one State. However, security for all can be achieved only by a genuine preparedness for co-operation. Lectures about "strong leadership" will hardly lead to that goal. One should not try to deny the danger of nuclear war and pretend that there is no such thing as an arms race. The peoples' concern must be taken seriously, especially by those States which have the most powerful nuclear arsenals.

As has been rightly noted in the debate, attempts have been made, on the one hand, to delete the word "negotiations" from the vocabulary of the Geneva Conference, while, on the other hand, calls are repeated for negotiations on an issue where the basis for negotiation has been destroyed systematically. Furthermore, in the aforementioned statement the well-worn cliché was used again to the effect that the strategic nuclear weapons of the United States were ipso facto stabilizing and those of the USSR destabilizing.

I should like to make some comments on the issue of medium-range missiles. I do not want to go into the details of the early history of the deployment of new United States first-strike weapons in Western Europe; they are well known. We recall the far-reaching proposals of the Soviet Union and the countless urgent appeals of the peace movement and of statesmen from all over the world addressed to the United States not to thwart the negotiations by an approach of ultimatum. It was all in vain. What is more, the deployment of Pershing-II and Cruise missiles
was then hailed by the other side as a tremendous victory. Now it is continuing
without interruption.

The socialist States gave timely and urgent warning of the consequences of
such deployment. Unfortunately, some of those who are now complaining did not take
that warning seriously. They preferred to believe those who promised that a policy
of strength, substantiated by deployment, would bring the socialist States to
accept Uniteu States demands and thus seriously endanger their security. Now they
will hardly feel more secure than before that step, which was so fateful for the
situation in Europe. The fact remains that more missiles do not bring more
security for the peoples but less.

Some bring up again and again the myth of a threat by the SS-20; others
apparently believe that they can speak up more clearly now. No less an authority
than General Rogers, Supreme Commander of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty
Organization (NATO), explained in a press interview on 9 August of this year that
the point was to be able to reach the territory of the Soviet Union from Western
Europe with new land-based nuclear missiles. His statement concluded with the
following: "We decided that we had to modernize - not because of the existence of
SS-20." That makes it quite clear.

The willingness of the socialist States to negotiate cannot be questioned by
anybody. However, negotiations must be on the basis of equality and equal
security. It is for the United States to give clear signals that it is ready for
such negotiations. That applies to both the multilateral and the bilateral fields.

In conclusion, I feel bound to state the following. In his statement last
Friday, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Wegener,
among other assertions, said it was an uncontested fact that the Eastern States
continued to possess and produce chemical weapons. Obviously, he did not say that
inadvertently, because a similar formulation can be found also in his statement of
2 November. Such a statement seems to imply that the German Democratic Republic
produces and possesses chemical weapons. That is simply a lie, and the
representative of the Federal Republic of Germany knows it. The delegation of the
German Democratic Republic emphatically rejects such deliberate defamations.
Despite all the differences that countries may have on important matters, the
minimum standards for civilized political dialogue should be observed. I believe
that we have enough reason to expect such accusations against socialist countries
to be stopped.
Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of the delegations of India, Mexico, Sweden and my country, I have the honour of introducing the draft resolution on cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament which has been circulated in document A/C.1/39/L.43. It is also a pleasure to announce that the delegations of Greece, Indonesia and Romania have joined in sponsoring the draft.

As stated in the preambular part of the draft resolution, the need to put an end to the nuclear arms race is increasingly clear. Existing nuclear arsenals at present are more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth and have brought about an untenable state of insecurity.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which so correctly conveyed the thinking of the international community on this issue, contains very eloquent paragraphs that reflect the urgent need to reverse a situation which is becoming ever more dangerous and disquieting.
There is virtually no international forum dealing with disarmament which does not express profound alarm over the prevailing state of affairs and which does not reiterate the need to step up as much as possible all efforts aimed at ending the nuclear-arms race.

In this context, we should highlight - and this is reflected in one of the preambular paragraphs of the draft - the Joint Declaration of 22 May 1984 issued by the Heads of State and Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania, which called for the suspension of tests, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, followed by a substantial reduction in nuclear forces.

In the light of that Declaration and on the basis of the positions which the Group has traditionally held, the Group of 21 submitted to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva a document (CD/526) once again emphasizing the need to undertake effective action to initiate the process of nuclear disarmament, pursuant to paragraph 50 of the Final Document.

Despite everything which has been said on this subject, and the dangerous situation which prevails today, efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race are either stagnant or have not even begun. The bilateral negotiations in Geneva have been interrupted and the Conference on Disarmament has not yet been able to undertake multilateral negotiations on item 2 of its agenda.

This is the aim of the draft resolution which it is my honour to introduce, which mentions:

"that efforts should be intensified with a view to initiating, as a matter of the highest priority, multilateral negotiations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 50 of the Final Document" (A/C.1/39/L.43, operative para. 1)

It also:

"Requests the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc Committee...to elaborate on paragraph 50...and to submit recommendations...as to how it could best initiate multilateral negotiations of agreements..." (A/C.1/39/L.43, operative para. 2)

The Conference on Disarmament should have taken that first step a long time ago in compliance with the Final Document and its own agenda. Further delay is
neither possible nor warranted, and it is to be hoped that the adoption of this
draft resolution - which we hope will occur - will represent, in accordance with
the will of the States represented in this Assembly, a definitive push forward
which reason claims and which the future of mankind requires.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): This very
brief statement is intended to formulate a request which I dare hope the
Secretariat will find it easy to comply with. This request relates to document
A/C.1/39/L.11, which deals with the Review Conference of the Parties to the
Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental
Modification Techniques. That is a Conference which was held in Geneva from
10 to 20 September this year.

The draft resolution in that document contains words of praise for the Review
Conference in question and also for the Convention mentioned therein.

Since my delegation is not accustomed to voting blindly for draft resolutions
of this type, we consider it essential to have the relevant documentation before
putting the draft resolution to a vote. It is for that reason that it is essential
for us to be able to obtain the Final Act of the Conference or, if the Final Act is
too long, then at least the Final Declaration, which is specifically referred to in
the draft resolution in document A/C.1/39/L.11.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the Committee Secretary with regard to
the statement we have just heard.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): The Secretariat has taken note
of the request made by the representative of Mexico and, as this is a request
emanating from a Member State, it will be complied with, as appropriate.

Mr. RAJAEI-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Were it not for the
accepted tradition of the Committee, I would extend my congratulations and tribute
to you, Mr. Chairman.

Although many representatives have spoken before me during this thirty-ninth
session of the General Assembly and at previous sessions of the Assembly, I cannot
conceive of any one of them having spoken in favour of weapons of mass destruction;
yet there are some indications that, in spite of this unanimity, when specific
cases of chemical warfare are discussed some unexpected and unjustified
reservations seem to appear.
"War is waged with weapons, not with poison", wrote the Roman jurist. War is as much a part of human political history as the effort to minimize or at least to humanize it. Since, in the light of man's nature, outlawing war altogether has had very little impact on the actual behaviour of human political societies, as was the case with the fate of the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928, outlawing aggressive war, far-sighted men have sought to establish a norm, according to which in the course of a war one should be as humanitarian as possible.
One of the areas of great concern seems to be the use of poisonous weapons in war. On 27 August 1884 the Conference of Brussels concerning the Laws and Customs of War adopted a Declaration stating:

"According to this principle are strictly forbidden: (a) The use of poison or poisoned weapons ...".

That is from article XIII.

The issue was debated again a few years later, during the Hague Conference of 1899 and again in 1907. As the final outcome, the position of the Brussels Conference was reaffirmed. The Convention dealing with the Laws and Customs of War on Land, in article 23, chapter 1, section II, of the final resolution, declared:

"Besides the prohibitions provided by special conventions, it is especially prohibited: (a) to employ poison or poisoned arms; ... (e) to employ arms, projectiles, or material of a nature to cause superfluous injury".

At the time of the drafting of those Conventions, the problem did not appear so urgent. The scientific and technological advances of the twentieth century increased the potential of poisonous weapons, in particular in the form of chemical and bacteriological elements. Up to the time when Iraq began using chemical elements such as nerve agents, toxins and mycotoxins, the most widespread use of chemical weapons occurred in the First World War. The first massive attack was in 1915 and claimed 5,000 human lives. Unfortunately, the use of this dangerous weapon claimed many more lives during the course of the war. A United Nations publication on chemical weapons, for example, states:

"It is estimated that from then" — that is, from 1915 — "until the end of the war in 1918, at least 125,000 tons of toxic chemicals were used, and according to official reports gas casualties numbered about 130,000, of which about 100,000 were total".

The horror of the mass killing prompted the move towards an international convention on the banning of the use of chemical weapons, and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 was the outcome. Unfortunately, the Protocol did not stop countries from using this weapon, and certainly not the Iraqis, who happened to be among the signatories of that Protocol. Chemical weapons were employed by the Iraqi Army against the Iraqi Kurdish rebels in 1970. Thus when the Iraqi authorities resorted
to chemical weapons against the Islamic Republic of Iran they were simply repeating
the experience obtained from the use of the same prohibited weapons against their
own people.

At this juncture I do not have the intention of reiterating the details of the
numerous incidents in which Iraq has used chemical weapons against us, since all
that has been recorded in United Nations documents. I am sure the representatives
here have all noticed the many letters circulated as Security Council documents
regarding the cases of Iraqi chemical warfare against us, and they have also taken
note of the experts' report contained in document S/16433 as an annex to the note
by the Secretary-General. The representatives here have seen many pamphlets,
photographs and posters concerning the Iraqi chemical war against us, exposing the
magnitude of the Iraqi crimes against my country. I am sure that they have seen
posters like this and that they have seen this book, because a copy has already
been given to all the delegations in the United Nations. These posters, pamphlets
and books demonstrate only very selected cases illustrating the effects of the
chemical war against us. The sympathetic and sincere response we have received
from many delegations indicate that, even if we reiterated all those facts again
and again, they would all find it justified because, as many have rightly put it,
no matter how much we say about the Iraqi chemical warfare, it would still not be
enough.

The fact is that Iraq has simply used chemical weapons against us. The types
of chemical agents, according to the report of the Secretary-General, were mustard
gas and a nerve agent known as Tabun, which is among the most dangerous and
deadly. Tabun can kill in 10 minutes.

What really matters is that neither the report of the Secretary-General nor
the statements of the Security Council have discouraged the Iraqi authorities from
repeating this crime. They have repeatedly committed the crime of resorting to
chemical weapons, even after the Secretary-General's report was circulated. This
fact too has been reported to the international community in a letter which has
been circulated in document A/39/333.
Moreover, and worst of all, Iraqi officials have claimed that they will commit the same crime again; so said the Commander of Iraq's Third Army. The Kuwaiti newspaper Al-Anba'a in its issue of 19 September this year quoted a high Iraqi official as saying:

"And generally Iraq will certainly employ such weapons whenever the defence of its nation's dignity and territorial integrity as well as that of the Arab nations warrant it."

Just a few days ago The Washington Post in its issue of 3 November reported:

"The Iraqis used almost all their stocks of chemical weapons at that time [March 1984] but have significant stocks of gas weapons."

For this boldness of the Iraqi authorities we believe the inaction and acquiescence of the international body are similarly to be blamed.

Devices of mass destruction such as chemical and bacteriological weapons, as well as atomic weapons, have been the most important concerns of people of all countries and of all international organizations. This Committee has been persistently struggling to control, reduce and - it is to be hoped - if possible defuse and annihilate all such weapons, which have brought the greatest nightmare to all mankind in this century. Many concerned and good hearted people, like all members of this Committee, have been striving for the past six or seven decades, and even the past century, to save mankind from that horrible nightmare, although little has been achieved, in spite of all those efforts.

The problem of our people, however, is slightly different from the nightmare which scares the whole family of mankind, in that one of those lethal weapons, the vision of which brought the nightmare to the whole of human society, has been poured on our heads. In other words, unlike many others, we are trying not simply to save ourselves from this nightmare but from chemical warfare itself. What can the Committee do for us in these urgent and serious circumstances? If members of the Committee were in our place, what would they do?

It must be remembered that in a certain respect chemical weapons are even more dangerous than atomic weapons, because they are easy to produce, probably too easy to produce. Highly sophisticated chemistry is not really needed. Even the Iraqis can do it. Chemical war is a more immediate danger than atomic war, since it can be launched so easily. The Committee should therefore give a certain degree of urgency and priority not only to the issue of chemical warfare in general but to
the recent specific cases of chemical warfare against us, which can recur at any moment.

The saddest fact of all is that some countries unjustifiably apply certain political considerations, simply because this deadly prohibited weapon has been used by Iraq, or because it has been used against us. I say to those concerned: "Please do not behave like those who feel a threat only when it comes to their own doors." Matters of chemical and atomic disarmament must be treated as completely detached from all political considerations, simply for the sake of mankind. Otherwise, there are always friends of one or other future adversary, and therefore in every conflict some will just keep irresponsibly silent.

Another important matter that makes our case uniquely different from the general issue of chemical war or any other previous cases is that it is the only well-documented case before the Committee. I say to members: "Please concentrate on it. If you cannot stop a specific, unequivocal and clear case like this, on what ground do you hope to stop potential cases of a general nature? After all, the rationale behind all the arguments and concerns that many show for the Constitutional and procedural niceties is to save people, including our people. Do you not think that if you ignore our people in favour of those niceties, you will have been acting contrary to your own purpose? We ask you to see our case not simply as a component of the war but as a dreadful case of chemical war which all of us wish to prevent. Please take constructive advantage of this case in order actually to experiment in such matters as verification of production and stockpiling."

Let the United Nations have a complete record of experience on how to conduct verification, if members are at all interested in any verification. Let the United Nations see the practical problems of verification and the possible ways and means of conducting such verification. Let us learn the general from experiencing the specific, instead of discussing hypothetical matters up in the air. This means that we should not politicize or contaminate our work with political considerations if we hope to achieve honest and successful results. Those who may hide their faces behind instructions from their Governments, instructions that they either await or have received, should ask any man in the street of any country, ask any people they wish, whether chemical warfare should be used or not. The answer will be quite clear.
We need the help of this Committee, not for or against anybody but for stopping chemical warfare against us. That is all.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations made an appeal to both parties to make a solemn commitment not to use chemical weapons. We should have been annoyed at that time because, contrary to our expectations as the victims of Iraqi mustard gas and nerve gas attacks, the appeal addressed us with the same language as it addressed the criminal. Nevertheless we maintained our full self-restraint and did not mention anything, either implicitly or explicitly, regarding this injustice. Instead, we simply responded immediately and positively to the appeal of the Secretary-General. But the other party, according to the Secretary-General's letter to my mission, has not yet given any formal response to that appeal.

However, and very sadly indeed, unofficial indications have convinced the Secretariat that it should not anticipate a positive response from the Government of President Saddam Hussein. I am therefore speaking of a real and serious danger of further crimes.

We therefore expect all members of this Committee to stand against crime. Our officials have been consulted as to whether we should start producing our own stocks in order to convince the enemy of the danger of retaliation. Up to now the religious authorities in the Islamic Republic of Iran have given a definite negative answer. We are not permitted to produce prohibited weapons. I appeal to the Committee not to make retaliation our only solution. We hate such a solution and we do not wish to have it imposed upon us. We appeal to members of the Committee to use their influence and at least to use their votes to end this danger. Only in that way can other cases of threat be stopped. If the Committee is able to justify this and only make future cases the aim of its effort, I am afraid it will always have to ignore the present dangerous cases and keep itself amused with hypothetical ones. We therefore expect the Committee to support a draft resolution which we have submitted to the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last speaker on the items on the agenda for today's meeting and I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): I do not wish to take much of the time of this Committee in replying to the statement just made by the Permanent Representative of Iran. However, I feel impelled to correct the record.
The Permanent Representative of Iran came to this Committee with an appeal to law and justice, with a request for help and assistance, forgetting that these concepts are indivisible and cannot be treated in a dissected manner. He has omitted any reference to the reply of my Government to the report of the Secretary-General in document S/16438 of 27 March 1984. He has elected, as he has done in the past on numerous occasions, to conduct some theatrics by showing photographs and documentation.

The fact remains that The Washington Post, which the representative of Iran quotes here, has been described by him on other occasions and in press releases of his mission as an imperialist newspaper. He asked the question, if one went on to the streets and asked everybody whether they wanted chemical warfare the answer would be, "No, we do not want that"; but he forgets to say if the question were addressed to the people in the streets of Iran whether they wanted the continuation of the war, what sort of answer he would get.

He counsels the non-politicization of our work in order that honest results may be achieved, yet he has done exactly that in the statement we have just heard today.

I am sorry to have to refer to the letter of the Secretary-General which the representative of Iran referred to. I am bound to reveal what is obvious in that letter, for the benefit of my colleagues. The letter was a confidential one, addressed to the two countries on 29 June 1984. The fact that it was published on 6 July 1984 in document S/16663 was because the Iranian reply contained in document S/16664 of 6 July, the very date, sent on 2 July, was circulated upon the request of the permanent mission of Iran.

So the picture is clear. The question of the allegations of the representative of Iran were dealt with by the Security Council, a report was issued, a presidential statement was adopted by the Council and the moment it was adopted it was attacked by the Iranian authorities.

Only two months later we have the circulation of the same report on a request from Iran under agenda item 64 in order to repeat the same theatrics as we have seen on television, in newspapers and around the United Nations.

If the Iranian representative does not have any intention but — as he put it — to seek honest results, why did his delegation prevent my delegation from at least making a statement on the issue in the Conference on Disarmament?
Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I think there were only two points in the statement just made by the representative of Iraq. One was that my delegation holds that The Washington Post is an imperialist newspaper. That might be so, but even some imperialist papers cannot ignore some of the facts. All delegations here will remember that it was only after the international media, representatives of which visited our injured people in hospitals in Europe, disseminated the dreadful information on chemical warfare - only then - that this international body was forced to take action; and even at that time it was not generous enough to make it a resolution. It just confined itself to a simple statement. That is one point.

Regarding the second point raised by the representative of Iraq, no one can at this stage yet fail to appreciate the contribution of the representative of Iraq in two ways: first, he never mentioned that Iraq had not used chemical weapons; secondly, he provided some further time for my delegation in order to show the Committee some further evidence of the use of chemical weapons.
The Committee may not have time to look at what we have produced for its consideration. Some of the officers of the Secretariat of the United Nations have actually seen these bodies. I have seen them too, and I have seen some of them die. I do not say anything for or against any war. Wars might take place again. I am speaking of chemical warfare. In the same pamphlets, if one goes through them carefully, one will find photographs of women which indicate that chemical warfare was used even against civilians.

What the Committee is deliberating and debating is not whether the continuation of any war or some wars is possible or justified; the Committee is debating weapons of mass destruction. We do not know whether the representative of Iraq is prepared simply to commit his country to refrain from using chemical weapons any more. That would be greatly appreciated in this Committee.

Mr. AL-QAYSÍ (Iraq): If the Ambassador of Iran will bother to look at document S/16438, he will see there that my Government has categorically denied the use of any chemical weapons.

Secondly, if the Ambassador of Iran is against wars, I wish that he would state here for the record that his Government is so inclined because certainly it is not in favour of stopping a war which it started.

Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Again I appreciate the statement made by the representative of Iraq in that it concerned mainly lack of continuation. It seems that to wage a war against a neighbouring country creates no problem from the Iraqi point of view. It is only in some stages of the war that the representative of Iraq shows some interest in the matter of continuation.

Everybody knows that to launch a war of aggression against others is a unilateral decision, but to end the war means to end many problems resulting from the war and in at least a bilateral way. Therefore, those who started the war and those who defined their own interest in launching a deadly war against a neighbouring country, a non-aligned country, should not hide their faces behind the fact that, when they are defeated, they automatically show interest in stopping the continuation of the war. All representatives would agree that, if Mr. Hitler had produced a peace offer in the final days of his reign, nobody would have accepted that from him.
The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Secretary to make some announcements to the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Mr. Chairman, as you announced the deadline of 6 p.m. for the submission of draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items, I wish to inform representatives that, if there are any further draft resolutions to be submitted by 6 p.m., they should be handed to the Secretariat in room 3170 E of the Secretariat building.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded the second phase of the consideration of disarmament items on our agenda, that is, the general debate and statements on specific items. We shall start a new phase of our work on Wednesday which will be devoted to the introduction of draft resolutions and comments on them.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.