



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96:
Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)
Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*)
Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (*continued*)
Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*continued*) 1

Chairman: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231; A/C.1/L.443, A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-7, A/C.1/L.445 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.446, A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.449)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) A/7189-DC/231; A/C.1/L.447 and Add.1 and 2)

Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231)

Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (*continued*) A/7134, A/7223; A/C.1/974, A/C.1/L.443)

Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*continued*) (A/7224 and Add.1, A/7277 and Corr.1, A/7327, A/7364; A/C.1/976, A/C.1/L.449-451)

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the first speaker on my list I wish to inform the members of the Committee that document A/C.1/L.448/Rev.1 of the nine-Power draft resolution has been circulated and that the draft resolution

introduced this morning by the delegations of Italy and and Brazil has been circulated as document A/C.1/L.451.

2. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): After the pertinent statements we have heard this morning from the delegations of Italy and Brazil [*1630th meeting*], I need not dwell unduly long on the background of the draft resolution distributed today in document A/C.1/L.451.

3. The draft resolution, submitted by six countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Italy, Pakistan and Yugoslavia, deals with questions of disarmament, security and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

4. Nuclear energy, its possession and development, has become what might properly be termed the political problem of our time. If we examine the factors that can vitally affect the interests of each and every State, the conclusion must surely be reached that there are two basic issues: on the one hand, peace and political security, and on the other, economic and social development.

5. Thus, peace and security in the third part of the twentieth century are indissolubly linked with nuclear matters. One need not be a prophet or a seer, or embark on the intriguing analyses made by Herman Kahn in his book *The Year 2000*,¹ to understand that the major instrument and barometer of power, and hence of peace and security, is nuclear energy. It is not just another fuel; it is far more than that. It is the factor that can determine what this last third of the twentieth century will be like; and within a relatively short time the connexion will apply also in the economic field.

6. On other occasions, and in other places, we have stated that we fully support all efforts to bring about what the French call a *détente* between East and West, and hence we have been sympathetic towards the efforts of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva. But in addition to a *détente* between East and West—or to be more precise, between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Powers, the edifice of peace, security and development must be rounded out by the recognition and observance on the part of the more interested and more powerful nations, five of them nuclear Powers, of the principles of non-intervention, non-use of force, and self-determination. On the economic and social side it must be rounded out by co-operation between the developed and the developing nations—co-operation I say, not aid. And today this picture is completed by a new dichotomy, which is not East-West, not NATO-Warsaw Pact, not north-south, not more-developed-less-developed nations, but the hard fact that there are nuclear and non-nuclear nations.

¹ New York, Macmillan Publishing Co., 1967.

7. This is an over-all picture and it cannot be split up. That is why my country, an under-developed country located in the Southern Hemisphere, finds itself obliged to consider the three factors jointly: East-West *détente*, north-south economic co-operation, and relationships in the Assembly (five nuclear and 121 non-nuclear Powers, and the ratio would be even greater if we counted the countries not Members of the United Nations).

8. As I said before, within a short time nuclear energy will move the world and, as a number of speakers have already prophesied, will determine the independence and development of nations.

9. A State not having access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes will be faced in the world of tomorrow with a painful dilemma: either it will have to risk technical and economic stagnation, or it will have to throw in its lot with another State that does have access to atomic energy. Consequently, no country can remain indifferent to what is happening in the field of disarmament and peaceful co-operation in the uses of nuclear energy, any more than to developments in conventional arms. All of us, nations large, medium-sized and small, must play our part as actors and not mere spectators of this drama, if we wish to preserve the spirit of international community.

10. The draft resolution submitted today by six Powers—one socialist, one from Western Europe, one from Asia, and three from Latin America—and I am sure the African nations are sympathetic—is designed to allow all States, at a given moment, to play their part as actors on the stage of disarmament and peaceful co-operation in the use of nuclear energy.

11. I think I can sum up the essence of our draft resolution as follows: What is it all about? It would have Member States decide, after consulting the Secretary-General, that the Disarmament Commission, set up more than ten years ago by the General Assembly and with its full membership of 126 countries—nuclear, non-nuclear, Eastern and Western, northern and southern—should meet by July 1969, our target date, or after the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly but not later than March 1970, to discuss the important issues already mentioned.

12. It may be asked why my delegation favours holding the meeting in June, July or August 1969. This is not a mere question of juggling with dates; the fact is that if we look at the background as we understand it—and this is the way my delegation understands it—we find that in December 1967 an agreement was reached in this very room which embraced a very specific calendar of meetings, in fact more than a calendar: the meeting of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States in the early part of 1968; part two of the General Assembly session, resumed to deal with any draft resolutions on non-proliferation; and the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States held at Geneva in August and September 1968.

13. This was a sequence of events, not a confrontation. Those who supported resolution 2373 (XXII) concerning the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as did Chile, see no inconsistency in the fact of the Treaty following its normal course of signature (over eighty

countries have already signed it) and ratification—and very few countries have ratified it, including none of the countries represented by the co-Chairmen of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, although we respect their views. Why should there be any conflict in the fact that the non-proliferation Treaty—and we supported the resolution concerning it—follows its natural course while at the same time the action initiated at Geneva in September is likewise following a logical sequence, with a sense of urgency? On this basis we have sought a conciliatory formula by which Member States would resolve that the meeting should be held in July 1969 or in February or March 1970. But we are anxious that during the current session this Committee, and the Assembly itself, should decide to convene at Geneva an existing body, the Disarmament Commission, consisting of the 126 Members of the United Nations, so as to give a sense of continuity to what was discussed, embracing many shades of opinion but reflecting certain points of view held in common among the non-nuclear-weapon countries, and with the participation, without vote but active, of the nuclear Powers, or at any rate four of them.

14. The terms of reference laid down for the Disarmament Commission, comprising the 126 Members, are in our view a logical consequence of the premises of the problem: general disarmament and nuclear disarmament, co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and measures to assure security. Thus the idea is not to set up a new organ. My delegation was in favour of establishing an *ad hoc* committee, because of the importance of the problem. However, we have not proposed a new organ, because there was resistance to it in some quarters, and we are anxious to be conciliatory. What we do propose is to resuscitate an existing body, the Disarmament Commission, which has not been functioning, so that all countries can constructively and with a sense of urgency participate in making what I would venture to call contemporary history.

15. We have studied very carefully the six-Power draft resolution [A/C.1/L.450] distributed yesterday and sponsored by Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, Japan and the Netherlands—all of them developed countries. We note, and we have pointed this out in very helpful conversations with the six sponsors I have just mentioned, that nothing is said about deciding to convene the Disarmament Commission, but the Secretary-General is requested to place the item on the provisional agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. It seems to us imperative to take a decision on convening the Disarmament Commission because of this sense of continuity and urgency. The whole of the negotiations undertaken to arrive at draft resolution A/C.1/L.451 that we are submitting today to the representatives on the First Committee were conducted, I believe, in a generous spirit of conciliation and animated by the constructive urge towards disarmament, peace and peaceful co-operation.

16. We have aimed at wholesale participation, at allowing the greatest possible number of countries to be heard. We have held useful discussions with the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear Powers, especially the countries I have just mentioned as having submitted a draft resolution on the same subject yesterday.

17. We believe we have exhausted every means of arriving at a broad draft capable of gaining general acceptance. Nobody wanted a provocative text. Among those who support this, among the six sponsors of the proposal distributed today, some have signed the non-proliferation Treaty and some have not; some, including Chile, voted for the resolution commending the Treaty, and others did not.

18. Particular care was taken not to interfere with the non-proliferation Treaty or the process of signing and ratifying it. Particular care was taken also not to duplicate the functions of existing bodies such as the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva and the International Atomic Energy Agency at Vienna. We have everywhere tried constructively to find common ground where legitimate interests are involved, in the hope of finding solutions that might be generally acceptable. At the same time we have endeavoured to garner the fruits of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States and, as I have said so many times, to allow all countries to be actors in the drama of disarmament, and the struggle for peace and security, so as to achieve a system of peaceful co-operation in the use of nuclear energy.

19. Chile took part in these negotiations in what we felt to be a constructive, open and independent spirit. We know that our geographical and political stature does not single us out for star roles, but we have a responsibility to ourselves and to our country. We do believe that together with a group of countries representing all sectors of the General Assembly, we have not only been defending the vital interests of the non-nuclear States, but that we have taken a few small but positive steps towards a better future for the international community as a whole.

20. In co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.451, Chile is endeavouring to follow its chosen path in regard to disarmament and to co-operate constructively to achieve the aims that have been set. The sponsors of the draft trust that it will be widely supported here in this Committee and subsequently in the General Assembly, because we believe that it reflects the essence of what the United Nations is—a community of sovereign States—and the interests of the countries represented in this Committee.

21. That is why we have co-sponsored the draft, and my delegation wishes to state that it is anxious to have comments and is ready to hold any conversations necessary to ensure that this problem, vital as it is in this last third of the twentieth century, will find a solution taking account of the views of all, not a confrontation between nuclear and non-nuclear States, between developed and developing States, but a solution in keeping with the international community's needs, and geared to this new phenomenon of nuclear energy.

22. Mr. HUSAIN (India): I wish to speak briefly about draft resolution A/C.1/L.446, which was commended this morning by the delegation of the United States [1630th meeting].

23. The proposal made in that draft resolution regarding the registration of arms transfers has evoked considerable interest during our present deliberations. Following the views expressed by the delegation of Saudi Arabia, my

delegation stated its strong objections in principle to the concept underlying the proposal to elicit views of Member States on the registration of transfer of arms, ammunition and other implements of war. My delegation was gratified that its views were shared by the delegations of Argentina, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Indonesia, Pakistan, Syria, the United Arab Republic, and others.

24. My delegation was therefore interested to hear the statement made later in the morning meeting by the representative of Denmark on behalf of his own delegation and the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.446, Iceland, Malta and Norway. My delegation would like to express its satisfaction at the decision of the co-sponsors not to insist on the draft resolution being put to the vote and to express our deep appreciation of the spirit of co-operation and conciliation shown by the representative of Denmark and the other sponsors, and also of the sympathetic understanding shown towards the differing views expressed in this Committee.

25. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): We shall hand in our draft resolution² to the Secretariat, but we think it is too late for representatives to acquaint themselves with it today. Moreover, I am not yet ready to explain it.

26. I should like to say that the delegations of the People's Republic of Hungary and the People's Republic of Bulgaria are submitting this draft resolution because they have not found it possible to support either the draft resolution submitted some time ago already by six Powers [A/C.1/L.450] or the one just submitted [A/C.1/L.451] about which my friend the representative of Chile spoke so enthusiastically.

27. I should like to be given an opportunity, at the beginning of the next meeting, to submit this draft resolution and to give some explanations of its contents.

28. The CHAIRMAN: We have now completed the general debate on the disarmament item. The representative of Yugoslavia has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

29. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia): I want to make only a brief statement as my delegation is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/C.1/L.451] that has been circulated and is now before the representatives. I can be very brief because I agree fully with the content and the spirit of the statements already made by other sponsors in this Committee.

30. I would add only two or three points. First, I would confirm that the draft resolution is a compromise among trends and currents reflected in a large number of private meetings, including collective meetings of the group of co-sponsors of this draft resolution and the group of co-sponsors of the one [A/C.1/L.450] previously submitted by a certain number of delegations headed by that of Finland.

31. We agreed with that group on practically all points except the terms of reference of the Disarmament Com-

² Subsequently circulated as document A/C.1/L.452.

mission of the United Nations, when it is convened. The points of disagreement are therefore the only points on which it is worth while to elaborate and I shall do so very briefly.

32. First, the question arose whether the Disarmament Commission should deal with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We were of the opinion that it should, primarily because the two questions—disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy—are so closely connected. They are so closely connected because they deal with the same new source of energy which gives its main characteristic to the new developments—technological and otherwise—in the world community.

33. We considered on the other hand that the peaceful use of nuclear energy is of tremendous importance for a problem that should always be present in the mind of any United Nations body, that is, the problem of the underdeveloped countries and their development. Here is a source of energy which could be of tremendous use in advancing towards a solution of the problem of the division of the world between the poor and the rich. The two questions are so closely connected that you can hardly avoid discussing one without discussing the other. One of the proofs of this thesis is the text of the non-proliferation Treaty.³ Some of its articles deal specifically with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy while the whole idea is disarmament. The Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States again dealt with disarmament and peaceful uses because they are so closely connected. You cannot dissociate those two and it is unimaginable that a meeting on disarmament nowadays should not deal with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. For instance, it would have to deal with the Treaty on non-proliferation. Should it be precluded from mentioning the articles which relate to peaceful uses and deal only with the articles that refer to disarmament, in the more narrow sense of this word? It is impossible, you cannot dissociate those two things.

34. Another question was the date: we think the compromise we proposed was finally accepted, and we hope that it will meet with the approval of practically everybody.

35. As to the convening of the Disarmament Commission itself, we accepted the objections that were presented in private conversations tending towards the appointment of an *ad hoc* committee—which would, in our opinion as in the opinion of other co-sponsors, have been a better solution. But we found in the debate in this Committee and in private conversations that there was very wide agreement that the Disarmament Commission should meet in the near future. There were a number of statements made here not connected with the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon

States which discussed the idea that after several years of recess this organ should meet once again. It was never in our minds that such an organ, if convened, should supersede or do away with any other organ dealing with disarmament, especially the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. On the contrary, we were all in agreement that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is a very useful organ and the best one for negotiations on disarmament between, more particularly, those countries which are expected to disarm first because they are first in armaments. Nevertheless, it is not only their concern; disarmament is the concern of everybody, and the discussions here—which were only an exchange of views, I would say, not much more—should be pursued somewhere and one should go deeper into the matter.

36. There is one question especially that has been left aside constantly, and that is the question of security—I mean the general principles of security—security arrangements, multilateral or otherwise, and security assurances, individual or collective. In any event, I should like to stress that the question of security is one of the questions which somehow has been a motherless child or a displaced person in the United Nations for many years. It could be dealt with in the Security Council, in the First Committee, in disarmament committees or commissions, in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament or in any of its sub-organs if there are any. The fact remains that it has not been dealt with. This field could be covered by a meeting of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations. It could form a sub-commission to go into the matter thoroughly and finally to initiate the necessary negotiations on it.

37. I also confirm the readiness of my delegation, in keeping with the readiness of the other sponsors already indicated this morning, to listen to any objection to the present text, because we also want—and everybody wants—as wide an agreement in this Committee as possible on the matter dealt with in this draft resolution.

38. The CHAIRMAN: Having completed our general debate on the disarmament items under consideration, we shall be able tomorrow to start consideration of the draft resolutions which have been submitted. I would request delegations that wish to speak on them to inscribe their names with the Secretariat so that we can proceed to consider them. Since I have only one name inscribed on the list so far, I would suggest that we meet tomorrow afternoon. This would give delegations time to add names to the list, to prepare their statements, and perhaps time also to begin consultations on the different draft resolutions under consideration.

39. As that seems to be agreeable to the Committee, we shall meet again tomorrow at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

³ Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII), annex).