

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1541st  
MEETING

Monday, 4 December 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Mr. Vasily Ivanovich Kozlov, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic . . . . .	1

Agenda item 96:

Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons ( <i>concluded</i> )	
Consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.409 . . . . .	1

*Chairman: Mr. Ismail FAHMY  
(United Arab Republic).*

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Vasily Ivanovich Kozlov,  
Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the  
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic*

1. The CHAIRMAN: It is with deep regret that I have to inform the Committee of the demise of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, His Excellency Vasily Ivanovich Kozlov, on Saturday 2 December. He had been the Chairman of the Presidium since 1948. I am sure that I am expressing the feeling of the members of the Committee in extending to the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and to the family of the late Mr. Vasily Ivanovich Kozlov our deep sympathy on the occasion of his death.

2. Mr. TCHERNOUCHTENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): On behalf of the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all the members of this Committee who have expressed sympathy on the occasion of the death of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Vasily Ivanovich Kozlov.

3. Our Republic has suffered a grievous loss. President Kozlov was a prominent leader in State and social affairs in our country. He was one of the organizers of the partisan movement in Byelorussia against the Hitlerite invaders and was awarded the title of "Hero of the Soviet Union" for services rendered in the fight against fascism.

4. He held many responsible government posts and since 1948 had been President of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, i.e. for almost twenty years.

5. May I assure members of this Committee that their expression of sympathy and condolences will be transmitted to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and to the members of the family of the deceased.

AGENDA ITEM 96

**Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of  
nuclear weapons (*concluded*) (A/6834; A/C.1/L.409)**

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION  
A/C.1/L.409

6. The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, we will take up the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.409] and after hearing a statement from the representative of the Soviet Union, we shall then listen to explanations of vote before the vote. When we have finished with that, we shall vote on the draft resolution today.

7. Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran): May I first of all express my condolences to the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on the death of Mr. Kozlov, the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

8. The draft resolution which the Chairman has just mentioned reached us only this morning, although I gather that it was distributed on Saturday. Therefore, I should like to ask that we be allowed more time in which to consult with our Government and to seek instructions. I understand that some other delegations are also in the same position. We have not yet been able to consult our Government.

9. The CHAIRMAN: In connexion with the statement made by the representative of Iran, I should like to say that, when I made the proposal that after the explanations of vote we could proceed to the voting, I did not hear any objections, either formally or informally, from any member of this Committee. However, if the delegate of Iran finds himself in difficulty, we may be able to accommodate him, but I appeal to him not to press now for the postponement of the voting but to wait until we proceed a little further in our deliberations. We shall see how things appear in the light of the explanations of vote; I shall take up his point a little later in our proceedings. Does he still ask for the floor?

10. Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran): No, Mr. Chairman, I am in your hands.

11. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before passing on to the main part of the statement of the Soviet delegation, may I, in the name of the Soviet delegation and following your example, express our heartfelt condolences to the delegation, Government and people of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on the untimely demise of the prominent Byelorussian statesman and public figure, the Chairman of

the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Vasily Ivanovich Kozlov.

12. The delegations of Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mongolia, Nigeria, Romania, Sudan, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia have submitted draft resolution A/C.1/L.409 on the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Working on this draft the sponsors, in consultation among themselves and with many other delegations represented in this Committee, reached the conclusion that the most appropriate course would be to present to the First Committee a draft resolution which would advance the solution of the question of the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, which would at the same time gain the widest possible—if not unanimous—support.

13. The sponsors endeavoured to move forward towards a definite goal and with this in mind they prepared the draft resolution which, in our opinion, bearing in mind the situation which developed during the general debate on this item, is most likely to foster this positive objective. I repeat once again that our desire was to move forward within the possibilities and at a pace which would be realistic, but in any case to move forward.

14. Our draft resolution is based on two positions relating to the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons, which can be said to have been gained already by the peoples of the world.

15. In the preamble we mention the Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermonuclear Weapons contained in resolution 1653 (XVI), and we reaffirm the conviction expressed in resolution 2164 (XXI), adopted at the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, that the signing of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons would greatly facilitate negotiations on general and complete disarmament under effective international control and give further impetus to the search for a solution of the urgent problem of nuclear disarmament.

16. The preamble of the draft expresses the conviction of the General Assembly that, in view of the present international situation, new efforts must be made to expedite the solution of the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

17. In the operative paragraphs, the draft resolution is based on the assumption that the first new step forward that must be taken towards the solution of the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons must be an urgent further examination of that question and of the conclusion of an appropriate international convention.

18. Consequently, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution "urges all States in this connection to examine in the light of the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 1653 (XVI) the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and the draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and such other proposals as may be made on this question". In the same

paragraph all States are urged to undertake negotiations concerning the conclusion of an appropriate convention and various possible ways in which these negotiations could be held are suggested. It goes without saying that it will be for the States to choose from among them.

19. Three such possibilities are: an international conference convened for the special purpose of examining this question of the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; consideration of this question by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament; and direct negotiation between States.

20. The sponsors of this draft resolution were guided by the fact that all types of negotiations should be used as seemed appropriate to Member States in order to achieve this goal. In conformity with this, in paragraph 3, it is proposed to request the Secretary-General to transmit to all States Members of the United Nations and to the conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament the necessary documentation—the draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the records of the meetings of the First Committee relating to the discussion of the item entitled "Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

21. Such is the scope of our draft resolution. We would draw the attention of our colleagues once again to the fact that this draft resolution is drafted in a way which will enable us to move forward towards a definitive objective. That is the desire which inspired us all when we prepared it.

22. I shall conclude by addressing an appeal to all delegations present to study carefully this draft resolution and to adopt it unanimously.

23. The CHAIRMAN: I will now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

24. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): First of all, I should like to express my delegation's sincere condolences to the Government and people of Byelorussia on the most unfortunate passing away of their great leader.

25. I should now like to explain briefly the vote of the Japanese delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.409 which concerns the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

26. As the representative of the only country which has ever been visited by the scourge of nuclear weapons, I can say with confidence that the Government as well as the people of Japan fully realize the horror and disastrous effects of such weapons. We are determined to do everything possible to ensure that this terrible weapon will never be used again. I reaffirm, therefore, our firm determination to do all that we can to bring nuclear weapons under control in the ardent hope that no other country will ever have to pass through the misery that we once experienced.

27. We are of the opinion, however, that the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons must be brought about by

way of a fool-proof formula, by the phased, gradual and balanced reduction of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons in accordance with a programme for general and complete disarmament.

28. That idea is endorsed in the conclusion of the Secretary-General's report on the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons and on the security and economic implications for States of the acquisition and further development of those weapons. The report states:

"Security for all countries of the world must be sought through the elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the banning of their use, by way of general complete disarmament." [A/6858 and Corr.1, para. 91.]

29. It has been repeatedly pointed out by many representatives that we have met with difficulties in the process of trying to achieve general and complete disarmament. But we should spare no effort to reach this goal, acting in the belief that this is the only way to ensure the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, removing any possibility that such weapons might ever be used again by one nation against another.

30. Although we realize the importance of studying the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, we consider the approach taken in draft resolution A/C.1/L.409 to be ineffective as well as unrealistic in that it is intended to separate and settle this issue apart from such other disarmament measures as the prohibition of the production of nuclear weapons, their reduction and abolition. Accordingly, we shall abstain when this draft resolution is put to the vote.

31. Mr. HASSAN (Somalia): Before speaking on the item before us, allow me to express my delegation's condolences to the Government and people of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic upon the death of Mr. Kozlov, the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of his country.

32. Turning now to the item under discussion, there is no doubt that mankind is very much concerned at the existence of nuclear weapons which are capable of causing wide destruction. That destruction will befall any area that unfortunately happens to be the target of such weapons.

33. The concern felt by the world in general is aptly explained in the Secretary-General's report:

"The enormity of the shadow which is cast over mankind by the possibility of nuclear war makes it essential that its effects be clearly and widely understood." [A/6858 and Corr.1, para. 1.]

34. The world is aware of the destructive power of these weapons, yet there has been little agreement about their destruction or the prohibition of their use. We feel that any move that is aimed towards an international convention would be a major step towards the establishment of a universe in which mankind can live for successive generations in safety and freedom from fear.

35. Many attempts have been made, and are still being made, towards the noble and lofty aim of general and

complete disarmament. This is a view to which most States subscribe. Yet, we have witnessed that, in spite of all declarations of good intentions, the achievement of such aims has not been reached. Until such aims are achieved, we feel that it is not out of place to take steps which will bring us nearer to the goal of general and complete disarmament.

36. The destructive power of nuclear weapons makes it imperative that we should continue unrelentingly the search for their banning and eventual destruction. If the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be a step towards the abolition of all nuclear weapons, we feel that we should all support any move that would achieve that end.

37. In the Secretary-General's report we are warned about the effects that could result from their use. The nuclear Powers, as well as the non-nuclear Powers, should take these effects into consideration. Allow me in this context to quote from the Secretary-General's report:

"The effects of an all-out nuclear war, regardless of where it started, could not be confined to the Powers engaged in that war. They themselves would have to suffer... the immediate and more enduring lethal fall-out whose effects have already been described. But neighbouring countries, and even countries in parts of the world remote from the actual conflict, could soon become exposed to the hazards of radio-active fall-out precipitated at great distances from the explosion, after moving through the atmosphere as a vast cloud. Thus, at least, within the same hemisphere"—and I repeat 'hemisphere'—"an enduring radio-active hazard could exist for distant as well as close human populations, through the ingestion of foods derived from contaminated vegetation, and the external irradiation due to fall-out particles deposited on the ground." [A/6858, para. 40]

38. The General Assembly has already taken initiatives on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons in resolution 1653 (XVI). This resolution lays down that the use of such weapons is contrary to the laws of humanity.

39. The search for the survival of mankind cannot be left entirely to the nuclear Powers. This is an obligation which we all owe to ourselves and we cannot delegate it.

40. We welcome the initiative taken by the representative of the USSR in bringing up this matter. Concern for the survival of the human race compels us to support the aims of such a convention and we will vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.409].

41. Mr. DENORME (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The Belgian delegation would like to offer its sincere condolences to the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on the sad loss it has just suffered in the death of Mr. Kozlov.

42. In explaining the vote we shall be casting shortly on the ten-Power draft resolution, the Belgian delegation wishes to add its voice to those raised earlier in the debate to describe the fearful havoc and the truly apocalyptic destruction which resort to nuclear weapons would bring. Better than any science fiction novel or futuristic film

could have done it, the report of the Secretary-General in a gloomy enumeration of facts has shown us convincingly what the use of such weapons in future wars would mean for the fate of mankind. The expert-consultants deserve our gratitude for their preparatory work on this impressive report, in which unanimously and with compelling realism they describe the spectacle of death, massacre, wreckage and flames as the explosion of a single megaton bomb transforms "a vast living city into a sea of blazing rubble".

43. For a long time now we have been at danger point, and everything possible must be done to obviate the risk of a nuclear holocaust obliterating every trace of civilization, perhaps even wiping out all life on the earth for ever.

44. But convinced though we are of the urgent need to prevent such a disaster, my delegation nevertheless cannot unreservedly endorse the means advocated here to achieve that end. How could anyone honestly believe that the mere signing of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would have any weight if the moment came for the Government of a Power possessing great stocks of nuclear weapons to choose between defeat and resort to those weapons, and it came to the conclusion that the latter course could decide the issue?

45. If we are truly concerned about the survival of mankind in this age of the nuclear Juggernaut, there is in our view only one solution, namely that reached in the report by the twelve experts from a wide range of countries:

"Security for all countries of the world must be sought through the elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the banning of their use, by the way of general and complete disarmament." [A/6858, para. 91.]

46. The Belgian Government has at all times favoured a progressive and balanced plan for general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Unfortunately that idea is not reflected in the draft resolution submitted to us, and for that reason the Belgian delegation will abstain from the vote on it.

47. Mr. SKOBELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Political Committee is about to conclude consideration of an important and urgent question, namely the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, included in the agenda of the session at the request of the Soviet Union. The detailed and lengthy discussion has, we think, shown clearly enough that the majority supports the idea that a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons must be concluded, and recognizes the importance and timeliness of this new peace initiative of the Soviet Union. It can be concluded from the subject matter of the statements that the majority of speakers supported not only the idea of a convention but the adoption of effective measures to achieve it. Those who took part in the general debate, and who assessed the problem positively, have expressed a number of very useful views.

48. The Committee now has before it a draft resolution on the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, sponsored by Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mongolia, Nigeria, Romania, Sudan, Union

of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia [A/C.1/L.409].

49. The position of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on the question of the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons was set out in detail during the general debate. This position is perfectly clear and reflects the steadfast determination of the workers of the Byelorussian SSR to consolidate international peace and security, and their desire to see a relaxation of tension in international relations and the reduction of the threat of a nuclear war.

50. The head of the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, speaking of the Soviet proposal, said that a draft convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons would help to create solid guarantees of peace, dispel the threat of a nuclear war and pave the way for conditions which would make it easier to reach agreement on the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the destruction of existing stocks of them. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has declared its readiness to sign this convention together with other countries.

51. However, as we know, some countries are not prepared to sign this convention, including various nuclear Powers. Given existing conditions, we must continue to bend our efforts towards achieving a convention for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The General Assembly can and must immediately take measures to ensure that the prospects for the conclusion of a convention are soon improved. Our delegation is profoundly convinced that these objectives and tasks are served at the present stage by draft resolution A/C.1/L.409. This draft furnishes wide possibilities for all States to study as soon as possible the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the draft convention proposed by the Soviet Union.

52. Our delegation considers that the draft resolution before the Committee is consonant with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of States. It is soundly based on the generally recognized need to make new efforts towards expediting a solution of the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and does not lose sight, as some mistakenly think, of our main objective, which is to facilitate negotiations on general and complete disarmament under strict international control.

53. This draft resolution is important in that it will intensify efforts on the part of the international community to create peaceful conditions for free social and political development, but it is extremely important that this resolution should not remain a mere declaration. The task of the United Nations is not only to achieve the adoption of positive resolutions but also to take realistic measures to see that they are carried out. We hope that the measures provided for under the resolution concerning the conclusion of a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons will not be unduly delayed and that all States, taking into account the present situation, will take urgent measures to carry out the tasks which, we are sure, will be supported by the majority of Members of the General Assembly.

54. We sincerely regret that some delegations, and above all those of such nuclear Powers as the United States and

the United Kingdom, were not able to respond favourably to the proposal which is in the common interests of nuclear and non-nuclear countries. We consider that history will finally and incontrovertibly prove how narrow and dangerous this idea of nuclear deterrence is, and will compel those who now oppose the conclusion of the convention to review their position.

55. The Byelorussian SSR fully supports this draft resolution and asks all other delegations to vote in favour of this important document.

56. Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, before explaining my vote, allow me to add my voice to yours and to the others who have expressed their condolences over the loss suffered by our Byelorussian colleagues in this Committee.

57. The United States delegation wishes to explain why it will abstain on the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.409] disposing of item 96, entitled "Conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons". It is not necessary at this stage for the United States to state again the reasons why it believes the draft convention attached to the Soviet request for inclusion of the item [A/6834] would not be a useful step in the effort in which we are all engaged, the effort to avoid the dread spectre of nuclear war.

58. However, the United States, as a matter of policy, does not refuse to consider, to study and to discuss honest proposals put forward by any nation in good faith. Thus, although we cannot agree that the Soviet proposal has merit, we shall not oppose further consideration of this subject matter in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, if this is the wish of the General Assembly.

59. We note, in this connexion, that the draft resolution on which the vote is being taken does not endorse *per se* the proposed convention on prohibition, but only remands it, together with such other proposals as may be made on this subject, for further study and negotiation in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, or in an international conference, or between States.

60. Finally, I believe that this body can be proud of the statesmanlike debate on this item manifested by most delegations. It is the hope of my delegation that other measures—measures that we consider far more meaningful relating to the problems of nuclear weapons—will be accorded similar treatment in this, as well as in other disarmament forums.

61. Mr. HSUEH (China) (*translated from Chinese*): My delegation has not participated in the general debate on the Soviet proposal for the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons [A/6834], for although the underlying problem is urgent and important, the proposed convention is one which has been carefully considered and thoroughly debated before, through several sessions of the General Assembly. The views of many delegations, including those of my own, on similar proposals have been repeatedly stated and made clear.

62. The issue involved in the Soviet proposal is surely not whether the use of nuclear weapons should be prohibited.

To that question, I am sure the answer of each and every one around this table is an emphatic "Yes". It is precisely this universally desired goal that Members of the United Nations have been striving to achieve, year in and year out, through the General Assembly and the other organs related to disarmament. That the goal is still not within reach only shows the magnitude and complexity of the problem.

63. The issue is how the use of nuclear weapons can be effectively prohibited. It would be the happiest day for all of us—and indeed for all mankind—if, after so many years of painstaking search for a solution to the problem, we should now suddenly discover that the solution has been nowhere else but right here in our own file all this time.

64. But unfortunately the matter is not so simple. The core of the problem is the availability in national arsenals of those terrible weapons, not only in growing quantity but also in an increasingly devastating capacity. Only recently it has been reported in the press that a new missile has been developed, capable of delivering nuclear warheads to targets along orbital flight about 100 miles above the earth, thus giving only three minutes' warning to defenders using present radar-detecting systems.

65. Could a simple undertaking not to use nuclear weapons, even sanctified in the form of an international convention, be meaningful when such weapons continue to be manufactured in ever more sophisticated forms and stockpiled? The question is similar to the one posed in a Chinese proverb: can a tiger be tied up with a piece of string?

66. It has been argued that a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons would have at least some moral value; but surely it is not a moral injunction against the use of nuclear weapons which is lacking. No convention can have higher moral force than the United Nations Charter, which enjoins all Members to refrain from the threat or use of force except in cases of collective action and self-defence. Thus the Charter prohibits the use, or at least the initial use, of nuclear weapons as well as conventional weapons.

67. If that provision of the Charter needs to be strengthened, another statement of principle will not serve that purpose. What is required is the working out of effective and reliable machinery that would make the use of force undesirable and impossible—to be achieved through, among other things, the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

68. A specific moral undertaking not to use nuclear weapons might be harmless if it did not give rise to dangerous consequences. Let us assume that a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons would be strictly observed by all the parties thereto—although such an assumption is doubtful as past experience shows that war has never been stopped simply by the signing of a convention renouncing war. A possible dangerous consequence of a convention on the prohibition of nuclear weapons is the upsetting of the military balance between States or groups of States, without equal assurance of security for all. An even greater danger lies in the deceptive delusion that the use of nuclear weapons would no longer

be possible. Such an illusion would not only lull innocent States into a false sense of security, but would encourage potential aggressors to become bolder and more reckless in their aggressive designs and actions. Instead of preventing nuclear war, the proposed convention could very well increase the risks of war, with the eventual possibility of a nuclear war.

69. For those reasons, my delegation cannot support the proposal for the conclusion of a simple convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. As I have said earlier, the underlying problem is important and urgent; and the search for its solution is being carried on by the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee within the context of general and complete disarmament. My delegation finds no elements in the present debate that would call for further action on the part of the General Assembly.

70. Mr. MORTENSEN (Denmark): Before explaining the vote of my delegation, I should like to express to the Byelorussian delegation my sincere condolences on the passing away of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mr. Kozlov.

71. The question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has been considered, in various forms, by several sessions of the General Assembly.

72. The sixteenth session adopted resolution 1653 (XVI) containing a Declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. That resolution on which my Government abstained, requested the Secretary-General to consult the Governments of Member States to ascertain their views on the possibility of convening a special conference to consider the signing of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

73. In a reply of 30 June 1962 to a letter from the Secretary-General, acting in compliance with the said resolution, the Foreign Minister of Denmark summarized the Danish position as follows:

"It is a well-known fact that the Danish Government are strongly in favour of all endeavours to minimize the risks which nuclear weapons present to mankind. The Danish Government are conscious of the responsibility which every Member State of the United Nations must bear in this respect. The views expressed in resolution 1653 (XVI) are therefore in many respects in conformity with those of the Danish Government who highly appreciate the motives underlying this resolution.

"The Danish Government consider that the risks involved by the use of nuclear weapons for purposes of warfare are best discussed in the framework of discussions on general and complete disarmament under international control.

"In these circumstances the best forum for discussion of measures that may contribute towards a lasting and safe solution to the problems attending nuclear weapons would seem to be the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 26, document A/5174, annex II.

74. My delegation finds that these views are still valid. It cannot be realistic to detach this fundamental problem from its general context and deal with it in isolation.

75. However, this stand does not mean that my Government is not fully aware of the dangers inherent in the very existence of nuclear weapons. Nor does it imply any change in our attitude to the question of placing nuclear weapons on Danish territory. We uphold the view that it would not serve the cause of *détente* to receive such weapons.

76. On the other hand, we believe that a positive result can be reached only by tackling the problems in their proper and logical sequence. Our goal must be to provide for the elimination of nuclear weapons under an agreement on general and complete disarmament subject to international control. And that goal cannot be accomplished by dealing with the problems of nuclear weapons in isolation from the entire range of problems involved in disarmament.

77. For those reasons my delegation will abstain on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.409.

78. The CHAIRMAN: There being no further speakers on my list to explain their vote before the voting; and since, as I understand, the representative of Iran is not pressing his request for postponement until tomorrow, the Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.409, co-sponsored by Czechoslovakia and nine other Member States. After completion of the voting I shall call on all those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

*A vote was taken by show of hands.*

*The draft resolution was adopted by 56 votes to none, with 33 abstentions.*

79. U SOE TIN (Burma): Permit me first to join in expressing the condolences of the delegation of Burma to the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and, through it, to the Government and people of Byelorussia, on the demise of their beloved leader, Mr. Kozlov.

80. The delegation of Burma shares the common concern expressed by all delegations regarding the dangers to humanity inherent in the outbreak of a war involving nuclear weapons, and is as anxious as others to see the world relieved once and for all of the threat of a nuclear or thermonuclear war. It therefore welcomes the ultimate objective of the draft resolution, namely, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, it has noted the very wide and divergent views among the nuclear Powers as to the basic concept of achieving this desired objective.

81. Considering the response of the other nuclear Powers on the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union, as embodied in the present draft resolution, the delegation of Burma entertains grave doubts as to its effectiveness.

82. The considered view of my delegation is that a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be valuable if it exercises effectively a moral and psychological restraint in situations of, or leading



to, war between nations, affording belligerent Powers a mutual pause for a saner second thought. However, like all measures in the field of disarmament the convention is intended essentially for observance by the nuclear Powers, and the refusal by any of those Powers to adhere to the convention would, because of its moral and psychological appeal for a nuclear restraint, nullify its effectiveness.

83. Further, we feel that in all matters of disarmament it is necessary to balance what is desirable with what is practicable, and the delegation of Burma is, therefore, hesitant about committing itself to the concept and procedures outlined in the draft resolution of holding an international conference for the specific purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

84. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): Before explaining my vote, I should like to join the delegations preceding me in expressing our sincerest condolences to the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR on the deeply regretted death of the Head of State of that Republic.

85. When, on 24 November 1961, at the 1063rd plenary meeting resolution 1653 (XVI) entitled "Declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons" was adopted, the General Assembly unequivocally expressed its condemnation of such weapons of mass destruction. The resolution to which I have referred establishes clearly that the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons is contrary to the spirit, letter and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations; that it is also contrary to the norms of international law and the laws of humanity; and that it shall therefore be considered that any State using such weapons is violating the United Nations Charter, is acting contrary to the laws of humanity, and is committing a crime against mankind and civilization.

86. Mexico has not only given conclusive proof of its unqualified opposition to the use of nuclear weapons, but has gone much further in its efforts also to obtain the prohibition of the testing, production, purchase, stock-piling, installation, placement, or any other form of possession of any nuclear weapons. This Committee was recently discussing the Treaty of Tlatelolco on the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America [A/C.1/946] signed by twenty-one Latin American States. That Treaty, which is already fully in force with respect to Mexico, since the Government of Mexico has deposited its instrument of ratification in compliance with all the requirements of article 28 of the Treaty itself, is intended, as you all know, to maintain in perpetuity a system whereby nuclear weapons will be totally absent from the Latin American subcontinent. Therefore, my delegation, which voted in favour of resolution 1653 (XVI) in 1961 can only be in favour of a definitive prohibition, once and for all, of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons.

87. The most authoritative spokesmen of our time in all continents have repudiated weapons of mass destruction, advancing irrefutable arguments. Mankind is daily becoming increasingly aware of the need to channel atomic energy towards peaceful ends, rather than those of destruction and death. These are the reasons that have motivated my

delegation to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.409 which has just been adopted.

88. However, it should be understood that our vote in no way prejudices or limits the attitude which the delegation of Mexico may adopt either in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament or wherever this question is to be discussed, since we are convinced that, for a convention of the kind proposed to be effective, it is necessary to obtain the agreement of those nations which possess nuclear weapons, without whose co-operation no practical progress can be achieved in this field.

89. We also feel that the agreement or convention to be concluded must not be regarded as an end in itself, but as a means that may simultaneously serve to speed up the negotiations designed to achieve the total elimination of the enormous arsenals of nuclear weapons existing at present and those constantly being manufactured. For, as the President of my country put it, "We are convinced that the world must either put an end to nuclear weapons, or nuclear weapons will put an end to the world".

90. We refuse to believe that the so-called deterrent effect of those weapons can count as a positive factor justifying their existence. The fact that over the past twenty years we have been able to maintain a precarious peace, based on an uneasy balance of fear, is far from a convincing argument in our view. During the millions of years of pre-history, which it is customary to divide into the Stone, the Bronze and the Iron Age, the deterrent effect of primitive artefacts made of those metals was enough for man; and in thousands of years of recorded history in which—we should not forget—there have been many periods of over half a century during which peace has prevailed, the power of dissuasion never went beyond the already sufficiently terrifying instruments based on TNT or dynamite, and that only in comparatively recent times.

91. We simply cannot understand why it should be necessary today to make international peace and security contingent upon weapons such as nuclear ones. That argument has led a contemporary historian of the stature of Arnold Toynbee to state quite rightly that the threat to the survival of the human race is much greater since 1945 than it was during the millions of years before the possibility was discovered of applying the atom to war purposes. In this context my delegation will examine most attentively the draft convention [A/6834] submitted to the General Assembly by the delegation of the Soviet Union, as well as any other proposal that may be submitted on the subject, in the hope that we may be contributing to free mankind from the threat which nuclear weapons create to its very survival.

92. Mr. BURNS (Canada): The Canadian delegation would like to join you, Mr. Chairman, and the other representatives who have spoken in expressing condolences to the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and, through the delegation, to the Government and people of Byelorussia, on the death of their distinguished leader, Mr. Kozlov, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian SSR.

93. In a statement made at this Committee's meeting on 28 November [1537th meeting], the Canadian delegation

explained that it did not agree with the arguments set out in the memorandum of the Soviet Union [*A/6834*] and the draft convention attached thereto. However, the draft resolution which we have just voted upon only urges all States to examine the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and such other proposals as may be made on this subject. Furthermore, the draft resolution urges all States, in terms which, in the English text, are somewhat unclear, to undertake negotiations respecting the matter in one of several ways.

94. We must say that we are not happy about the wording of two of the operative paragraphs. Operative paragraph 1 as now worded expresses a conviction which we cannot fully share. We think that the word "conviction" is too strong. In the present circumstances we do not think that a convention of the kind proposed is either essential or urgent.

95. In the second operative paragraph, there is a reference to resolution 1653 (XVI), which we voted against in 1961. Incidentally, a representative of the Soviet Union, in our meeting of 30 November, referred to the argument that the Canadian delegation made at that time against holding a conference for the purpose of developing a convention for prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons. To set the record straight, I should like to quote from the statement which I made in plenary on 24 November 1961 as follows:

"... we have reason to be hopeful that an agreement will soon be reached concerning the resumption of general disarmament negotiations in an appropriate negotiating forum. My delegation feels that it is of great importance that this Assembly should take no action which might in any way hamper the success of these resumed negotiations."<sup>2</sup>

96. In the same statement I said:

"... in the light of recent developments to which I referred, our doubts about the wisdom of adopting this draft resolution have been reinforced. For example, it appears to my delegation that the convening of a special conference, as envisaged in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, would be ill-advised in present circumstances. Action to assemble a world conference to sign a convention of doubtful utility might very well detract from the effort to negotiate binding disarmament agreements which are the only finally effective means of dealing with the threat of nuclear weapons."<sup>3</sup>

97. The Canadian delegation still believes that the arguments which it advanced at that time were valid. However, in spite of the above considerations, Canada, because of its long-standing and continued concern with all questions relating to disarmament, did not feel that it would be justified in rejecting outright the urging of a substantial majority of the Member States of the United Nations. Therefore, we abstain from voting on draft resolution *A/C.1/L.409*.

98. We had a further reason for not voting against the draft resolution, namely, that in discussions on the non-

proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, as well as in this Committee, many delegations voiced the opinion that States which are not nuclear Powers and which are expected to pledge themselves not to acquire nuclear weapons should be given an assurance that the nuclear Powers will not use nuclear weapons against them.

99. The Canadian delegation has much sympathy with that argument. An assurance such as that sought by the non-nuclear States might be considered in a sense as a partial prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and hence as being related to the subject of the resolution just voted upon.

100. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): In the first place, may I offer the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic the deep condolences of my delegation on the loss suffered by his people and his country on the death of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

101. The ten-Power draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.409*] was circulated last Saturday and has been voted upon this afternoon. The intervening period was hardly adequate for my delegation—or indeed for several other delegations—to ask for and to receive instructions from their respective Governments on a matter of such fundamental importance as this. My delegation had hoped that more time would have been allowed to those delegations by postponing the vote to a subsequent meeting of this Committee. Therefore, it was mainly due to a lack of instructions that the Pakistan delegation was obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

102. Mr. BAYANDOR (Iran): My delegation did not press for a postponement of the vote on this draft resolution, despite the fact that it found itself in a difficult position due to a lack of instructions because it did not have sufficient time to consult its Government.

103. Therefore, in the absence of any specific instructions from its Government, my delegation has had to abstain from voting on the draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.409*]. However, I shall like to reserve the right of my Government to take up whatever position it deems fit when the draft resolution is put to the vote at the plenary meeting of the Assembly.

104. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has concluded its consideration of item 96 with the statement of the representative of Iran.

105. Before we proceed any further, I should like to clarify the position for the sake of the record. The draft resolution sponsored by the ten Powers [*A/C.1/L.409*] was received by the Secretariat last Friday and was circulated to all Member States on Saturday. It was voted upon here without any objection by any particular representative this afternoon. That means that the Committee acted in accordance with the rules of procedure which give representatives only a period of twenty-four hours before the vote. In view of that, and of the fact that the representative of Pakistan did not either formally or informally request a postponement, I felt it necessary to put the facts on record.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1063rd meeting, para. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 8.



106. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that consideration and action on item 96 has been concluded.

*It was so decided.*

107. Before I adjourn the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that, in the light of the progress achieved

today I intend to cancel the meeting scheduled for tomorrow at 3 p.m. If there is no objection, it is so decided.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.*