

(Mr. Velayati, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Is this single case not sufficient to show that international laws and regulations are only worthless toys in the hands of Superpowers, used either to dupe public opinion or to prevent tyrannized countries from gaining their rights? In such circumstances, do not we, and all other countries that have fallen victim to the Superpowers' ambitions and greed, have the right to bring these long, boring and fruitless negotiations and exchanges of views under consideration? Unfortunately the problem is not only limited to the Superpowers. There are other active participants in the deadly race of production and use of chemical weapons. But we have listened repeatedly to their eloquent statements on disarmament. The justification given by these countries for their participation in the arms race has always been that they are obliged to do so in self-defence. It is on this basis that the "deterrence" theory has been formulated; this theory is now the main axis of the arguments of arms producers. I am not going to analyse here this theory which is founded on the balance of terror. Historical experience has disproved this theory and shown that maintenance of the balance of terror leads nowhere but to the intensification of the arms race. There are two related points that are worthy of attention. First, adherents of this theory have reserved this right only for themselves and prevent others from following suit. The reason is clear: maintenance of their dominance over other countries requires superiority in arms. Secondly, the greater part of the arms produced in the world are intended for use in aggression against other nations or are being sold to Third World governments with some other evil designs in mind; in fact the maintenance of the balance of terror, or, as claimed by the arms producers, defence needs, have never been any incentive for the production of arms. Allow me to refer to the experience of my nation in order to clarify this point. But I would like to make clear that if, in the meantime, reference is made to the Iraqi invasion, it is by no means intended to display the dimension of this aggression, because I am dealing mainly with the subject of chemical weapons here. Since, for a while now, Iraq has been using chemical weapons against Iran, reference to the aggression inevitably entails reference to the second-degree agent of aggression. I called it the second-degree agent of aggression because, we believe, the first-degree agents of aggression are the countries furnishing the arms necessary for aggression.

I am happy, on the other hand, that the representatives of the majority or rather all the first-degree agents of aggression are present here. I think they are going to provide this Conference with convincing explanations for their lethal chemical gifts that our military personnel and civilian population have, for several months and even years, been receiving from land, sea and air. If such explanations are given, we will be grateful, especially because their repeated and emotional speeches on various aspects of disarmament make us the more eager to hear these explanations from them.

You, distinguished delegates, know well that when my country was invaded, the Superpowers and other Western Powers declared total neutrality, and stated that they would not furnish arms to either conflicting party. In addition to statements made by individual countries to this effect, this position was even reflected in the Security Council's resolutions on the imposed war, which were first of all signed by the Security Council's Permanent Members.