



Thirteenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 27 October 1958, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. URQUIA

(El Salvador)

1. Question of disarmament [64] (continued)
2. The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests [70] (continued)
3. The reduction of the military budgets of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France by 10 - 15 per cent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries [72] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.963. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed record.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF DR. GUSTAVO GUERRERO

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It is with profound sorrow that I have to inform the Committee of the death of an illustrious diplomat, jurist and international official from El Salvador, who died at The Hague where he had occupied the position of Judge in the International Court of Justice. I refer to Dr. Gustavo Guerrero, whose whole life was devoted to the service of law and justice and whose efforts towards international peace were recognized all over the world. These efforts were summed up in a number of books which he had published, particularly in the volume entitled International Order, in which he succeeded in focussing the great problems of international reorganization which arose after the Second World War.

Dr. Guerrero not only occupied the highest political positions as well as the highest diplomatic positions in his country -- for example, the position of Minister for Foreign Affairs and Ambassador to France and other European countries -- but also held important international posts in which he carried out his functions in a worthy manner.

Dr. Guerrero was President of the tenth session of the General Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva in 1929. He was President of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague from 1937 to 1946, and President of the International Court of Justice from 1946 to 1949. This means that Dr. Guerrero was the last President of the old Court and the first President of the International Court of Justice.

In view of all that I have said, and fulfilling a rather unhappy duty at the moment, may I express the feelings of my colleagues as Chairman of the First Committee and our condolences to the people and the Government of El Salvador. I would ask representatives to stand in silence for one minute in tribute to the memory of an eminent jurist of the International Court of Justice, Dr. Gustavo Guerrero.

The representatives stood in silence.

AGENDA ITEMS 64, 70 and 72

1. QUESTIONS OF DISARMAMENT (continued)
2. THE DISCONTINUANCE OF ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN WEAPONS TESTS (continued)
3. THE REDUCTION OF THE MILITARY BUDGETS OF THE USSR, THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND FRANCE BY 10-15 PER CENT AND THE USE OF PART OF THE SAVINGS SO EFFECTED FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE UNDER-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (continued)

Mr. BOUZA (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Having heard the sad news of the death of Dr. Gustavo Guerrero, jurist, international diplomat of world renown, who occupied the highest international positions and carried out the duties entrusted to him in a most worthy manner, may I express to you, Mr. Chairman, both personally and on behalf of my delegation, our sympathy in the loss which has been suffered by your country and by the world.

Speaking towards the close of our debate on disarmament, a subject which is undoubtedly one of the most important of all international problems, the delegation of Uruguay reaffirms its faith and hope in the destiny of the United Nations to serve the common ideals inspired by a love of peace and a belief in the reign of law and order.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

We trust that the thirteenth regular session of the General Assembly will be the best of all omens and that the final decisions taken in this Committee will fully satisfy the hopes of humanity. These are the sincere hopes that we wish to express. We trust that the road we are following will arrive at the end which has always been sought by my country. May I remind the Committee that as far back as 1907, during the Second International Peace Conference held at The Hague, a statesman who occupies a very high position in the history of my country, Mr. Batlle y Ordoñez, made the following statement to the nations there convened, on behalf of the Government of Uruguay:

"Now that so many alliances have been made to impose arbitrary judgements, we might rather make an alliance to impose justice.

To paraphrase him, might I say that we would like the United Nations to be the alliance of the peoples of the world, to impose justice and to outlaw war among the nations of the world, and serve as a most useful instrument by adopting measures that will apply to the problem before us.

We cannot forget that we are a part of and members of a truly unhappy generation that has seen and twice felt war break out between nations, war with all its unhappy and profound social and economic conditions, wars that have seriously affected all the world.

The delegation of Uruguay, through me, declares that it is participating in this debate because we are conscious of a responsibility that is common to all Members of the United Nations and because the precepts of the Charter are the guiding principles of common action that is supposed to fight force within the limits of what is truly legitimate, and to avoid such excesses as might sap peace and international security, and to set up this collective security on the most solid bases.

We feel that the implementation of the systems set forth in the Charter cannot be termed nor deemed static. There is a dynamic process which must be undergone. We have to serve the ideal of peace, constantly striving for it in our Organization, so that we will be able to set up the principles upon which this Organization is built -- this Organization which is the greatest and most universal known to history -- and so that these principles should gradually and in a living way enter the life of all peoples and the conduct and behaviour of Governments representing such peoples.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

This is and must be the only reason for these disarmament debates. It is only necessary that the General Assembly should devote its attention to disarmament and this it has done since its first regular session in 1946. It was the General Assembly that was given the main tasks of synthesizing the principles of this matter. It was the General Assembly that had to avoid the risk of armed conflict. It had to reduce to their just and **strict** limits both the number and power of military forces so as to protect humanity, which is embodied in the masses, against the fear of future wars.

As President Roosevelt said in his statement embodying the doctrine of the Four Freedoms:

"Freedom from fear on the universal level **constitutes a total reduction of armaments** to the point and in such a way that no country can ever commit acts of aggression."

The essential and final concern of any plan on disarmament must forcefully lie in the radical suppression of any possibilities of aggression. We have listened with great attention to the statements made by eminent members of our Committee, bearing on disarmament, which clearly expressed the universal conscience that requires disarmament as an indispensable condition for men all over over the world to be able to continue their ever-rising path toward a better future. What has been said so far by these eminent representatives confirms the statement made by the representative of Venezuela, because, fortunately, we have been able to gather that in the points of view expressed there are fundamental agreements. There is also the hope that the world will continue to live in peace, and there is a knowledge of the need to stop the armaments race, and the total exclusion and prohibition of the use of such terrific and tremendous weapons as are the atomic weapons.

After the Soviet Union suspended its nuclear tests on 31 March, that decision seems to have been made null and void afterwards, according to what we heard from the representative of France, Mr. Jules Moch, in his statement of the 22nd of this month. He pointed out that in the last few days, and from 20 September, there have taken place twelve Soviet nuclear explosions which, Mr. Jules Moch said, was a density of explosions so far not achieved elsewhere.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

In view of all this, we must point out that the Governments of the other two atomic Powers, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, have invited the Soviet Union to participate in a conference of experts in Geneva to study the methods of a control of suspension of such violations. Mr. Lodge, the representative of the United States, has informed this Committee that the United States accepts the report of the Experts and the system of control contained in that report. Mr. Noble, on behalf of the United Kingdom, also told us, very clearly and in very open words, that the declaration of the United Kingdom of 22 August constitutes the acceptance by his Government of the report of the Experts and the recommendations contained in the report on effective international control.

(Mr. Ecuza, Uruguay)

And Mr. Zorin, on behalf of the Soviet Union, observed that the above-mentioned Western Powers accepted the system of control proposed at that conference in a way similar to that expressed by the President of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union. All this indicates to us the possibility of finding a unanimous formula that will be acceptable to the three great Powers at the Geneva Conference. We feel that that unity is possible and necessary and that it will be better understood if they unite their efforts to adopt a text that could be supported by all.

A number of draft resolutions have been submitted for consideration to the Committee, draft resolutions dealing with the fundamental question of disarmament. My delegation would like to make its views known regarding the resolutions. In due course, naturally, we may wish to consider again the suggestions made in the Committee and in the General Assembly, especially those stated by the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Mr. Padilla Nervo, and also the amendments and the draft resolution presented by the representative of Ireland, Mr. Aiken.

We shall vote in favour of the seventeen-Power draft resolution, headed by our sister Republic, Argentina. I must say that we reserve the right of our delegation, in due course, to correct the Spanish translation of the draft resolution so as to adjust it in its concepts to what is contained in the succinct English version.

It is clear that we will vote in favour of this draft resolution because we believe that it starts from the undeniable principle that disarmament is an indivisible problem and that, therefore, it must be dealt with jointly, as one, even though we must pay the due and correct attention to the parts that form and integrate that whole. That is why that draft resolution

"Urges that in the negotiations between States that have tested nuclear weapons the parties make every effort to reach early agreement on the suspension of nuclear weapons tests under effective international control". (A/C.1/L.205)

The resolution also

"Urges the parties involved in these negotiations not to undertake further testing of nuclear weapons while these negotiations are in progress". (Ibid.)

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

The resolution also

"Calls attention to the importance and urgency of achieving the widest possible measure of agreement in the forthcoming study of the technical aspects of measures against the possibility of surprise attack", and

"Expresses determination that the trend of the recent encouraging initiatives, including the technical approach, should continue with a view to contributing to a balanced and effectively controlled world-wide system of disarmament". (Ibid.)

Disarmament raises a very important problem of sincerity; it seeks to avoid armed conflict between countries, with the truly essential and fundamental preoccupation of avoiding surprise attacks. This being the case, it is somewhat difficult to understand this question of the disarmament of conventional armaments being separated from the same rules that must apply in the case of nuclear disarmament. At this moment -- and I am keen to lay stress on this concept -- we are not trying to humanize war but to eliminate it in all its aspects. For this very same reason, we do not believe it is right to exhort States making hydrogen and atomic weapons tests to cease these tests immediately and recommend to States possessing nuclear weapons that they start negotiations to agree on some convention, appealing to other States to support that agreement unless at the same time we impose a cessation of the production of new materials and the prohibition of the use of their present existing stocks for the manufacture of weapons. We understand and we highly value the desire to free humanity from the dangerous consequences of atomic radiation which result from test explosions of atomic and hydrogen weapons. This is very clearly stated in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union. It is also stressed in the draft resolution of the thirteen Powers, and also the consideration voiced in the Soviet draft resolution that such a cessation would be a

"first important step towards the total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and would present a serious obstacle to the creation of new and ever more destructive types of weapons of mass destruction". (A/C.1/L.203)

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

But test explosions are intended to experiment with the destructive power of these weapons, and therefore they are a mere effect, they are a symptom but they are not by any manner or means the cause. The root of the evil lies in the production of fissile material; even though disarmament must obviously go through a series of stages, and therefore may have to be partial, our desire to protect humanity from atomic radiation must not be separated or isolated from the equally disturbing matter of saving humanity from a fear and a terror which is the general consequence of an increase in armaments, both nuclear and conventional.

We do not believe that it is right to propose the cessation of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons unless at the same time we seek a total renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons and the total elimination of them from military arsenals, and use something that is more effective and more real than the mere confidence in other States that such promises, if given, will be fulfilled while, on the other hand, refusing to accept the only efficient and assured measures, that is, that of control over the production and use of both fissile material and classical or conventional weapons under international control created in accordance with the expressed and sovereign will, in an efficient manner, by the great Powers.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

On the other hand, the draft resolution for which my delegation will vote contains constructive measures which will certainly be an important step along the road to nuclear disarmament. In expressing his views on the draft resolution, the representative of the United States, Mr. Lodge, pointed out the political evolution of his Government on this question. We received that statement by Mr. Lodge with true satisfaction, because it is basically of interest to all countries to learn that a country like the United States of America is evolving in order to meet the changing needs of the present situation.

Furthermore, we wish to state that the problem of disarmament cannot be separated into nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament, because disarmament must refer to nuclear weapons as well as to conventional weapons. We must not lose sight of the substance because of the shadow. We might state that the splitting of the atom has definitely changed the problem of the security of States. The world is becoming smaller as science and industry advance. The problem of security now faces us in a different dimension. Before the last world war we lived in the illusion that fortified frontiers offered the best protection against aggression. We must now bear in mind that the invasion of States is not even necessary in order to destroy their vital centres. The present arms race makes the problem of security even more acute.

After the splitting of the atom and in view of the present situation of the atomic Powers, the formula of the balance of power makes it imperative that we do not limit any recommendations on disarmament exclusively to the modern types of armaments. We must also include conventional armaments in such agreements; otherwise conventional weapons would alter the very essence of the balance of power and would make it precarious and dangerous. The decision for peace or war would then be left exclusively in the hands of those who maintained superiority in the field of conventional weapons.

We desire disarmament. and we do not want to argue about adjectives, but we do want to avoid the destructive forces of all weapons. We wish to state again that the security of all must be safeguarded against surprise attack. This can be obtained only by means of effective international control machinery that will be alert at all times to detect, at its very inception, any aggression. The heritage

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

of civilization has cost humanity tremendous sacrifices, and the defence of international peace must be of concern to all peoples. The losses in men and material goods, the crippling of youth, the ruins of cities, the destruction of invaluable treasures and the extension of a conflict to the entire world, today make it more urgent than ever for humanity to decide on ways to ensure a permanent peace. This can only be done through disarmament, because it is only by disarmament that people will be permitted to live and work with dignity.

My country is an impassioned defender of the principles of international law. In the course of our history we have never been led by the ambitions of any leader, by any feelings of economic rivalry or by the hungers of any politician or by racial prejudice -- we have never dipped our hands into blood. We have always sought juridical arbitration. If we have never bowed to the great, we have never tried to humiliate those who were weaker. In our peace with the world we have always sought juridical solutions to our international problems in a spirit of understanding and calmness.

Along with some other Latin American countries, we have co-sponsored an amendment (A/C.1/L.209) to the seventeen-Power draft resolution. We believe that the States concerned should devote, out of the funds made available as a result of disarmament, as and when sufficient progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world, and especially in the less developed countries. Disarmament would release valuable resources which would allow for the development of the countries which are in serious need of it, with logical priorities based on need.

I should like to conclude by referring briefly to the question of the responsibility which is incumbent on all of us in this truly crucial situation of fear and anxiety through which humanity is striving. That is why we hope that our decisions on disarmament will be unanimous. In that way we would be fully satisfying the demands of a world which is watching us. No State in which the will of the people rules can desire war. We all want disarmament. That is why, true to our tradition, we say that the most solid support for security can be found in the identity of peace, with the true rule of democratic institutions.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

The United Nations was constituted by peace-loving nations, but that requires from all of us certain imperious obligations. No matter what our institutions may be, no matter what the set-up in countries may be, no matter how countries and peoples are organized nor how people live every day, it is not the people themselves who make known their views directly; it is their Governments that speak for them. It is the Governments that speak regarding their peace-loving character or their decision to declare war and it is therefore to the Governments, and especially to the men leading such Governments, that in all purity the universal conscience must turn in order to judge their behaviour and their conduct.

We admit that at one time the world may have believed that disarmament was Utopia but we state now that today, to achieve what yesterday seemed to be an unrealizable ideal, it is the most urgent and vital requirement of humanity, and we trust and hope that the General Assembly will thus understand its duties.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium)(interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, like other delegations, my delegation wishes to express the satisfaction felt by the Committee at meeting under your enlightened guidance, with the assistance of the eminent personalities who are at your side.

Belgium's position was set forth by its Foreign Minister, Mr. Wigny, on 1 October in the General Assembly. Therefore I can be brief, which is only proper at this stage of the debate.

The Belgian delegation has associated itself with the initiative embodied in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.205. The reasons for this are as follows.

The disarmament question has turned out to be extremely complex, since it comprises the question of security and is inseparable from the question of security. Its elements are interdependent, and are capable of solution only in relationship with the object pursued: that is, to achieve greater security. The draft resolution clearly abides by this concept, and its provisions should be interpreted accordingly.

The draft resolution flows from two fundamental principles. On the one hand, it implies the bilateral character of the measures required for any regulation of armaments that would be compatible with security. In the absence of this condition

(Mr. Nisot, Belgium)

the equilibrium, the equipollence, which the maintenance of peace depends, would be jeopardized. On the other hand, the draft resolution fully takes into account the imperatives of control, a principle which, like the former one, dominates the problem. It is true that much has been said about mutual confidence in the past and as much is being said now. This topic retains its value. But can confidence be produced or maintained in any way other than through precautions capable of discouraging evasions? There is no legislation, no matter how old, that has the principal object of testing intentions, verifying, controlling, so as to make possible the coexistence of individuals. A fortiori, in the matters before us, one cannot simply disregard human inconsistencies and pretend to be able to establish conditions capable of conjuring away the dangers without control, even though those dangers are today exceptionally grave and their gravity and prevalence is proclaimed by the history of nations.

The draft resolution pays considerable attention to the method of approaching by technical steps the problem of which disarmament is one aspect. This is a rational process. How can one profitably negotiate in the political field if one has not ascertained, according to reliable criteria, what is capable of concrete fulfilment? The validity of this method has been confirmed in a particularly striking manner by the Committee of Experts, which concluded that it was possible to detect violations of any possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests. Belgium attaches great value to the suspension of such tests. The draft resolution urges those States that have tested nuclear weapons to make every effort to reach early agreement; it also urges them not to undertake further tests of nuclear weapons while these negotiations, which are about to begin, are in progress.

The draft resolution seeks to foster studies for ascertaining and clarifying the technical aspects of measures to prevent surprise attacks and leading to the establishment of a world system of balanced disarmament. Such disarmament, it is generally felt, must cover, in the military field, the production and stockpiling of fissionable materials.

Finally, the draft resolution reaffirms the responsibility of the United Nations with regard to the disarmament question. It emphasizes the importance of the deliberations and the resolutions of the General Assembly as well as the value

of the contribution represented by the Secretary-General's assistance. Moreover, since the General Assembly has only powers of recommendation, it is only proper that the resolution explicitly and implicitly emphasize the urgency of the conclusion of the necessary agreements.

In short, if account is taken of the need to proceed gradually and in stages, the draft resolution at the present juncture appears to be a useful contribution to the efforts to find a solution of the problem. That is why the Belgian delegation has given it its support.

I do not wish to conclude without asking our colleague from El Salvador to accept and to transmit to his Government and to the family of Dr. Guerrero the heart-felt condolences of the Belgian delegation. Dr. Guerrero's death deprives the International Court of a great judge and is an irreparable loss to international justice.

Mr. BRANNON (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of El Salvador, in beginning its statement today, wishes to express with much emotion the sorrow that we feel at the loss of Mr. Gustavo Guerrero, an illustrious Salvadorian, one of the prides of our university and a well-known international jurist who dedicated his life to the noble cause of the maintenance of harmony, justice and peace in the world.

Mr. Guerrero, former Foreign Minister of El Salvador, was a great champion of the principle of non-intervention, and at a time when that concept, part of American international law, had not as yet been deeply rooted in the minds of those who were supposed to apply it and to respect it. I think that everyone bears freshly in mind his participation in the International Conference of Havana where Mr. Guerrero expressed in a memorable debate the feeling of independence and autonomy not only of his country but of all Latin American countries, thus becoming the paladin of the principle of non-intervention.

The University of El Salvador owes to Mr. Guerrero the first decree recognizing its autonomy. At the moment of his death, as Mr. Urquia said, Mr. Guerrero was a judge in the International Court of Justice at the Hague. Our delegation is grateful for the tribute of silence that was paid by the members of this Committee. Especially do we wish to express our appreciation to the Ambassadors of Uruguay and Belgium who uttered words of sympathy in our moment of loss. We believe that the best tribute we here could pay Mr. Guerrero would be to follow the example he gave of dignity and decorum on the international stage.

Now, I should like to go on and fulfil the protocol requirements, to repeat to you in public the congratulations that were previously tendered you on your election to the Chair of the First Committee. All delegations that voted in your favour, Mr. Chairman, have earned our gratitude because it is easy to understand that the confidence expressed in you is an honour for our country. I must admit that I was not surprised that you were elected to the Chair of the First Committee because I knew full well your capacity as a jurist and your diplomatic experience. Therefore it was only obvious to me that you were selected. I know that you will not disillusion those who voted in your favour.

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

I also wish to express my congratulations to the Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Osman, and the Rapporteur of the Committee, Ambassador Matsch. Because of their conduct, because of their knowledge and their wisdom, the Committee quite correctly entrusted to them very important tasks -- positions of great responsibility.

The delegation of El Salvador considers that the items that this Committee has to consider and debate, especially items 4, 7 and 8 of our agenda, which deal with the question of disarmament, are undoubtedly subjects of the greatest importance. That is why we have very carefully followed the development of the debates and the discussions. We have taken great care to weigh all arguments. We have tried to ferret out the reasons for disagreement. We have noted how the two great blocs in conflict have stood unmovably within their original and initial positions so that we are arriving at the end of this debate with an obvious negative result, in so far as disarmament is concerned. We are arriving also at the moment of a vote, but we are certainly not arriving at an understanding on the part of the Powers. After all, it is that understanding between the great Powers that the people of the world are awaiting.

In the general debate the Foreign Minister of El Salvador, Ortiz Mancia, in his statement of 30 September, anticipated the results that we are seeing now, when he said:

"Such a situation, which has cropped up very often in the Middle and Near East" -- and he referred also to the military conflict in the Strait of Formosa -- "make it difficult to consider certain other very important problems contained in the agenda of the present session, such as disarmament and the peaceful use of outer space. If the consideration of these items is difficult because of the lack of the necessary atmosphere of moderation, understanding and tolerance, it is also much more difficult to arrive at concrete conclusions on such important questions upon whose solution, even though provisional, depends a great part of the possibility of reducing international tension, which is so important at the present stage of history." (A/PV.764, page 11)

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

"Unfortunately a formidable danger threatens humanity in our days. Anguish fills all hearts and minds impressing on them what we should not like to have to call the seal of the second half of the twentieth century."

And the Foreign Minister of El Salvador rounded out his thought by saying:

"We ask ourselves with anxiety how far the statesmen of the more powerful nations understand their responsibility, not before history but before the divine will that created the world, where they can condemn to extermination innocent peoples and impose on them the consequences of rivalries that should and must be overcome." (Ibid., p. 12)

In this Committee and in the Assembly we have heard a constant and firm repetition of arguments justifying these two ideas which are diametrically opposed in form but similar in substance: first, the idea that the cessation of atomic and **hydrogen** weapons tests and the reduction of the military budgets of the great Powers are one aspect of the general problem of disarmament and that, therefore, all these subjects must be discussed at the same time, with the speakers being able to refer separately to each of the questions in their analysis; and, secondly, the idea that in the decision of the allocation of items to Committees a separate enumeration was made first of the question of disarmament, secondly of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests and thirdly of the question of **the reduction** of military budgets of the great Powers. Therefore, one group holds that if the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the General Committee, separated the subjects, they should be analysed separately and resolutions should be adopted separately, beginning with the question of the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen **weapons tests** because it is the subject upon which agreement could be most easily achieved.

At first sight, it would appear that there is no real basic difference in these two points of view because fundamentally the problem is being considered in such a way as to achieve disarmament in the end. Therefore, any impartial observer must be led to ask: Why is it that after so many days we have not been able to advance towards the noble ends of disarmament which, after all, within their respective views, all delegations consider to be the main problem? It has already been quite correctly stated here that this is a political problem with many currents and cross-currents wherein are at stake the interests and security of the nuclear Powers, a label which points to these countries as owning these murderous weapons that so terrify the earth.

The representative of Argentina, Mr. Amadeo, in a brilliant statement on the 21st of this month, said:

"The United Nations was intended to guarantee peace, but within the realm of law. It did not have as its object to change those in power or, to use an old Spanish expression, 'to be a king-maker or a king-breaker'." (A/C.1/PV.957, page 36)

My colleague, in defending the seventeen-Power draft resolution, also referred to what he called the balance of power, when he said that the military potential of countries is the result of historic processes that fall outside our purview, and that, therefore, we cannot go into it. We cannot propose measures that might alter the balance, measures which obviously would not be accepted by States that might consider themselves affected.

Despite the truth inherent in those concepts, it is time that we overcome obstacles and that we eliminated pessimistic views. We must state categorically what our views are because there is another power which is decisive and frightening. It is the only power **that** the small nations can use to see that their rights are respected, that is, the strength and the power of world public opinion expressed here on behalf of our Governments and of our people in a serene, tranquil and documented way. If we emphatically, zealously and vigorously state to the great Powers that our conviction and our right to express ourselves make it imperative that we tell them that we do not want war, that we want to maintain peace and health and that we are against atomic and hydrogen weapons that might deform and destroy great sectors of the population of the world, if by our behaviour and our conduct we show our repudiation of the arms race, then the great Powers that may consider themselves affected by our expressions will finally bow to the will of the majority and accept some formula of understanding and compromise which will return peace, calm and tranquillity to the peoples of the earth.

It is here that importance is given to the concept voiced by the Foreign Minister of El Salvador when he asked: How long could the **statesmen** of the great atomic Powers condemn innocent people to annihilation by imposing upon them the consequences of rivalries that could and should be overcome and set aside? Dictatorships armed to the teeth have succumbed to the impact of peoples repudiating them. The representatives of Colombia and Venezuela, merely to refer to the two most recent cases, know full well how correct I am in saying this. It is therefore not difficult to consider that in the question of disarmament that might be the pressure that could be exercised and that that pressure, world public opinion, is the only force that can lead to practical and beneficent solutions.

In this very Committee room, I have heard the representative of Peru, Ambassador Belaunde, pass interesting judgements. When referring to the opinion expressed by those who believe that in this Assembly the Soviet Union is seeking not an understanding but rather a forum for propaganda, Ambassador Belaunde said that we ought to congratulate the Soviet Union and its delegation for their efforts to win over sectors of world public opinion. Ambassador Belaunde thus gave us to understand that even in the case where the intention attributed to the Soviet Union was a correct one, it would already be progress because it would show the desire of a world Power to justify its position to the conscience of the world. In view of this, the delegation of El Salvador wishes careful note to be taken of the fact that we are of the opinion that the problem of disarmament is of a generic character. It is one and indivisible.

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

Therefore, we support the idea that a joint study should be made of disarmament, discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests and the reduction of military budgets of the great Powers by 10 to 15 per cent -- these great Powers being France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States -- and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries.

Pursuant to the idea of the question of disarmament being indivisible, of all the substantive draft resolutions put before us, the one that most closely approaches the views of El Salvador is the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.205), with the additional paragraph proposed by a number of countries (A/C.1/L.209), in which a concept is introduced to the effect that the States concerned would devote "out of the funds made available as a result of disarmament, as and when sufficient progress is made, additional resources to the improvement of living conditions throughout the world and especially in the less developed countries".

However, in view of the possibility of a draft resolution, whatever one it may be, being approved by the required majority, but without the acceptance of one or more of the Powers directly concerned, and later becoming a deadletter -- as was the case with the resolution on disarmament adopted by the Assembly at the last session -- it might be appropriate to try to set up a small working group composed of countries other than those which have submitted draft resolutions and also excluding the great Powers. This working group could try to prepare a compromise draft resolution which might be adopted unanimously and which, therefore, would give more promise of progress towards disarmament and the strengthening of international peace.

This suggestion is similar to that formulated by the representative of Haiti in his interesting statement of 23 October. In making it, we are merely endeavouring to bring forth opinions on matters of great importance.

My delegation views with sympathy the valuable efforts made by those delegations which have submitted draft resolutions and amendments in an endeavour to solve the problems raised in the debate. However, we are deeply sorry that we cannot vote in favour of those draft resolutions which only partially affect the general problem of disarmament. Nevertheless, the draft

MW/dk

A/C.1/PV.963
37-40

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

resolution submitted by India and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.210) on the composition of the Disarmament Commission seems to us to suggest a most intelligent way of coping with the problem of the composition of the Commission. At the same time, we are much interested in the draft resolution as presented by the delegation of Ireland (A/C.1/L.206) which is intended to limit the possession and use of nuclear weapons. This is a most practical and humanitarian draft resolution.

We must also refer, because of its interesting content, to part of the statement made by Mr. Nuñez Portuondo, the representative of Cuba, on 21 October. He expressed the idea of setting up a fund to meet the expenditures incurred in the creation of military forces designed to re-establish international peace and security, a fund which should be set up by means of voluntary contributions in a manner similar to that in which the technical assistance fund was set up originally; larger contributions would have to be given by the great Powers because of their special responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security. My delegation believes that if the great Powers, through the Charter itself and according to precedent in the United Nations, enjoy special privileges -- such as their position as permanent members of the Security Council, including the right of veto -- it is only fair that, when confronted by certain duties, they should have to assume greater responsibilities.

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

The idea thus expressed is of great importance and interest to the smaller countries if note is taken of the slender resources of such countries. As we know, the emergency forces are at present paid for in accordance with the general scale of contributions to the budget of our Organization. This is not only difficult for the smaller countries to bear but also implies the utilization of resources which might otherwise be used for the public services which are urgently needed in many countries, services such as health and culture. So many of the small countries need help in those fields. My delegation feels that this subject does not fall precisely within the scope of the items which are now before this Committee and that perhaps the question ought to be raised elsewhere, but since one of the items on our agenda is "the reduction of the military budgets" of the great Powers and "the use of the part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries", we feel nevertheless that we should not miss the opportunity of referring to the problem, because nothing would be more equitable for the under-developed countries than to free them from the heavy burden that is inherent in their contributions to the maintenance of emergency forces as at present decided upon and established.

In order to refer at the necessary length to the Mexican draft resolution, I have left that until the last. This draft resolution was submitted by the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Mr. Padilla Nervo, and has been distributed in document A/C.1/L.208. Mr. Nervo, addressing this Committee on Monday 13 October, made these important and basic declarations. First, that disarmaments as the main and most important of all international problems besetting the world today; second, that the technical agreement of Geneva on the detection of atomic explosions must, as a corollary, bring a political agreement for the cessation of experimental explosions; third, that whatever the results obtained in Geneva may be we should reaffirm the responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; fourth, that it would be abnormal for the United Nations to be able to consider the question of disarmament only once a year, since this problem concerns not only the great Powers but all members of the United Nations; fifth, that all efforts should be made to ensure that the situation which has obtained in this connexion since the previous session of the General Assembly should not be considered as permanent, and sixth, that the First Committee should examine the possibility of successfully renewing negotiations.

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

The Foreign Minister of Mexico then proposed that this Committee should request the representatives of the great Powers to meet here in New York as soon as possible to study the renewal of negotiations on disarmament and to try to decide on the body which ought to be set up for that purpose, so as to get out of the stalemate that has lasted since last year.

I do not wish to underestimate the correct analyses and the valuable concepts that have been expressed in this Committee on the question of disarmament, nor do I wish to undervalue the draft resolutions that have been submitted on the subject and to which I have previously referred. My delegation considers, however, that this highly delicate question has been outlined by the representative of Mexico in a very clear and felicitous way. A very practical and realistic solution has been offered, one which is worthy of wholehearted support by all. If agreements are to be achieved, it is only logical that such agreements should be first arrived at by the Powers possessing nuclear weapons, and that is the view contained in the Mexican draft resolution. We must understand that in order to remedy the present situation it is indispensable to obtain the co-operation of those nuclear Powers, because without it any agreement would be inoperative and although an agreement in such circumstances might give partial and transitory parliamentary victories to some, it would do nothing to stop the explosion of a single atomic bomb or to prevent the launching of a single destructive rocket.

The States not possessing nuclear weapons, as I have said before, are merely the mouthpieces of public opinion. We can only bring pressure upon the others to bring them towards peace. The Mexican draft resolution emerges from the speculative dialectical field and places us firmly with our feet on the ground. It makes us realize that the only practical steps which can lead us to the understanding we desire is for the representatives of the great Powers to renew their negotiations on disarmament at the request of this Committee, which at the moment is basically the body through which world public opinion makes known its views on the question of disarmament.

My delegation wishes to state that it is thoroughly and wholeheartedly in favour of the Mexican draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.208, which will receive our affirmative vote because, if it is adopted by the Committee, we shall recuperate much of the time that has been lost in unending torrents of speeches, many of them very interesting, many of them highly

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

illuminating, but the majority of them suffering from the flaw that they did not offer a practical solution which will advance us one step forward along the thorny path of the items on our agenda.

The delegation of El Salvador will vigorously support the Mexican draft resolution because we consider that it is an objective and valuable effort to get out of the stalemate in which, unfortunately, we have marked time for a year. The delegation of El Salvador concludes these remarks by stating its beliefs that the United Nations represents the most advanced Organization for understanding between all nations of the world and is a superb instrument for the expression of world public opinion and for making a decisive contribution to the cause of peace.

(Mr. Brannon, El Salvador)

As a highly densely populated country, with a heroic history of a constant fight against nature, with a permanent desire to progress and develop, my country desires peace, and in order to achieve this end we will accept and shoulder the greatest sacrifices. Our Government and our people have their hope and their faith placed in the United Nations, which must be the place where reason rules, where law and the great moral values, the heritage of humanity, must be allowed to reign.

Mr. SON SANN (Cambodia) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, like the delegation of El Salvador, it is my duty, on behalf of the Cambodian Government, to present to you our condolences on the occasion of the death of Dr. Gustavo Guerrero, a great jurist and a great judge.

May I also join with the speakers who preceded me in congratulating you very sincerely, Mr. Chairman, not only upon your election but also for the admirable way in which you have guided our deliberations. I also wish to address my congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur, as well as to all the other people who are directing the work of this Committee.

The disarmament question has been debated in the United Nations for almost thirteen years, and before the United Nations got hold of it, it was already on the agenda of the League of Nations. All the aspects of the problem have been thrashed out. Eminent speakers have spoken at length in this Committee, and with eloquence, of the mortal dangers of nuclear and thermonuclear explosions, of the need for an immediate cessation of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons, on the urgency of general disarmament, on the desirability of the destruction of stockpiles of atomic and nuclear weapons, on the peaceful uses of cosmic space, and on the advisability of reducing military budgets with a view to extending increased assistance to under-developed countries.

Everyone agrees on the principle of disarmament and the cessation of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Technicians have already met and have concluded that control over the cessation of test explosions is feasible. But it seems that agreement is far from having been reached on the means to be used, on the procedure to be followed.

(Mr. Son Sann, Cambodia)

To begin with, must the three so-called atomic Powers be left to settle all these questions among themselves? The Cambodian delegation is convinced that nothing will be settled without the agreement of those Powers, but it is likewise convinced that no final decision can be taken without the direct or indirect participation of all the other nations, large and small alike. The sinister consequences of nuclear and thermonuclear explosions have in fact been felt beyond the frontiers of these three great countries. It is inhabitants of other countries which have frequently fallen victim to them.

In the event of atomic war, the people of non-belligerent countries, as well as those of the belligerents, will suffer the same destiny: extermination and horrible sufferings. The small countries especially, because they are short of resources and of the necessary means of protection, will be exposed. On the other hand, other countries, like France, will soon be able to manufacture nuclear weapons. Is it desirable -- what am I saying, is it in fact possible -- to remove them, to keep them out of these disarmament negotiations? France has already declared in this Committee that it will not consider itself bound by the negotiations which are about to open in Geneva without its participation.

May I likewise recall here the words spoken by His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia. He said:

"Nor can we truly put an end to the testing of nuclear weapons so long as China, placed beyond the pale of the nations and answerable for its actions before nobody, cannot offer the help of its scientists and the sanctuary of its vast territory to the research and experiments which a friendly Power may ask it to undertake."

It is even more manifest that negotiations for a reduction of so-called conventional armaments will have no validity without the participation of countries like China, with its population of more than 600 million people. Whether we like it or not, the United Nations will have to take direct or indirect cognizance of all negotiations relating to nuclear or general comprehensive disarmament. The principal purpose of the United Nations, its raison d'être, is after all the maintenance of peace in the world.

In this connexion, the representative of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Ahmed Shukairy, gave a striking survey of the efforts made by our Organization during the past dozen years, which unfortunately have so far yielded only continual failure.

(Mr. Son Sann, Cambodia)

It is true that negotiations between the Powers concerned have had no more success. Gentlemen, do you not think that the time has arrived, at this thirteenth session, to try to alter our methods of work so as to find new channels of action for the United Nations? Must we continue to rest content with platonic resolutions and allow our Organization's decisions to remain dead letter? Is it our sole duty to compile draft resolutions, put them to the vote, and then let happen what will?

So often frustrated, the United Nations, the supreme hope of the small nations, will surely in the end, if this goes on, lose all of its prestige and forfeit its authority. Is it not the duty of every Member State to have the courage of its opinion and contribute to breed a strong public opinion in support of the United Nations, a bold world opinion capable of compelling moral or material sanctions to be taken against recalcitrant countries?

His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk also said the following:

"But perhaps it would not be pointless, if the United Nations considered itself a club of peaceful nations, to envisage not only the cases in which nations would be considered unfit for admission, but also the case of countries already Members of the Organization, which, by their policies or their anti-peaceful actions, would not deserve to continue to be seated there." (A/PV.756, page 16)

It has seemed to me that the problem of control, feasible from the technical point of view though it may be, presents great political difficulties. National sovereignty has been invoked. I wonder, since the question is vital for all peoples of the world alike, whether this national sovereignty lends itself more easily to control by the United Nations or by a Commission composed of representatives of countries that cannot be suspected of partiality or alignment, and of experts of the nuclear Powers.

(Mr. Son Sann, Cambodia)

In any case, the delegation of Cambodia supports statements like that of U Thant of Burma, who appealed for an immediate understanding and an immediate decision. A resolution unanimously adopted would surely be very desirable. The Committee might agree to the proposal of Mr. Sylvain, representative of Haiti, as well as the proposal of the representative of El Salvador, concerning the formation within that Commission of a committee to which we would assign, jointly with the delegations of the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the USSR, a draft resolution that might be adopted unanimously. The members of this committee might be appointed by you, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of equitable distribution in order to avoid any misgivings.

If this proposal were not adopted and if a vote is taken on the various draft resolutions, the Cambodian delegation will vote in favour of the draft which was submitted jointly by Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Nepal, the United Arab Republic, Yemen and Ethiopia.

The delegation of Cambodia, however, would wish for a unanimous and vigorous decision. It likewise hopes for, first, the United Nations to participate or at least watch closely the negotiations which will soon begin in Geneva on the cessation of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons and on the establishment of a system of international control; secondly, the United Nations to re-establish the Disarmament Commission which would get to work immediately, if need be, by watching and keeping tabs of the negotiations at Geneva, in a new frame of mind, sustained by a vigorous public opinion and disposed, if need be, to propose any sanctions that might be taken by our Organization.

If this turns out to be impossible, we may have to acknowledge frankly and immediately the ineffectiveness of the United Nations and its failure in the field of general disarmament so that the peoples of the world should no longer cherish vain hopes and so that they may endeavour to cast about for other solutions in order to oblige those responsible to get together to bring about the immediate cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons with a view to general and swift disarmament.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.