

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1192nd  
MEETING

Friday, 10 November 1961,  
at 4.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

### Agenda items 73 and 72:

Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	155
The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	

**Chairman:** Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

## AGENDA ITEMS 73 AND 72

Continuation of suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests and obligations of States to refrain from their renewal (A/4801 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3, A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3) (*continued*)

The urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international control (A/4799, A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3) (*continued*)

1. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) said that he wished first to emphasize that his delegation appreciated and respected the motives of the sponsors of the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3).

2. He noted, however, that the draft resolution neglected to mention the elementary right of self-defence reserved to all States under the Charter of the United Nations. In that connexion, it was relevant to recall the reply given on 5 August 1961 by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Khrushchev, to a correspondent of The New York Times, who had asked him whether the Soviet Union was prepared to declare that it would never be the first nation to employ nuclear weapons in a war. Mr. Khrushchev had replied that anyone who made such a statement, even in all sincerity, might find his words belied by events, for should there be a war and one side felt that it was losing, it would undoubtedly use its nuclear bombs.

3. Mr. Khrushchev had gone on to say that world peace should be assured not by undertakings to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons, but by a radical solution of the cardinal issues, the best guarantee of peace being the destruction of armaments and the elimination of armies—in other words, disarmament. On that fundamental question, the United States agreed with the Soviet Union, as had been demonstrated by the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, when he had submitted to the General Assembly (1013th plenary meeting) a programme for general and complete disarmament. The ultimate aim of the United States was to bring about a free, secure and peaceful

world of independent States adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law, a world in which complete disarmament would be achieved under effective international control. In order to fulfil that objective, the United States was advocating a series of specific measures, including the disbanding of all national armed forces, the elimination of all armaments, including weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery, the institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements and the settlement of disputes, and the establishment, within the framework of the United Nations, of an international disarmament organization to ensure effective compliance with disarmament measures.

4. In the first stage of the plan proposed by the United States, all States would adhere to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons. The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons would be stopped and the reconversion of existing stocks would be undertaken. States owning nuclear weapons would be called upon not to relinquish control of such weapons to any nation which did not possess them and the latter would undertake not to attempt to obtain such weapons. A commission of experts would be established from the outset to report on the feasibility of the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

5. In the second stage, there would be further substantial reductions in the armed forces and armaments of States, including strategic nuclear weapons and countering weapons. In the third stage, States would retain only those forces and non-nuclear armaments required to maintain internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a United Nations peace force. The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited, except for those to be used by the United Nations peace force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

6. Nevertheless, pending the achievement of general and complete disarmament—and the United States pledged itself to exert every effort towards that end—that is, until a peaceful world was established with appropriate machinery for settling all disputes by peaceful means, within the framework of the United Nations Charter, no State could abrogate its right of self-defence, recognized in Article 51 of the Charter. There was nothing in that Article which limited the right of individual or collective self-defence or stated what type of forces or armaments might be used in repelling an individual or collective armed attack. Indeed, it would be suicidal to impose such a limitation, for an aggressor might arm itself with weapons which the intended victim might not have.

7. Conversely, any use of armed force in a manner contrary to the United Nations Charter should not be

sanctioned, directly or indirectly, by a declaration referring exclusively to a particular weapon. Moreover, the United States was against the use of all force when it was contrary to the United Nations Charter. In the twelve-Power draft resolution, it was proposed to outlaw only the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, which would appear to indicate that the use of other types of force, even in violation of the Charter, might be deemed acceptable. For those reasons, the United States would be compelled to vote against the draft resolution in its unamended form.

8. The amendments submitted by the Italian delegation (A/C.1/L.295) introduced new elements which the United States Government deemed appropriate. As amended, the draft resolution would condemn not only the use of nuclear weapons, but the use of any armed force contrary to the Charter. Accordingly, the United States delegation supported the Italian amendments. If they were adopted—and he sincerely hoped they would be—it would vote in favour of the draft resolution as amended.

9. The declaration under consideration was not a final or complete solution of the problem of the illegal use of force. The problem could be solved only by a general disarmament agreement which would secure the replacement of the use of armed force by adequate peace-keeping machinery under the rule of law. Thus it was only by adopting a plan for general and complete disarmament, such as that proposed by the United States, that it would be possible to bring about the abolition of all illegal use of force, not only in Africa but throughout the world. In the first stage of that plan, States would reaffirm their obligations under the United Nations Charter to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force contrary to the principles of the Charter.

10. With regard to the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3), the United States would vote against sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of the operative paragraph and would abstain on all the other paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole.

11. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), exercising his right of reply, pointed out that the question asked by the correspondent of The New York Times to which the United States representative had referred had called for a unilateral pledge by the Soviet Union that it would not be the first nation to use nuclear weapons. The twelve-Power draft resolution, however, called for an international convention binding all States to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons. Hence, the statement quoted by the United States representative had no relation to the question before the Committee.

12. Mr. TURBAY AYALA (Colombia) moved the suspension of the meeting in order to enable his delegation to confer with the sponsors of the fourteen-

Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.291/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1-3) concerning an amendment which Colombia proposed to submit to that text.

*The motion was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 40 abstentions.*

*The meeting was suspended at 5.5 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.*

13. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) declared that his country was against all nuclear tests, wherever they might be carried out. Moreover, Cyprus was a neighbour of Africa and had close friendly relations with the nations of that continent. The Cypriot delegation would therefore vote in favour of the fourteen-Power draft resolution, on the understanding that it was a step towards the prohibition of tests in all continents, since the world, its peace, its health and its life were indivisible. If the rest of the world was to suffer from nuclear tests, Africa would not be immune.

14. Referring to the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.292 and Add.1-3), he stated that Cyprus was firmly opposed to war, in particular to nuclear war, and appreciated the motives of the sponsors. The draft resolution, however, dealt only with the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons in war and made no reference to the outlawing of nuclear weapons tests in peacetime. The sponsors could have either included a reference to tests in their draft resolution or reserved the latter for discussion in connexion with the disarmament item. Nevertheless, despite that procedural aspect, the Cypriot delegation would support the draft resolution.

15. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) said that he fully sympathized with the desire of the new countries of Africa to avoid the dangers of radio-active fall-out. Accordingly, the Indian delegation would vote in favour of the fourteen-Power draft resolution.

16. With regard to the twelve-Power draft resolution, his delegation did not see how it was contrary to the spirit of the United Nations Charter and, specifically, to Article 51. The sponsors were not seeking to impair the natural right of States to self-defence; they simply considered, for the reasons given in the preamble to the draft resolution, that nuclear weapons should never be used, even in self-defence. The Italian amendments would therefore appear to go against the very spirit of the draft resolution. The Indian delegation would not, therefore, be able to support them, but would vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood.

17. Mr. ORTIZ MARTIN (Costa Rica) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*The motion was adopted by 58 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.