

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1946th
MEETING**

Monday, 5 November 1973,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Organization of work	241
Agenda items 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38 (continued): Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security	
World Disarmament Conference: report of the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference	
General and complete disarmament: report of the Confer- ence of the Committee on Disarmament	
Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: report of the Secretary-General	
Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests:	
(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2935 (XXVII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibi- tion of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General	
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on the Indian Ocean	241

Chairman: Mr. Otto R. BORCH (Denmark).

Organization of work

1. The CHAIRMAN: I am informed by Mr. Amerasinghe that the contact group has reached complete agreement on the dates for the two sessions of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. He has requested that that agreement be submitted to this Committee for its decision. I would suggest that we devote a brief period at the beginning of tomorrow morning's meeting to taking a decision on the contact group's agreement. That decision could then be included in our report to the Assembly on the sea-bed item, thus obviating the need for a separate discussion in the Assembly on the question of the dates.

2. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that suggestion.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 AND 38
(continued)

**Economic and social consequences of the armaments race
and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and
security**

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Special
Committee on the World Disarmament Conference
(A/8990 and Add.1, A/9033, A/9041, A/9228)

General and complete disarmament: report of the Confer-
ence of the Committee on Disarmament (A/9039,
A/9141, A/9293, A/C.1/L.650/Rev.1)

Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of
their possible use: report of the Secretary-General
(A/9207, A/C.1/L.650/Rev.1)

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report
of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
(A/9141)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear
tests (A/9081, A/9084, A/9086, A/9093, A/9107,
A/9109, A/9110, A/9117, A/9166, A/C.1/1031, 1036,
1039):

(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on
Disarmament (A/9141);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/9208)

Implementation of General Assembly resolution
2935 (XXVII) concerning the signature and ratification
of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibi-
tion of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of
Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (A/9137,
A/9209)

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report
of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Indian Ocean (A/9029)

3. Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): Our deliberations on
disarmament questions are being held in a period which, in
spite of certain disturbing aspects, may be generally
characterized as a period of further détente and broadening
co-operation among States. It is an outcome of numerous
partial steps, among which a firm place is occupied by the
positive achievements accomplished in the field of disarma-
ment.

4. The Czechoslovak delegation believes that such agree-
ments as the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests
in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water,¹ as
well as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear
Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex], and other
treaties, have played a significant role in creating conditions
for the improvement of international relations in general.
These, as well as other treaties of both a multilateral and
bilateral character, create firm links in the system of

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, No. 6964, p. 43.

measures aimed at maintaining durable peace and security in the world.

5. The importance and complexity of the questions pertaining to disarmament, together with other aspects, have necessitated disarmament talks in various bodies and on different levels. We have welcomed the opening of the talks between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the limitation of their strategic arms, talks which have already brought concrete results. This year, following the significant treaties of May 1972, further important results were achieved in this field. The Agreement of 22 June between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the Prevention of Nuclear War [see A/9293] is of truly historic importance and is rightly regarded as the most significant international instrument aimed at preventing the possibility of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict, and against the use of nuclear weapons in general.

6. Also, the negotiations on the mutual reduction of forces and armaments, and associated measures, in central Europe, which are now under way in Vienna are of major importance. Though the questions on the agenda of these talks are of a particularly sensitive and complex nature, we should like to express our hope that positive achievements will be scored in this field also in the foreseeable future.

7. A proper role in disarmament talks has been played by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which has presented in document A/9141 its report on this year's deliberations. The report itself makes a bulky document which—and I am now speaking in the name of a member of the Committee on Disarmament, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic—draws an objective picture of the Committee's work in dealing with disarmament issues.

8. This year, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament held its meetings under favourable conditions and had a suitable opportunity and conditions to reach concrete results in its work. In the first place, it had been expected that a draft agreement prohibiting chemical weapons would be worked out. However, because of the way the situation developed, no major progress was achieved. This state of affairs justly disturbs many members of the Committee itself who have made efforts for the speedy adoption of effective disarmament measures. We understand these views and concerns, the more so since Czechoslovakia has spared no effort to attain practical accomplishments in the field of disarmament and has been disturbed by the fact that for the period of the last two or three years the Committee has been unable to submit, as a result of its work, any draft of a concrete agreement which would solve a concrete disarmament question, be it only in a partial way.

9. Experience gained in the deliberations in the course of the last few years shows, however, that an overall assessment of the work of this body should be based on a longer period of its work. If we were to judge the period of one or two years separately, without taking into consideration the preceding period, the situation existing in the Committee could be considerably distorted. In the past, the Committee on Disarmament has proved more than once that when there was goodwill on the part of its members it

was capable of elaborating significant international legal documents aimed at curbing the armaments race, limiting the spheres of possible deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and destroying the existing stockpiles of these weapons. When assessing the work done by the Committee, we do not of course limit ourselves to judging only its past activities. It is the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation that the Committee on Disarmament plays, at the present time also, a deserving role in preparing new disarmament measures. True, we cannot be completely satisfied with the state of this year's deliberations. Our dissatisfaction arises from the fact that certain States are not prepared to adopt the appropriate political decision in order to reach a concrete agreement, for example in the field of the prohibition of chemical weapons, rather than from the system of the Committee's work, its composition or its procedure. The Committee on Disarmament itself, as a body designed to conduct disarmament talks, may accomplish concrete results only on the condition that all States represented in it exert the necessary efforts and show their goodwill for solving individual disarmament issues in a practical and consistent manner.

10. The past activities of the Committee relating to the preparation of the agreements that have already been concluded have proved that the elaboration of the concrete language of a multilateral legal agreement usually requires a prolonged period of time. Such is the case even when concrete proposals exist which, however, have usually to be worked on in a spirit of compromise to make a final formula. This has also been proved by the deliberations of other international bodies.

11. In the course of the past two years, the deliberations of the Committee have been concentrated on the elaboration of the language of a draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. It may be seen from the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that several concrete documents have been presented in the aforesaid period in this regard to facilitate and accelerate the work on the preparation of a draft convention. The socialist countries, including Czechoslovakia, presented in March 1972 a draft convention on the prohibition, development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and on their destruction.² That draft provides practical guidelines for solving these problems. The draft presented by the socialist countries has met with the agreement of many delegations, both in the Committee and in the United Nations as a whole, who have expressed their support for it and have agreed that it should become the basis for the working-out of a final draft of a convention.

12. A substantial contribution to the deliberations of the Committee has been made by the working paper presented by the group of non-aligned countries [A/9141, annex I, sect. 8], which embodies many interesting and matter-of-fact proposals relating to this question. The socialist States have welcomed the initiative of the non-aligned countries and have expressed their support for many important provisions of this working paper. These facts attest to a genuine interest on the part of the majority of

² Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1972, document DC/235, annex C, section 5.

States in elaborating and subsequently adopting a concrete convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. This results from their policies aimed at achieving effective disarmament measures. At the same time, the fact that the positions taken by the socialist and many non-aligned countries on numerous important aspects of the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons are either identical or very close, is both important and favourable.

13. Indeed, there exists a broad platform of shared views on the method of solving the above issues. It is to be regretted, however, that the Committee, in spite of the efforts exerted by the majority of delegations has not started its work on the preparation for the drawing up of the draft convention. We share the view of the delegations which hold that this state of affairs is a direct consequence of the fact that with regard to the solution of the question of prohibiting chemical weapons, no concrete proposals have been presented in the Committee on Disarmament during the last two years by the Western States. The delegations of the Western States concentrated their activities in the Committee merely on commenting on the proposals and views of other delegations without fulfilling their promise, as was also the case of the United States, to submit their concrete proposals. The representative of the United States stated at the conclusion of this year's deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament that his country had not presented any concrete proposals since as a matter of fact it had been unable to find a method which would assure it that it would have completely solved all the problems and difficulties related to these issues.

14. The Czechoslovak delegation regards the unpreparedness of the United States to resolve this question as the very reason for the delays in the Committee's deliberations on the preparation of the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

15. We cannot hide in this connexion our disappointment about information which was contained in answer to Mr. Les Aspin, Democratic Representative from Wisconsin, by the United States Army several months ago. According to this information the United States Army confirmed that it plans to produce a new nerve gas that would enable the United States of America to maintain its "retaliation power" and would, at the same time, be a substitute for the existing stockpiles of this gas. A spokesman of the United States Army has stated in this connexion that the production of the said gas is to be started in the Pine Bluff arsenal in Arkansas in 1977.

16. At the close of the Committee's session, the delegation of Japan submitted a working paper [*ibid.*, sect. 21] on the main points for an international agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons. Since it was presented just before the session of the Committee ended, delegations had no opportunity to comment on it. It is necessary of course to take into consideration that the views of Japan on the solving of the question of prohibiting chemical weapons were presented not in the form of a draft convention but in a form of a working paper. Although this document makes a positive contribution to the deliberations of the Committee on the prohibition of chemical weapons, in order to accelerate the process of preparing the draft convention, the ideas and views embodied in the working paper

submitted by Japan should be presented as final formulations of the draft convention.

17. Since deliberations in the Political and Security Committee do not go into details but consider the individual questions from a broader point of view, we deem it useful that all proposals and working papers presented thus far should be considered in detail by the next session of the Committee on Disarmament with a view to completing speedily the deliberations on the question of prohibiting chemical weapons by elaborating a draft of a respective international agreement.

18. Another important area discussed by the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva was problems related to a ban on nuclear-weapon tests. A special part of the report is dedicated to these questions. They have been dealt with also by four unofficial meetings of the Committee with the participation of experts. The deliberations have once again proved that these types of questions can be dealt with and the socialist countries fully supported the discussions.

19. It is obvious from some of the working papers attached to the above-mentioned report, for instance, the working paper of Canada [*ibid.*, sect. 14] and the Netherlands [*ibid.*, sect. 24] that there exist broad opportunities for the use of seismological means to verify compliance with the underground test ban. To this effect it would be possible to use fully the opportunities provided by the international exchange of seismic data and by other forms of international co-operation. Such forms of control, which are acceptable to the majority of the future parties to the convention, create the conditions necessary for securing a sufficiently effective control over compliance with the ban.

20. There were many speakers who noted that in spite of the achievements scored in the field of the lessening of international tensions, the arms race is continuously escalated and ever increasing sums are being spent on military purposes. According to some information, nearly \$220,000 million have been spent on military purposes this year. This alarms the peoples of the world particularly in those countries where measures to eliminate hunger and illiteracy and to secure the necessary health care for their populations could not have been implemented due to insufficient financial funds. A number of developing countries suffer from a permanent insufficiency of resources to implement plans for the development of their national economies.

21. Under these conditions, the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to reduce the military budgets of States that are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council by 10 per cent and to use a part of the funds thus saved for providing assistance to developing countries should be valued particularly highly. This proposal justly deserves the attention and support of the delegations here. The Czechoslovak delegation intends to make a statement on this question and to explain the position of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly where this question will be under discussion.

22. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): Once again, we have taken up what has now become the perennial, yet no less crucial,

question of disarmament. It is a question which we have discussed so much in its various aspects over the last quarter of a century that perhaps, if we are not wary, we may sink into boredom, frustration and despair. But can we afford to be bored or to despair? The issue is so vital to peace that, in spite of our frustrations, we should continue our efforts until we make meaningful progress.

23. At the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Countries held at Algiers in September this year, a political declaration was adopted which *inter alia*: “declares itself in favour of general and complete disarmament, and especially a ban on the use of nuclear weapons and the manufacture of atomic weapons . . . and the total destruction of existing stocks, as well as the total cessation of all nuclear tests in all environments and all regions of the world”. The declaration further “demands that a world conference on disarmament, with the participation of all States, shall be convened as soon as possible”.

24. This declaration demonstrates clearly the preoccupation and concern of a large majority of States, Members and non-members of the United Nations, over this vital issue. The big Powers, especially the nuclear super-Powers on whom depends primarily the success or failure of disarmament, cannot and should not ignore the concern and aspirations of a majority of mankind so forcefully and persistently expressed. Events of the past month culminating in the threat of the USSR to send a military force to the Middle East to enforce Security Council resolution 338 (1973) on the cease-fire, and the placing of United States forces on alert should forcefully bring it home to us all how fragile our present world peace is and how essential it is that we should take urgent measures to ensure against a conflagration arising out of miscalculation or accident.

25. It is now becoming customary to refer to the relaxation in the cold war and to pat ourselves on the back as though we have now found a magic wand capable of resolving all world problems by its touch. We of course welcome the accord concluded and the discussions going on between East and West in the wake of détente as important steps in this constant search for a durable peace. The first phase of the strategic arms limitation talks has been concluded and the second phase is now under way. In June this year, the Soviet Union and the United States reached an Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War, and on 30 October this year negotiations began in Vienna on the mutual reduction of forces and armaments in central Europe. These indeed are welcome developments and my delegation commends them. But we should beware of being lulled into a sense of complacency. These developments should not deflect us from our objective of general and complete disarmament, for they only scratch the surface of the problems and do not go to the core. To limit the production of strategic arms or reduce forces and armaments in Europe does not eliminate the capacity for overkill, since even the layman knows too well that a few perfected inter-continental ballistic missiles can do no less harm than a thousand such missiles can do.

26. The Swedish Minister of State, Mrs. Myrdal, in her knowledgeable and characteristically frank statement on this item on 30 October, regretted the insensitivity of the

major Powers to the views and aspirations of the international community. She said: “One of the most conspicuous shortcomings in the world today is the impossibility to make the major Powers accountable to the international community”. [1941st meeting, para. 101.] She was speaking in reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, but her observation is quite pertinent to the whole broad question of disarmament. How and when will the major Powers act, not always solely in their parochial national interests, but with due consideration of the interests of the entire international community to which they also belong? A few days ago, we found the two super-Powers acting together in their self-interests, but whatever these interests might have been, they were acting together for a good cause—to stop the wanton destruction in the Middle East and to bring peace there. Why cannot they act together with the international community in another area—perhaps the most important area of peace—that of genuine and meaningful disarmament?

27. For two years now the General Assembly has, in resolutions supported by a large majority of Members, called for the holding of a World Disarmament Conference as a matter of urgency. At the twenty-seventh session, after considerable haggling, we made what some of us thought was progress towards the convening of the Conference by setting up a Special Committee to make preparations for the Conference in 1974. But in what I can only call the “non-report” of the Secretary-General, supplemented by the report of Mr. Hoveyda of Iran at the 1934th meeting, we have been presented with a shocking picture of non-co-operation and obstruction on the part of some of the nuclear Powers. Any hopes of a change of heart by these nuclear Powers at this current session have now been dashed to the ground by the apparently uncompromising declaration of the United States representative made on 23 October: “We oppose convening a world disarmament conference or setting a date or starting preparations for one at this time” [1934th meeting, para. 66].

28. My delegation finds this statement highly self-centred and disappointing. Since by general consent, a World Disarmament Conference can only achieve maximum results with the participation of all the nuclear Powers, the United States position I have just referred to amounts to a veto on the holding of such a conference. My delegation firmly insists that we should not allow such obstructionist attitudes to stand in the way of a World Disarmament Conference as desired by a majority of States Members of the United Nations. The Special Committee should thus be reactivated at this session and should perhaps be somewhat enlarged to meet the objections raised as to the inadequacy of political and geographical representation. It should be mandated to make concrete proposals for holding the Conference in 1975 even if the nuclear Powers still refuse to participate in its preparatory work. In this connexion my delegation endorses the Chinese view that the Conference should have the containment of the risk of nuclear war high on its list of priorities.

29. The report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/9141] gives us little cause for satisfaction. At the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was

mandated to give priority attention to the total prohibition of nuclear tests and to the adoption of effective measures for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and for their destruction. The Conference has reached a stage of total impasse on these two important questions. While one can appreciate the complex problems with regard to the effective prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, one finds it difficult to understand the failure to reach an agreement on the total prohibition of nuclear tests. This failure still centres around the now traditional question of verification, but on this there exists a large body of expert opinion showing that underground tests can be effectively monitored without recourse to on-the-spot inspection. What is lacking is the political will on the part of the nuclear Powers. It is regrettable—indeed intolerable—that 10 years after the conclusion of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water and two years before the review of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons no agreement has been reached on a comprehensive test-ban Treaty. The danger here is that this lack of agreement may put the non-proliferation Treaty in jeopardy.

30. With regard to the prohibition of the production of chemical and other incendiary weapons, my delegation fully supports draft resolution A/C.1/L.650/Rev.1 sponsored by Sweden and other delegations and is happy to add its name to the list of sponsors. The proposal contained in this draft resolution is the least we can do in the circumstances of the impasse in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament if we are to keep the matter alive and hope for progress on it.

31. My delegation warmly welcomes and supports all measures aimed at creating nuclear-free zones. Whatever their limitations, they constitute important contributions to our efforts towards nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Thus my delegation welcomed the Treaty of Tlatelolco³ and has noted with satisfaction the acceptance of Additional Protocol II by France and China.

32. We urge them to follow up this commendable move by adhering to the even more important disarmament measures of the nuclear test-ban Treaty and the non-proliferation Treaty. We would also urge the Soviet Union, the only nuclear Power which has as yet not done so for reasons which we find difficult to understand, to accept Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. My delegation also supports all measures to make the Indian Ocean a nuclear-free zone.

33. Finally, we must not lose sight of the important and fundamental fact that all our efforts at meaningful disarmament will come to naught unless we remove the basic causes of conflict, of fear and of insecurity. Colonialism, racism, foreign domination and interference, these are issues which we can only ignore to our peril. We must all work assiduously to eliminate them if we are to ensure world peace.

34. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My statement today will be entirely devoted to

³ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634, No. 9068, p. 283).

item 36 of the agenda of the General Assembly entitled “Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests”.

35. Very soon, on 29 November 1973, a whole year will have elapsed since the General Assembly adopted resolution 2934 C (XXVII), in which, for the nth time, it urged Governments of nuclear Powers to put an end to all nuclear-weapon tests and, reaffirming what had been said the previous year in its resolution 2828 A (XXVI), appealed to them to do so “not later than 5 August 1973”. It is well known that that date was the tenth anniversary of the moment when, in Moscow, the multilateral Treaty whose official title was the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, was opened for signature.

36. It is no mystery to anyone that the nuclear Powers, as has been so often the case in the past, turned a deaf ear to the General Assembly’s appeal. It is precisely for that reason that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, following the initiative of the Group of 12, agreed that its 619th meeting, held on 7 August last, would be considered a special meeting, during which the representatives of no less than 20 States spoke. The great majority of the speakers expressed their disappointment and their concern over the complete absence of progress in the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Since the statements of those representatives are reproduced in the working paper presented by my delegation [*ibid.*, annex II, sect. 23], I shall limit myself here to citing, for purposes of illustration, a few comments from those documents in order to show the views expressed by members representing the broadest geographical spectrum.

37. Mrs. Alva Myrdal, the representative of Sweden, with her usual eloquence and frankness, stated the following:

“While the date 5 August 1963 is recalled with partial rejoicing, the date 5 August 1973 must be marked as a day of mourning. When, on 12 April this year I did not hesitate to use such a strong term (CCD/PV.600), it was because we—the majority of the world’s nations who have no nuclear weapons in our hands and conduct no tests to acquire them—consider that we are facing a breach of promise on the part of the super-Powers. They not only signed a pledge to seek the discontinuance of all tests. They also led us to believe that the Moscow Treaty would reduce the nuclear testing and impose limits on nuclear weapons development.

“As a matter of fact, in August 1973, a closing of the test series that sustained the nuclear arms race seems to be farther away than ever.

“We can no longer be made to believe the generalities which express some innermost will to cease such testing but profess impotence to carry out that will due to some residual differences as to how to organize foolproof verification. This reproof is addressed to both the super-Powers. If one of them—perhaps not here, but in the framework of bilateral talks—would signal to the other a definite willingness to stop the nuclear arms race, they should certainly be capable of technically overcoming or politically setting aside the minimal uncertainties which remain in regard to verification.”

38. The representative of Ethiopia at that time stated the following:

“The tenth year of the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty has come and gone without a comprehensive treaty. This failure to fulfil an essential undertaking embodied in the Treaty, to render comprehensive its partial coverage, is a stark fact whose historical consequences in terms of endangering the security and survival of humanity are incalculable. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to express the concern and disappointment of the Ethiopian delegation.

“... ”

“A greater disappointment is the awareness that even signatories of the partial test-ban Treaty no longer have the political will and purpose to fulfil the obligation they assumed so many years ago to negotiate a comprehensive treaty prohibiting nuclear tests; and allow their political vision to be obscured by the pursuit of a perfect, watertight monitoring system of seismological events that remains illusive and is hardly attainable.”

39. The representative of Japan, Mr. Nishibori, who is with us today, after recalling that 6 and 9 August were days of mourning since on those days in 1945 nuclear weapons were used “to the horror of mankind”, and stating that the number of dead as a result of the use of such weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki has reached a total of 128,444, pointed out:

“The partial test-ban Treaty, in its preamble, expresses the intention of the Original Parties to seek ‘to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, determined to continue negotiations to this end...’. After the decade which has passed since the signing of the partial test-ban Treaty, a comprehensive test ban is the task which remains to be achieved. On the significant occasion of this special meeting, I wish to call upon the distinguished representatives of this Committee to renew our realization of what horrors the use of nuclear weapons can bring to mankind and to promise among ourselves to do our very best in making another important step in order to avoid nuclear war for ever through a prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments.”

40. In his turn, the representative of Pakistan stated:

“However, what gave this Treaty its special significance was the solemn pledge made by the three nuclear Powers, designated in the Treaty itself as the ‘original Parties’—the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the USSR—that they would seek to ‘achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time’. This was a pledge given not only in the preamble but further reinforced in article I (b) of the Treaty by clearly stating their determination to conclude a treaty ‘resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground.’

“Ten years have passed, but the pledge remains unfulfilled.”

41. The representative of the Netherlands declared:

“The will toward further negotiations aimed at general and complete disarmament and, in particular, at nuclear disarmament was very clearly expressed in the preamble to the partial test-ban Treaty. So far, the solemn pledges embodied in that preamble have not been fulfilled, even though some partial arms-control agreements have since been concluded. The partial test-ban Treaty has not yet been complemented by the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban.

“To our regret some countries have not yet acceded to the partial test-ban Treaty and have continued their testing in the atmosphere. Other Powers have continued testing underground. Although 10 years ago several countries were of the opinion that a ban on atmospheric testing would curtail the possibilities of developing new weapons, in practice the partial test-ban Treaty has proved to be mainly an important health measure. The qualitative arms race between the main Powers has not been slowed down by the partial test-ban Treaty.”

42. Finally, I myself had the honour of speaking at that memorable meeting as representative of Mexico, and at that time I stressed, as I wish to do again today, that the nuclear-weapon tests, in the 18 years that have elapsed between 1945 and 1963, have amounted to approximately 500—of which 379 were carried out in the atmosphere and 121 underground. In the decade between 1963 and 1973 the number has risen to approximately 439—45 in the atmosphere and 394 underground. Therefore, this means that in the last 10 years, the annual average of these tests has increased by almost 60 per cent.

43. Bearing in mind these irrefutable facts and taking into account a number of others that are particularly pertinent with regard to the unbridled nuclear arms race, I ventured, among other views, to state the following.

“It would seem inescapably clear from what I have just stated that the verdict of history will not be very favourable to the position adopted so far by the nuclear Powers with regard to the partial test-ban Treaty. Not to put too fine a point on it, I would say that this position has dashed the hopes which mankind had placed in the Treaty when it was opened for signature 10 years ago. Although the Treaty has had beneficial effects in preventing the radioactive contamination of the environment, its value as a disarmament measure, even within the so-called collateral measures, has unfortunately been non-existent.

“... ”

“We are fully aware that general and complete disarmament is a goal which can be attained only as the culmination of a series of agreements and measures aimed at achieving the gradual limitation, reduction and elimination of weapons, beginning with nuclear weapons. But we are also firmly convinced that among those measures there is none in respect of whose adoption there could be such an unjustified delay as has occurred in relation to the measure promised in the preamble to the Moscow Treaty. We are convinced that, as the General Assembly

has rightly said, there is no valid reason for postponing the permanent prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. The tenth anniversary of the 1963 Treaty is, indeed, a sad occasion. It is for the nuclear Powers alone to ensure that such a discouraging one will not occur again."

44. These significant statements that I have quoted from some of the main statements delivered by representatives from four different continents at the special meeting that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament held in order to stress the fact that 10 long years have elapsed since the so-called original parties to the Moscow Treaty committed themselves—and I quote from the Treaty itself—"to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time", truly reflect, we are convinced, the heartfelt sentiments of all peoples towards the situation confronting the world, which bespeaks a complete forgetfulness regarding that solemn commitment.

45. It is for these reasons that a number of delegations, including that of Mexico, have felt in duty bound to submit to this Committee a draft resolution, which we trust will be ready for distribution tomorrow, which I shall then have the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors.

46. For the moment I would merely say that the draft is based on our conviction of the axiomatic truth that lies in the conclusions put to us by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 29 February 1972, almost two years ago, at the 545th meeting of the session of the Conference that year, when he stated the following:

"No other question in the field of disarmament has been the subject of so much study and discussion as the question of stopping nuclear-weapon tests. I believe that all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement. . . . It is my firm belief that the sorry tale of lost opportunities that have existed in the past should not be repeated now and that the question can and should be solved now."

47. Mr. ELIAS (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, may I extend to you and the other members of the Bureau the congratulations of the delegation of Spain on your election, and also express our pleasure at seeing our work guided by such capable hands. Your competence, experience and tact ensure us of positive results from the discussions of such important and delicate questions as those before us, and my delegation assures you of our unconditional co-operation in order to achieve such success.

48. The Committee has before it eight items on disarmament. Two deal with the types of weapons that should be prohibited; two others with geographical zones to which certain disarmament measures specifically apply; two other items raise the question of the universal forum in which disarmament should be achieved and the stages for achieving it; another item touches on the prejudicial consequences of the arms race; and, finally, the last item deals with the suspension of nuclear testing. Thus we see that the problems entailed by disarmament are complex; and that complexity is derived not only from the gigantic

scope of the arms race that we are witnessing and of all its truly formidable technological implications, but also, to a large extent, from the propensity shown by some States—perhaps in direct proportion to the volume of their war-making potential and their arms industry—to approach disarmament questions from the standpoint of their political and economic interests, rather than from the standpoint of their true defensive needs and their ability to lead the world to an era of peace and co-existence worthy of such a name.

49. In passing judgement, we are not necessarily casting a negative light on, or discriminating against, the intentions of any country; because we believe that all have their motives, which we must respect, for acting as they do. But we are in an international forum, and what we do and say here is valid only if reasons of national expediency, which it is our primary duty to serve, each in his own way, are accompanied by inspiration and universal will; for today the world has become so small that that phrase of the Latin poet, "nothing human is alien to me", which 22 centuries ago might have sounded excessively idealistic, is today a mere expression of common sense, bespeaking a common awareness that is gaining ground in all countries.

50. Some of the preceding speakers in this debate have pointed to the lack of positive results from this year's disarmament discussions, and even you, Mr. Chairman, in your opening statement were constrained to say that the achievements in the field of disarmament and arms limitation in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have, in the last 12 months, been meagre. Yet you did see fit to add that some promising seeds had been planted for future progress in this field, and my delegation shares that view. The expressions of scepticism and discouragement, although they can be justified, offer little help in travelling a road so beset with difficulties. Therefore, my delegation believes that in this Committee we should encourage a constructive spirit—not one of false optimism, but one of prudent trust based on the fact that all countries, without exception, have expressed views favourable to disarmament. That would, therefore, lead us to expect the co-operation of all when concrete measures become the order of the day, however small they may be, in order to achieve the final objective which we all desire, namely, general and complete disarmament.

51. Because disarmament is the ideal of all peoples, although as yet, unfortunately, it is a distant one. Item 33 of our agenda is perhaps worded in over-ambitious terms, since it might lead to the impression that the United Nations is truly dealing with the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament. That in turn might justify a question that the man in the street very often asks, namely, what is the United Nations for if not to adopt concrete measures on a matter on which theoretically all its Member States agree? We can give only one answer, and that is to say that the United Nations serves to bring us closer step by step to that ultimate objective. But in order to do so, the United Nations requires the co-operation of all, so that each year we can take another step and not be satisfied with the steps taken in previous years.

52. In the last decade we slowly and painfully made progress in the three partial or preparatory aspects of

general disarmament, namely, that of the competent forums to deal with disarmament, that of denuclearized or peaceful geographical zones and that of the types of armaments and stages of production that can be controlled or suppressed. Then the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was created, and more recently the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. Bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States have progressed, arriving at concrete results. In Europe a pan-European conference has begun work, a conference which a number of Western countries for many years felt to be both premature and unfeasible, and the two military alliances that still exist in that continent appear now at last about to decide on a balanced reduction of their military effectives in the centre of Europe, which in turn leads us to hope that the main allies of each bloc will also decide in the near future to extend to the peripheral zones of the European continent the same reduction of their military forces.

53. In other words, the forums where disarmament matters are being discussed have multiplied. Later I shall refer to the most recent of those forums, namely, the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, whose composition and possibilities of action have been challenged and have resulted in many controversies.

54. But we must stress the progress that has been achieved in the delimitation of nuclear-free zones or what are virtually zones of peace. Let us first look at the Treaty of Tlatelolco for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America. We must take it as a positive and hopeful sign that two nuclear Powers decided this year to adhere to the Additional Protocol II of the Treaty, apart from the two Powers that had already ratified it. We have noted with interest the Romanian proposal for the establishment in the Balkans of a new zone of peace and co-operation free of nuclear weapons, referred to in paragraph 37 of the report [A/9141] submitted by the two Co-Chairmen on behalf of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

55. With regard to the Indian Ocean, we have read with great attention the report submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee established by the last session of the General Assembly in resolution 2992 (XXVII), for which my delegation voted. We believe that the *Ad Hoc* Committee has an extremely important task before it, namely, to set forth the necessary elements to guarantee that the Indian Ocean shall be a zone of peace and co-operation and not an arena for rivalries and confrontations, and that warships and military aircraft shall not use it in contravention of the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of any State, as set forth in resolution 2832 (XXVI). My delegation considers that the Declaration on the Indian Ocean and the *Ad Hoc* Committee established with respect to it are extremely valuable as precedents that might well be applied to all other oceans that call for a régime to encourage the peaceful interests of all nations and not to abet the rivalries and confrontations of the military blocs.

56. The third partial disarmament aspect on which progress has been made, although not to the extent or with the speed desired, is the types of armaments that should be prohibited or the development and production of which should be slowed down because of their specifically

destructive or annihilating characteristics. Here again we must recall that, on both the bilateral and multilateral levels, agreements have been reached to limit or prohibit the production or possession of specific types of weapons. In this connexion, it is important to accelerate and intensify the study and exchange of technical information that will allow us to move beyond the standstill we seem to be experiencing in the talks on the systems of verification, since both the prohibition of underground nuclear tests and of the production and use of chemical weapons might be endangered if we postpone for too long the adoption of agreements and allow the uncertainty to persist regarding means of control. If no positive result is arrived at soon, that discussion will only undermine the mutual confidence that is so necessary for the achievement of further progress in the different fields of disarmament.

57. I should now like to make known the position of my delegation regarding item 32 of our agenda: "World Disarmament Conference: report of the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference". It is a known fact that the delegations of the Member States nominated to make up that Special Committee met on 26 April, at which time the Special Representative of the Secretary-General called the meeting to order as the first meeting of the Special Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. That meeting immediately turned into an unofficial exchange of views under the guidance of Mr. Hoveyda of Iran. Such exchanges of view continued later, and, as a result, it became obvious that there was no consensus, although a consensus was required, under resolution 2930 (XXVII), if the Committee was to submit a report to the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. Mr. Hoveyda, with the tact and diplomatic competence to which my delegation would like to pay a tribute at this time, guided the various exchanges of view and reported to the First Committee on these matters very adequately when he spoke at the 1934th meeting.

58. I would like to point out that the exchanges of view among the members of the Committee were in fact discussions on matters relating to the World Disarmament Conference that went beyond the limited and concrete framework of the mandate entrusted by the General Assembly to the Committee. In fact, many representatives of Member States discussed the timeliness of the Conference, who would participate in it, the need adequately to prepare it, when it should or should not be held, and so on. Confusion was worse confounded by the fact that in these exchanges of view one slipped very easily from discussion of one of these aspects into another, and very often the discrepancies between the views of the speakers were a result of the fact that they were simply speaking of completely different matters. Hence, sight was lost of the ultimate goal of the Committee, which was not to convene a conference or decide when it should be held, or even to pass judgement on whether it should be held or not; but only, as resolution 2930 (XXVII) says, "to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems". In other words, disarmament is the ultimate objective, but first of all the world disarmament conference has to be held, and on that matter there seems already to exist a consensus. Before the conference can be convened, the conditions suitable for it will have to be created. Again,

paragraph 1 of resolution 2930 (XXVII) spells this out. And prior to the creation of adequate conditions must come a consideration of the views of Governments, which must be a methodical and orderly examination of official views of Governments as expressed in their replies to the Secretary-General and in the debates of the First Committee. It is for that reason that the Special Committee was established. My delegation must admit that we do not fully understand the difficulties that some representatives see in all this. The Committee, with its limited and modest mandate, should be able to work, once its membership has been completed so that all interested groups and parties will have adequate representation. We regard as excessive the argument that anything that may be done in connexion with a world disarmament conference, even something as inoffensive as the examination of the opinions of Governments, can be considered to endanger the final objectives of the conference. Quite the contrary, we believe that a serious and objective consideration of the opinions of Governments must be carried out; that it is an urgent question, since only through it can the conditions conducive to the ultimate convening of the world conference be created.

59. The Spanish delegation is ready to support all efforts that will lead to the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 2930 (XXVII), which we consider to be still valid and to which, at the time, the States Members of the United Nations gave almost unanimous support.

60. It is, furthermore, obvious that the study to be carried out by the Special Committee must not interfere with or prejudice the results of talks that are being held in other forums to achieve partial disarmament measures regarding both the production and utilization of certain types of weapons and the creation of zones free of all types or of some types of weapons.

61. My delegation has taken note with interest of the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union at the 1938th meeting that among the disarmament problems calling for thorough study was that of the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories.

62. The Spanish delegation is in favour of all military bases disappearing in due course, because we believe that the only true security is that born of general and complete disarmament and not that derived from the always precarious balance maintained through military alliances. My delegation understands that, in the search for that final objective, we must set ourselves the urgent task of dismantling military bases maintained through force, since they constitute a violation of the territorial integrity of States and a constant undermining of their sovereignty, even in the cases in which the military base is artificially covered by a status that is intended to disguise its nature as a foreign base. The presence of an imposed military base thus becomes an act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, an act which carries with it the stigma of intervention in the domestic affairs of States, and, as such, is a threat to the peace and security of the entire international community.

63. The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Elias for his generous remarks about the other officers of the Committee and me.

64. Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): The item on disarmament has been thoroughly examined by the United Nations in all its scientific and technical ramifications over the years. It is now, in our opinion, in its purely political phase. It is therefore in that frame of reference that my delegation craves the indulgence of this Committee to hear my remarks.

65. Since the founding of the United Nations, and despite the silence of its Charter on disarmament *per se*, the world community has been involved in the search for a substitute for war systems. Article 11 considered the subject of disarmament only in the context of general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, with the General Assembly making recommendations to the Security Council. Articles 26 and 47 are more or less specific in clothing the Security Council, assisted by the Military Staff Committee, with responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and for regulation of armaments and possible disarmament. Nevertheless, the chief concern of the world community has been and must be total disarmament which means that all aspects of the field must be considered, and as such it has remained one of the main tasks of the Organization and the chief item of the United Nations agenda over the years.

66. Since the first resolution in 1946, adopted by the General Assembly, setting up the Atomic Energy Commission having as its terms of reference the exchange of information on atomic energy for peace, controlled for peaceful purposes only, and the elimination of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction from national armaments, with effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to make sure there is no evasion of controls, many have been the efforts to achieve the ends envisaged. Assuming that Members are cognizant of the history of the item, I shall not encroach upon your patience with a detailed recital, but shall say only that since 1946 there has been a divergence of views instead of the freely-negotiated concurrence of the permanent Powers of the Security Council and of the General Assembly. The Disarmament Commission of 1952; Atoms for Peace, in 1953; the Disarmament Sub-Committee, London 1954-1957; the Geneva Conference, 1957; the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee—all these Committees and discussions ended or continued with charges and counter-charges. This was the period of the so-called cold war—1946-1960.

67. Since the invention of the nuclear bomb, the chances of man's survival have been threatened. Now we must work for peace with greater determination if there is to be any generation to save from the scourge of war. Disarmament is inseparable from security and security is inseparable from genuine confidence. Therefore, it is purely political. Herein lies the future task of the United Nations in general and the super-Powers in particular. Political problems and the mutual lack of confidence, compounded by the development of new, sophisticated weapons, have enlarged the areas of distrust and suspicion and rivalry.

68. The present contradictions of distrust and promise among nations, great and small, do not at all contribute to the attainment of genuine confidence. Some States are

more interested in gaining marginal commercial advantages than in dispensing justice and fair play in united action.

69. The transition from the cold-war era to a new era of détente is viewed with serious misgivings, in view of the tensions that have followed. In terms of behaviour, what is needed is concrete disarmament deeds and not goodwill rhetoric. Otherwise détente may prove to be a gimmick to create a false euphoria in the international community as military budgets rise higher and higher.

70. In assessing the achievements of the United Nations, some of us view it with scepticism and disappointment, especially in the area of disarmament. To some extent they are right. The achievements in peace and security fall short of the expectations of the architects of the Charter. By the nature of its composition, compromise is the weakness of the United Nations. The rate of progress is slow in some areas. It has moved at a walking pace instead of the racing speed visualized by many enthusiasts. Nevertheless, its critics are wrong when they direct criticism against the Organization itself. It must never be forgotten that the United Nations is a voluntary Organization of sovereign and independent States. Its activities and majority decisions in many fields are, by and large, subject to the veto of the permanent members of the Security Council. Besides, decisions adopted by the majority are not binding, even on those who voted for them, unless by virtue of conventions signed and ratified by States in the traditional way. Deeply entrenched national interests cannot be uprooted by appeal to logic and common sense. Sovereignty to all countries represented here, irrespective of systems of government, is still as precious as personal freedom to the individual. Notwithstanding frailties, frustrations and defects, notwithstanding cold-war roadblocks, the United Nations is making steady if slow progress in developing appropriate techniques of co-operation for common aims of peace and solidarity.

71. The world stands at a most critical crossroads. We need a concerted and concentrated effort to ban nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; we need to reduce conventional weapons and progress towards general and complete disarmament. Given sufficient dedication, the political will and the requisite planning of specific objectives, I hazard the guess that the security of the entire world would be tremendously enhanced.

72. My delegation is interested in perfect peace for all mankind, and therefore in all aspects of the disarmament issue, and we should without equivocation or reservation support any meaningful resolution to that end. While congratulating the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and all those who have worked with unflagging zeal to make the coming conference on disarmament a reality and a success, we should be shy with regard to our policy performance inside and outside the *United Nations*.

73. Some of the difficulties encountered in our search for acceptable means of containing the arms race may be attributed to the attitude of Members of the United Nations, both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, in the consideration of issues before them; acting at times along purely ideological or ethnic lines, they have

undermined the prestige of the world Organization to the extent that Members are fearful of entrusting their security to the United Nations. Votes, in my opinion, are taken on regional or ideological interests rather than on the merits of the particular question. Everything here seems to be on a *quid pro quo* basis. Power and responsibility in political life should never be viewed in abstraction. We must stop voting under pressure—right or wrong—and end the corrosive rivalries that have besmirched the effectiveness and prestige of this great institution. Frustrated by such a tendency, nations are prone to take their security out of the hands of a large group of small States and commit it into the hands of one of the great Powers on the basis of bilateral agreement. We must seek relevant means of arresting this trend.

74. If we are to live together and enjoy the full benefits of the technocratic age we should re-think our votes with a purpose. We must adjust the United Nations and all its bodies to the requirements of justice and fair play and implicit confidence, or destroy it. The super-Powers, for their part, instead of manipulating the small States to do their will, should employ their great power towards achieving a better life for all mankind and lasting harmony among the nations of the world. They must assume their responsibility for peace before it is too late.

75. I should take this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude to the Minister of State of Sweden, Mrs. Alva Myrdal, for her illuminating statement in this Committee at the 1941st meeting during which she discussed the Swiss Government's decision to convoke the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts in Geneva in February-March 1974. It is my delegation's fervent hope that that Conference, when convened, will devote some time to the consideration of the means to ensure confidence among States as a *sine qua non* to international peace and security.

76. History should guide mankind to a reconstruction of his living processes. All attempts to prevent wars and conflicts since The Hague Peace Conference of 1899 have failed. In the wars of 1914-1918, 1939-1945, men lost all sense of morality, not because they did not desire peace, but because of their incapacity to understand and master the objective forces that cause wars. But after 25 years of the pooling of ideas in the United Nations, though a very short period in the reconstructive process, we should make a redoubled effort to see peace not as the rhetorical dream of prophets and philosophers, but as the indispensable condition for survival of all mankind.

77. The atomic stockpiles of the great Powers cannot save them. No nation can attain security in isolationism, in preparedness or in alliances. The balance-of-power principle in restraining war has tragically failed. International relations are of vital interest to all peoples of our world.

78. In retrospect, every peace treaty since the Napoleonic Wars invariably contained the seed of another war. The Treaty of Vienna in 1815 put an end to the Napoleonic Wars and prepared the way for the wars of nationalism. The Treaty of Paris in 1856 ended the Crimean War and paved the way for the Russo-Turkish War; the Treaty of Frankfurt

in 1871 ended the Franco-German War and prepared the way for the First World War. The Treaty of Versailles in 1919 prepared the way for the Second World War. To cure this and other unforeseen imbalances is the *raison d'être* of the United Nations.

79. Unless there is a change of heart in the chancelleries of the world, regionalism is not the answer to peace and security. Failure in the past to make the United Nations an effective instrument led to a series of regional defense pacts. The Rio Treaty of 1947, the Western Union of 1948, the North Atlantic Pact in 1949 and the Warsaw Treaty all were born of good intentions; but they have proved to be no substitute for a universal agreement for universal peace within the United Nations. Regionalism leads to compartmentalization of the world and to evil consequences. Regional pacts may be effective in economic and cultural associations, but for the type of peace envisaged on the issues of disarmament under consideration, they are wholly inadequate. Human nature being what it is, they will ultimately lead to jealousy, rivalry, fear, and, I daresay, to war.

80. While disarmament is the concern of all the Member States of this Organization, the participation of all States is imperative. I think that disarmament made in good faith with constructive action is possible only in the context of serious negotiations between the super-Powers under the aegis of the United Nations. The only time, as you have observed, that we can get action on major issues in this Organization, is when the Soviet Union and the United States are on the same side of the fence. The recent conflict in the Middle East is a case in point. Lack of confidence will nullify any measure adopted under general debate. We may adopt conventions and treaties banning weapons of certain categories but in the absence of confidence they may be substituted by others more sophisticated and more dangerous.

81. My delegation wholly endorses the objective frankness with which Mr. de Guiringaud, the Permanent Representative of France, presented his Government's position in this Committee ending on a note:

“... not without sadness and disappointment, the continuing threats which overshadow our world. We are here to discuss these threats and to try to remedy, to the utmost of our ability and determination, the real evils of our times. Let us get . . . to work with determination and equanimity.” [1943rd meeting, para. 80.]

His full statement emphasized the need for the establishment of confidence.

82. In this connexion I am inclined to agree with the representative of Laos, when he addressed this Committee at the 1945th meeting, in bemoaning, *inter alia*, the absence of the Pauline spirit of love in our dealings with other nations. Love, he implied, means justice, confidence, honesty and security. It implies according to other States or nations the same considerations that we wish for ourselves. The contrary only leads to confrontation expressed or implied, aggravated by the present bloc-voting propensity founded on the so-called principle of solidarity rather than on merit.

83. We are not suggesting that the permanent Powers only should resolve the disarmament issue without the participation of the other 130 Members. What we are suggesting is simply this, that the permanent Powers, because of their nuclear capabilities, get together without rancour and work out an agreed confidence formula for the consideration of the coming Conference or the General Assembly. When the non-aligned movement was truly non-aligned and unbiased, the Presidents of India, Yugoslavia, Ghana, Indonesia and the United Arab Republic, in their letter and resolution, commonly called “the initiative of the five”, addressed to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 30 September 1960, called upon both sides with equal vehemence, on the President of the United States and the President of the Ministerial Council of the USSR, to find a solution to the unsettled problems and to ease world tension by negotiation. The non-aligned movement today can retrieve its prestige from the stigma of ideological one-sidedness, by calling upon the five permanent or nuclear Powers, friends and foes, to initiate useful efforts to reduce tension and pave the way to promoting confidence toward disarmament and peace.

84. My delegation is in favour of convening a world disarmament conference at any time, the sooner the better, in the hope that it will serve as a catalyst for the various points of view expressed. It will be regrettable if any of the nuclear Powers refuse to participate. I am confident that the non-aligned Powers will spare no efforts in inducing their friends to participate in such a Conference.

85. I think the forthcoming Conference should devote some time to an examination and study of the means of insuring confidence among the nations great and small. It should devote time also to developing plans to police the world with satellites to monitor military activities in all States as a safeguard against an arms build-up by any particular State.

86. Reverting to the disposition of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation entertains no strong views on whether it should or should not be continued, or whether another Committee or group should be constituted in its place. What matters is that it should function effectively in enlarged terms of reference that should include a search for confidence.

87. How can a man disarm when he does not know what his neighbour is going to do, when he is afraid of him, when he thinks that while he is disarming, the other is building up and stockpiling? This is the problem before the United Nations and this is the whole question of disarmament. We can pass resolution after resolution. Until confidence is established we shall never be able to do anything, because I personally am not going to leave my security in the hands of other people when I do not know whether they are going to jump on me tomorrow. This was borne out by the statement of the French Ambassador when he spoke to us.

88. Finally, man is subject to the general laws of physical nature, but he has powers to modify these laws to his own advantage. Although this power is not great individually, when it is exercised by mankind collectively and over a long period, it can balance the forces of nature and can even be regarded as the work of nature itself. For if nature has

endowed man collectively with the capacity to learn from experience to understand its laws and to modify their effects, the progression of man from nature is itself natural and leads to an interest in the welfare of other human beings and their destiny.

89. My delegation reserves the right to intervene again on the relevant resolutions on the items under consideration should it become necessary.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.