CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.400
3 April 1969
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDREDTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 3 April 1969, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. R. CARACCIOLO (Italy)

GE.69-7589

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:	Mr. S.A. FRAZAO
	Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA
	Mr. L.F. PALMEIRA LAMPREIA
	Mr. J. NOGUEIRA FILHO
Bulgaria:	Mr. K. CHRISTOV
	Mr. M. KARASSIMEONOV
	Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
	Mr. I. PEINIRDJIEV
Burma:	U KYAW MIN
Canada:	Mr. G. IGNATIEFF
	Mr. A.G. CAMPBELL
	Mr. J.R. MORDEN
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. M. KLUSAK
	Mr. V. SAFAR
	Mr. J. STRUCKA
Ethiopia:	Mr. A. ZELLEKE
India:	Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
	Mr. N. KRISHNAN
	Mr. K.P. JAIN
	Mr. S.P. JAGOTA
Italy:	Mr. R. CARACCIOLO
	Mr. F. LUCIOLI OTTIERI
	Mr. R. BORSARELLI
	Mr. U. PESTALOZZA
Mexico:	Mr. M. TELLO
Nigeria:	Alhaji SULE KOLO
	Mr. C.O. HOLLIST
	Mr. L.A. MALIKI

Poland:	Mr. H. JAROSZEK
	Mr. K. ZYBYLSKI
	Mr. H. STEPOSZ
	Mr. R. WLAZLO
Romania:	Mr. N. ECOBESCO
	Mr. V. CONSTANTINESCO
	Mr. C. GEORGESCO
	Mr. C. MITRAN
Sweden:	Mrs. A. MYRDAL
	Mr. A. EDELSTAM
	Mr. T. BENGTSON
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:	Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
	Mr. I.I. TCHEPROV
	Mr. N.S. KISHILOV
	Mr. V.A. USTINOV
United Arab Republic:	Mr. H. KHALLAF
	Mr. O. SIRRY
	Mr. E.S. El REEDY
	Mr. M. ISMAIL
United Kingdom:	Mr. I.F. PORTER
	Mr. R.A. RIDDELL
	Mr. M.E. HOWELL
United States of America:	Mr. A.S. FISHER
	Mr. C. GLEYSTEEN
	Mr. W. GIVAN
	Mr. R. McCORMACK
Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. D. PROTITCH

1. The CHAIRMAN (Italy) (translation from French): I declare open the 400th plenary meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

2. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): At the Committee's meeting on 18 March we set forth in general outline the position of the USSR on the problems of disarmament and the cessation of the arms race (ENDC/PV.395, paras. 60 et seq.). In our subsequent statements we intend to deal in greater detail with our position on individual disarmament measures put forward in the Memorandum of the Soviet Government of 1 July 1968 (ENDC/227). Today it is our intention to explain the Soviet position on the question of prohibiting the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof for military purposes. To supplement and expound at greater length what we said at the above meeting of the Committee, we should like to dwell on the contents of individual provisions of the draft treaty on that question submitted by the Soviet Union for the Committee's consideration (ENDC/240), and to put forward some comments and considerations in connexion with the statements made by other delegations.

3. We note with satisfaction that the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union has attracted the attention of the members of our Committee and has been assessed positively in the statements of several representatives, in particular the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Sule Kolo (ENDC/PV.396, para. 7); the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Myrdal (ENDC/397, para. 101); the representative of Bulgaria, Ambassador Christov (ENDC/PV.398, para. 32); the representative of Poland, Ambassador Jaroszek (ENDC/PV.399, para. 65); and the representative of Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Klusak (ibid., para. 87). The urgency of the question of prohibiting the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes has been pointed out in the statements of many representatives in the Committee. We share that point of view.

4. The problem of prohibiting the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes should be solved now, when the arms race on the sea-bed has not yet developed to the same extent as in many other areas. At the same time, it would be wrong to assert that the problem of the use of the sea-bed for military purposes is of little or no urgency since the sea-bed and the ocean floor are not yet being used for military purposes. Information already exists that the military authorities of certain countries are elaborating far-reaching plans for using the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes, including the emplacement of various military objects there, particularly on the submerged areas of the continental shelf, which are now more accessible.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

5. Thus, the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes is already included in the long-term military plans of the NATO countries. This is confirmed by press reports. Thus the United States magazine U.S. News and World Report wrote in October 1967 that the planning bodies of the Navy were working intensively on the problems of the post-1975 period, seeking possibilities of increasing or replacing the 'Poseidon' arsenal. One of the ideas was to place under water, close to the enemy's coast, remote-controlled missiles enclosed in containers. The missiles would be fixed to the sea-bed, but would be movable.

6. According to the United Kingdom military magazine Journal of the Royal United Services Institution (No. 651, 1968, pp.193-201), the NATO countries also consider the use of the sea-bed for the emplacement of means of counter-submarine warfare to be very promising.

7. Experience of the development of international life shows that any discovery in the field of military technology invariably entails dual consequences. First, each side endeavours to acquire the weapons which its potential enemy possesses or plans to create; secondly, the improvement of offensive means lead to the improvement of defensive means and that, in turn, induces the opposing side further to improve its offensive means, and so on ad infinitum. The plans now being elaborated in the NATO countries for the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes will inevitably lead to the result that other States, in order to safeguard their own security, will be compelled to develop similar types of weapon. Thus, the facts show that the danger of the sea-bed becoming yet another area of the arms race in the fairly near future is entirely real.

8. Nevertheless, we are convinced that such a development of events is not inevitable. There is another alternative, and that is to ban completely, without waiting for the arms race in this field to begin, the military use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, and to conclude an international agreement guaranteeing the demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof. Desiring to contribute to the accomplishment of that aim, the Soviet delegation has submitted, on behalf of its Government, a draft treaty on prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof.

9. The draft treaty provides for the complete exclusion of the aforesaid area from the military activities of States. Article 1 of the draft treaty reads as follows:

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

"The use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof beyond the twelve-mile maritime zone of coastal States is prohibited.

"It is prohibited to place on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof objects with nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass-destruction, and to set up military bases, structures, installations, fortifications and other objects of a military nature."

Thus, any military activity by States on the sea-bed and the ocean floor would be unconditionally prohibited and outlawed.

10. We are profoundly convinced that this measure meets to the greatest extent the interests of curbing the arms race. The assumption of this obligation by States would mean one more step in the direction of widening the areas in which military activity is prohibited. This would be a useful continuation of the efforts which resulted in the conclusion in 1959 of the Antarctic Treaty 1/ providing for the exclusively peaceful use of that continent and in the signing in 1967 of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies (General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI), annex), under which the moon and other celestial bodies are to be used only for peaceful purposes.

11. The conclusion of an international agreement on the demilitarization of the sea-bed would help to bring about a favourable climate for reaching an agreement on other disarmament measures. The complete prohibition of military activities by States on the sea-bed and the ocean floor is in keeping with decisions already adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, particularly resolution 2467 (XXIII). May I remind representatives that this resolution mentions, among other tasks assigned to the Committee concerning the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, the need "to study further ... the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor". We should like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the word "exclusively". Thus, it follows quite clearly from the aforesaid resolution that our Committee has the task of ensuring the complete prohibition of military activities by States on the sea-bed and the ocean floor in accordance with the General Assembly's appeal.

1/ United Nations Treaty Series. Vol. 402, pp. 71 et seq.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

12. In this connexion we have some doubts about the view expressed here in the Committee that we should confine ourselves to prohibiting only the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

13. First of all, we should like to draw attention to the fact that the Soviet draft treaty also contains a proposal to ban the emplacement on the sea-bed and the ocean floor of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

14. However, if we intend to prevent an arms race in this field, can we limit ourselves in this case to the aforesaid measure? The conclusion of a limited agreement prohibiting only the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor would open the way for the unleashing of a conventional arms race in this sphere. Such an agreement would not answer the set purpose, namely to prevent the spread of the arms race to this sphere of human activity, which as a matter of fact has not yet been opened up. In these circumstances it is difficult to concur with the view that such an agreement would ensure the utilization of this sphere exclusively for peaceful purposes. On the contrary, it is rather to be expected that the conclusion of such a limited agreement governing only questions concerning the prohibition of the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction would constitute a kind of legalization of military activities by States in this area so far as conventional weapons are concerned. If we agreed to the conclusion of such an agreement, we would be acting contrary to the recommendations of the General Assembly and would fail to justify the hopes placed in the work of our Committee by the peoples of the world.

15. In this connexion we should like to note the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Porter, who, referring to the Soviet draft treaty on prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, stated that it "goes too far" (ENDC/PV.296, para. 38). We should like to ask Mr. Porter how we should understand his statement and, in particular, the words "too far". Do they mean that the United Kingdom is not prepared to agree to ensuring the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor exclusively for peaceful purposes? In this connexion we should like to stress that this is

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

precisely what is called for in resolution 2467 (XXIII) of the United Nations General Assembly, which the United Kingdom delegation also supported.

16. The view was also expressed that the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed would be "unworkable and probably harmful". In support of this statement references were made, in particular, to the difficulties connected with the fact that certain installations -- for example, communication and navigation aids -- are used for both military and peaceful purposes. We should like to give some clarifications in this respect.

17. If we turn to international law, we see that demilitarization does not presuppose limitations on the establishment or use of means of communication, beacons or other means of infrastructure. Throughout history States have often resorted to demilitarization as a way of limiting armaments in relation to specific zones or areas, and this has made it possible to work out a certain legal concept of demilitarization that has proved its worth. In this connexion reference may be made to the opinion of L. Oppenheim, an outstanding authority in the field of international law. In his major work "International Law" it is stated that demilitarization means "... the agreement of two or more States by treaty not to fortify, or station troops upon, a particular zone or territory." (L. Oppenheim, "International Law", vol.2: Disputes, War and Neutrality. Seventh edition, para. 72, p. 244).

18. Consequently, the concept of demilitarization covers quite concrete matters, namely, renunciation of the right to station troops and to deploy objects and structures of a military character. It follows from this definition that demilitarization in no way implies the destruction, or prohibition of the emplacement and use, of means of communication, beacons and other installations having no direct military purpose.

19. This is also confirmed by actual practice in international relations. Let us take a comparatively recent example: the demilitarization of the Aaland Islands in the Baltic Sea. The obligation of Finland to demilitarize the Aaland Islands includes the requirement "... not to fortify them and not to make them available for the armed forces of other States".2/ Obviously in this case also there was no

---

2/ United Nations Treaty Series, Vol. 67, p.146.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

question of prohibiting the establishment or emplacement of means of communication, navigational means and other means of infrastructure. Common sense tells us that if demilitarization is feasible on land, it can also be carried out on the sea-bed, and the problems arising in this connexion must be solved in accordance with existing practice and common sense.

20. As an argument against the full demilitarization of the sea-bed there has been put forward the thesis that the use of submarines requires the establishment of a tracing system for purposes of self-defence. In this connexion we should like to point out that the Soviet draft treaty provides for the establishment of a twelve-mile coastal zone which would not be covered by the treaty and which would therefore be within the area in which States would have freedom of action, including the freedom to place submarine tracing stations. This provision of the draft treaty adequately meets the interests of States seeking to safeguard the security of their own territory. As for States which plan to place such stations far from their own coasts in neutral waters, the question naturally arises as to whether such stations are really being established for purposes of self-defence or for some other purpose.

21. Another argument which is put forward against the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed is that a considerable part of scientific research is carried out by military personnel with the use of military auxiliary equipment. It is now widely recognized that military personnel or military equipment can be used for peaceful scientific research, especially in areas where the carrying out of such research meets with considerable difficulties or requires special training. By way of example we may refer to the Antarctic Treaty and the outer space Treaty, which contain special provisions to this effect. The use of military personnel in outer space research and at scientific stations in Antarctica did not prevent the reaching of an agreement to demilitarize Antarctica and to prohibit the use of celestial bodies for military purposes. As regards the sea-bed and the ocean floor, in our opinion the use of military personnel or military auxiliary equipment for peaceful scientific research cannot and should not constitute an obstacle to the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

22. As an argument in favour of the conclusion of an agreement limited to the prohibition of the emplacement on the sea-bed and the ocean floor of weapons of mass destruction, fears were expressed that the conclusion of an agreement on complete demilitarization might complicate the problem of control over its implementation.

23. We believe that such fears are groundless. It is precisely demilitarization of the sea-bed that would facilitate the problem of control. Indeed, if the ban covered only certain types of activity, the controlling party would be faced in each specific case with the question of whether the object concerned had to do with prohibited or permitted activities. The solution of that problem would require the insertion in the agreement of articles laying down the principles of the activities and the powers of the controllers, verification procedures and so forth. The practical implementation of control would in that case become a complicated affair requiring a great deal of time and effort and would greatly complicate the relations between the controlling party and the party being controlled. But in the case of complete demilitarization, in the first place, the number of objects subject to control would be sharply reduced since only peaceful objects would remain; and secondly, verification would be considerably less complicated, because States would have no fears that verification of the objects placed by them on the sea-bed would reveal their military secrets to the controlling party.

24. Should an agreement on a comprehensive ban on military activities on the sea-bed and the ocean floor be concluded, the parties could apply the principle of free access to objects placed on the sea-bed in order to verify compliance with the treaty. That is precisely what the proposal of the Soviet Union is aimed at. In this connexion, may I quote the text of article 2 of the Soviet draft treaty, which reads as follows:

> "All installations and structures on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof shall be open on the basis of reciprocity to representatives of other States Parties to this Treaty for verification of the fulfilment by States which have placed such objects thereon of the obligations assumed under this Treaty."

25. In its proposals concerning control over the implementation of this draft treaty, the Soviet side is following the principles used in the Antarctic Treaty

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

and the outer space Treaty -- principles which have proved their worth and are being successfully applied, for example, in the activities of States in Antarctica. The system of control on the basis of free access has proved to be effective and workable in practice. Indeed, in those cases involving areas where there are no national borders -- such as Antarctica, outer space or the sea-bed -- the principle of free access can be applied fully and is the most complete and effective method of control. This form of control will, we are convinced, contribute to the growth of mutual understanding and confidence in international relations. In these cases spheres of human activity are concerned which have practically not yet been or are only just being opened up. States not at present engaged in military activities in these areas have nothing to hide and have no reason to fear that control based on the principle of free access will be used for carrying out military intelligence.

26. Should it be agreed to conclude an agreement providing not for the complete prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, but only for the prohibition of the placing of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction there, the principle of free access would be difficult to apply. Indeed, if we were to prohibit only the placing on the sea-bed of nuclear weapons and other types of weapons of mass destruction, while at the same time permitting the placing there of conventional weapons, it is doubtful whether a State, even if honestly complying with the agreement, would agree to the inspection of its military installations by the controlling party, since such a form of control would reveal its military secrets and only lead to tensions and conflicts between States parties to the treaty.

27. Our point of view is that the method of control over the implementation of the agreement should be organically linked with the contents and scope of the ban on military activities on the sea-bed and the ocean floor. Complete demilitarization of the sea-bed should be matched by the principle of free access for the purpose of verification.

28. In our statement of 18 March we dwelt at some length on the question of the sphere or area to be covered by the proposed treaty. In their statements, members of the Committee have mentioned various methods of defining the limits of the areas to which the treaty would apply. It has been pointed out that some of the methods -- those, for example, which take account of the existing limits of national

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

jurisdiction -- may considerably complicate the solution of this question and create a situation of inequality for various States on account of the differing limits of their territorial waters, the continental shelf and so forth. The difficulties connected with this approach were pointed out, in particular, by the representative of the United States of America in his statement on 25 March (ENDC/PV.397, paras. 26-43).

29. In this connexion our delegation would like to point out that the solution proposed by the Soviet Union of the question of the area to be covered by the treaty makes it possible to do away with all these controversial questions. We propose the establishment for the purposes of this treaty of a twelve-mile maritime coastal zone beyond which military activities by States on the sea-bed and the ocean floor would be prohibited. In doing so, we have in mind that this zone, established exclusively for the purposes of the treaty, does not involve the question of the limits of territorial waters, concepts of national jurisdiction and other problems. Thus, many controversial issues are eliminated and, at the same time, the widest possible inclusion of the area of the sea-bed subject to demilitarization is obtained. This proposal is also aimed at ensuring that the treaty becomes effective at an early date, by excluding the continental shelf from the arms race -- that is, the sphere which, from a technological standpoint, is most easily accessible in view of present-day scientific and technological possibilities, and which may be the first to become the site where military activities by States would go on and thus a military arms race would take place in that sphere.

30. In support of this view we may quote the following conclusion, contained in a study by the United Nations Secretariat on the military uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor:

> "Technically, the deployment of military weapons and other devices in the region of the continental shelf and the deep ocean peaks, existing information indicates, is either already feasible or will be so in the near future. The deep ocean bed, on the contrary, is an area that so far seems from available published material to be the object of military research and development efforts only. Actual deployment, it has been stated, is probably some time off, although the great intensity of present military interest might possibly affect this picture in the not too distant future." (A/AC.135/28, para. 5)

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

31. In order that the treaty should meet the interests of international co-operation in the best possible way, we have provided in the draft for the principle of universality -- any State in the world may accede to the treaty when it is opened for signature or subsequently at any time when a State deems it desirable to do so (article 4, para. 1). That point, in our view, is of great importance, because the greater the number of States acceding to the treaty the more effective will be the treaty itself and the greater will be the contribution of its conclusion to progress in the cause of disarmament.

32. A State party to the treaty, in exercising its national sovereignty, may withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country.

33. The conclusion of a treaty on prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof would be a significant contribution to curbing the arms race, would create an atmosphere conducive to agreement on other collateral measures, would facilitate further progress in disarmament and, in the final analysis, would contribute to the solution of the main problem -- general and complete disarmament. Prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor would also create an atmosphere favourable to the development of international co-operation between States in investigating the world's oceans and in solving other aspects of the problem of the sea-bed.

34. We express the hope that members of the Committee, in the interest of developing international co-operation and strengthening peace and security will consider with due attention the draft treaty which we have submitted.

35. The Soviet side will, for its part, endeavour to contribute in the fullest possible way to the solution of the problem of banning the use for military purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and is ready to discuss all considerations and proposals which might facilitate progress in that direction. In particular, we are prepared to hold, for that purpose, informal meetings of the Committee, as proposed by Mrs. Myrdal (ENDC/PV.397, para. 102).

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

36. We are convinced that a fruitful discussion on this item of the agenda will make it possible to find a solution to the problem under consideration, which would meet the interests of all mankind.

37. Mr. ECOBESCO (Romania) (translation from French): Before expressing our views on the substance of the problems under consideration, may I, on behalf of the Romanian delegation, fulfil the pleasant duty of paying tribute to all the representatives here present. We should like most especially to welcome the co-Chairman of our Committee, Mr. Smith, the representative of the United States of America; the new representative of Brazil, Mr. Armando Frazão; the new representative of Canada, Mr. Ignatieff; and the representative of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Klusák. I am also very happy to extend greetings to Mrs. Myrdal, Mr. García Robles, and Mr. Fisher, who are again among us. We are happy to see again Mr. Protitch, Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who together with his colleagues gives our Committee all his support and devotion.

38. In its constantly ascending path mankind has never known a period so rich in radical changes as that of our time. We live in an era of profound political, economic and social changes which follow one another at an accelerated pace and to which the modern scientific and technical revolution gives unprecedented dimensions.

39. Among the decisive changes which have occurred in the contemporary world, it seems to us that it is appropriate to recall those which, in our view, are decisive for approaching the problems that are the subject of negotiations in this Committee. We have in mind the right of each nation to decide its own future; the equal right of all States to peace and security, to development and progress; and the universal value and indivisibility of the principles which must govern international relations.

40. One of the most characteristic features of our era is the vigorous self-assertion of nations, and their development and flourishing. Each nation has its own historical experience and a patrimony of material and spiritual values which constantly enrich the cultural treasure of mankind; each nation has a specific personality and character which demand attention, consideration and respect; each nation can and must make its contribution to the realization of mankind's great aspirations for progress and civilization.

41. Respect for the sacred and inalienable right of nations to decide their own future without any outside interference, to organize their life according to their will and

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

aspirations, is a primary condition for the free and independent development of each people and for the positive development of relations between States, upon which in the final analysis the very peace of the world depends.

42. In order to be able to devote their full energies and resources to constructive activities, all countries need peace, tranquillity and security. That is precisely why ensuring that States have an equal right to peace and security -- a right which international law has enshrined and is duty-bound to promote and defend -- is a major imperative to which the disarmament negotiations must constantly be subordinated.

43. The Romanian people, who throughout their turbulent history have known the sufferings of war as well as the blessings of peace and who today are devoting all their energies to a vast programme for their country's multilateral development, are vitally interested in the establishment of peace in the world and in the reign of understanding and friendship among nations.

44. Moved by those ideals, Romania resolutely works for the elimination of force and the permanent outlawing of wars from the life of society and for the achievement of disarmament. In all its external activities Romania bases itself on the well-known truth that nothing in international life can last without scrupulous respect in relations among States -- regardless of their social and political systems -- for the essential postulates, which are the principles of sovereignty and national independence, equality of rights, non-interference in internal affairs, non-recourse to force, and mutual advantage.

45. Normal relations of peaceful co-existence between the nations of the world are not and cannot be conceived except within the framework of international law and on the basis of international law, and of the great principles, standards and institutions which stem from the very essence of that law.

46. Those principles and fundamental standards of law are applied by Romania in its relations with all States without exception. Those principles, which are incorporated in Romania's Constitution, have the force of law in all the external activities of the Romanian Government and State.

47. It is our firm conviction, borne out by the facts of life, that the construction of a world of peace, co-operation, and friendship among peoples is intimately linked with the observance and rigorous implementation of those principles by all States, and that each of those principles is related to that construction.

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

"The strengthening of peace and security and the normalization of relations between States" the President of the State Council of Romania, Mr. Nicolae Ceauşescu, recently stated, "are directly interdependent and condition each other. Practice shows that these objectives can be achieved only in so far as each State acts on the basis of the indefeasible right of all peoples to decide their own future, without interference from outside, respect for the principles of independence and national sovereignty, equality of rights, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual advantage ... We are convinced that a spirit of responsibility in regard to the fate of mankind must be shown by all States, large and small, and by all statesmen, whose duty it is to act resolutely and consistently to eliminate the existing hotbeds of war in the world, to settle disputes through negotiation and to concentrate efforts on continuing and strengthening the relaxation of tension in international life."

48. Experience shows that whenever those imperative standards in international behaviour have been respected, peace and security have triumphed. Conversely, disregard for, or violation of, those standards has always led to tension, conflicts and an atmosphere of fear and suspicion.

49. Nothing can justify contempt for those rules, which took shape and became imperative at the end of a long process of historic development, and whose recognition and implementation demanded of mankind a heavy price in suffering and sacrifice.

50. Those principles, which, like peace and security, are universal and indivisible, constitute the very foundation of international legality and at the same time are indispensable and essential both for the harmonious development of relations between States and for the solution of the great problems confronting mankind, among which disarmament holds pride of place.

51. The Romanian Government attaches especial importance to the present session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. It can be said that this Committee finds itself not so much on the threshold of a new session as at the beginning of a new period in its activities. The experience acquired throughout the years, the balance sheet of the work done hitherto, the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (ENDC/226*) and, above all, the profound realities of international life, with their constant change and development, call for an over-all reassessment by us of our way of thinking and acting. In fact, they do more than call for a reassessment: they require it.

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

52. The main objective of our negotiations has been and continues to be the achievement of general disarmament and, first and foremost, nuclear disarmament. By next autumn a decade will have elapsed since the United Nations General Assembly adopted a well-known resolution in which the question of general and complete disarmament was proclaimed to be "the most important one facing the world today" (resolution 1378 (XIV)). Consequently, it is only natural that all of us should, here and now, look back to see what has been achieved, and also consider what we shall have to do to carry out the mandate entrusted to us.

53. Unfortunately, in this field negotiations have not led to the expected results. But what is most disquieting is that during these ten years the arms race has assumed an ever increasing rate and proportions. The capacities for destruction which have been accumulated in the arsenals of the nuclear States are such that the very existence of mankind is threatened.

54. In these circumstances, it is necessary to adopt radical measures aimed at ending the arms race, to undertake resolute action in the direction of general disarmament, and to take specific steps to reduce and, finally, eliminate the nuclear threat.

55. Romania has spoken and continues to speak in favour of the outlawing of atomic weapons, the cessation of production of such weapons, and the reduction and elimination of existing stockpiles. The prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the limitation and reduction of strategic offensive delivery systems, and the cessation of all tests of such weapons would help to put a brake on the atomic arms race and to create the pre-requisites for the final cessation of that race and for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

56. The acute question of effective security guarantees for those States which, under the non-proliferation Treaty, renounce nuclear weapons, as well as the question of unhindered access by all countries to the benefits of the peaceful uses of the atom, are among the problems to which adequate solutions must be found.

57. Under the obligations deriving from article VI of the non-proliferation Treaty, and by virtue of resolutions of the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament must place general and complete disarmament and its main component, nuclear disarmament, at the very centre of its negotiations (ENDC/237).

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

58. Disarmament, a problem of fundamental interest to all peoples, can be achieved only through the convergent efforts of all the States of the world. That is why we have supported and continue to support the idea of convening a world conference on disarmament to which all the States of the world would be invited. The appropriate conditions should be created for ensuring the participation of the People's Republic of China in the debate and in the solution of all existing international problems, among which disarmament holds a place of primary importance.

59. The establishment of an effective system of peace and security presupposes the concentration of the efforts of all States towards the relaxation of tension, the peaceful solution of urgent international problems with due regard to existing realities, and towards the organization of multilateral co-operation among the countries of the world, which will ensure the unhindered progress of every nation.

60. Life itself requires the elimination of artifical barriers, the abolition of opposing military blocs and their replacement by a general system of peace and security, the liquidation of all military bases located on the territory of other States and the withdrawal of foreign troops within the limits of their national frontiers. The general interests of peace demand that States renounce definitively and in deeds the policy of the cold war, the rattling of arms, demonstrations of force such as military manoeuvres on the territory or the frontiers of other States, and threats which only increase mistrust and international tension.

61. Another field that is of concern to us all is the outlawing of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Having regard to the place and scope of this problem within the general context of the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, the Romanian delegation feels that its true solution must be based on the consolidation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, through strict observance of its provisions and adherence to it by all States.

62. We share the view expressed during the debates that the study of this question will be facilitated by the report of the group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, a report which we have been told will probably be presented next July.

63. As the Romanian delegation has already had occasion to state, we are in favour of the adoption of measures to ensure the use of the sea-bed exclusively for peaceful purposes. In order that the immense underwater riches, whose value can barely be glimpsed

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

at present, may be explored and exploited for the benefit of mankind, a prerequisite is the prohibition of all military activities on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof in the area situated beyond national jurisdiction.

64. We believe that any future regulation must be based on recognition of the need to ensure the use of the sea-bed for the benefit of all peoples, large and small, while taking into account the interests of all States, without any discrimination whatsoever. In the process of negotiating such an agreement we shall undoubtedly have to clarify the various aspects of the question requiring a thorough study and find appropriate solutions.

65. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the draft (ENDC/240) submitted to the Committee by the Soviet delegation constitutes a useful basis for thorough negotiations on the demilitarization of the sea-bed and the subsoil thereof.

66. As regards regional disarmament measures and measures for the relaxation of tension, Romania naturally gives particular attention to the continent of which it is part and to the geographical area in which it is situated. Our country is vitally interested in the establishment of normal relations of co-operation and good-neighbourliness between all the States of Europe, and in the establishment of peace and security on this continent.

67. Our approach to this problem is based on the conviction that the achievement of European security not only would meet the aspirations and interests of the peoples of that region but would also serve the general cause of peace. We are of the opinion that, on the whole, the evolution of the situation in Europe reveals the existence of favourable opportunities, of positive trends towards the relaxation of tension and co-operation. What is involved is, undoubtedly, a complex and evolving process, a path along which progress can be made step by step, by systematic and continuing efforts, by the normalization and persistent intensification of relations between the States of the continent. It is the duty of the European countries to act in such a way that this process is neither slowed down nor interrupted but, on the contrary, encouraged and expanded so that the process of relaxation of tension continues and that any action which might poison the climate in Europe is avoided. It is only in so far as each European State is certain that its independence and territorial integrity will not be threatened, in so far as each people is convinced that it can freely choose its own path of development, that a lasting foundation will be created for the security of the whole continent.

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

68. In this respect, the withdrawal of all troops from the territory of other States within the limits of their national frontiers, the elimination of the foreign military bases existing in Europe, the abolition of NATO and, at the same time, of the Warsaw military pact, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, and the implementation of other regional disarmament measures would be of great importance. Romania considers that the governments of European States would render a great service to security and peace if they decided to forgo the organization of military manoeuvres and other demonstrations of force on the frontiers or on the territory of other States.

69. Convinced that security in Europe must be the fruit of unremitting efforts by all European nations, Romania is making its own contribution to that task. Side by side with its concern to expand bilateral relations at different levels with all the States of Europe, Romania has co-operated and is co-operating with other countries on many occasions with a view to promoting European security.

70. As is well known, in 1965 the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted the resolution on the improvement of good-neighbourly relations among European States, the draft of which had been submitted by nine countries including Romania (resolution 2129 (XX)). The ideas and principles affirmed by that resolution retain their full value and topicality. The request addressed by the General Assembly to the governments of European States:

> "... to intensify their efforts to improve reciprocal relations, with a view to creating an atmosphere of confidence which will be conducive to an effective consideration of the problems which are still hampering the relaxation of tension in Europe and throughout the world"

constitutes now, as it did at the time, a forceful call to action.

71. We consider that there are many possibilities which have not yet been explored and whose identification and implementation call for all our powers of thought and an absolute will to succeed.

72. Recently, the States parties to the Warsaw Pact, in reaffirming the well-known proposals contained in the Bucharest Declaration of 1966 concerning European security, addressed an appeal to all the States of the continent, inviting them to co-operate in order to achieve its aim. The appeal says:

> "The present and the future of the peoples of Europe is indissolubly linked with the maintenance and consolidation of peace on our continent. Genuine security and reliable peace can be ensured, if the thoughts, pursuits

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

and energy of the European States are directed towards the aim of relaxing tension, solving with due regard to realities international problems that are ripe for solution and arranging for all-round co-operation on an all-European basis."

.....

"It is a vital necessity for the European peoples to avert new military conflicts and to strengthen the political, economic and cultural links between all States on the basis of equal rights and respect for the independence and sovereignty of States." (ENDC/243, pp.3 and 5)

73. We are of the opinion that a positive step towards the solution of such problems would be the convening of a European conference in which all the States of the continent would participate and which would examine concrete measures designed to secure a relaxation of tension and peace and security in Europe. It is the duty of all European countries to co-operate in the creation of a climate favourable to the organization and success of such a conference.

74. One of the most important contributions to the achievement of European security would be the normalization of relations between the Balkan States, and the intensification of their efforts and activities aimed at improving the climate in that part of Europe and transforming the Balkans into an area of peace and international co-operation.

75. The Romanian delegation would now like to state its point of view on the important operational problems which have been touched on, in one way or another, in all the statements made so far. Our considerations and suggestions are based on the following ideas which seem to us to be essential: (1) the acute need for a coherent programme of action comprising both immediate and long-term oblectives; (2) the improvement of methods of work and the intensification of the pace of negotiations; (3) the decisive importance of the political will of States for the success of the disarmament negotiations.

76. The crystallization of a unitary concept and the delineation of a clear, precise and broad vision of the proposed aim are indispensable conditions for any rational action. The concept of programming and planning has become imperative in all spheres of human activity. The fascinating adventure of the end of the present century, in which mankind places so many justified hopes, cannot be separated from the factor, which is so important, of immediate and long-term forecasting and programming.

77. Major activities of the United Nations, such as development and decolonization, have been conceived in the light of a global strategy consisting of a set of measures phased in time and necessarily subordinated to practical objectives.

(Mr. Ionesco Romania)

78. The United Nations proclaimed a first Development Decade and, as is known, the idea of a second Decade has already been accepted. But that method has not been used in the disarmament negotiations, despite the obvious connexion that exists between development and disarmament.

79. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the efforts of States aimed at achieving effective progress towards disarmament should be directed in a new manner, so as to give the negotiations perspective, continuity, consistency and effectiveness. We believe that it would be advisable to have recourse to a functional approach consisting of a series of measures, all integrated within the fundamental objective pursued, namely, general disarmament and, first and forement, nuclear disarmament.

80. It is in that light that one could view the proclamation of a United Nations disarmament decade, 1970-1980, which would be harmonized with the second Development Decade, thus making it possible to combine the efforts undertaken by the international community in these fields of vital significance for promoting progress throughout the world and for ensuring general peace.

81. Such a decade should draw its inspiration from and be based on the resolutions adopted in recent years by the General Assembly of the United Nations, the recommendations of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (A/7277), and the provisions of article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Profiferation of Nuclear Weapons; should be in complete agreement with the provisional agenda adopted by our Committee on 15 August 1968, (ENDC/236 p.3), and take into account the proposals and suggestions put forward by various States both in the Committee and in the United Nations.

82. The laying down of a complex programme of work based on those essential components would open up a vast horizon for disarmament negotiations and would make it possible to establish a hierarchy of priorities and precise time limits for the phased implementation of the various measures.

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

83. In view of the great danger represented by the existence of atomic weapons to the whole of mankind, measures in the field of nuclear disarmament must naturally be given the highest priority. Moreover, in our Committee a unanimous consensus was reached last August that absolute priority must be given in the negotiations to: "Further effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament."

84. The Romanian delegation regards as a matter of the utmost urgency the accomplishment of such measures as the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the limitation of strategic delivery systems, the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, and the cessation of the production of such weapons. It is our profound conviction that there can be no valid reasons to justify the postponement of the conclusion of agreements on the aforesaid measures, all the more so as such measures are viewed as preliminaries to more far-reaching actions, namely, the gradual destruction of nuclear weapons and their complete elimination from national arsenals.

85. On the other hand, special attention should be given to partial measures which would engender confidence and whose implementation would, in a tangible manner, promote a relaxation of tension and contribute directly to the improvement of the international political climate. We have in mind the liquidation of military bases on foreign territory, the withdrawal of troops within the limits of their national frontiers, the prohibition of military manoeuvres and other demonstrations of force on the frontiers or on the territory of other States, the abolition of military blocs, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, regional disarmament measures, the prohibition of military activities on the sea-bed, and so on.

86. Prepared in its initial form in this Committee, the programme we suggest would be completed at the General Assembly, with the participation of all Members of the United Nations. Thus it would constitute the basis for actions to be undertaken within the framework of the United Nations disarmament decade. Tackled along a broad front, with clearly defined objectives and with time-limits established in advance, the urgent problem of disarmament, like that of development, would be the focus of the concerns of the international community in the nineteen seventies.

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

87. The same innovating attitude should also guide our efforts in regard to our methods of work. We believe that all members of the Committee will agree that the forms of organization and the procedures used here are not, and cannot be, immutable, established once and for all. Acting constantly in accordance with the criteria of efficiency and always bearing in mind the need for adaptability, we shall have to make the changes required by the scope and urgency of the tasks confronting us. In short, we should together seek out and reach agreement on the most appropriate ways and means of attaining the proposed objectives.

88. Advocates as we are of a "dynamic conception" of the negotiations, we consider that it is more than ever necessary to intensify our work as much as possible, to diversify it and to improve its efficiency, so that we can proceed, after the general debate, to a detailed examination of the problems entrusted to us. The Romanian delegation shares the view held by the representatives of many countries that the negotiations should be concentrated on a broad range of measures and that the discussions should not be limited to one point, as has often happened in the past.

89. An essential condition for fruitful activity is the carrying out of a true dialogue, through the participation of all, in the spirit of, and with rigorous respect for, the principle of the equality of the States meeting around the negotiating table. That presupposes a constructive approach to the problems on the basis of a method of work, an understanding of and receptiveness to the arguments of each one, respect and consideration for the positions put forward, as well as the harmonization of the interests of all countries.

90. In the light of the considerations I have just mentioned, the Romanian delegation is in favour of increasing the number of weekly meetings, of convening unofficial meetings, and of creating, if necessary, flexible organizational structures with the participation of all member countries, or of those that are interested, with a view to considering in greater detail specific questions or questions on which agreement could be reached in a relatively short time. We might also have recourse more often to the highly qualified services of the Secretariat of the Conference in order to draw up summaries or documentary studies that are so necessary to our work.

91. We are, of course, aware that the preparation of a programme of negotiations and the improvement of our methods of work — which are elements of the utmost

(Mr. Ecobesco, Romania)

importance -- cannot in themselves provide the key to the success of the negotiations. We are considering problems of great complexity entailing the most profound political, military, economic and social consequences which, by their nature, call for decisions of the highest responsibility.

92. The determining factor for the achievement of real progress towards disarmament has been, and still is, the will of States to reach agreements, their political will to set out resolutely along this path, and the creation of a healthy climate favourable to the continued progress of the negotiations.

93. In the field of disarmament, as well as where the solution of major international problems is concerned, States should meet each other half way and seek, with perseverance and consistency, for ways of understanding in the interest of co-operation and peace. It is the duty of all States to contribute, through concrete actions, to the achievement of those objectives. It would be particularly just and equitable that the great Powers should themselves, in the first place, set the example in that respect, which would be beneficial to all countries, to relaxation of tension and to international co-operation.

94. We believe that all of us in this Committee are fully aware of the need to have our dicussions result in agreements on effective disarmament measures. The value of the statements we make here could never be better confirmed than by the force of deeds, which are so expressive.

95. Being aware that what is expected of us is deeds and meaningful achievements, we think that it is appropriate to recall the old but very topical saying that beautiful harmony undoubtedly comes from a meeting of words and deeds.

96. The Romanian delegation has expressed its views frankly, both on the substance of the problems and on the forms and methods of work. We have done so because we are convinced that the spirit of frankness -- which has also characterized the statements of other representatives -- must prevail in our negotiations in order that we may engage in a constructive and fruitful dialogue.

97. For its part, our delegation has firm instructions from the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania to act in a practical manner, in co-operation with the delegations of other countries, to promote the cause of disarmament and peace and, at the same time, to contribute to the progress of the negotiations.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 400th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador R. Caracciolo, representative of Italy.

"Statements were made by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Romania.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Tuesday, 8 April 1969, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12 noon.