

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records *



FIRST COMMITTEE
4th meeting
held on
Monday, 17 October 1977
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 4TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention
of the danger of nuclear war

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.4
18 October 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

77-73021

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 127

DEEPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNATIONAL DETENTE AND PREVENTION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR (A/32/242; A/C.1/32/L.1 and L.2)

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the programme of work and the timetable adopted by the Committee at its meeting on 7 October 1977, we are beginning today the consideration of agenda item 127.

Members of the Committee are aware that this item has been inscribed on the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly on the initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as an important and urgent question. The General Assembly, by its decision of 30 September, allotted this item to the First Committee. As regards consideration of this item, I should like to draw your attention to the following documents. First of all, there is a letter dated 27 September 1977 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR addressed to the Secretary-General which actually is an explanatory memorandum on the question under discussion (A/32/242). Then there are two documents circulated by the Soviet delegation for consideration by the Committee: a draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente (A/C.1/32/L.1) and a draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war (A/C.1/32/L.2).

As you know, many participants in the general debate in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly welcomed the process of international détente and emphasized the necessity of strengthening it and extending it to all spheres of international life and to all regions of the world. It shows the interest of many delegations in this problem.

The item put for consideration to this Committee is closely connected with current developments in the world. It is true that in recent years we have witnessed some improvements in international relations, such as an easing of tensions. But it is also true that we still face explosive crises in some regions of the world, the arms race still persists, the remnants of colonialism and racism still exist in the southern part of Africa, thus posing a threat

(The Chairman)

to international peace, discrimination still exists in economic relations, and there are other numerous problems which should be solved. Undoubtedly, the further development of the process of détente would create favourable conditions for the solution of all existing problems confronting the United Nations and the whole world. And of course, as it was stressed at the plenary meetings, the United Nations should not stand aloof from the struggle for further improvement in the international climate; there should be deeper involvement and an increasing role for this Organization in the process of seeking détente.

The general debate also showed the concern of the peoples of the world with the problem of how to remove the nuclear threat and prevent the danger of nuclear war. The United Nations, which proclaimed in its Charter the maintenance of international peace and the removal of threats to the peace as its main objective, should make greater contributions to the prevention of the danger of nuclear war.

With these reflections in mind, I shall open the debate on the agenda item.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): May I begin by congratulating the Chairman on his election to the important post of the chairmanship of the First Committee of the General Assembly and assuring him that we are confident that the First Committee will do a fine job under his wise guidance. You may rest assured that the Soviet delegation will co-operate with you in all matters.

I take great satisfaction in conveying, on behalf of my delegation, warm congratulations to Mr. Hollai of Hungary and to Mr. Pastinen of Finland on their election as Vice-Chairmen of the First Committee and also to the Rapporteur, Mr. Correa of Mexico. The Soviet delegation assures the officers of the First Committee of its intention to work constructively in the Committee and to co-operate with them, and wishes them every success in their work.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The First Committee is beginning its work with the discussion of an agenda item proposed by the Soviet Union and entitled "Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war". As you, Mr. Chairman, have noted in your introductory remarks, the letter dated 27 September 1977 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations contains comprehensive argumentation in favour of this proposal. Allow me today to provide some additional insight into the reasons why we regard this item as an important and urgent question which deserves the most careful consideration by the States Members of the United Nations.

An analysis of the development of the international situation indicates that in the last few years there has been a turn away from explosive confrontation towards mutually beneficial co-operation and from the "cold war" to the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems.

That positive process is referred to at times differently - as easing of tensions, improvement of the international climate and détente - yet its essence is the same. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Leonid I. Brezhnev, emphasized that:

"... détente means, first of all, the overcoming of the 'cold war' and transition to normal, stable relations among States. Détente means willingness to resolve differences and disputes not by force, not by threats or sabre-rattling, but by peaceful means, at the conference table. Détente means a certain trust and ability to take into consideration each other's legitimate interests."

Numerous examples abound where the desire of States to be guided by a policy of détente in search of solutions to a variety of problems besetting them leads to positive results in the most diverse spheres of international life.

If we address the most important task facing States - the task of preventing the danger of another world war - we may note with satisfaction that it has been possible in recent years to achieve significant progress along those lines. The policy of "brinkmanship" has become bankrupt. Gone from the agenda are many problems that in the past provoked uncertainty and suspicion

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

in international relations. States assume obligations to avert situations which could lead to aggravation of relations between them and to exacerbation of the threat of war. The current international scene is now characterized by the practice of talks and contacts at the highest level, systematic consultations on foreign-policy matters and agreed common approaches to pressing international problems in joint communiqués and statements. There is every reason to conclude that the danger of another world war has receded and that the prospect of its complete elimination appears to be a feasible task.

Building up confidence in relations between States has contributed to certain progress in the field of disarmament. A series of treaties and agreements has been concluded to limit the race in nuclear and some other weapons, and concrete talks are under way regarding further steps in this direction.

In conditions of détente a favourable atmosphere is created for a successful struggle of peoples to ensure their independence and sovereignty. The selfless struggle of the heroic Vietnamese people and of all the peoples of Indo-China against imperialist aggression ended in an historic victory. The peoples of Angola, Mozambique and other former colonial Territories have achieved independence.

The improvement of the international atmosphere has resulted in expanded bilateral and multilateral co-operation among States in economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields. The development of mutually beneficial trade and broad exchanges of delegations lead to further increase in mutual understanding and trust between peoples; and that, in turn, contributes to successful solution of political problems.

International détente is a multilateral, interconnected process where success in one area is conducive to progress in another, and, conversely, obstacles which arise in some areas can lead to a stalemate in solving other problems.

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is an impressive example of fruitful co-operation among a large group of States with different

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

social systems in agreeing on common approaches to solving complex international problems. The Final Act of the Conference expresses the political will of the participating States "to exert efforts so as to make détente both a continuing and increasingly viable process, comprehensive in scope". The understandings reached at the Conference constitute a code of principles governing relations between States and fully meeting the requirements of peaceful coexistence. Those understandings determine concrete areas and forms of co-operation in various fields and outline a broad and clear-cut platform for actions of States on a unilateral, bilateral and multilateral basis for years, and possibly for decades, to come. The positive results of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe are important and beneficial not only for the countries of Europe but also outside it. Those results are intended to help all peoples throughout the world to live in peace as good neighbours. But, as

Leonid I. Brezhnev noted in his address before the Conference on 31 July 1975:

"... if the hopes that the peoples are pinning on this meeting and on decisions of the Conference are to be fully justified and not frustrated at the slightest change of weather, further common efforts and day-to-day work of all the participating States to deepen détente are required."

The need to contribute through all possible means to the relaxation of international tensions and to exert new efforts with a view to restructuring international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence has found its expression in a number of recent major bilateral and multilateral international instruments.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty reaffirmed in the Declaration adopted at the Bucharest Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee on 26 November 1976 their intention of abiding by the policy of détente in all their foreign policy actions, and to work towards making détente irreversible.

The Soviet Union bases its relations with States of all continents, large and small, developed and developing, on the principles of détente. This has been reflected in many treaties, joint communiqués and statements signed by the Soviet Union over recent years with a great number of States. As far back as 1972 the "Basic Principles of Relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America" stressed:

"... the need to spare no effort to prevent the threat of war and to create conditions conducive to the relaxation of international tensions in the world, the strengthening of world security, and to international co-operation."

The joint statement of the Soviet Union and France of 22 June 1977, on the relaxation of international tensions, was an important document which attempted to find a common answer to the question of the content of the policy of détente and the direction it should take in the present circumstances.

Provisions in support of further development of the policy of détente are also contained in communiqués and statements by many other States. Permit me to cite as an example the "Joint Communiqué on the State Visit of Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to Mexico", dated 13 March 1976 and issued as an official United Nations document (A/31/78). The Communiqué states that the Heads of the two States, while noting that:

"... the policy of détente has yielded certain results" (A/31/78, page 2) emphasized that:

"... the process of détente and negotiations should become a lasting feature of international relations and should be extended to all regions of the world and to all questions so as to ensure balanced and more rapid progress towards the elimination of areas of conflict, tension and distrust and towards the achievement of a lasting peace based on prosperity and justice for all peoples." (Ibid.).

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

The Colombo Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries devoted a special chapter in its Political Declaration to the task of lessening international tensions, where it welcomed:

"the positive changes which have taken place in international relations, thereby creating more favourable conditions for the resolution of major international problems." (NAC/CONF.5/S.2, para. 22)

The Conference noted that:

"... détente was still limited, both in scope and geographical extent," (Ibid., para. 25)

and emphasized the need for active participation of non-aligned countries in the process of easing international tensions.

Recently, statements in support of the policy of détente have been increasingly heard in the United Nations too. Most representatives, in the course of the general debate at the current General Assembly session, have pointed to the achievements of the policy of détente and the important role it plays in ensuring the security of peoples, and have emphasized the need to make détente irreversible and to extend it to all parts of the world.

The world is increasingly coming to realize that international détente is the only reasonable way of developing international relations, that in this nuclear age there is no reasonable alternative to it, and that the question actually is whether the world will follow the course of renouncing the use of force, the course of disarmament and equitable, mutually beneficial co-operation, or whether it will be plunged even more deeply into an unrestrained arms race and an escalation of armed conflicts fraught with the direst consequences for mankind.

The achievements of recent years in the process of international détente are the result of strenuous efforts in the struggle against the enemies of détente. A great deal has been done. Yet at the same time it is obvious that at the present stage we are in fact only at the beginning of the process of restructuring international relations. What is more, in the development of international events a number of negative factors have recently emerged. The successes of the policy of détente have caused a flurry of activity among reactionary and militaristic circles in some countries, which are attempting to slow down the

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

process of détente and to distort its nature and content. Underlying the attacks of all kinds against the policy of détente are generally to be found the interests of the military-industrial complex, which profits from manufacturing the engines of death and destruction. Moreover, politicians who are still doggedly clinging to the tenets of the "cold war" are also quite active in a bid to prevent a thaw in the international climate. Attempts to whip up an atmosphere of military psychosis are aimed directly at justifying yet another spiral in the arms race, so detrimental to the peoples of the world.

All this proves that the process of détente cannot be safeguarded from setbacks, or even reverses. Many complex problems, which require persistent and purposeful efforts, will have to be solved in order to advance the cause of détente.

The process of international détente, if it is to be successful, urgently requires that an ever greater number of States, large and small, should be involved in it, that new initiatives should be advanced, and that it should be extended to all spheres of international life and all regions of the world.

At times we hear allegations to the effect that the process of détente is limited in nature, that it is in the interests of just a few States and that it does not contribute to the long-overdue solution of a number of problems. Such allegations represent a distortion, deliberate or not, of the true meaning of the policy of détente, which is to strengthen peace and prevent the threat of nuclear war. There is no doubt that the ensuring of peaceful conditions serves the vital interests of all peoples and creates a favourable atmosphere for solution of the most diverse problems facing the international community. In this case, it is only those who seek to aggravate international tensions and to step up the arms race who stand to lose.

The Soviet delegation is convinced that at the present stage of world development it is urgently necessary that the policy of international détente be given fresh impetus. This was also underscored by the many representatives who, in the course of the general debate, expressed their concern over the fact that lately the development of détente has not been duly stimulated, that its scope remains limited and, what is more, that the process of international détente may even run the risk of being reversed.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

We believe that it is the United Nations, as the most universal and influential international forum, that should provide such an impetus. A solemn declaration by the United Nations Member States of their commitment to the policy of détente and of their determination to step up efforts aimed at the deepening and consolidation of détente will be fully consonant with their obligation under the Charter to live in peace with one another as good neighbours. That is why the Soviet Union has submitted a proposal for adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a special declaration which would spell out the content of the policy of international détente and determine the priority spheres of application of peaceful efforts by States.

As is well known, there have been a number of instances in the practical experience of the United Nations where the General Assembly has adopted declarations on most important and pressing problems of international relations. Reference may be made, inter alia, to such historic documents as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Declaration on the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in Accordance with the United Nations Charter and others. These documents have played and continue to play an important role in focusing the efforts of States on the solution of the pressing tasks arising from the Charter of this Organization. It is obvious that at the present stage it has become necessary to adopt a similar document on such an urgent problem of today as the consolidation and development of international détente.

The draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente submitted by the Soviet Union has been drawn up with due regard for various international instruments. It reflects the attitude to the policy of détente assumed by a great number of States. We believe that such a declaration would serve as a kind of compass to be used by States for setting their bearings in the stormy sea of current international policies. The adoption by the United Nations Member States of such a declaration would undoubtedly contribute to overcoming the obstacles arising in the path of the

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

process of détente, improving the political climate in the world, reducing the threat of nuclear war, building up confidence and developing all-round co-operation among States.

What should be the basic provisions of the proposed declaration as we see them? The further deepening and consolidation of détente calls, above all, for retaining the gains obtained in recent years in the process of improving the international climate. Therefore the declaration should, first and foremost, contain an appeal to promote actively the implementation of multilateral treaties and agreements which serve the interests of the strengthening of international security and the development of peaceful relations, as well as of the declarations and resolutions of the United Nations aimed at achieving these objectives.

A major direction of activities for securing peace on earth, which requires concerted efforts by all States, is unquestionably that of containing the arms race and implementing measures of genuine disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. The need to include a relevant provision in the declaration becomes all the more urgent because lately the danger of yet another spiral in the arms race has become quite real. Plans are afoot to develop and deploy even deadlier weapons. Therefore it is highly important to take resolute steps towards disarmament, steps based on the principle of the inadmissibility of gaining unilateral advantages and leading to greater confidence between States.

One of the basic elements of international détente, as also mentioned in the draft declaration, is the peaceful settlement of international conflicts and the prevention of new conflict situations. A just and peaceful settlement in the Middle East which would guarantee a lasting and durable peace without infringing the legitimate rights and interests of any people or any State in that area would have a tremendous positive influence on the situation in the world. Useful decisions by the United Nations concerning the settlement of the Cyprus problem and the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea are yet to be implemented. The fact that it proves impossible at times to prevent the emergence of new conflicts, which in certain cases result in military confrontation, gives rise to serious concern. The policy of détente

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

is incompatible with schemes of any kind which tend to inflame conflicts, especially between States which have recently liberated themselves from colonial and neo-colonial domination.

International détente calls for a new, higher level of co-operation between States and for greater mutual trust. This implies, in the first place, consistent observance of the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and respect for the sovereignty and independence of each other - something which the declaration should also emphasize. There is nothing new in the foregoing principles. They have been enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in a number of its decisions. Yet the practical experience of international relations still bears witness to flagrant violations of these principles. There are still those who just love to lecture other peoples on how to settle their internal affairs and at times even to intrude unceremoniously in the life of another State in a bid to reverse its course in pursuance of their selfish interests. Such a policy, naturally, not only leads to complications in relations between some States but also exerts a pernicious influence on the solution of various international problems and makes more difficult the development of the process of détente.

In current conditions the use or threat of force in international relations is absolutely inadmissible. Such actions entail a serious aggravation of the situation, exacerbation of tensions and a threat that local conflicts may escalate into a world nuclear catastrophe. The policy of détente requires that all disputes be settled by peaceful means at the negotiating table.

At the same time it is obvious that the principle of the non-use of force must be applied in strict accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, which provide for the right to individual or collective self-defence. It goes without saying that a victim of aggression has an inalienable right to resort to force to repel aggression or to eliminate the consequences of aggression. Similarly, no restriction can be placed on the right of peoples that are still under colonial and racist domination to wage a struggle for their liberation, making use of all means at their disposal. The task here is not to allow the use of force for the purposes of aggression. In that case there will be no need to resort to force to repel aggression.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Consistent and unswerving observance of the fundamental principles of international law by all States would imply a decisive shift in international relations towards lasting peace. Yet the requirements of détente do not stop at this. The positive experience accumulated in international relations indicates that States should maintain a favourable atmosphere in their relations with each other, take into account the legitimate interests and views of other States and measure their actions in relation to other States and in all parts of the globe against the requirements of détente. We propose that a relevant provision be included in the text of the declaration. The observance of these provisions would place relations between States on a plateau which would offer a clearer view of how to tackle even the most complex international problems and consolidate further the process of détente.

One of the factors which has plagued international relations over the entire post-war period has been the existence of opposing military groupings of States. The socialist countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty have repeatedly proposed that an end be put to bloc politics. As a first step towards the simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization they have urged that their military organizations be dismantled, or that at least no steps be taken to expand the existing or to create new closed groupings or military political alliances. The other side has yet to come up with a positive response to these proposals. We believe that the declaration should stress that the considerations of bloc politics should not be allowed to impede the development of the spirit of détente.

International détente has created favourable conditions for the speedy completion of the liberation of all colonial countries and peoples, the elimination of racist régimes and the eradication of the vestiges of national oppression and inequality in international relations, and the declaration should stress this in a forthright manner. The statement by the Soviet Union on the complete elimination of the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid of 5 October 1977 emphasizes:

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

"Consistently and unswervingly upholding the principles of the equality and self-determination of peoples, the Soviet Union vigorously condemns the criminal policies of the racist régimes in the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia; it is strongly in favour of isolating and boycotting those régimes and supports the complete eradication of the inhuman policy of apartheid and of all forms and manifestations of racial discrimination and oppression. A major contribution would in that way be made to improving the entire international situation, strengthening détente and reshaping of the entire system of international relations on an equitable long-term basis; the flagrant large-scale violations of human rights in this region would be brought to an end."(A/32/259, annex, p. 2)

Colonialism, racism and apartheid are anachronisms in the twentieth century. The speedy eradication of this shameful phenomenon would provide a strong impetus to the further development of the process of détente. Therefore allegations that are made at times to the effect that the interests of détente are different from those of the elimination of the last remaining bastions of colonialism and racism constitute a gross distortion of the meaning of the policy of détente and have nothing to do with reality.

The development of equitable, mutually beneficial economic relations among all States on a just basis is an integral part of the process of détente. This process, as the draft declaration points out, demands the elimination of discrimination and any artificial barriers to international trade and the restructuring of world economic relations so as to eradicate all manifestations of diktat and exploitation. In doing this, due account must be taken of the interests of developing countries. The statement by the Soviet Government on the restructuring of international economic relations of 3 October 1976 (A/C.2/31/2) stressed that:

"Further advancement of the cause of political and military détente, which is of paramount importance for the strengthening of world peace, will at the same time contribute to the normalization of the world economic situation. Progress in the sphere of restructuring international economic relations will in turn contribute to deepening and expanding international détente."

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It is in the interest of all States, and primarily of the developing nations, to develop and expand co-operation in making fuller use of natural resources and in advancing knowledge.

The improvement of political and economic relations between States is closely linked with building up feelings of friendship and mutual trust among all peoples. The draft declaration points to the need to foster mutual understanding among peoples by developing contacts between them and enhancing reciprocal familiarization with the culture and life of peoples. Of great importance also is the encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, as laid down in the international covenants on human rights and other relevant international treaties and instruments.

Such are the basic lines along which the Soviet Union believes States are called upon to join their efforts in order to deepen and consolidate the process of détente. Of course, in so doing full account must be taken of the peculiarities and diversities of their positions and views, which must not be infringed or forced on anyone.

The Soviet Union's approach to the cardinal problems of contemporary international relations, which is reflected in the draft declaration submitted for the Committee's consideration, derives from the Leninist foreign policy line of the Soviet State which has been pursued consistently for 60 years now. This line has recently been enshrined in the new Constitution of the USSR. A special chapter on foreign policy stresses that the Soviet State consistently pursues a Leninist policy of peace and stands for the strengthening of the security of nations and broad international co-operation. The text of the fundamental law of the Soviet Union reflects all the 10 principles governing relations among States which constitute the basis of the Final Act adopted at the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe

Guided by the provisions of the Soviet Constitution, the Soviet Union will continue to take active steps to defend peace and develop international co-operation.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

Addressing the General Assembly in the course of the general debate at its current session, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR,

Mr. A. A. Gromyko, said:

"Widening the scope of détente means at the same time pushing back the risk of mankind's finding itself under the crushing steam-roller of a nuclear war. These are in fact two most important aspects of securing a genuinely solid and genuinely lasting peace on earth."

(A/32/PV.8, pp. 62-65)

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

In the field of disarmament the Soviet Union, ever since the first explosion of an atomic bomb, has always put in the forefront the task of stopping the nuclear arms race, reducing and subsequently eliminating nuclear weapons altogether. Our State has made a large enough contribution to reducing the threat of nuclear war. Everyone knows full well the numerous initiatives in this field that have been taken by the Soviet Union since the early post-war years. A few years ago we proposed that a conference of five nuclear Powers - the USSR, the United States, the People's Republic of China, France and Britain - be convened to consider nuclear disarmament questions. In 1972 the General Assembly adopted a solemn Declaration on the Non-Use of Force in International Relations and Simultaneous Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons. A year ago socialist countries put forward a new important proposal to the effect that all the States which signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, should conclude a treaty on the non-first use of nuclear weapons against one another. The Soviet Union continues its persistent efforts in the field of real nuclear disarmament: limitation and subsequent reduction of strategic nuclear arms.

Far be it from us, however, to claim that the steps being taken in this field are sufficient. The threat of nuclear war remains real. The rapid development of science and technology, including military technology, has immeasurably increased the risk that any local conflict may escalate into a broader world conflict. In the 30 post-war years nuclear weapons have grown into a sprawling complex of systems. Accordingly, the problem of their elimination has become many times more complicated.

Of course, only drastic measures and the elimination of nuclear weapons altogether can permanently remove the threat of nuclear war which looms over the world. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is ready, as before, to sit down at the negotiating table with all the nuclear Powers - since real disarmament can be achieved only with their participation and consent, and they cannot possibly divest themselves of this responsibility - to consider the problem of nuclear disarmament in all of its aspects and jointly to elaborate concrete ways for its practical solution.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

However, until such time as this becomes possible, the Soviet Union believes that at this stage the United Nations can and must make a further substantial contribution to preventing the danger of nuclear war. Its resources in this area are far from being exhausted. The United Nations is called upon to use all its influence in order to mobilize all States to take further steps towards preventing the danger of nuclear war. That is why we have proposed the draft resolution of the General Assembly on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war (A/C.1/32/L.2), which is before the Committee. By adopting such a resolution the General Assembly would specify measures to be taken by all States, particularly nuclear-weapon States, for the purpose of reducing, to the extent possible, the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war. Most of the measures contained in the Soviet draft resolution have already been approved on various occasions by the United Nations, and many of them have been reflected in bilateral and multilateral documents signed in recent years. It appears to us, however, that it would be important to bring them together in one document and to give it the force of a solemn appeal on behalf of all Member States of the United Nations.

What then are these measures? First of all, it is essential that all States should act in such a way as to avert situations which could cause a dangerous aggravation of relations among them and to avoid military confrontations which could lead to a nuclear war - and such a war would be a catastrophe to all countries. The draft resolution also provides that the nuclear-weapon States, in view of their special responsibility as permanent members of the Security Council, should always exercise restraint in their mutual relations and show a willingness to negotiate and settle differences by peaceful means. They should do all in their power to prevent conflicts and situations which could exacerbate international tension. If all countries were to abide by these principles in their relations, a lasting peace would be to a significant extent secured.

It is very important for nuclear States to embody, in treaty form, their intention to seek to reduce and to prevent the danger of nuclear war. Some useful experience has already been accumulated in this field: there have been concluded a Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, a Soviet-French agreement on the prevention of the accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons and, very recently, a Soviet-British agreement on the prevention of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war. There is a possibility for these agreements to be improved and developed further, and also for such agreements to be concluded by those nuclear Powers which have not yet done so.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It would be useful to emphasize in the resolution the exceptional importance of strictly observing the principle of renunciation of the threat or use of force in international relations. This would unquestionably contribute to ensuring favourable conditions for curbing the arms race and saving mankind from the danger of war. The principle of the non-use of force, if it is to be comprehensive and effective, must encompass the use of both nuclear weapons and conventional arms. The observance of this condition will put all States, large and small, on an equal footing, and it will not provide unilateral advantages to anyone.

The draft resolution urges the nuclear-weapon States to take a series of steps towards a direct limitation of the nuclear arms race. Specifically, it provides for negotiations among the nuclear Powers with a view to reaching agreement on the withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons from certain areas of the world's oceans and on other possible measures to limit the nuclear arms race in those areas. The Soviet Union has always taken a sympathetic attitude to the wishes, expressed by many States on more than one occasion, for effective measures of military détente to be carried out on a regional scale. The Soviet Union is prepared to take steps, on a reciprocal basis, towards making the seas and the oceans an arena for peaceful co-operation, rather than tension, be it in the Mediterranean or in the Indian Ocean. Some time ago, with a view to reducing tension in the area of the Mediterranean, the Soviet Union proposed to the United States to agree on the withdrawal from that area of Soviet and United States ships and submarines carrying nuclear weapons. If implemented, this initiative would be in the interest of détente in that region as well as in the interest of the security of the States in question. It would also be a useful measure to establish zones completely free from nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

It is quite understandable that the efforts aimed at the limitation of strategic nuclear arms have an exceptional significance in preventing nuclear war. We may note with satisfaction that as a result of recent Soviet-United States talks in Washington appreciable progress has been made in narrowing the differences between the two sides with respect to achieving a new long-term agreement. However, outstanding issues still remain. The Soviet Union favours the earliest possible successful completion of the talks and is doing everything in its power to that end. It is prepared then to go even further and start negotiations on the reduction of existing strategic arms. It also appears useful to us to agree on the renunciation, on a reciprocal basis, of the development of new, even more destructive systems of weapons of mass annihilation.

The Soviet Union believes that the consideration and solution of such an important problem as disarmament and reduction of the threat of nuclear war require the participation of all States of the world. Disarmament cannot be carried out selectively, when some will disarm themselves while others will have an opportunity not only to retain their military capability but also to build it up. That is why we believe it important to include in the resolution an appeal to all States, which have not yet done so, to accede to the existing Treaties aimed at the limitation of the nuclear arms race: on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in the three environments, on the non-proliferation of such weapons and on the non-emplacement of these weapons on the sea-bed and in outer space. Pending their accession to such Treaties these States could declare their intention to act as if they were parties to those Treaties.

It would also undoubtedly be very useful for the General Assembly to appeal to all States, and above all to the nuclear-weapon States, to conduct negotiations in appropriate forums with a view to agreeing upon and adopting additional measures for the prevention of nuclear war, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the reduction of nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament. Those measures would constitute important steps leading towards the ultimate goal: general and complete disarmament under

(Mr. Troyanovsky, USSR)

strict and effective international control, which would guarantee peace and security for mankind on a lasting and permanent basis. The draft resolution does contain such an appeal.

Furthermore, the draft provides for an appeal to all States to prevent a further proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices while ensuring access for all States to the use of nuclear energy for the purposes of peaceful economic development.

Finally, to make headway in disarmament, the General Assembly could call on all States to refrain from any actions which would impede international talks on working out agreements directed towards the limitation of the nuclear arms race and the removal of the danger of nuclear war.

Adoption by the General Assembly of the resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war would, we are deeply convinced, contribute to uniting the efforts of all States of the world towards solving this most important problem of present-day international relations.

Such are the basic considerations which we wanted to set forth in connexion with the agenda item, proposed by us to the General Assembly, on the "deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war". The Soviet delegation expects that the drafts it has submitted will receive the broad approval of the Member States of the United Nations. Thus the Positive potential of the United Nations will be effectively utilized in the interests of further strengthening international détente and securing a lasting peace.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have made some notes and I have read a lot about this question but before I embark on my statement I should like to congratulate ourselves on having you, Sir, in the Chair and I must thank you for accepting the chairmanship of such a committee, which lays a burden on you and on the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. That is why we are indebted to you.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

Having said this, I should like to seize this opportunity to tell you what many of us, the small nations, think about this question. First of all, I must thank our colleague from the Soviet Union for having been so comprehensive in dealing with the question of disarmament. I would hasten to say that nuclear weapons, as the representative of the Soviet Union has said, are only part of the weapons that could be deployed. I am glad he mentioned conventional weapons because, apart from Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Second World War, one of the most brutal world conflicts, was fought with so-called conventional weapons. So it is not only a question of nuclear weapons, but of all weapons that might be deployed - God forbid - in any future war.

I should like to make some remarks, and in so doing I should like to eschew criticism of the major Powers, or super-Powers, as they are called. These remarks are in the nature of an analysis of the situation which I have followed since the inception of the United Nations.

The so-called cold war, it is true, is no longer with us except once in a while when it rears its head and we try to deal with it by the remedy of so-called détente. Détente is a good word. It was devised, I think, in the early nineteenth century during the Napoleonic wars, and it seems to give people hope that it will be a stepping stone towards the establishment of peace. It did so in Europe between 1815 and 1848 when the people of Europe erupted against what was called détente and the status quo.

There is no such thing as status quo in the world. Status quo does not exist. It is a convenient expression, used to calm people down. The world is predicated on change, not on a status quo. As we say in Arabic: "It is impossible to leave everything as it is".

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

The trouble with the world today is not the question how much weaponry a particular Power, big or small, may have in its arsenal. The trouble in the world today is the mistrust that lodges in the hearts of the leaders of major Powers and the small Powers. How can we create the mutual trust that will replace the mistrust that we find shaping the policies of States day in and day out?

I have no intention of being innovative in any remarks that I make nor of presuming to be creative in what I am going to say, but as long as the prescription that we have heard about, not only from the representative of the Soviet Union but also from others, lacks one element, namely, mutual trust, all the declarations that we make here in the United Nations will be futile.

Last year, the representative of the Soviet Union might like to know a couple of correspondents from Moscow approached me and asked what I thought of Mr. Gromyko's speech. It was a marvellous speech and well-intentioned but how to put it into practice? Let us assume that one party here, the Soviet Union, wanted to pave the way towards world peace. There could be no nobler aim than that, and no doubt our friends from the United States and from China are aiming at the same goal, but how to reach it?

I said that that prescription could have various elements like, for example, colouring, to make it more attractive for the patient. It could have sugar; it could have many other elements but they would not be sufficient unless the major element, that of mutual trust, were present and I have not found any mutual trust during the 30 years that I have been here.

Whether detente will make it possible to have mutual trust remains to be seen. But let us look at the picture today. No doubt the major Powers will not have any confrontation - thank God for that - unless there is a miscalculation, and that possibility is not within the orbit of our discussion here, although we should not discount it altogether. Should there be a military confrontation there will be nothing similar to the Nuremberg trials or Tokyo courts. It will be the people of those countries that use nuclear weapons - those who survive - who will see to it that their so-called leaders are buried alive wherever they may be.

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

whether in caves or in well-protected basements from where they may be trying to direct the war. We are not afraid that they will go unpunished. But what would be the use after the whole world has suffered -- not just the belligerents, not just those who are confronting each other, but the whole world -- from a poisoned atmosphere, fall-out and other by-products created by modern warfare?

Therefore, what should we do? Should we keep up, year in and year out, this exercise in futility, making laudable and well-intentioned speeches? I have no doubt that the Soviet Union wishes to see peace established. I have no doubt that the United States also wishes to see peace established. They are human like everybody else, but let us not forget that they world world power.

Now China is emerging as a world Power. It tells us that it is one of us, but nobody can deny the fact that China has emerged as a nuclear Power. Only the other day, China tested one of its nuclear bombs -- or whatever it would be called.

France and the United Kingdom have emerged as nuclear Powers, but they do not wield as much power as do the Soviet Union and the United States. I have no doubt, from my humble observation, that there is a rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the United States, but I should like to ask them here publicly: why do they interfere in spheres of influence that they think belong to them? We know. We do not have to give examples since we do not want to exacerbate matters by citing what is being done.

We know what happened in the Far East. I remember the 1950 war in Korea, which was the outcome of the policies of those two major Powers. Who told Mr. Stalin and Mr. Truman to draw a line at the thirty-eighth parallel? What about Viet-Nam? What about Cambodia? Things seem to have quieted down now, but it took about 20 years of bloodshed, suffering and destruction before they did.

Now the confrontation inside the spheres of influence has shifted to the Middle East and to Africa. It has been going on in the Middle East for quite a long time, but now Africa is the field where major Powers interfere in the affairs of small nations in order, allegedly, to serve their interests. They are not serving their interests, because nowadays the whole

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

world, because it spends so much on armaments, is on the brink of bankruptcy. Look at what is happening to the currencies, to the dollar. I do not know about the rouble, but I do not think that it purchases as much as it used to five or ten years ago. I know what the dollar purchases. I follow these things because I began life in the field of finance when I was a young man. I witnessed what happened after the Second World War when the victors became bankrupt through spending on war and on reparations.

We developing countries are tied to the so-called industrialized countries. The representative of the Soviet Union mentioned the economic aspect, but how can we prosper when currencies are floating because so much is being spent on arms? Three hundred billion, 400 billion - I have now the most recent statistics to hand - are being spent annually on war preparations, and we talk about détente. Détente, détente - from Kissinger on down. He borrowed this word from Metternich, I believe, and Tallyrand at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. We know about this détente, but please let us not be beguiled by such phrases, whether they are used by the Soviet Union, by the United States or by any Power, big or small.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

How can we dispel the mistrust? How can we make any progress when there are intelligence services that are doing their work surreptitiously, covertly, and not only gathering information for legitimate purposes, like finding out whether a State is conspiring against another State. I do not wish to confine my words to the major Powers. Almost every Power, every country, has an intelligence agency to find out what is going on in the international field. As I once mentioned, our American friends go to Moscow and no doubt they are given caviar and vodka, they are feted; and then our Russian friends go to Washington and they are feted on roast beef, or whatever the national dish is, steaks, bourbon, and so forth.

And what are the CIA and the KGB doing in the meantime, Sir? Let us be frank. I have spent 32 years with this Organization and I have listened to many speeches. In the meantime, what are the KGB and the CIA and, for that matter, the Deuxième Bureau of France - and we ourselves probably also have a small agency - what are we all doing? I don't know what the Saudis are doing; they do not tell me. But the pattern is wrong.

So you do not think that I am throwing mud at one people and sparing ourselves, I say that that whole system, that pattern is bankrupt; that pattern of smiling and saying we want peace, and then the intelligence services spend only 10 or 20 per cent of their budgets, perhaps, on gathering intelligence or information as to what others are doing; but what are they doing with the rest, the billions? Coups d'état! Intervention in the affairs of other people! Buying people, subverting them because they have found it is cheaper and they hope to weaken the other Power by such surreptitious and covert methods.

Let us face the facts as they obtain and not say everything is fine, everything is going very well. Let us be frank with each other. And I am not throwing aspersions at any one Power. I am told, if there is nothing constructive offered in this Committee, what is the use of criticism, or proposals to do away with this step by step sort of negotiation and step by step diplomacy? I think it was associated with Mr. Kissinger, whom we all know and like for his intelligence, for trying to devise something new, to

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

create the spirit of détente. I said once in the Security Council, referring to the step by step diplomacy in the Middle East, that if I wanted to leave my seat for the door, there were 10, 15 steps, but if each step took three or four years, then it would take 30 or 40 years, and that is how long it would take to attain anything that would lead us to the door of peace. Are we sure that within two or three decades, if we go step by step and do not do something radical, that we will not have war? Who can assure and ensure that we will not? Although step by step policy is better than conflict, of course.

There is no alternative to the United Nations; it is better to speak than to go to war, as we have always said. But it seems we are still having wars in these spheres of influence. And so what do we gain?

Let us have a look at those who are trying to catch up with the two super Powers in nuclear weapons. Take, for example, China. At one time I remember that in this Committee we discussed the question of the late statesman, General de Gaulle. Everybody said General de Gaulle should never have embarked on the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Speaking objectively, why should he have depended on the goodwill of the Soviet Union and of the United States when they treated him so shabbily in the Second World War? He learned a hard lesson in the Second World War, and therefore he thought he should have weapons.

Although I decry all testing, why should we take issue with our brothers in China? They seem to be afraid of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union seems to be afraid of them. So they feel they will be at a disadvantage if they do not catch up in nuclear weapons.

Do not think I am happy with the proliferation of nuclear weapons, whether in China or anywhere else. But the psychological factor is there. Mistrust is prevalent. Shall we tell China, "Now, be a good scout"? Eight hundred million people! What right do we have to admonish them? They think, rightly or wrongly, they are at the mercy of the Soviet Union; likewise, our American friends think they are at the mercy of the Soviet Union, because the NATO countries of Europe are close to the border. Now they are trying to devise neutron bombs and other sophisticated weapons; nobody knows what they are doing. And each one does it in secret.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

We hear about democracy, and everyone is extolling his own ideology, whether it is the United States, which allegedly at one time fought to save the world for democracy - or I don't know, to save democracy for the world, whichever it is; and the Soviet Union fought to save the Socialist system. Now, sitting here, if we want to engage in platitudes, what shall we gain? A pat on the back from either the Soviet Union or the United States if we sing their tune? But we want the human tune, the tune of humanity, the tune of survival, the tune of brotherhood.

How can we achieve it? How can we ask them to put the same ingredients, mutual trust, in the prescription and not let their intelligence agencies do what they are doing in various spheres of influence?

There is perhaps a radical solution - I said perhaps. Who am I, representing a small country, to say that it is the ultimate solution? But we should all think aloud about, try what I am going to suggest, and any other means of establishing peace.

(Mr. Baroody, Saudi Arabia)

As a first step, why do the nuclear Powers not disclose to the United Nations what they have in their arsenals - in the form not only of nuclear bombs but also of other diabolical weapons. Let us know, as a first step. The Russians may have 1,000 and the Americans may have 900 or 1,100; let us know. After they have told us how many they have, let them solemnly declare before the United Nations that they will not use those bombs. But the race is surreptitious. Some Powers say that they want to stop the arms race, but how can it be stopped when we, the spectators, do not see anybody. They are racing surreptitiously, covertly, with each other in panels of secrecy. Let us be frank: the race will go on. And that applies to our friends the Chinese, the British, the French and all those who have those weapons. Let them first declare what they have; let them disclose what they have in their arsenals - not only nuclear weapons but also of all those diabolical bombs of mass destruction. That first step should be followed by the promise that no one would use any bomb - let us not put the cart before the horse.

First, let us know what you have; and, secondly, solemnly promise that you will not be the first to use them. But that is not enough.

I listened very attentively to the representative of the USSR; it was a very good speech; it was a wonderful speech. I am sure that the Americans will give us a wonderful speech too. The milk of human kindness will be manifested to us all; but the trouble stems not from words but from the weapons.

Next I would suggest, after such a declaration, something that I have mentioned before in this Committee: the names of all the scientists who are engaged in devising new types of weapons should be registered with the United Nations. And if they know that anything more diabolical than has already been devised is in process of being manufactured they should report it to the United Nations.

That is Utopian, you say. Why? Scientists should be devoted to the good uses of science - not to casting humanity into the throes of suffering, if not of total destruction one of these days. I know these things may be considered Utopian, idealistic. But if we do not have ideals and dreams how can we go on

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

dealing with the harsh realities? By just making speeches, listening to them and acclaiming the good intent of our colleagues who have instructions from their Governments but do not know what those Governments are doing covertly and surreptitiously? Let us break the deadlock and have something new.

After we have listened to the representative of the United States, perhaps I may be allowed to make a few more remarks.

I do not wish my Soviet colleague to think that I have made my remarks in a spirit of destructive criticism. It was only a little analysis on my part, and I hope others will engage in some analysis that will contribute something constructive to our deliberations on this question.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.