

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.236  
1 February 1966  
ENGLISH

---

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 1 February 1966, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. H. KHALLAF

(United Arab Republic)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil: Mr. A. CORREA do LAGO  
Mr. C. H. PAULINO PRATES

Bulgaria: Mr. C. LUKANOV  
Mr. Y. GOLEMANOV  
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV  
Mr. T. DAMIANOV

Burma: U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada: Mr. E.L.M. BURNS  
Mr. S.F. RAE  
Mr. C.J. MARSHALL  
Mr. P.D. LEE

Czechoslovakia: Mr. Z. CERNIK  
Mr. V. VAJNAR  
Mr. R. KLEIN

Ethiopia: Mr. A. ABERRA  
Mr. A. ZELLEKE  
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India: Mr. V.C. TRIVEDI  
Mr. K.P. LUKOSE  
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy: Mr. F. CAVALLETTI  
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI  
Mr. S. AVETTA  
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico: Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria: Mr. G.O. IJEWERE  
Mr. L.C.N. OBI

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN  
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI  
Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCO  
Mr. N. ECOBESCO  
Mr. C. UNGUREANU  
Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL  
Mr. P. HAMMARSKJOLD  
Mr. R. BOMAN  
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist  
Republics:

Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN  
Mr. O.A. GRINEVSKY  
Mr. I.M. PALENYKH  
Mr. G.K. EFIMOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF  
Mr. A. OSMAN  
Mr. M. KASSEM  
Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT  
Sir H. BEELEY  
Mr. J.G. TAHOUDIN  
Miss E.J.M. RICHARDSON

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER  
Mr. C.H. TIMBERLAKE  
Mr. D.S. MACDONALD  
Mr. G. BUNN

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. P.P. SPINELLI

Deputy Special Representative  
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (United Arab Republic)(translation from French): I declare open the two hundred and thirty-sixth plenary meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Before opening the debate I have pleasure in welcoming to this Conference His Excellency Ambassador Amha Aberra, head of the delegation of Ethiopia, and Mr. Ijewere, representative of Nigeria.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translated from French): Before beginning my statement, I should like to associate myself very sincerely with the condolences that numerous delegations have expressed to the Indian delegation on the irreparable loss of Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India, and of the eminent Indian scientist Mr. Homi Bhabha, and also to the Nigerian delegation on the death of Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.

I should also like to associate myself with the welcome extended to Mr. Spinelli, Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and to yourself, Mr. Chairman, as the new Ambassador of the United Arab Republic.

I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to convey our best remembrances to Ambassador Hassan, who has hitherto represented your country in the Committee with such great competence and with whom my delegation had established the closest collaboration. I am sure that this collaboration will be continued with you, and I should like to express my sincerest wishes for the success of your work here.

I associate myself with the satisfaction expressed at the return among us of Mr. Blusztajn, the representative of Poland, and the presence in the Committee of Ambassador Amha Aberra, the new representative of Ethiopia, who is an old friend and to whom I extend my best wishes for the success of his work here in the months to come.

I should also like to welcome Mr. Ijewere, the new representative of Nigeria.

My delegation notes with genuine satisfaction that no sooner have the debates in the General Assembly been concluded than the problems of disarmament are taken up at Geneva. Thus agreements capable of ending the armaments race and relaxing tension are being sought unremittingly, either at United Nations Headquarters or here.

At our first meeting the interest taken in the resumption of our work at this time was highlighted by four messages addressed to this Conference. I cannot begin my statement without emphasizing the value of these communications.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

This is the first time that the highest dignitary of the Catholic world, pursuing his indefatigable activities for peace, has conveyed his encouragement to us and has asserted his confidence in our labours. The Italian delegation welcomes these noble appeals with feelings of sincere gratitude and profound respect. It will draw upon them for inspiration in its further action, for it regards this message (ENDC/163) as in complete harmony with its country's aims for peace.

In transmitting to us the resolutions on disarmament adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Secretary-General, U Thant, sent us through his Special Representative, Mr. Spinelli, a message which I am sure we have all greatly appreciated (ENDC/PV.235, pp.8 et seq.).

Lastly, in their important messages the President of the United States, Mr. Johnson (ENDC/165) and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Wilson (ENDC/166) reaffirmed the constructive intentions of their Governments, thus establishing a positive and promising starting-point for our work.

These messages and the statements which were made during our first meeting brought out some positive factors concerning the possible course that our work might take.

It seems to me that one important point was established from the outset: as we had hoped, the disquieting events which are taking place elsewhere will not interfere with our patient efforts to achieve results here. It is true that the statement made by Mr. Tsarapkin last Thursday unfortunately contained some highly polemical passages, in which the Soviet representative reiterated completely erroneous interpretations of the world situation and levelled some charges, as unfounded as they were unfair, against the policy of the United States and against the Federal Republic of Germany. We can only regret this profoundly, while hoping that it was merely a digression and that Mr. Tsarapkin will abide by his earlier statements to the effect that our negotiations will be useful and agreement will be possible despite the conflict which is in progress. In his statement Mr. Tsarapkin said that our struggle here for peace and disarmament has great significance (ENDC/PV.235, p.17). Those words imbued us with some confidence and some hope.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

The United States delegation's position leaves no room for any doubt. It was defined once again in President Johnson's message, in which he says;

"There are differences among the members of this Conference on Viet-Nam, but these differences make our common interest in preventing nuclear spread and curbing the nuclear arms race all the more important to pursue."

(ENDC/165).

This imperative need to pursue disarmament negotiations in the face of all difficulties has already been formally confirmed by the debates at the United Nations and by the unanimous votes which ensued. The resolutions of the twentieth session of the General Assembly reaffirmed the view of all Members of the United Nations that this Committee remains an essential instrument in the search for agreement on disarmament, and is hence an irreplaceable factor of understanding and rapprochement among peoples.

Another point that has emerged both from the deliberations in the United Nations and from earlier statements made here is that some clearly-defined and non-controversial objectives have been placed before this session of the Committee: namely, an agreement on non-proliferation and the general prohibition of tests. Of course we have other items on our agenda, such as general and complete disarmament and some important collateral measures. They will have to be discussed and scrutinized; but it is becoming increasingly clear that the two problems I have mentioned may be regarded as "prerequisites", since their solution would make that of all the other problems infinitely easier.

A third point in favour of this session is that the Committee has at its disposal for the solution of those two problems ample material for negotiation and clear and non-controversial recommendations from the United Nations (ENDC/161,162). On non-proliferation our Committee has before it, as indicated in General Assembly resolution 2028(XX), two draft treaties, submitted by the United States (ENDC/152) and the Soviet Union (ENDC/164) respectively, the memorandum of the eight non-aligned delegations (ENDC/158), and the Italian proposal for a controlled nuclear moratorium (ENDC/157).

It is obvious - and the debates at the United Nations have confirmed this - that we should first of all seek a solution of the problem of non-proliferation by concluding a general treaty on that subject. That would be a complete, integral and final solution of the problem, which would guarantee both general and irreversible progress and a political rapprochement on which could be based subsequent developments in the sphere of disarmament and peace.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

The requirements which must be met by a general treaty on non-proliferation are stated in General Assembly resolution 2028(XX) (ENDC/161) which recommends the prohibition of direct and indirect proliferation without any possible loop-holes.

Similarly President Johnson's message (ENDC/165) specifies in detail the provisions which, in the opinion of the Western delegations, should be included in the non-proliferation treaty. In accepting the prohibition treaty a non-nuclear country would have to commit itself not to -

1. Acquire nuclear weapons of its own;
2. Gain national control over nuclear weapons;
3. Achieve the power itself to fire nuclear weapons;
4. Receive assistance in manufacturing or testing nuclear weapons.

These prohibitions apply to -

- A. Direct or indirect acquisition, direct or indirect use, and direct or indirect aid or assistance;
- B. Acquisition, use or assistance obtained through third countries or groups of countries;
- C. Acquisition, use or assistance obtained through units of the armed forces or military personnel under any military alliance.

I have made a point of repeating the limitations which the Western side is prepared to accept, as stated in the United States message, so that the Committee may reflect on the starting-point of our negotiations.

Mr. Tsarapkin, for his part, stated at our last meeting (ENDC/PV/235, p.16) that the plan to give the Federal Republic of Germany access to nuclear weapons was the main obstacle to a non-proliferation agreement. But does the acceptance by the West of the United Nations resolution and the terms of President Johnson's message indicate the intention of the West to give any such access to the Federal Republic of Germany? If words have any meaning, the reply is obviously in the negative. Moreover, certain statements, some of them very recent, made by responsible persons in the Federal Republic of Germany, which is the only country to have renounced the manufacture of nuclear weapons, again confirm that that country neither asks nor wishes for such access. If the Soviet Union really wants a non-proliferation agreement, a basis for such an agreement exists.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

Of course, a non-proliferation agreement cannot nullify or invalidate existing alliances, any more than it can, so far as we are concerned, weaken or undermine the possibilities of Western defensive collaboration, which ensures peace and security in Europe through a balance of power. Only by progressive agreements towards general and complete disarmament can new balances and greater security for all be gradually sought. If the Soviet Union were hoping to use a non-proliferation agreement to undermine the necessary co-operation between all the members of the Western Alliance, that attempt would inevitably be doomed to failure and the non-proliferation agreement would be jeopardized.

But we do not believe that this is so. We believe that the Soviet Union is aware of the necessity for a balance in Europe, and that it is seeking through a non-proliferation agreement reasonable guarantees which correspond to the real meaning of non-proliferation and can be legitimately asked for in a world where security is still based on a balance of alliances. It was therefore with a feeling of hope that we heard Mr. Tsarapkin say (ibid, p.20) that his delegation was ready to engage in the preparation of a non-proliferation treaty article by article. That is the right method, a fruitful method which will help us gradually to reduce misunderstandings and differences. For our part we are ready and willing to undertake this work with an open mind and in a spirit of conciliation.

The Italian delegation proposes that, as soon as the general debate is concluded, the Conference should set up a drafting committee on which all its members would be represented and which would examine side by side the two draft treaties and any amendments that may be submitted. Such a committee should first of all draw up a document comparing the two texts we have before us. It should also be able to meet in closed session without records, so as to allow a confidential exchange of views on as wide and free a footing as possible.

It seems to me that this work might give rise to reasonable expectations of success. Our constant assurances and the oft-repeated assertions that our defensive alliances is not plotting aggression against anyone, and that it wishes to reduce its nuclear and conventional armaments as soon as possible, provided that this is done in a controlled and balanced manner, as well as the obvious developments in Western policy, should eliminate the obstacle to which Mr. Tsarapkin referred (ibid, p.16) and convince the Soviet Union that to conclude a non-proliferation treaty immediately is in its own as well as in the general interest. In addition, I think we are all aware



(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

that such a treaty, apart from its intrinsic advantages, would have a political significance of immense value and would certainly sow the seeds of far-reaching and favourable developments in all directions. This might also meet the legitimate expectations of the non-nuclear countries, which ask that their renunciation of nuclear weapons should be the starting-point of a wider process of nuclear disarmament by the nuclear countries themselves.

The conclusion of such a treaty is not only necessary but extremely urgent; if it were delayed, other means would have to be found to counter the imminent dangers. That is what led the Italian delegation to submit the proposal for a controlled nuclear moratorium, (ENDC/157) of which you are aware. That proposal met with a favourable reception by most of the delegations which participated in the discussions at the United Nations. They acknowledged the interest and value of our proposals and paid tribute to the intentions which inspired it.

In our opinion, the debates at the United Nations have confirmed that our proposal constitutes an effective alternative solution in the event - which we refuse for the time being to contemplate - that the preparation of a general treaty once again meets with unsurmountable difficulties or is subjected to very serious delays. The Italian delegation therefore reserves the right, if that becomes necessary, to address an appeal at the appropriate time to the non-nuclear countries in order that they may themselves take steps, at least temporarily, to check the threat of nuclear proliferation. I hope that the non-nuclear countries which genuinely seek non-proliferation will lend us their support.

In connexion with a possible moratorium, I note the statement in point 3 of President Johnson's message that "the nations that do not seek the nuclear path can be sure that they will have our [the United States'] strong support against threats of nuclear blackmail" (ENDC/165, p.2). That is a very important point, and these assurances, or any others that may be given, will serve to facilitate acceptance of the idea of a moratorium which we have put forward.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

Furthermore, I note with pleasure that the idea on which our proposal is based is steadily gaining ground: that non-nuclear or militarily weaker countries should not remain inactive but should actively promote the cause of disarmament within the limits of their capacity and in the spheres appropriate to them.

The United Nations has expressed interest in two specific initiatives which have emanated from non-nuclear countries and which we very sincerely support. I refer to the denuclearization of Latin America and of the African continent.

In considering the areas in which the non-nuclear Powers can take initiatives of their own, mention should also be made of the important plan submitted by Sweden (ENDC/154) to bring international co-operation to bear on the conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of tests. Italy is happy to support this proposal and, if called upon to do so, would be willing to collaborate with it actively, in the conviction that the problem of a complete prohibition of tests can be solved and that, in view of the close connexion of this problem with non-proliferation, its solution would also facilitate that of the latter problem.

The idea set out in point 7 of President Johnson's message can also be included among the measures which the less powerful military countries can take. In my opinion this idea deserves particular attention, especially since it has an affinity with a principle which the Italian Government has always had at heart, that of the transfer to peaceful uses of resources squandered in the armaments race.

Point 7 of President Johnson's message says:

"These resources" (meaning those spent on costly conventional armaments) "might better be spent on feeding the hungry, healing the sick and teaching the uneducated". (ENDC/165, p.3).

These are the same humanitarian aims of disarmament which we see recalled in the Pope's message to this Committee:

"With every day that passes, the contrast also becomes more painful and acute between the huge sums being swallowed up by the manufacture of armaments and the immense and growing material distress of over half the human race, whose most elementary needs remain unsatisfied". (ENDC/163, p.3).

Between these two messages, emanating from two authorities so different but equally concerned with the peace and well-being of mankind, there is a striking identity of intention and even of language which should be pondered over. It is high time that disarmament opened the way, not only to peace and security for all, but also to general progress in a brotherly association of effort and co-operation.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

I could go on to examine a number of other problems and proposals, some of them new, such as those for the destruction of a certain number of nuclear bombs and for a reduction in the number of nuclear carriers, referred to in points 5 and 6 of the United States message; but I shall leave this to a future occasion, so as not to detain the Committee too long.

What I still want to add today is that, as always, we believe that all possibilities of agreement in any area, be it non-proliferation or destruction of weapons, should be patiently and indefatigably explored. To reach agreements, even limited ones, on any aspect whatsoever of disarmament, on any problem whatsoever, would at the present juncture represent invaluable progress towards peace and would greatly facilitate the conclusion of other agreements. These agreements would not only lighten the present political atmosphere but might even encourage and facilitate the broadening of disarmament negotiations, in accordance with the wishes of the United Nations.

The convening of a world disarmament conference is a project to which we have lent our support from the outset; but, although we see some hope in such a conference, we are aware of the difficulties involved. If we could show here by concrete action that disarmament is neither a Utopia nor a trap, we should probably smooth the way for a comprehensive international conference on disarmament. The results achieved here might convince the sceptics or the opponents of such a plan, who could be shown that disarmament is not only attainable and feasible without danger, and without disequilibrium, but that it is the only path which, through the better common utilization of world resources, can lead to the advancement and well-being of all peoples.

Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): First of all I should like to associate the delegation of Czechoslovakia with those speakers who at our last meeting expressed their profound condolences to the delegation of India on the deaths of the distinguished representative of the Indian nation, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri, and the great Indian scientist Dr. Homi Bhabha; and also to the delegation of Nigeria on the death of the Prime Minister of Nigeria, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa.

(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

As in previous years, the Czechoslovak delegation has come to the present session of the Eighteen-Nation Committee with the aim of achieving concrete results. This course is dictated by the unflagging interest of the Government of Czechoslovakia in solving the problem of disarmament. This interest has also found expression in the positive attitude adopted by the delegation of Czechoslovakia towards the resolution of the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly in support of the plan to convene a world disarmament conference (A/RES/2030(XX); ENDC/162). In this connexion we should like to express the hope that the endeavours to implement this plan, which has already received extensive support throughout the world, will continue, so that a world disarmament conference can be held not later than 1967.

The delegation of Czechoslovakia is convinced that the organization of such a conference and the negotiations which would take place at it could provide a new and powerful impetus towards solution of the problem of disarmament. This would be extremely desirable, because so far the results of the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee are hardly a cause for satisfaction. Furthermore, the situation in which the Committee is resuming its negotiations remains extremely unfavourable.

As also last year, the Eighteen-Nation Committee has assembled for the present session in an atmosphere clouded by extremely grave events, as a result of which the process of the relaxation of international tension has been halted and the situation has considerably deteriorated. The cause of this is primarily the continuing and increasing aggression of the United States in Viet-Nam. Day by day the number of United States military personnel in this area is continually increasing, the military operations against the freedom-loving people of South Viet-Nam are being expanded and intensified, and the aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam continues.

Only yesterday the United States of America again resumed the senseless and barbaric bombing of the territory of the sovereign State of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, thus reducing to naught all the so-called peace initiative of the United States. The United States Government has once again demonstrated to the whole world its true intentions in this area and its disregard for world public opinion, which is calling for an end to this dirty war. The United States cannot escape the responsibility for this war, no matter to what political or other manoeuvres it may resort.

(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

This development is in direct contradiction with the tasks and mission of our Committee. The aim of our negotiations should be disarmament, or, at least, a cessation of the arms race and the implementation of measures that would lead to a lessening of international tension. The aforementioned actions of the United States, however, will have quite the opposite effect and will lead to a further increase in armaments and to more acute international tension. This is bound to have an adverse effect on the conditions under which our Committee works.

The representatives of the Western Powers allege that the statements of the delegations of the socialist countries, which quite rightly criticize the policy of the United States, are not conducive to the successful work of the Committee. I should like to point out that the delegations of the Western countries are addressing themselves to the wrong quarter, and that they are attempting to substitute the effects for the cause. The gist of the matter lies, not in the statements of the socialist delegations, but in the policy of the United States, which is the main cause of the aggravation of international tension and the creation of conditions which by no means facilitate our negotiations.

But South-East Asia is not the only area where events are taking place which are having an adverse effect on the present international atmosphere. Disturbing events whose harmful effects cannot be ignored are also occurring in other parts of the world, including Europe. It is true that in a number of European countries there are increasing tendencies towards normalization of the situation and the development of relations between European countries regardless of differences in their social and economic structures, so as to bring about in that way the conditions for lessening the danger of an armed conflict and for strengthening European security.

However, those tendencies run up against influential opposing forces which are manifested mainly in the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. On the part of the Federal Republic of Germany, revanchist demands, formulated more and more openly, are being proclaimed, and an extensive programme for revision of the results of the Second World War is being put forward. With the support of official quarters, attempts are being made, for example, to justify the Munich Agreement, to prove that it was legally binding at the time of its conclusion and on this basis to draw

(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

conclusions for the present time as well, so as to justify revanchist claims in regard to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as we have seen once again a few weeks ago.

The more and more openly formulated claims of the Federal Republic of Germany regarding access to nuclear weapons are another matter to which considerable attention has already been paid in the work of our Committee. The gravity of all these circumstances is further increased by the fact that this policy of the Federal Republic of Germany meets with tacit agreement or even open support from some of the States members of NATO, which are quite obviously prepared to yield to these demands so fraught with danger. This situation is reflected in various plans for the integration of nuclear armaments within the framework of NATO, the main purpose of which is to give the Federal Republic of Germany access to nuclear weapons in one form or another.

The implementation of such plans would be a serious obstacle to the conclusion of an agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. How can the Western Powers explain that, at a time when the demand for the prevention of the further spread of nuclear weapons is being made with increasing insistence throughout the world, and when so much attention is being devoted to this question in our Committee and in the work of the United Nations General Assembly, feverish negotiations on plans for nuclear integration, with the participation of the Federal Republic of Germany, are still going on in NATO?

The attention devoted to the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is fully justified, since the adoption of effective measures against proliferation is one of the most important tasks in the present situation. A realistic assessment of the situation in a number of countries shows that these countries could acquire their own atomic weapons in the near future, thus significantly increasing the number of countries possessing these weapons. If such a development took place it would lead to serious consequences both for the general world situation, especially from the point of view of increasing the risk of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict, and for the prospects of solving the problem of disarmament.

(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

It is therefore essential to reach agreement as speedily as possible on measures capable of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this connexion there is every justification for putting forward the requirement that in solving this problem the interests of all States, nuclear and non-nuclear, should be taken into account. In this respect we believe that all peoples are mainly interested in preventing any further increase in the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war.

It is to this aim that individual States should subordinate their other private interests. There is wide agreement that further spread of nuclear weapons in any form whatever would lead to extremely serious consequences, and, in particular, to increasing the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war. This danger could be averted by adopting measures against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. To do so would strengthen world peace and the security of all States.

In this connexion we think it appropriate to point out that it would be wrong to expect a treaty on non-proliferation to solve all problems, without exception, in the sphere of disarmament or the security of individual States. It would therefore be wrong to put forward such demands in connexion with non-proliferation. The question of non-proliferation is complicated in itself, and its solution comes up against serious obstacles, arising, for example, from the attempts of some States to ensure, within the framework of a treaty on non-proliferation, a definite privileged position for themselves and their allies in various military groupings. Attempts to link non-proliferation to other measures could only complicate an already difficult situation, and delay and make more difficult the reaching of agreement.

On the other hand, it is altogether justifiable to require that a treaty on non-proliferation should consistently solve those questions which it can and should solve: that is, that it should not leave any loop-holes for the direct or indirect proliferation of nuclear weapons in any form. This requirement is fully met both by the draft treaty on non-proliferation (ENDC/164) submitted by the Government of the USSR in September 1965 at the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly, and by the resolution adopted by the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly (A/RES/2028/XX; ENDC/161) which laid down the principle that the treaty on non-proliferation "should be void of any loop-holes which might permit nuclear or non-nuclear Powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form". The same resolution also mentions other principles for the drafting of a treaty on non-proliferation.

(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

In the light of all these circumstances some delegations have rightly pointed out that, in the sphere of non-proliferation, there have been created during the previous negotiations all the necessary prerequisites to enable the Committee to set about the clause-by-clause elaboration of a draft treaty. The delegation of Czechoslovakia fully shares this view and is ready to take part in this work.

There are still other questions before the Committee, however, and some of them are to a certain extent related to measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. These measures, like a non-proliferation treaty, would help towards reducing the danger of a nuclear war and halting the nuclear arms race.

From this point of view the Czechoslovak delegation regards as particularly important the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, or at least the unilateral assumption by individual nuclear Powers, of an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Since in the present circumstances an agreement on general and complete disarmament, which would once and for all eliminate the threat of nuclear war, is encountering great difficulties, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be an important step which would substantially reduce such a threat. At the present time the importance of such a measure is emphasized also by the effect which prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would have in respect of measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Its adoption would substantially restrict the danger of nuclear aggression or blackmail and would thus contribute to strengthening the security of all States.

The establishment of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world would also play a positive role. For this reason the Czechoslovak delegation supported the draft resolution submitted at the twentieth session of the United Nations General Assembly to make Africa a nuclear-free zone (A/RES/2033(XA); ENDC/162). We are convinced that the establishment of denuclearized zones would help to lessen tension and strengthen security in other areas as well. In this respect we attach particular importance to the establishment of denuclearized zones in Europe, as has been proposed in a number of important plans relating to this question submitted in the past. Their implementation would be an important contribution to the strengthening of security and peace in that part of the world.

In connexion with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is often urged, quite rightly, that nuclear tests should be banned completely. The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced that this question has long been ripe for solution and that this can be achieved by extending the scope of the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear



(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

tests in three environments (ENDC/100/Rev.1) to cover underground nuclear explosions. The only obstacle standing in the way of agreement on this question is that the United States stubbornly insists upon so-called on-site inspection. Therefore it depends entirely on the United States whether the Committee will achieve positive results in regard to the prohibition of underground nuclear tests.

Among other collateral measures I should like to mention the proposal (ENDC/167) to eliminate foreign military bases and to withdraw foreign troops from the territory of other States. The socialist countries have already been endeavouring for a number of years to secure the implementation of that proposal. Recent events have once again emphasized its reasonableness and urgency. Wherever hotbeds of tension have recently cropped up, foreign military bases and armed forces on the territory of other States have played an important part. Therefore there can be no doubt that, among the measures to be considered by the Committee with a view to lessening international tension, it is necessary to place in the forefront the proposal to eliminate foreign military bases and to withdraw foreign troops from the territories of other States.

The main task assigned to the Eighteen-Nation Committee when it was set up was the solving of the problem of general and complete disarmament. The Czechoslovak delegation bases itself on the assumption that the preparation of a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament continues to be the main task of the Committee, although, as a result of the position of the Western Powers, its accomplishment is meeting with serious obstacles which will obviously not be easy to overcome. We therefore support the recommendation of the two co-Chairmen of the Committee (ENDC/PV.235, p.11) that, after consideration of the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a question which at present justifiably occupies the first place among the Committee's tasks, due attention should be given to the problems of general and complete disarmament so as, in discussing the subject, to concentrate attention mainly on measures the implementation of which would lead to eliminating the threat of a nuclear war - that is, on measures concerning nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. We are convinced that the compromise proposals of the Soviet Government on this question (ENDC/2/Rev.1/Add.1) constitute an adequate and realistic basis for fruitful negotiations and for achieving concrete results.

(Mr. Cernik, Czechoslovakia)

In conclusion, allow me to join those speakers who have already welcomed to our Committee the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Spinelli; the new head of the delegation of the Polish People's Republic, Mr. Blusztajn; the head of the delegation of Ethiopia, Mr. Aberra; the head of the delegation of Nigeria, Mr. Ijewere; and also you, Mr. Chairman, as head of the delegation of the United Arab Republic. On behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation I wish all of them the utmost success in their work, and I should like to express the conviction that their participation will be an important contribution to the work of this Committee.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 236th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Hussein Khallaf, representative of the United Arab Republic.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Italy and Czechoslovakia.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 3 February 1966, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.