

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1549th  
MEETING

Wednesday, 13 December 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 29, 30 and 31:

*Question of general and complete disarmament  
(continued):*

(a) *Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament;*

(b) *Report of the Secretary-General 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 these weapons . . . .*

*Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued). . . . .*

*Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued) . . . . .*

Page

1

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

AGENDA ITEMS 29, 30 AND 31

Question of general and complete disarmament (continued):

(a) Report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/6951-DC/229; A/C.1/L.411, A/C.1/L.412);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General 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 these weapons (A/6858 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued) (A/6951-DC/229, A/C.1/L.414)

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued) (A/6951-DC/229)

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before I give the floor to the first speaker on my list, I call upon the representative of the Netherlands who wishes to make a statement in connexion with an amendment.

2. Mr. ESCHAUZIER (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like to address myself to the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.411) submitted by

the representative of Malta concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons.

3. During the last session of the General Assembly, my delegation stated that, in its view, the Geneva Protocol<sup>1/</sup> was outdated and that the time had come for its review and revision. In fact, it was our opinion that that was already long overdue. Therefore, I whole-heartedly concur with the purport and intent of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Malta, but I should like to make two suggestions.

4. It appears to me that, although outdated, nevertheless, the Geneva Protocol remains the only instrument of its kind and it is therefore important that, while the study recommended by the representative of Malta is being undertaken, such restraining influences as the Geneva Protocol may have should not be lost. This requirement could in my opinion be met by calling attention to last year's resolution 2162 B (XXI). By inserting a reference to that resolution in the preamble of the Maltese draft resolution, we would reaffirm that the General Assembly:

"1. Calls for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Protocol . .

"2. Invites all States to accede to the Geneva Protocol . . .".

5. I suggest that the relevant sentence might best be inserted between the second and third paragraphs of the preamble. It would thus become a new third paragraph:

"Reaffirming its resolution 2162 B (XXI), adopted on 5 December 1966".

6. I hope that by this insertion the representative of Hungary would, at least to a certain extent, be satisfied and would feel that one of the omissions in the Maltese draft, which he pointed out, had been adequately dealt with.

7. Under these circumstances, I respectfully ask the representative of Hungary whether he would be willing to reconsider his own draft resolution [A/C.1/L.412] and not press for a vote on it. It appears to me that if, on the one hand, we adopt unanimously—as I hope we shall—the draft resolution put forward by the representative of Malta [A/C.1/L.411] calling for a study—and I would like to underscore, for a study—on the definition and the use of chemical and biological weapons, it would, on the other hand, be inconsistent and untimely also to adopt a resolution containing

<sup>1/</sup> Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed at Geneva, June 17, 1925.

principles or a declaration on a matter of great complexity, the study of which has as yet to be undertaken and on which the Secretary-General is to make a report.

8. I have one further point. Yesterday's discussion centred also on the exact meaning of the words "radiological weapons". It would seem to me that these words could best be deleted since it is not quite clear to me what the meaning of radiological weapons is in the present context. It might therefore be better to speak simply of "chemical and biological weapons".

9. That was the amendment I wished to put forward formally.

10. The CHAIRMAN: The amendment proposed by the representative of the Netherlands will be circulated shortly.<sup>2/</sup> I should now like to announce that Japan has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.414, and that Yugoslavia has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.414.

11. Mr. Martinus L. JOHNSON (Liberia): Were we only to stop and assess the manpower, time and energy consumed year after year in this Committee in the discussion of the question of general and complete disarmament, perhaps we would realize how far removed all of us are from being realistic and honest with ourselves. There need be no search for the underlying cause which generates this debate, for that cause is too well known to all of us; pure unmitigated mutual distrust among the great Powers.

12. Distrust is alarming within the context of the word itself, but the accompanying connotation is the more distressing fear. When we speak of universal concern in regard to the total destruction of our planet by nuclear power, we are expressing the fear of every living soul today concerned with the preservation of life, a major concern cherished and guarded by all of us and one none wishes abandoned.

13. Since our last discussion on this item, three important achievements in the field of disarmament have been accomplished: first, the approval given by the Assembly, in its resolution 2222 (XXI), to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space; second, the conclusion, in Mexico City, of a Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [A/C.1/946]; and third, the draft treaty on nuclear non-proliferation tabled on 24 August 1967 by the United States and the Soviet Union in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee.<sup>3/</sup>

14. There are indeed many side-issues connected with these treaties that must be worked out, but we are more concerned that neither France nor the People's Republic of China participates in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee and that atmospheric nuclear tests have continued. Furthermore, no agreement has yet been reached between the United States and the Soviet Union on acceptable

terms of verification and compliance with an underground nuclear test ban.

15. Speaking before the General Assembly on 11 October 1967, the Secretary of State of Liberia, Mr. J. Rudolph Grimes, commented on this issue of peace as follows:

"The tremendous arms build-up, far from assuring us of true security, is generating more uncertainty, scepticism, mistrust and suspicion. This in turn is creating more apprehension, more misgiving, fear and alarm. However, we do not seem to possess either the courage or the resoluteness to take bold steps to end the senseless armaments race so as to make available the resources which could be usefully deployed to fight the war mankind must wage against ignorance, poverty and disease. It is indeed a tragic and pathetic situation, and it is no wonder that some people have even expressed doubts that disarmament is a realistic goal in the world today.

"In spite of the frustrations in this field and our apparent inability to control the inventions which our scientific advancement has made possible, we cannot afford to despair. We must redouble our efforts, improve the machinery of our Organization, and do all we can to find peaceful solutions to international disputes, and to ensure mankind's over-all progress so that we all may benefit by scientific inventions and live a better life free from fear and anxiety."<sup>4/</sup>

16. The question of complete disarmament is indeed the crisis of our times. John H. Hallowell, in his book entitled Main Currents in Modern Political Thought,<sup>5/</sup> has rightly stated that the sickness of the modern world is the sickness of moral confusion, intellectual anarchy and spiritual despair; that modern man oscillates between extravagant optimism and hopeless despair. Modern man's great lack is lack of conviction, particularly the conviction that good and evil are real. Mr. Hallowell goes on further to say that where formerly men looked to God for the salvation of their souls, they now look to science and technology for the gratification of their desires, and finally, that man's technical knowledge and capacity have outstripped his moral capacity.

17. This fear and suspicion to which we refer can be exploited in two distinct directions: either a reason to arm or a reason to disarm. My delegation prefers to exploit the latter: the reason to disarm.

18. Turning to the report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament for the period 27 January—25 August 1966,<sup>6/</sup> we have studied the various proposals, all possessing their genuine merits, by States or groups of States. However, a small country like my own cannot concede that those proposals and arguments touch the heart of the problem. The crux of the matter lies in a sincere willingness on the part of the nuclear Powers to agree that, in the name of humanity and for the preservation

<sup>2/</sup> Subsequently distributed as document A/C.1/L.415.

<sup>3/</sup> See Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1967 and 1968, document DC/230 and Add.1, annex IV, sects. 6 and 8.

<sup>4/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Plenary Meetings, 1587th meeting, para. 98.

<sup>5/</sup> Holt, New York, 1950.

<sup>6/</sup> Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1966, document DC/228.

of our civilizations, disarmament must take place here and now. The very structure of the United Nations makes it impossible for this Organization to play any real, effective role towards this necessary end. The year-to-year exercise in this Committee is truly one of futility and a waste of the money this Organization so badly needs for more constructive purposes, such as solving the various problems of human misery. Unless the nuclear Powers, meeting on a genuinely human common ground, can agree and see the uselessness of the armament race, we shall continue to undergo this futile exercise for years to come without achieving our goal, the goal of general and complete disarmament.

19. My delegation associates itself with previous speakers in extending congratulations to the Secretary-General and his team of experts for their comprehensive report [A/6858 and Corr.1] in response to General Assembly resolution 2162 A (XXI) of 5 December 1966, on the effect of the possible use of nuclear weapons. The conclusions reached in that document are enlightening indeed. Annex II of the report, concerning the genetic effects of nuclear radiation, is indeed horrifying, and annex IV, on basic costs of nuclear warheads, seems most revolting, considering the poverty that exists in our world today. The report is a document that should be read by every living creature in every corner of this world. Yet, while so many of us read, how few of us there are who will digest the substance of such a report.

20. However, this report has been examined in much deeper detail by many speakers, and it is not our intention to duplicate the words of our fellow representatives. Let me just record the words of one of our great scholars on this subject of total and complete disarmament which I hope will give us a still newer perspective. I refer to the words of the late Adlai E. Stevenson, who said:

"A disarmed world could still be a world of great diversity, in which no one nation could seriously pretend to have the wit and wisdom to manage mankind.

"It would be a world in which ideas, for the first time, could compete on their own merits without the possibility of their imposition by force of arms.

"It would be a world in which men could turn their talents to an agenda of progress and justice for all mankind in the second half of the twentieth century.

"In short", he concluded, "it would not be a perfect world, but a world both safer and more exhilarating for us all to live in."

21. My delegation notes that the report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is incomplete and that, as a matter of fact, only initial work has been done in rendering it. My delegation regrets that, in the words of the interim report, the Committee "has not been able to devote sufficient time to the consideration of these matters" [A/6951-DC/229, para. 5], that is to say, the item entitled "Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America". We note that the Committee intends to submit a full report—and I

emphasize the word "full"—including all documents, as soon as possible. The ramifications of such a task are tremendous, yet the urgency and priority that are envisaged for that task are of utmost importance. Time, patience and goodwill are all-important in such negotiations, and that is why we went along with the Chairman in postponing the discussion of item 28 until Friday. As far as my delegation is concerned, all of the items are interrelated, for we are seeking only to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament by all possible means. We hope the promised report from the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament will be at the disposal of the Assembly before the twenty-third session, and we reserve our right to take the floor on item 28 should this become necessary.

22. Finally, my delegation would therefore appeal to the nuclear Powers to turn their technological know-how to constructive scientific experimentation rather than towards ends that could result in the total annihilation of the human race. We appeal for an agreement now that a convention be worked out for total and complete disarmament, a convention to which all States will strictly adhere. Let suspicion and fear be replaced by reason and genuine trust, so that generations unborn may herald the end result of our work as a true charter of peace.

23. Mr. SIMBULE (Zambia): The question of disarmament was never so important to mankind as it is today, particularly in the present decade. The disastrous arms race has continued and has reached a stage where, with modern weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, it threatens the very existence of man on this planet. The survival of the human race on this globe will be determined by the achievements of this Organization in taking the necessary measures which will prevent the proliferation and use of deadly nuclear weapons in the world.

24. The question of disarmament is of great significance to both nuclear and non-nuclear Powers, and it is a matter of deep regret that this Committee is forced to discuss it in the absence of a full report from the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. My delegation also regrets that this subject has been truncated and a significant part of it left out. We believe, as do many others in this Committee, that the subject under consideration is indivisible and has grave implications for the peace and security of the whole world. We feel that, as such, it should not be left to a few Members of this world body to make gentlemen's agreements on it as if the rest of us did not exist. When I spoke in favour of the point of order raised by the representative of Pakistan requesting the Chair to allocate more time to all aspects of this subject, including agenda item 28, it was with great concern lest the Committee overlook the important role of the non-nuclear nations.

25. My delegation is well aware of the serious consequences of a nuclear war. The Secretary-General, in his report [A/6858 and Corr.1] succinctly brings home the effects of the possible use of nuclear weapons, and the economic and security implications such use would have for the entire world. In that report, the United Nations is invited to imagine the explosion of a nuclear weapon about 3,000 times the power of the

bomb used by the United States in 1945 against Japan. We know what happened in both Nagasaki and Hiroshima in 1945. The Secretary-General's report states:

"Available estimates are that 78,000 were killed and 84,000 injured in Hiroshima, and that 27,000 were killed and 41,000 injured in Nagasaki. In addition, there were thousands missing in both towns. Most of the immediate fatal casualties were caused by the violent disruption of residential and office buildings. In Hiroshima 60,000 houses were completely or partially destroyed." [A/6858 and Corr.1, para. 7.]

26. The terrible danger of death caused by radiation is also amply spelled out in the same report, which I need not quote any further. I merely wish, at this point, to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for this important report, to which Poland, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and others made significant contributions.

27. When I cited the example of Japan and what has come to be a comparatively small-yield type of bomb, it was with the horror that I momentarily experienced in my mind, a horror which need not be actually experienced to be appreciated. I feel that this should suffice as a motive force for denuclearization of the entire world. And this is why we of the non-nuclear countries feel strongly that this subject should be given the special attention it deserves.

28. It seems to my delegation that a more meaningful debate on this subject should go along a well-mapped-out course beginning with what has already been laid down as the foundation in the nuclear test-ban treaty and going on to the agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; I wish to add here that lending nuclear technical know-how to other countries as the United States and West Germany have done to South Africa is a cause of disquiet, especially when it is done while the world community is engaged in serious debate on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The South African Government leaves no one in doubt as to its sinister intentions vis-à-vis the rest of the independent African States.

29. If the first steps of non-proliferation and test-ban have been accepted, it should be possible for the nuclear Powers to negotiate the complete destruction of their nuclear stockpiles, with the supervision of the United Nations. This would leave the question of foreign military bases which would be eliminated under the appropriate United Nations initiative and supervision, so that the world would rid itself of the many threats which military pacts, such as NATO, CENTO and SEATO, pose. At this point I cannot but point out the tragic absence in the United Nations of the People's Republic of China which is a nuclear Power capable of playing a significant role in this regard.

30. It is generally acknowledged both within and outside the United Nations that it is vital that the People's Republic of China should participate in the peace efforts of the world community. At the same time it is a matter of grave regret that delaying tactics have been employed in the General Assembly to prevent the People's Republic of China from assuming its rightful place in the world body. We

believe that a more honest approach should be taken and that more sincere efforts should be made by both the East and the West toward disarmament. Obviously such efforts would have to be taken by all nuclear and non-nuclear Powers.

31. Zambia is a peace-loving country and a non-aligned State, and Zambia therefore feels that it can make a contribution to the peace and progress of the world, in spite of its smallness or lack of advanced technology. We, in concert with other similarly inclined nations, hope to provide a bridge in a divided world for the better life of the whole of mankind. As such, we attach great importance to the efforts of the United Nations as an instrument of international peace and security. We feel that disarmament, coupled with an effective United Nations peace-keeping mechanism, would yield useful results.

32. It may be pertinent to point out that we are not crying for the moon when we earnestly speak of disarmament. Rather we are honestly trying to realize a world in which, once nuclear arms and the expenses they incur are removed or otherwise eliminated, healthier economies throughout the world would benefit nations which need them for the betterment of their peoples. At the same time as this is realized, the world would be sensible enough to place its energies in the world body which would then be in a better position to perform its functions as an effective instrument of international peace and security.

33. I turn now briefly to the draft resolutions which have been presented for the Committee's consideration. My delegation welcomes the draft resolution presented by Malta [A/C.1/L.411], which invites the attention of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee to the Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, dated 17 June 1925. We agree with the recommendation for the up-dating, revision or replacing of that protocol and in this regard we would be glad if the Hungarian draft [A/C.1/L.412] on the same subject could be married with the Maltese draft; that is, we would appeal to the States Members of the United Nations to accede to the Geneva Protocol after revising or up-dating it, if this is necessary.

34. The draft resolution [A/C.1/L.413 and Add.1] on 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 is also welcomed by my delegation. We would repeat here our appreciation of the Secretary-General's efforts which resulted in the publication of that report.

35. In addition, my delegation would like to extend this appreciation to those distinguished scientists and economists who made their invaluable contribution to the report, and especially to their Governments, for the co-operation they gave in this regard. My delegation also welcomes the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.414], presented yesterday by Brazil and others, on the test-ban Treaty signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963. We welcome this and other draft resolutions on other disarmament items only because they seem to us to be earnest efforts to tackle this problem in stages.

36. As I said earlier, my delegation is disappointed that the Committee is debating this issue this year in the absence of a report from the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. We are also disappointed to note that agenda item 28, especially its sub-item (b), could not be debated separately. We feel that any consideration of disarmament should go hand in hand with the assurance of the security of both nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. The non-nuclear States are anxious to proceed with consideration of possible action to facilitate the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Government of the Republic of Zambia is naturally interested in this exercise and hopes to participate in the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States which is scheduled for the first half of 1968.

37. I wish to reserve my delegation's right to make a further intervention, if necessary, on agenda item 28 (b).

38. Mr. KULAGA (Poland): In taking up item 31 of our agenda, let me state at the beginning our opinion that foreign military bases are in essence a projection into the present of a past of unequal relations among States. As such, they are basically in contradiction with the present, which the Charter characterizes as a period of the sovereign equality of all States. The goal of our present discussion, as I understand it, is to ensure that this projection of the past into the present will not last in the future.

39. Foreign military bases have always been at the roots of what was once called imperial or colonial policy, then big stick policy, later containment policy, only to assume in present conditions the name of global strategy, when talking in a businesslike manner, and that of defence of the free world, when talking for propaganda purposes. Foreign military bases today embrace a large part of the world. Even a superficial look at their location will show that they are being established mostly in a vast arch encircling the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They have become the backbone and the infrastructure of the policy from the position of strength. These facts are well known, but one could well quote the words of the Secretary-General's report on the implications of the possible use of nuclear weapons, that the meaning of these facts "has all but been lost through repetition" [A/6858 and Corr.1, para. 2]. Repeat it we must, however, in a debate on the ways to achieve disarmament and through it, peaceful relations among States.

40. Now, bases are most common in dependent Territories, and I am using that term within the meaning of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter. In a way, this fact is both understandable and inexcusable. It is understandable, firstly, because the will of the administering Powers may best be imposed upon peoples in dependent Territories. Experience has shown, and unfortunately continues to show, that in spite of the Charter and, in particular, its Articles 73 and 76, such a situation still prevails. Secondly, dependent Territories are more remote—very often in the proper geographical sense of the word; always within the political meaning of the word. It is easier for the administering Power to keep control over dependent peoples since public opinion, as well as, to a great extent, the United Nations, is not appropriately informed about developments in dependent Territories. Finally, dependent

Territories very often afford a convenient geographical location in the sense of present-day global strategy.

41. Being, from the point of view of the administering Power, understandable, the policy of turning dependent Territories into military bases is all the more inexcusable because, first, it is contrary to Chapters XI and XII of the Charter and, in particular, to Articles 73 and 76. It is contrary to resolution 1514 (XV)—the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It is in direct contravention of resolutions 2105 (XX) and 2158 (XXI), which specifically forbid the establishment of military bases in dependent Territories and specifically demand that such bases be dismantled.

42. Again, apart from legal reasons, the political argument is very strong indeed. Dependent peoples are, first of all, peoples, besides being dependent. They have the same right to independence as have all others. The status of dependence is a provisional one which, according to resolution 1514 (XV), should be terminated immediately. In no case can the state of dependence be taken advantage of in order to enforce military policies about which such peoples have not been consulted and to which they have not agreed.

43. One cannot overlook, either, the inexcusable practice of dividing, mutilating and carving up dependent territories for the purpose of establishing bases there. The most recent example of that practice, which is fundamentally contradictory to the Charter and to resolutions 1514 (XV), paragraph 6, 2158 (XXI) and 2232 (XXI), is the creation of the so-called British Indian Ocean Territory for the purpose of establishing Anglo-American bases.

44. Again, there are economic reasons for which the policy of establishing military bases in dependent Territories is inexcusable. History and experience show that wherever a military base has been established by the administering Power the whole economy of the Territory is geared to the needs of the base. Agriculture and industry are developed to the extent, and only to the extent, determined by the needs of the base. Infrastructure is subordinated to those same needs. The whole economic life of the Territory may thus be distorted at the expense of the only valid criterion from the Territory's point of view—balanced over-all development. And this fact has an essential meaning for the Territory once it becomes independent. Such a newly independent State is faced with the dilemma of either maintaining the base, with its continuing inherent menace to the newly won independence, or starting its independent life in the conditions of a distorted economy whose former nerve centre, the military base, has been cut out. I was much impressed by a statement made in the Fourth Committee some time ago by the representative of Tunisia with regard to Bizerta. Will not the situation be the same, for example, in the case of Aden?

45. Finally, the maintenance of these bases is inexcusable from the point of view of the danger which they may and do present to international peace and security. The dependent Territory of Guam has been and continues to be one of the main bases for pursuing American aggression against the people of Viet-Nam. Ascension Island is still closely associated in our minds with the tripartite aggression against the former



Stanleyville. The Portuguese colonies serve as bases from which aggression is being perpetrated against the Democratic Republic of the Congo in particular. More examples could be quoted. The three I have advanced amply demonstrate our point.

46. Bases are also maintained and developed in independent countries. One may say that it is a question of the sovereign decision of a given country's Government. We do not argue against that whenever it is a sovereign decision. Nevertheless, a discussion of the effects of such bases is revealing. Since the problem is inscribed on our agenda, it is also in order.

47. There is first the element of the cause which the base is serving. Independent of the reasons given for the creation and maintenance of that base—and that is, of course, an element of subjective interpretation—there is also the objective ground of the role played by the base. On that ground nobody can maintain, for example, that the United States military bases in Thailand serve either the cause of peace and disarmament or that of self-determination and the freedom of peoples. The same can be said of South Korea and South Viet-Nam, although I would strongly suggest, of course, that those two countries should be placed in the category of dependent Territories, not within the meaning of Chapters XI and XII of the Charter but within the meaning of Territories whose Governments are actually entirely dependent on the United States.

48. The true meaning of foreign military bases must be judged not on the elaborate salesmanship of the aggressive Powers which maintain and develop them but on their factual role. Foreign military bases in a given country have primarily a regional role to play within the global strategy of the Power establishing them. For instance, United States military bases, from Guam and Okinawa to South Viet-Nam and Thailand, are used primarily to suppress the struggle of the Viet-Nameese people for national liberation. In the process they are a source and means of wilful infringement of the sovereignty of independent countries, such as Laos and Cambodia. Therefore such bases constitute the infrastructure of aggression in the given region, of intervention in the internal affairs of the peoples of that region. Their role, therefore, is dangerous and unacceptable in itself. Furthermore, it has its own mechanism of escalation, from over-flying the territories of foreign countries all the way up to the elaboration and implementation of the theory of hot pursuit. We do not need to recall here the recent words of General Eisenhower concerning the necessity for putting that latter theory into practice. What we cannot overlook, however, are the effects of the realization of that theory. Non-existent concentrations of enemy troops on the territory of a third country are conveniently invented when that country happens to follow a policy not to the liking of the Power possessing the bases. Immediately upon that, the theory of hot pursuit is invoked for launching actions which are nothing less than aggression against that State—military pressure to force it to bow to the will and interests of the Power possessing bases. A case providing the most vivid illustration of the application of that mechanism of escalation is the situation as regards Cambodia.

49. The use of such foreign military bases is usually connected with the violation of a number of funda-

mental principles of international law and of international instruments in force. The latest aggression against the Democratic Republic of the Congo is, of course, a violation of the basic right of peoples to sovereignty and independence. The use of the United States military bases in Thailand for the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the military action in Laos is in direct contradiction with the Geneva Agreements of 1956 as well as of the Geneva Agreement on Laos of 1962, in particular with article 1, paragraphs (g) and (i) of the latter Agreement.

50. The effects of the presence of foreign military bases upon the international status of the country where such bases are situated are obvious in many aspects. Connivance in the violation of international agreements is one such aspect. The case of Okinawa demonstrates that the need for bases has a direct influence on the political status of that island. Even in the case of the Treaty of Tlatelolco on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the questions of United States bases and of the transit of nuclear weapons have adversely affected the importance of the Treaty.

51. Of no less importance are the effects of foreign military bases upon the internal situation of a given independent country. One problem must be separated from that category, in view of its special inadmissibility and danger, and that is the problem of Guantanamo. That is a pure example of aggression against a sovereign country, contrary to each and every rule of international law.

52. Under this heading there are a number of important factors involved. One is the influence upon the development of the political situation in the given country. In this connexion South Korea and South Viet-Nam are indeed typical examples. The presence of United States military bases in South Viet-Nam has led to the actual governing of the country by the United States military authorities, with South Viet-Nameese Governments changing with kaleidoscopic rapidity, acting by proxy.

53. In our statement, we have made what we consider to be an objective analysis of the effects of the existence of military bases on foreign soil upon the problem of disarmament and the international situation. Everything in that analysis points to the definitely harmful character of those bases as the forward aggressive component of the policy of "the position of strength". Consequently everything points to the necessity for their elimination if we are to serve the cause of disarmament and international peace and security.

54. With your permission, Sir, I should like to make a brief remark on the subject of the proposals put before this Committee concerning chemical and bacteriological warfare.

55. The Polish delegation is of the opinion that the positive decision taken last year by the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Hungarian delegation, which found its expression in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2162 (XXI), has proved to have been both timely and of the utmost importance. Its positive influence may be illustrated by the fact that, during the period which has elapsed between the pass-

ing of that resolution and our debate today, about ten countries have deposited their instruments of accession to the Geneva Protocol. It has also been proved, perhaps more clearly than in the past, that, approaching the problem in general terms, the Geneva Protocol has demonstrated its full validity.

56. Is it not a fact that the massive use of the weapons precisely proscribed by that Protocol has been resorted to in Viet-Nam by the United States—a Power which has so far refused to accede to that international agreement of primary humanitarian importance? Is it not a fact that none of the parties to the Protocol has ever resorted to the use of prohibited weapons of mass destruction? In those circumstances any attempt to suggest that the Geneva Protocol is of no value today clearly ignores the facts of life and, what is more important, constitutes highly dangerous propaganda.

57. That was obviously the approach of such countries as Cyprus, Sierra Leone, the Maldive Islands, Niger, Ghana, Tunisia and Madagascar, which have followed the appeal of the General Assembly in resolution 2162 (XXI) and acceded to the Geneva Protocol. Such was also the approach of the Vatican, which has now been contested by the representative of Malta,

who devoted his elaborate intervention to undermining the essence of the resolution of last year and the usefulness of the Geneva Protocol.

58. Should we not here rally all our efforts in order to make certain that no country is allowed to stay outside the Protocol and disregard its provisions? The draft resolution submitted by the Hungarian delegation [A/C.1/L.412] serves that end, and that is why the Polish delegation gives it its full support. That is also why we consider the draft resolution presented by Malta [A/C.1/L.411], to be harmful to that cause and extremely dangerous. The Polish delegation will therefore vote against that resolution.

59. The CHAIRMAN: I have no further names on my list of speakers for this afternoon.

60. I would remind the Committee that tomorrow we shall have three meetings. I hope that we shall be able to complete the list of speakers on the three items under discussion and that if we are able, even, to take some of the speakers on item 28, in accordance with the desire previously expressed; I hope they will be ready to speak tomorrow.

*The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.*