

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1832nd
MEETING

Friday, 19 November 1971,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 98 (continued):	
General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency	
Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2666 (XXV) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General	
Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security: report of the Secretary-General	
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace	
General debate (continued)	1

Chairman: Mr. Milko TARABANOV (Bulgaria).

AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 32 AND 98
(continued)

- General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8328, A/8337, A/8457, A/C.1/1018)
- Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8457, A/C.1/L.578 to 582)
- Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8457)
- Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency
- Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2666 (XXV) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (A/8336/Rev.1, A/8346, A/8435)

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security: report of the Secretary-General (A/8469 and Add.1)

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace
(A/8492 and Add.1)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. ELLEIH ELLE (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): The debate going on since 12 November concerns agenda items which, if obviously interconnected—as indeed they may be connected with so many other agenda items—taken individually, nevertheless retain a certain specific character enabling each delegation either to approach them in their totality or to examine them one by one, or else to specifically express its interest only in some of them. The Cameroonian delegation will adopt the latter approach, not because in so doing we seek in any way to minimize the importance of those items on which we shall not dwell, but simply because Cameroon—a developing country, a peaceful country—cherishes peace above all: that profound, lasting, organized and final peace of which Jean Jaurès spoke, a peace that means the absence of war, the end of all armed conflict, but above all a peace founded on well-being, in the most comprehensive meaning of that word. My statement therefore will concern primarily the items on general and complete disarmament and on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security.

2. To begin with, permit me to express to the Secretary-General—whom we wish a speedy recovery—the great interest of the Cameroon Government in his report on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race [A/8469 and Add.1], which we hope will be carefully examined by all Members of our Organization. I should like to convey to him and to the expert consultants who assisted him the congratulations of the Cameroon delegation for the work they have done so well.

3. Peace is without any doubt the supreme good to which we all, in isolation or collectively, great or small, aspire. Ever since Cain had the idea and took it into his head to pick up a club to do away with his brother Abel, the descendants of Adam, which we are supposed to be, have certainly lost their most precious possession. Ever since then, in imitation, individuals and communities have invented all kinds of objects to kill and annihilate each other. Man, then, is the author of this absurd logic whereby in order to defend himself against possible attack by another man, he must arm himself against all men.

4. Thus the world has so far found itself involved in the unhappy doctrine of the force of deterrence and its result, the balance of terror. But the tragedy did not end there. To what did it lead? If the two great super-Powers have succeeded in frightening the world, have they not finally in fact ended up by being frightened themselves?

5. The report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race states that some years ago the accumulated power of destruction in the world—which has obviously increased astronomically since nuclear weapons came into being—was equivalent to about 15 tons of TNT for every inhabitant on the planet. In other words, today for each of us, whether he be of Cameroonian, American, Chinese, Russian, French, British or any other nationality—provided he be on the earth—there are at least 15 tons of TNT ready to destroy him. So that in any war between the super-Powers of the day, once they bring into play the enormous resources and destructive techniques of mass destruction that they have persisted in accumulating, the result would be the total annihilation of all life on our planet—the end of Washington, Moscow, France and China; even Africa would disappear, nothing would be left. Is that security?

6. We should thank God that each and every one of us, beginning with the younger generation which wants only to live a little on this human earth, has been able to perceive the monstrosity of this macabre evidence.

7. Ever since the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water¹—to which, unfortunately, not all have adhered—right up to the talks at present going on between Moscow and Washington, we get the impression that wisdom is timidly but irreversibly taking the place of recklessness. That is a step in the right direction.

8. The restoration to the People's Republic of China of its lawful rights in the United Nations and the growing role which, by that very fact, it will henceforth play in the search for international peace and security by taking its place among the other great Powers gives ground for legitimate hope. It is an exceptional occasion, that of the great China, older than history, yesterday regarded as a rival, today as an equal partner in prestige, dignity and honour, participating in the name of its valiant people of over 700 million in the great gathering for peace, security and well-being. My Chinese brothers, Cameroon salutes you. On behalf of our country I welcome you in our Committee.

9. But our hopes are for a world absolutely and finally peaceful; a world where tolerance reigns; a world where war is outlawed. To achieve this, Cameroon has always advocated true disarmament. We must begin by destroying what already exists, which constitutes a permanent threat. We have to achieve complete and controlled disarmament, leading to peace. If this were not achieved what would happen? What would happen is what we are witnessing now.

10. First of all, with regard to the great Powers, the report of the Secretary-General says that the efforts to improve

the quality of arms, or to plan defensive systems, follow a certain logic: invention of a new weapon or a new system of armaments, a counter-weapon and then a counter-counter-weapon. But—and I quote paragraph 11 of the report: “these steps neither usually nor necessarily occur in a rational time sequence. The people who design improvements in weapons are themselves the ones who as a rule envisage the further steps they feel should be taken. They do not wait for a potential enemy to react before they react against their own creations.” What dangerous verbal acrobatics, what expensive frivolity, what puerile vanity, when we know that it is highly improbable that the arms manufactured and improved in this way would ever actually be used as weapons on a battlefield in circumstances of an actual war; or, even supposing they were, they would be far from conferring the least advantage on either side in the combat zone; all it would do would be to lead to a general holocaust, involving the whole of mankind.

11. But that wild venture does not stop there. The great Powers establish military alliances and military bases throughout the world, which constitute a grave threat to peace.

12. They—at least some of them—agree to stopping nuclear testing in outer space, on earth and in the sea, but they continue with underground testing. What we want is the final end of all kinds of nuclear testing for military purposes, wherever they may be, including that in outer space.

13. What is even worse is that, in spite of all the resolutions adopted by our Organization, some Powers continue to provide arms to South Africa and Portugal—Portugal, that ancient Power which is today one of the most under-developed countries of the world; they are providing it with arms to kill the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea—whether they be those of Guinea (Bissau) or Conakry—and even Senegalese and Congolese; whereas, if they really wanted to help that poor country, they would do much better to assist it in developing its agriculture and building roads; in other words, aid its development. But instead of that those Powers prefer, in the name of political affinities or economic and military alliances, to provide arms to Portugal and South Africa.

14. So the independent countries of Africa that have to face up to the arrogance of South Africa and Portugal, as well as to safeguard their national independence and to protect themselves from international subversion, are in their turn obliged to arm. Furthermore, although for more than 25 years there has been no war in Europe, in North America or on Soviet territory, it is in the countries of the third world that there are wars every day—civil wars, rebellions, liberation wars, and so on. It is thus precisely the countries of the third world which have good reason to arm. However, paragraph 31 of the report of the Secretary-General brings out quite clearly that “With nearly half of the world's population, they account for only about 6 per cent of world military spending, and their influence on the world trend in expenditure, and on the technological arms race, is consequently minimal”.

15. On the other hand, the great Powers seem to have devoted to military expenditures—and I am still quoting the

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964.

report—sums equivalent to about \$1,870,000 million for the period 1961 to 1970. This is a sum more than two and a half times higher than that devoted by all Governments to health and education, a sum equivalent to 30 times—I repeat, 30 times—the official economic assistance provided by developed countries to developing countries, a sum equivalent to the gross national product of the United Kingdom and Italy together, or that of all the underdeveloped countries of South Asia, the Far East and Africa.

16. When it is realized that, as is pointed out in the report, most of these countries have to face up to such difficult problems as those of housing, full employment, agriculture, education, and others which I will not mention, and when one sees so much money being wasted and so much scientific expertise being mobilized to prepare for suicide—which, I stress once again, no one wants—how can one prevent oneself from asking certain questions? When one notes that quite deliberately these countries do not provide the same priorities for housing as they do for armaments, they might object by saying that this is their domestic business, their internal affair. But we are directly concerned, when we think of the sums wasted in this way which could have helped the development of our countries.

17. To this effect my delegation has become a sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.577 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This draft resolution, which we hope will receive the unanimous support of our Committee, in its paragraph 6:

“Urges the implementation of the resolutions contained in the Declaration on the United Nations Second Development Decade, in which the need was clearly established for a general and complete disarmament, in order to facilitate the redirection of resources employed in the production of armaments towards the social and economic development of countries, especially the developing ones.”²

18. The General Assembly has laid down targets for the total contribution of capital which should reach 1 per cent of the gross national product of the developed countries by 1975 and for the total of public assistance for development which should reach 0.7 per cent of the gross national product. The report of the Secretary-General states in paragraph 107 that it would be enough to reassign to development only 5 per cent of the present expenditure on arms to approach the objectives laid down and it adds:

“The volume of fixed investment in the developing countries is estimated to have been around \$65 billion in 1969. A shift of 10 per cent from world military expenditure to investment would provide enough resources to raise the figure by almost a third.”

19. Hence, it will be easily understood how concerned my country is about the problems of disarmament.

20. It appears quite clearly that one of the main consequences of the arms race and military expenditures has

been a lowering of the order of priority formerly accorded to assistance to developing countries. Of course, countries have understood—at least we hope so—that justice, peace and international security as well as the economic interest of all parties concerned, properly understood, militate in favour of an increase in international co-operation, but alas, action has not always matched their conviction.

21. When countries devote such a large proportion of their resources to preparations for war, the suspicions and tensions which flow from that tend to dominate all their relations. This situation paralyses co-operation and prevents countries from concerting their efforts to deal with the problem of development at the necessary level.

22. The wish of my delegation is that disarmament should lead to an increase in assistance for development and I know that is a wish very largely shared. But if some still harbour some doubts about the possibility or effectiveness of such a reassignment, I would refer them simply to the report of the Secretary-General, which I was tempted to quote in its entirety. However, permit me to conclude my statement by quoting just one sufficiently eloquent passage from paragraph 105 which may give food for thought:

“As already noted, total world military expenditures are some 30 times the level of official development assistance, which now adds up to some \$7 billion. The sum has fallen steadily throughout the 1960s not only in relation to the gross national product of the donor countries, but also to that of the developing countries; in 1970 such assistance was equivalent to only one third of 1 per cent of the combined GNP of the donor countries. Official aid now contributes resources equivalent to 10 per cent of investment in developing countries, but this falls far short of United Nations objectives . . . A slowing of the arms race would make more such funds available to this end . . .”

I repeat and stress: “a slowing of the arms race would make more such funds available to this end”—in other words, for purposes of development. I think we should reflect for a moment on this conclusion so that by putting it into practice, all together, we can contribute to the building of a better world so that, all together, we may be able to write one of the most beautiful pages in our history, the page of international co-operation.

23. Mr. KÖMIVES (Hungary): The circumstances in which our Committee at the present session of the General Assembly has opened the general debate on the questions of disarmament and is considering the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8457] are in our opinion more favourable, though no less complicated, than last year.

24. The fact is that the international situation is still overshadowed by numerous unsolved questions and that there is a continuance of the arms race, the heavy burdens of which are outlined in the valuable report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security [A/8469 and Add.1].

25. At the same time, first of all in Europe and thanks to the efforts of the socialist countries, there have been

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 34, document A/8626, para. 11.

strengthening tendencies towards better prospects for European peace and security. I wish to refer in this connexion to the treaties between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany and between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany as well as to the Four-Power Agreement on West Berlin.

26. The Hungarian delegation believes that the conditions for the multilateral preparation and subsequent convening of a European conference on security and co-operation are becoming ever riper. Such a conference could institute a European security system, as well as co-operation among the countries of Europe, furnishing thereby a realistic basis for the reduction of armed forces and various disarmament measures.

27. We regard as a positive factor of the favourable development of general international conditions the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, which enables all of the nuclear Powers to participate in the Organization. I should like to take this opportunity of extending my greetings to the delegation of the People's Republic of China in this Committee and to express the hope that the People's Republic of China, as one of the five nuclear Powers, will play a constructive part in solving the different problems of disarmament.

28. As regards the various negotiations on disarmament and arms limitation, the Hungarian Government invariably attaches great importance to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the Soviet Union and the United States, since their success is not only in the interest of the two negotiating partners but in the interest of universal peace as well. We value and welcome as an important by-product of those talks, if I may say so, the agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States on measures to prevent the accidental outbreak of nuclear war on the one hand, and on the improvement of the "hot line" on the other.

29. The Hungarian delegation, as its chairman stated in the General Assembly, welcomes the Soviet proposal for the convening of a world disarmament conference, for it regards this proposal as extremely important, fully necessary and very timely. Such a conference would be worthy of the Disarmament Decade by giving new impetus to the various efforts towards disarmament.

30. Considering the positive developments in Europe, the numerous disarmament proposals made by the Soviet Union, and the participation of all nuclear Powers in the discussion of disarmament questions in the United Nations, may I express the belief of the Hungarian delegation that good possibilities exist now for opening a new period of disarmament negotiations which might lead to important results on both the global and the regional level, as well as in the field of nuclear and non-nuclear disarmament.

31. The report of the Conference is a true reflection of the significant and successful work done by the Committee on Disarmament this year. My delegation notes with satisfaction that the Committee was able to elaborate and to submit to the General Assembly a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling

of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [*A/8457, annex A*].

32. The draft convention in question is the most important result of this year's work of the Committee on Disarmament. After working out, with success, the draft treaty concerning the sea-bed, the Conference concentrated its attention on the problem of the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons. At that time, however, circumstances well known to members of this Committee did not make it possible, regrettably, to include in a single draft convention provisions for the prohibition and destruction of these two types of weapons. Then a new initiative of socialist countries of the Committee, regarding the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and their destruction, opened a way out of an almost hopeless situation. The draft prepared by socialist countries served as a basis for further discussion. Finally, thanks to joint and mutual efforts, the talks resulted in the preparation of the draft convention included in annex A to the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

33. The main features and characteristics of the draft convention were amply outlined by the two Co-Chairmen of the Conference and by the representative of Poland. That is why I should like to add only a few words concerning the verification procedures of the draft convention. With regard to those procedures, the draft convention combines national and international measures, which is in full conformity with the provision of General Assembly resolution 2662 (XXV), though only for bacteriological (biological) weapons. The resolution underlines that: "verification should be based on a combination of appropriate national and international measures, which would complement and supplement each other, thereby providing an acceptable system that would ensure the effective implementation of the prohibition". In this connexion I should like to remind the Committee of the draft Security Council resolution submitted by Mongolia, Poland and Hungary [*ibid.*, annex C, sect. 2], according to which the Security Council would confirm its preparedness to consider and to act on possible complaints.

34. The Hungarian delegation, which from the very beginning has taken an active part in the struggle for the prohibition and destruction of chemical and bacteriological weapons, regards the draft convention as an important result. With the entry into force of this convention, one of the most dreadful weapons of mass destruction will be eliminated from the military arsenals. We think this convention is an important step towards the earliest possible elaboration of a treaty on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. The convention itself also makes this a duty of the contracting parties. It contains provisions according to which each State party to the convention undertakes to continue negotiations in good faith with a view to reaching early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction.

35. As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.579, I wish to express the hope that the Committee will adopt it unanimously and endorse the draft convention prepared by the Committee

on Disarmament, and that, accordingly, it will soon be open for signature.

36. The elaboration of the draft convention on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction constitutes an important step, but only one step, forward in the field of the elimination of the so-called silent weapons. We still have ahead of us the task of achieving the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, a task to which the Hungarian delegation has attributed great significance from the very beginning.

37. That is why at the present session the Hungarian delegation, together with others, has taken an initiating part in the preparation and presentation of a draft resolution on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. It was as a result of broad consultations that on 16 November 25 Powers, including Hungary, submitted the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.580.

38. I am happy to note that the number of sponsors has been increased to 34 by the addition of the delegations of Costa Rica, Honduras, Iceland, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Malta, Nicaragua and Rwanda. We welcome this as demonstrating the growing interest of and support by the Committee for these draft resolutions.

39. In judging draft resolution A/C.1/L.580, my delegation thinks it is of fundamental importance that it follows the principles and purposes of the Geneva Protocol of 1925³ and takes amply into account the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly earlier in the matter of the prohibition and destruction of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. The draft resolution also takes into account the draft convention, elaborated by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and presented to the General Assembly at this session, on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) weapons and on their destruction, and it lays down that the draft convention "is an important step toward the achievement of early agreement for the effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on the elimination of such weapons from military arsenals of all States". The draft convention confirms that aim, and the States parties to it undertake to continue in good faith the negotiations towards that end. In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly requests the Committee on Disarmament to continue its consideration of the problem of chemical methods of warfare, taking into account in its further work the joint memorandum of the 12 non-aligned States members of the Committee on Disarmament of 28 September 1971 [*ibid.*, sect. 33] and the other relevant proposals, suggestions, working papers and views put forward in that Committee and in the General Assembly. In paragraph 3 the Assembly urges Governments to take all steps to contribute to a successful outcome of the negotiations by the Committee on Disarmament which could facilitate rapid progress towards agree-

ment on effective measures for the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

40. It is important in this connexion, as was pointed out by the representative of Poland at the 1828th meeting of this Committee, that States should refrain from any action which might hamper or retard the achievement of an early agreement.

41. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 declared the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons to be publicly outlawed by the civilized world. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly have appealed to all States that have not yet done so to ratify or to accede to the Protocol and to abide strictly by its principles and objectives. That appeal is now renewed.

42. My delegation believes that the Committee will unanimously support draft resolution A/C.1/L.580, which provides a good basis for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to report on success also in this field at an early date.

43. Coming now to the question of nuclear disarmament, I wish to advance a few considerations on behalf of the Hungarian delegation.

44. At this year's session of the Conference the prohibition of underground nuclear weapon tests was also the focus of attention. Members of the Committee raised a number of issues and made proposals, containing both old and new ideas. I am sorry to state, however, that no progress has been made this year either.

45. The Hungarian delegation firmly believes that, with the present level of scientific and technological progress, we now possess all the ways and means for the satisfactory and reliable system that is necessary in order to verify a ban on underground nuclear weapon tests. Any attempt to make the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty in any way subject to on-site inspection is nothing but a pretence to cover the lack of political willingness to stop underground tests.

46. The readiness of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to take a positive step even before the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty was clearly shown during the last session of the General Assembly, when we adopted resolution 2663 B (XXV), which called upon all nuclear weapon States to suspend nuclear weapon tests in all environments.

47. My delegation is of the view that it is of the utmost importance that the results so far attained in the limitation of the armament race should be made universal by urging all States that have not yet done so to adhere to, or ratify, the Moscow partial test ban Treaty,⁴ the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] and the sea-bed Treaty.⁵ I firmly

⁴ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

⁵ Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (resolution 2660 (XXV), annex).

³ Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV, 1929, No. 2138).

hope that the successful elaboration of the safeguards system relating to the non-proliferation Treaty will prompt those States which have made this step subject to the existence of an appropriate safeguards system to sign or ratify it.

48. In connexion with the non-proliferation Treaty, we are glad to note that Austria, Finland, Poland and Uruguay have already concluded safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). I have the honour to inform the Committee that the Hungarian People's Republic, which was among the first to sign and to ratify the non-proliferation Treaty, was the fifth State to initial, in Vienna on 11 November last, the safeguards agreement between Hungary and the IAEA.

49. Fast progress in respect of the conclusion of safeguards agreements between the States parties to the non-proliferation Treaty and the IAEA is all the more important since the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy is coming more and more to the foreground, as was convincingly shown by the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva in September 1971.

50. In the interest of the limitation of the nuclear arms race and with a view to reducing the danger of nuclear war, the Hungarian delegation continues to attach great importance to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world. In this connexion my delegation listened with the greatest interest at the 1830th meeting to the statement of the representative of Finland who outlined the Kekkonen plan of 1963 aimed at the creation of a nuclear-free zone consisting of the Nordic countries of Europe. We have always regarded this idea as a valuable initiative for strengthening security and reducing tension in Europe.

51. Last but not least, the Hungarian delegation considers it extremely important and opportune to conclude an international convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. I refer in this connexion to General Assembly resolution 1653 (XVI), which contains a declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. As the Hungarian delegation has repeatedly urged here in the United Nations and in the Committee on Disarmament, the principles laid down in that declaration should be embodied without any further delay in an international instrument.

52. The conclusion of such a treaty would demonstrate the determination of the world community, and first of all the nuclear Powers, to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear disaster. It would pave the way for the elimination of all means of nuclear warfare and greatly promote the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; and it would release tremendous resources, by stopping the nuclear arms race, for the purposes of development. The draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, submitted by the Soviet Union at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly,⁶ could serve as a good basis for the practical elaboration of such an international treaty.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 96, document A/6834.

Finally, the conclusion of a treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons would to a considerable extent facilitate negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

53. In connexion with disarmament and disarmament talks, I should like to touch upon some questions which in our view are not only important but also very timely.

54. Experience so far has shown that progress on the road towards disarmament is a historical process. Its rate and pace are dependent on the development of the international situation. Even the best programme of disarmament remains a dead letter unless the improvement of the international situation, the lessening of tension and consequently the growth of confidence provide an adequate basis for further measures of disarmament and arms limitation. It follows from this that those who want to advance in the field of disarmament must at the same time do their utmost to do away with the causes of international tension and, conversely, every given step taken towards disarmament can contribute to the further lessening of international tension.

55. The tasks of disarmament lying before us require the participation and the efforts of all States, Members or non-Members of the United Nations. May I draw the attention of the Committee in this connexion to the statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the agenda item regarding international security:

"With its policy the Government of the German Democratic Republic supports the appeal contained in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security to increase the efforts aimed at restricting and halting the arms race. Its preparedness to act accordingly is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the German Democratic Republic has signed and ratified all treaties on questions of arms limitation and that it pays utmost attention to the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and other competent bodies. The German Democratic Republic supports the comprehensive programme of action of the USSR for arms limitation and disarmament which is above all aimed at nuclear disarmament of all States possessing nuclear weapons, at the reduction of foreign and national military forces and arms in areas where military confrontations are of particular danger, especially in Central Europe, and at general and complete disarmament." [A/C.1/1015.]

May I add that the statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the questions of disarmament and arms limitation which was published yesterday is contained in document A/C.1/1018.

56. That is one of the reasons why my delegation supports the proposal for the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States.

57. At the same time we are firmly convinced that measures of general and complete disarmament, taken in the true sense of the word, can be suitably handled and effectively implemented only with the participation of all the nuclear Powers. Also for this reason in the field of nuclear disarmament it would be desirable to implement the Soviet proposal for a conference of the five nuclear

Powers [A/8328] in the interests of promoting nuclear disarmament.

58. Every partial measure taken at any stage on the road towards general and complete disarmament as its final aim should be so designed that not a single State or group of States might turn it to its military advantage, so that security might be equally ensured to all.

59. The history of the disarmament talks is at the same time the history of the forms and framework of various stages of disarmament negotiations. In the period following the Second World War these have been very flexible and manifold, beginning in 1946 with the Atomic Energy Commission, through the Commission for Conventional Armaments and other bodies, up to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. The whole picture of course was much wider, but we do not mention the different bilateral and multilateral negotiations and top-level meetings in which the question of disarmament has always occupied a foremost place. This diversity of disarmament negotiations, forums and framework continues to exist even today. We think that this is quite natural since the different forums and framework are not contradictory but complement one another.

60. The greatest attention and interest have been attracted by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and then by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which have really deserved this attention and interest. No other disarmament forum has achieved so much success—modest as it is—in its work as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Under general international conditions the Committee on Disarmament has been able to attain important results because it has not been too large, while being duly representative under the given circumstances for the purpose of effective disarmament negotiations and the elaboration of conventions.

61. Relying on its own experience, the Hungarian delegation evaluates positively the work of the Conference and believes it is important and necessary that the Committee should continue and strengthen its activities. The participation of all nuclear weapon States in its work in a manner satisfactory to the States concerned could only improve the possibilities of still speedier advances in the field of disarmament, because the Committee would retain, and even increase, its negotiating capability while strengthening its representative character.

62. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce that Iran has been added to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.579; New Zealand has been added to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.580; and Guyana has been added to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.581.

63. Mr. BLANCO (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia wishes, very briefly but forcefully, to submit some opinions on this important question of disarmament which year after year, in regular and special sessions, has been considered by the United Nations and other international bodies which find that an essential basis for peace and security is the search for an agreement which will meet this obvious aspiration of mankind.

64. A great deal has been said, tons of paper have been printed and hundreds of speeches have been made on this subject on which opinions converge in all areas of the world; apparently we are all anxious to reach agreement on satisfactory procedures. It can be said that on disarmament, which is a very complex and difficult subject, there exists virtually spontaneous agreement on exactly what the word implies. But there has been a lack of agreement on the ways and means of putting it into practice, in accordance with rules that are reliable and can be respected. Lack of confidence, malice and extreme shrewdness have created obstacles and have kept the entire subject in the realm of the impossible. Of course no one comes out and advocates an arms race and, depending on circumstances, every one at one time or another espouses the cause of disarmament. Beginning with the major Powers, each and every one of them, alternately and frequently, wishes to appear as a sincere advocate—although, simultaneously, it is full steam ahead in the arms factories. This is really one of the most difficult issues on which the hopes and expectations of international opinion are focused.

65. Of course it is very easy to understand that a sound disarmament policy can be achieved only by a vigorous and honest policy of sincerity and good faith. Real disarmament can be achieved only by the gradual accumulation and stockpiling of moral principles beyond suspicion which will ensure compliance with promises, agreements and even good intentions which have not yet led to written covenants. All this should be done as a tribute of love and consideration to mankind. Here, in this very room, on a recent occasion we heard the greatest possible authority on the subject, speaking about the smallness and fragility of our planet compared with the infinite space surrounding us, and this unique spectacle encourages the great idea of peace and coexistence, which can be possible only if there is an honest attempt to bring about disarmament among brothers.

66. Everyone agrees that any effort to combat underdevelopment and poverty must be accompanied by a campaign against the arms race. The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization, correctly stated:

“If the world is to survive and to prosper, progress must be made during the 1970s in both disarmament and development. Both the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade have related objectives; progress in each of them will have a beneficial effect on the other and will facilitate the establishment of conditions of peace, justice and progress in the world. Because of the central importance of questions of armaments, disarmament and development to international peace and security, I would recommend that a study on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures be undertaken, with the assistance of consultant experts, every three years. Such periodic studies could provide current information and a study of the trends, and help to bring about a fuller understanding of the harmful effects of the arms race and the need, and perhaps also of the modalities, of converting the arms race into a peace race.”⁷

⁷ *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 50.

To think that this moving warning, which is perfectly valid, is in a report which, a few paragraphs before, states:

“Not only have the nations of the world failed to halt or slow down the arms race—particularly the nuclear arms race—but they have escalated this disastrous course at a greater rate and to a higher level than ever before in history. During this period, world military expenditures have increased from \$120,000 million to over \$200,000 million per year. Each of the two nuclear super-Powers has at its disposal sufficient nuclear ‘overkill’ to destroy each other and the world many times over. They are still engaged in testing and producing nuclear weapons and in testing and deploying more sophisticated delivery systems.”⁸

67. To brighten this sombre picture a little, fortunately what has been accomplished by the Disarmament Committee can be considered very important and whatever progress is made in the immediate future will be especially important. Any effort made by nations individually and by the Organization in general to encourage agreement in that Committee will therefore be most welcome, including the adoption of measures specifically recommended by U Thant. The technological and political complexity of the issue, which is so frequently referred to, must not continue to stand in the way of agreement, because in the shadow of this complexity a smokescreen has been created which is favourable to those who wish to maintain distrust and encourage it and use it to further their all too obvious ends. A disarmament policy must not be just a policy to use as a mere humanitarian veneer. This policy must be a sincere and realistic desire of a lofty and urgent nature. This is the desire of the whole world, particularly that of the dozens of developing countries which see in the astronomical sums invested in armaments the disappearance of their chances and hopes for progress.

68. Whenever a reference is made to the arms race, how can we fail to look towards the countries of Latin America, the economic victims of this process? Is it not true that their economic stagnation is related to the terrifying figures mentioned by the Secretary-General and, to put it quite bluntly, that their status as customers of the purveyors of weapons has made these countries the real victims of the production of weapons? It is precisely for this reason that there has been in Latin America a tradition of rejecting the arms race and its disastrous consequences. The Organization of American States has deliberated at least eight times on the limitation of armaments, beginning in 1923 at the Fifth International American Conference in Santiago de Chile. At the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace held at Buenos Aires in 1936, resolution XXXIII was adopted on the limitation of armaments, and the subject was debated at the Fifth Meeting of the Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, 1959, in Santiago de Chile. There is also the Declaration of American Chiefs of State, signed at their meeting at Punta del Este in 1967, expressing the intention to restrict military expenses in an attempt to apply all resources to progress and social development, thereby making progress in a clear-cut direction—the only direction that can make the kind of progress desired, as was stated in the General Assembly of the

Organization of American States in San José, Costa Rica, in April 1971. Resolution 26 was adopted there, and it leads clearly to an anti-armaments policy, a policy that will encourage all those devoted to the study and adoption of the universal principles which we are proclaiming here.

69. As regards in particular Colombia, whose respect for law and order has been one of its finest and most widely recognized traditions, an anti-armaments policy has been espoused as our own cause, and we have never hesitated to set forth our views and our irrevocable convictions whenever necessary. It is therefore only fitting for our delegation to refer here to a statement recently made in San José, Costa Rica, by our Foreign Minister, Dr. Alfredo Vásquez Carrizosa:

“Together with the exigencies of under-development there is also the problem of the arms race in the poor countries, which is one of the paradoxes of our time. Latin America is still a poor customer of the purveyors of conventional and more sophisticated weapons. In varying degrees, we all face the need to improve outmoded or obsolete equipment, some of which was manufactured before the Second World War, and in the same way we must deal with internal situations which require constant attention in countries which do not have easy means of communication. Colombia can say that a country of 21 million inhabitants, with many large cities scattered throughout our territory or more than 1 million square kilometers, annually invests in arms and armed forces less than what the operations for one day cost in Viet-Nam, or much less than countries which are smaller, such as the Netherlands and Switzerland, which are considered to be among the most peace-loving in the world.

“No Colombian Government thus far has pursued an arms build-up to an excessive extent. We have tried to settle our occasional and temporary differences through the proper channels of law. We waited for more than a century for our border disputes with other Governments to be settled because the Governments of the parties concerned wished to exhaust all resources of international law. Our love of our own country, our nationalism, has never been confused with hostility towards other countries and our armed forces are the first to maintain law and order and a democratic adherence to our Constitution.

“This justifies our coming out against unnecessary military expenditures. Latin America is involved in the arms race and the dilemma facing the poor countries is to limit their development programmes or be at a disadvantage as regards national defense. The register for arms expenditures for 1971 shows to what extent some areas of the world invest exaggerated amounts in arms compared to the economic capacity of the under-developed countries, which are not even able to feed their poor masses. There are some countries which in recent years have received military assistance exceeding \$4,000 million, which would be enough to solve all the development problems of an entire continent.

“America must now ensure that this phenomenon does not take place in our continent. If we spend more on arms there is no doubt that our economic and social

⁸ *Ibid.*, para. 42.

development will suffer in a way which we all wish to avoid.

"The phenomenon of other countries is that under the weight of great expenditures on arms the system of collective security may fail. Solutions then are sought through the use of force. There are some nations, like Viet-Nam, which have not known peace for the past 30 years. Some nations maintain in Asia a state of permanent hostility towards their neighbours. Other countries, after scaling the arms pyramid, find that they are interminably competing with their rivals to build up arms of equal size.

"Great progress was made in Latin America when in 1967, on the initiative of Mexico, we signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which banned atomic weapons from our part of the world, and we feel that we should be careful at this point in our history not to follow the example of other continents. The danger today is that the arms race may spread throughout the world, regardless of inter-American treaties, merely because of one's desire to imitate the action of others.

"But Latin America can set an example for the entire world, because it is a continent which is organized for the purpose of peace."

70. Everything indicates that disarmament is the fundamental preoccupation of any meeting anxious to serve mankind in its desire to improve. In very large areas of the world the clamour has gone out for disarmament—and this is a historic commitment for the sake of future generations.

71. Of course, a great deal has been done in this first Disarmament Decade, and we owe a great deal to the Disarmament Committee which with goodwill and hard work produced a comprehensive and thorough report which we have before us at this twenty-sixth session [A/8457]. It can be said that no stone has been left unturned in an attempt to create legislation covering the complexity of the issue, reducing at the same time seeming or real tension which exists between the parties. Many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly—and principally those which were drafted at the twenty-fifth anniversary session—have said that it will not be possible to reduce efforts or waste time, that this undertaking must be pursued ever more vigorously, for the world has its eyes on us in this undertaking which in fact is the legitimate defence of our lives.

72. After this first stage which we all wish to conclude with the 1971 report of the Disarmament Committee, which was involved in fruitful studies at all levels, especially in considerations of each kind of armament, it is desirable then that we should now move on to the second stage: concrete achievements and agreements to bring about reductions and complete international control. We all know that matters concerning international life require careful and, at times, exasperatingly slow treatment. We have had 20 years of debates on possible and necessary reforms in the Charter and there are even some who even now believe that the time has not yet come. Slowness is the common denominator of a parliamentary régime, but it is only fair to say in defence of this institution that this slowness may possibly be beneficial because it creates a situation in which this and other issues are not discussed until the time is ripe,

and this without any harmful disruptive effects. It should not be forgotten that the backbone of peace and security in the world will be better protected if an agreement is reached as a result of good faith and honesty.

73. The proposition is untenable that the more arms, the more security. It would be a catastrophic failure to recognize moral values and principles and would create irreparable damage if we were to espouse this proposition. Respect for law, for other people's property and for the settlement of disputes through the use of written laws can improve relations among men, peoples and nations, will improve standards of human life and of the community, and will enhance the status of man himself.

74. The delegation of Colombia wishes to repeat its irrevocable attachment to that position and our confidence that the work in the Disarmament Committee will proceed at an accelerated pace. It has already completed a mission which is deserving of praise. We trust in the wisdom and the effectiveness of the decisions to be adopted by all Members of the Organization at the present session of the General Assembly.

75. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I should like to announce that Australia has become a sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.580.

76. Mr. TALBOT (Guyana): Mr. Chairman, although my delegation's first intervention comes at a late stage in this Committee's proceedings, I take this opportunity none the less to pay tribute to you and to the other distinguished officers of the Committee. The fact that this body has been able to complete consideration of some items on its agenda in a spirit of compromise and goodwill is in no small measure due to your skilful conduct of our affairs. We trust that, given your continued guidance, our work will progress with the same dedication and serious purpose which have been displayed thus far.

77. The presence here today of the delegation of the People's Republic of China and the promise of their active participation in our deliberations augurs well for the success of our discussions on the topic now before us—the all-important question of disarmament. For, contrary to the belief held by some, this subject is not the prerogative of a select few but, indeed, the concern of all humanity. Thus, in welcoming the People's Republic of China in our midst, my delegation wishes to urge, at this historic moment of time, a universal and co-operative endeavour by these United Nations to banish war and to say a farewell to arms.

78. We have read with interest the account given by the Secretary-General in his report on the work of the Organization⁹ of the work done by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament over the last year. We acknowledge, with some satisfaction, the efforts made by that Committee to establish effective measures to induce an early cessation of the nuclear arms race, and to achieve general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. Nevertheless, my delegation would be less than candid if it did not express the view that the Conference, such as it is presently constituted and

⁹ *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 1, part I, chap. IV, part A.

conceived, is inadequate to the task of resolving the innumerable and multi-faceted problems of disarmament.

79. Admittedly, the Committee on Disarmament has become over the years a highly competent and expert group, well qualified to negotiate the details of some agreements. It has, however, lacked the broad-based motivation and comprehensive machinery which are the *sine qua non* for a genuine attempt to curtail today's vertiginous arms race. The important voices of France and the People's Republic of China have so far not been heard in its counsels which, with their own inherent limitations, continue to treat outstanding matters in partial and piece-meal fashion. Worse yet, such is the preoccupation with the technical and long-term aspects of the problem, the Conference caters mainly to the self-interest of the main protagonists, leaving its work beyond the grasp and influence of the vast majority of States.

80. Clearly, there is now an imperative need for finding an instrument which will produce a more balanced projection of views. In this connexion, suggestions have been made calling for a world disarmament conference, a revival of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, or a conference of all nuclear Powers, as several possibilities which would be as comprehensive as the times require and would ensure that all nuclear Powers not only accept agreements arrived at but also share in their preparation.

81. There are undoubtedly those who will contend that any large or open-ended conference will result in a futile exercise. Persuasive arguments will be adduced for the holding of private negotiations. In this regard, it might be useful to recall the words of the celebrated Canadian statesman and diplomatist, Lester B. Pearson, who, while an ardent supporter of quiet operations, had this to say of disarmament talks:

"We are entering a new territory, in every sense of the word, when we begin discussion of these subjects in such a world forum as the United Nations. Yet such a discussion is important so that there might be the widest possible exchange of views on the principles involved and on the ideas that should govern later diplomatic negotiations with a view to seeking general diplomatic agreement."

82. It is my delegation's considered opinion that, while we cannot and must not exclude direct negotiations and small working groups on disarmament, emphasis must now be placed on involving all nations in the search for solutions. As Secretary-General U Thant has so rightly pointed out in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization:

"... questions concerning a possible nuclear war and human survival, as well as the economic and social burdens of the arms race, directly and intimately affect every human being on earth. Let us recall that the United Nations under the Charter has been given specific responsibility in the field of disarmament."¹⁰

83. Accordingly, my delegation favours the widest scope possible for clarifying issues and mobilizing international

opinion, either as a prelude to negotiation or as the only substitute for negotiation when the latter fails to achieve desired results.

84. Regrettably, there seems to be a growing tendency for this world Organization to be deliberately left out of those matters which some major Powers consider to be in their protected province. This is especially unfortunate since, if traditional military power is to be erased from the world scene, it is the United Nations body which must offer alternative and reliable machinery, geared specifically to the maintenance of peace and world order. Our debate on the need for strengthening international security would indeed be in vain if there were no universal willingness to give to this Organization the ability to institutionalize ways and means for adequately serving the goals of disarmament and peace-keeping.

85. At the present time, however, enough is not being done to equip the United Nations for fulfilling the role which it must play in these important areas of activity. Articles 26 and 47 of the Charter, for example, entrust to the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee the serious responsibility of controlling world armaments, but thus far the achievements of these organs have been hardly spectacular. It is essential that their mandate and obligation be carried out. Additionally, it may be useful to consider the expansion of the numbers and functions of the Scientific Advisory Committee—as recommended by the Secretary-General—and the International Atomic Energy Agency so that Member States may receive as much information as possible in the field of nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament, as well as in the related field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Only in this way can all peoples and all Governments understand and be ready to cope with the problems of disarmament.

86. For, in the final analysis, it is only a forceful impetus launched by aroused world opinion that will bring the present institutions of power to final destruction and thus halt the insane production of arsenals. And even in the biggest bastions, the people will rebel when they see how that wasteful expenditure on arms inhibits their own chances for economic and social welfare. In the face of such pressure, the most entrenched militarism will yield and give way to a universal cry for peace and prosperity.

87. In this regard, my delegation welcomes the issue of the report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security, as contained in document A/8469. This is perhaps the most startling and sobering study which anyone could ever hope to read on the folly of the arms race. It is a shocking exposé of the senseless and destructive use of resources, both human and material, for the endless stockpiling of murderous weapons. Furthermore, it is written in language which the layman can understand and in a style which, albeit simple, presents the stark and horrific reality of the situation in a way which no romanesque effort could ever rival. All the grisly implications imaginable—political, economic, social and psychological—are so painted and highlighted therein that when one finally puts it down one is filled with the dread and terror of a nightmare.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 1A, para. 48.

88. The grim statistics of death remain, however, firmly engraved in the mind: the estimated total for world expenditures on arms during the period 1961 to 1970 amounts to some \$1,870,000 million. In paragraph 24 of the report it is stated:

"Military expenditures are in fact now running at two and one half times what all Governments are spending on health, one and one half times what they spend on education, and 30 times more than the total of all official economic aid granted by developed to developing countries."

All this is being spent by only six nations of the world.

89. The tragedy becomes even more pitiful when one considers the good to which these resources could have been put, especially for the disadvantaged majority of mankind. In 1953, General Assembly resolution 724 A (VIII) had urged Member Governments,

"... when sufficient progress has been made in internationally supervised world-wide disarmament, to devote a portion of the savings achieved through such disarmament to an international fund, within the framework of the United Nations, to assist development and reconstruction in under-developed countries".

Today, the economic distress of the third world is just as urgent as it was 10 years ago and the crying need for financial assistance has become even more intense.

90. It is very significant, we think, that the Second United Nations Development Decade, which was launched last year by the General Assembly [*resolution 2626 (XXV)*], has been made to coincide with a Disarmament Decade. Both are closely related and both can contribute to lifting the burdens of poverty and to attaining a better standard of life in the developing countries. Indeed, running concurrently as it does with the Second Development Decade, this new Disarmament Decade presents fresh opportunities for undertaking meaningful projects to divert such wasteful military expenditures as we have read about to the peaceful purposes of economic development.

91. The International Development Strategy concluded last year has set targets for the total flow of capital from the developed to the developing countries, which it is proposed should reach 1 per cent of the gross national product of the developed countries by 1975, and for the flow of official development assistance, which should reach 0.7 per cent of the gross national product. However, while a number of countries have made progress towards these targets in recent years, the over-all tendency has been for the share of aid in the gross national product of the developed countries to fall rather than rise.

92. And yet, as the Secretary-General has pointed out, it would take only a five per cent shift of current expenditures on arms to development to make it possible to approach the official targets for aid. In paragraph 84 of the report contained in document A/8469, he further comments:

"If even a fraction of what has gone into military research and development were provided for a frontal

attack on some of the main economic and social problems of the world, one ought to expect much larger benefits in the peaceful uses of science than have come from the spin-off from military research and development."

This thesis is, however, not easily subscribed to by the military establishments themselves. At the prospect of disarmament, these institutions see their very existence threatened and predict economic chaos if they are touched.

93. Yet, it is not difficult to see that, with a strong political will and adequate planning, the arms cartels could place their highly sophisticated skills in service to mankind. The argument that weapons of war improve upon technology is vicious, since the technology produced results mainly in destruction. The truth is that modern man can, if he is allowed to, devote his knowledge to the pursuit of economic and social progress. All the encouragement needed towards this end is a decision by Governments, especially the nuclear Powers, to reverse immediately their militaristic programmes. Nations can agree upon a fool-proof system of disarmament once there is political agreement.

94. My delegation would thus like to urge that the United Nations give continued publicity and meaning to the concept which lies behind the Disarmament Decade. Concerned agencies, such as the Office of Public Information and the International Atomic Energy Agency, should mount a planned campaign for attracting world attention to the evils of arms production. As a priority task, the report on the economic consequences of disarmament should be given widespread distribution and suitable pamphlets and bulletins should be designed for the general reading public. At the same time, the Secretary-General should be authorized to produce a similar study on a continuing biennial basis so that the question remains within constant view.

95. Here at the United Nations, in as many committees as possible, pressure should be brought to bear on the big Powers to revive draft treaties for general and complete disarmament and to seek new areas for economic co-operation. Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] must be continually invoked so that the super-Powers are, in its words, obliged to pursue negotiations "in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date".

96. The non-aligned nations, especially, should also act in stimulating alternative draft treaties which are likely to gain popular acceptance. More immediately, however, support should be given to the proposal for the holding of a world disarmament conference at which the problem might be looked at, for the first time, from a truly global perspective.

97. While commending this international endeavour, my delegation also sees great value in taking a regional approach whereby communities of States may collectively adopt measures for proscribing the creation and proliferation of destructive arms in their particular areas. Consequently, we welcome the initiative being taken by Ceylon [*A/8492 and Add.1*] to make the Indian Ocean a nuclear-free zone. That represents a concrete and positive step, albeit circumscribed, to control the threat of nuclear force.

More of those zones should quickly come into being and, wherever required, this Organization should foster regional conferences which seek to achieve this goal of disarmament. Regional treaties should, however, embrace all States in such arrangements. It is only in this way that such measures can be really effective.

98. My country is far from being a nuclear State; but so deeply concerned are we for the survival of peoples everywhere that we are constrained to add our voice to the plea for rapid and general disarmament. It is true that, over the year, we have seen promising signs for an improvement of the situation, such as the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof [*resolution 2660 (XXV)*]. There has also been recently optimistic news of a possible agreement at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). But the battle is far from won, and my delegation pledges to do its utmost during this debate to foster any hopeful measure which will bring disarmament nearer to reality.

99. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to introduce a revised text of the draft resolution which he had already presented.

100. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have asked to speak at this late hour to transfer the draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.583*] which I submitted on the cessation of nuclear testing to the item entitled "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests", which is now under consideration.

101. A number of my colleagues have pointed out to me that my draft resolution would be more relevant to the disarmament question than to the item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", in connexion with which my draft resolution was originally submitted.

102. I have revised the text of that draft resolution and handed it to the efficient Secretary of our Committee. I say "efficient", because he has promised me that it will be distributed to all representatives, in five languages, tomorrow morning.

103. We non-nuclear States can no longer remain silent concerning the race we are witnessing among nuclear Powers to perfect weapons of mass destruction and to attain an ever-more-elusive parity among themselves. Within less than two weeks two nuclear tests have been conducted, one by the United States of America and the other by the People's Republic of China. I was shocked this morning when I read the news that an Asian country had exploded some sort of nuclear weapon.

104. We are still shocked by what happened in Japan during the last world war, and can we feel smug sitting here like college professors reading our dissertations on how things should be done?

105. The youth of the world are losing faith in us, and rightly so. We should not let them down. We are, of course, bound by instructions from our Governments; and we are

here as diplomats to implement those instructions. But we should remind our Governments, especially those States which are nuclear Powers, that the Charter speaks of "the peoples of the world", not of Governments. And, if we really represent our Governments, we should represent the conscience of our peoples.

106. Next week I shall ask for 10 to 15 minutes in order to present the revised text of the draft resolution in full. As I have said, the hour is late and I do not want to tax the patience of the Committee by doing so now. However, suffice it to say that I am not a member of any disarmament committee and I come here amongst you untrammelled by all the technicalities which, allegedly, are being discussed in the disarmament committees and subsidiary bodies. What we need is not a sort of complicated technology for detecting nuclear tests; what we need is goodwill and to set an example for each other, instead of waiting to see what new weapons have been developed by one nuclear Power which will give impetus to another to emulate it. I submit this is an abortive attempt, it is academic, it has no impact. For what is to prevent any nuclear Power from saying, "We are still working on the technology of detecting by seismic apparatuses, machinery or any other means, to see whether we can check on whether another nuclear Power is doing things surreptitiously"? That would get us nowhere, because all those tests are being carried out in great secrecy.

107. I do not say we should not follow up the technology of seismic detection; but when there is a will there is a way. The question is not when there will be a perfect system of detection. The whole question lies in the hearts and minds of the leaders of the States which have nuclear weapons. They should decide once and for all that they will stand before history. And, perhaps there will be no history 30 years from now because what they are doing now may bring this species to an end. We have no assurance that there will be no miscalculation and that a situation will not present itself that may drive one of the nuclear Powers in desperation to resort to nuclear weapons in any conflict that may erupt at any time.

108. We have not only a responsibility towards our Governments but a responsibility, as I started by saying, to the peoples of the world as proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations. And, I will take a little more time, with your permission, Sir, at an appropriate moment next week I hope, when I read to the Committee the revised draft resolution with some further explanations.

109. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the People's Republic of China in exercise of his right of reply.

110. Mr. AN (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Please permit me, Sir, to make a reply to the representative of Saudi Arabia on behalf of the delegation of the People's Republic of China.

111. A few moments ago he mentioned that recently there were two nuclear explosions. I have not received word from my Government as to whether we have carried out a nuclear explosion. However, my Government's policy towards nuclear explosions is very clear. Our development of

nuclear weapons is for self-defence and is a limited development. Also, every time we carry out a nuclear test explosion we make a statement that we will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. This policy declaration is very clear to all. Therefore, once again, I say here in answer to the representative from Saudi Arabia that we will denounce such allegations.

112. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

113. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I am indeed heartened by the reply of my colleague from the People's Republic of China, which is in consonance with the statement delivered in the General Assembly that China will not be the first one to use any atomic bombs or nuclear weapons.

114. I should like to bring to his attention that that is precisely what all the other nuclear Powers have been telling us—that they will not be the first. If they will not be the first, why are they stockpiling all those nuclear weapons? What for? It is such a waste of money and treasure and generates world fear.

115. I am one of the great admirers of Chinese civilization. We know what Lao-tze said about soldiers 500 or more years before the Christian era. We all know that ethics started in China with Confucius. The moral code started there. But the Chinese people and, for that matter, the American people, the Soviet people, the British people and the French people are not the ones with whom we are taking issue here. We are taking issue with their Governments, which seem to think that they should develop nuclear weapons. For what purpose? To be the arbiters of the balance of power and power politics. It is the Charter that should guarantee peace and security and save us from the scourge of war.

116. We have not made progress since the days of the League of Nations, since it was my privilege to observe it *ex-officio* in the 1930s. In the name of self-defence we are inventing more and more diabolical weapons of mass destruction. Who from amongst the politicians or the leaders—let us call them statesmen—of the nuclear Powers can guarantee to us that by some miscalculation those weapons will not be used? After all, the cessation should not start with the machinery for detection but, as I said, should start in the minds and hearts of men. Then, we will not be used to that idea of the deterrence of fear. Is it any wonder that the youth of the world are restless? Is it any wonder that many of them do not have hope in the future? Is it any wonder that society is in a flux, in a state of *laissez-faire*?

117. That is what I appeal to the nuclear Powers to ponder—that the world is no longer ours but that of the next generation. And I have no doubt but that China will respect what it has declared it would not do: that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons. But that is not a satisfying answer because it has been said before by the other nuclear Powers, and we find that they are still in the race.

118. Therefore, let us not put our faith in the protracted machinery for detection, although, if it is necessary—and I am not a specialist—the matter should be pursued. Let us put our faith in the hope that the leaders of the nuclear Powers will look upon this suffering humanity as being in the throes of fear, genuine fear, which sometimes is subconscious, but is nevertheless fear. And fear causes frustration in people, and then rebellion, and rebellion means sometimes forcing the hands of leaders to engage in war. That is our problem. It is a moral problem, not a scientific problem.

119. Then there is the question of detection. We do not know anything about detection. We are diplomats here. We know nothing. Should we always think of the narrow interests of our Governments? We small Powers have a clear conscience. We can be more objective than the nuclear Powers which, understandably, have to rationalize the stand of their Governments. We are coming here without any *arrière-pensée*, without finding excuses. We are pleading with them. We are not even urging them: we are appealing to them to transmit our fears to their respective Governments so that hope may again reign in the hearts of men.

120. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of the People's Republic of China, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

121. Mr. AN (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Since it is late, I do not wish to speak at length. However, our position and our policy is very clear. I denounce the attack on us made by the representative of Saudi Arabia. Why he made such a statement is very clear, and it is clear to all what his intentions were.

122. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

123. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I did not attack anybody. I was appealing to the representative of the People's Republic of China. I did not single him out when I spoke about the fear that is in the hearts of men regarding nuclear weapons. I mentioned China apropos of what I read this morning in the newspapers. But before we had the privilege of having him seated amongst us, I mentioned the same thing about the United States, the host country, before they exploded that bomb, or whatever it was, in the Aleutians. So I have not been singling out the representative of China and he cannot dismiss what I said, if he does not agree with me, by denouncing me. I can denounce him, but I do not want to denounce him: I am appealing to him.

124. If we want to use this language, I may tell my good friend from China that I have a good knowledge of it. I am not denouncing him; I am appealing to him. He is my brother. Whether he likes it or not we belong to the same continent, regardless of the ideologies to which each one of us belongs. Do not take that line and say, "I denounce". This is no way to explain your stand. You can say, "All right, I note", "I do not agree".

125. You denounce me? I can denounce you a hundred times. Try to denounce me. This is not denunciation. I respect you, Sir. I do not denounce you. But you come and

dismiss what I said. As regards my appeal, coming from one with a service of 25 or 26 years in this Organization, you dismiss it by denouncing me? What have I done that you should denounce me? I can denounce you too. But I do not want to denounce you. I admire you for your clarity. I admire the lucidity with which the Chinese speech in the General Assembly was made—I do not know who made it, whether it was you or your chief. So, for heaven's sake, let us act here in a manner that will yield results and not dismiss whatever one says by a few words.

126. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I call on the representative of China, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

127. Mr. CHEN (*translation from Chinese*): I was not present when the representative of Saudi Arabia spoke.

However, I understand the gist of his speech. My alternate representative already gave a categorical reply to him. I think that the representative of Saudi Arabia appears to be fair and just, but he does not distinguish between who is an aggressor and who is the victim of aggression, who develops nuclear weapons in order to threaten and bully others and who develops nuclear weapons for self-defence and for a just cause. To whom his speech is advantageous or detrimental is quite clear.

128. I think this is clear to all peace-loving countries and peoples. No matter what the representative of Saudi Arabia said in his speech, whether it is a denunciation or an appeal, I categorically reject both. This is all I want to say.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.