



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 5TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BOATEN (Ghana)

CONTENTS

Deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention
of the danger of nuclear war (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/32/PV.5
18 October 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 127 (continued)

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

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. Chairman, the most important Committee of the General Assembly, under your distinguished chairmanship, has two political documents before it whose significance for international relations can hardly be overestimated. This morning, in his important, comprehensive and lucid statement, Ambassador Oleg Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union, formally introduced an initiative made three weeks ago from the highest rostrum in our Organization by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Andrei Gromyko. As members of the Committee are aware, it comprises a draft declaration on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and a draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war.

Poland welcomes the initiative as a new imaginative and stimulating step in enhancing the positive processes in the world of today.

Indeed, we can see in it a pertinent reflection of what the Secretary-General of the United Nations termed in his recent report on the work of the Organization as

"wisdom and statemanship" which "may provide a welcome opportunity to clarify the ground rules of peaceful coexistence and détente".

(A/32/1, p. 2)

We further see in it a concurring identity with our own approach to world developments and benefits of improved international relations, with an approach and philosophy of détente in the making, which only several days ago were fully expounded in the general debate of the current session of our Assembly by Poland's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Emil Wojtaszek.

We see in it, too, a clear-cut evidence of the consistent line of States of our socialist community. Of the recent joint forums, it is strongly embedded in the decisions of the Bucharest Meeting of the Political Consultative

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

Committee of States Members of the Warsaw Treaty last November. On a still broader, universal plane, it conforms fully with the cravings of nations to see a better and more peaceful world.

In the context of its sponsor, let me say, there is also a historical dimension to the proposal on deepening and consolidation of international détente and prevention of the danger of nuclear war. Sixty years ago next month, on the morrow of the victory of the great October Socialist Revolution, the young Soviet workers' and peasants' Government issued its famous Decree on Peace, calling upon all peoples and their Governments to start immediate negotiations for a just, democratic peace. It was precisely the Leninist Decree on Peace that gave birth to the corner-stone of détente, namely, the policy of peaceful coexistence, an idea which has offered in practice full proof of its validity, correctness and far-sightedness by initiating the process of historic transformation of international relations and by continuing its immense impact upon the strengthening of the processes of easing tensions today.

The present proposal is but a direct continuation of the same consistent and principled line which has brought about the existing relationship of world forces and positively affected the fabric of international relations. In its own way it spans all of the past 60 years of struggle for peaceful relations among States. It develops the theory and practice of peaceful coexistence in an atmosphere of international détente, both political and military.

The 32 years of the existence and functioning of the United Nations have introduced for good the term and notion of détente into the political vocabulary of our times. Even its semantics has given way to sober and realistic judgements on its form and contents. As President Giscard d'Estaing of France put it more than a year ago, "the only alternative to détente is preparation for conflict. So there is no real alternative to détente". Hence it is a path away from holocaust in the direction of lasting peace and significantly alleviating the crushing economic and social hardships of the world. It boils down to a choice between a road of renouncing the use of

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

force, the road of disarmament and equitable and mutually beneficial co-operation, on the one hand, and plunging the world into the abyss of an unrestrained arms race and armed conflicts fraught with the gravest consequences for mankind, on the other.

As the Committee is well aware, the position of my country in this regard has been consistent and clear. It was reaffirmed by the highest policy-making body, the Seventh Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party, which stressed anew Poland's dedication to the policies of international détente and peaceful co-operation among nations.

In the quest for a definition of international détente, one should not expect ready-made formulas or ultimate prophecies. It is a multidimensional, continuous and living process. It is moulded by living people and exposed to the vicissitudes of humankind. And yet, the record of accomplishment on this path is by no means unimpressive.

The international détente of today has been particularly shaped by world developments and experiences of the last several years. First of all, propitious conditions to embark upon the process with intensified strength were created by measures with a view to settling problems left over by the Second World War and accumulated in the course of the world's post-war development, especially problems unnecessarily delayed by the cold war. These were, inter alia, treaties on normalization of mutual relations signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Poland, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia with the Federal Republic of Germany, the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin, admission of the two German States to the United Nations and full recognition by all of their sovereign international status.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

Last but not least, came the Magna Carta of European peace contained in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Thus ended the post-war era and we entered a time of active coexistence and co-operation.

Secondly, the present phase of international détente derives from efforts at doing away with other sources of international tension, notably in the field of arms reduction and disarmament, and eliminating, or at least confining, the effects of open conflicts in different parts of the world. The well-known Treaties banning nuclear weapon tests in the three environments, and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Sea-Bed Treaty and several other treaties and conventions pertaining to disarmament, mark a significant beginning. New momentum and hopes were generated by the first SALT agreement within the extremely important Soviet-American negotiations, which also produced a series of other bilateral accords; by the initiation of the start of the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and by signs of progress in the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which only last year contributed the well-known Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques.

Agreements and accords of a general political nature to develop binding rules of international conduct in relations among States and providing for new methods and mechanisms as an elaboration and expansion of the principles of peaceful coexistence, represent the third characteristic feature of the current trends in deepening and consolidating international détente. The Final Act of Helsinki is no doubt one case in point. We earnestly hope that the current meeting in Belgrade will fortify the full implementation of the Final Act in its entirety as the paramount and long-term objective of all its signatories.

Other prominent examples include documents which extend the benefits of political détente directly into the military sphere, to mention only the Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, the French-Soviet agreement on the prevention of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons, and the latest agreement of this kind between the Soviet Union and

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

the United Kingdom. Indeed, the long register covers numerous bilateral declarations of friendship and co-operation signed between States with different socio-political systems. It also contains Poland's own share in the process, namely, more than 20 bilateral declarations elevating our respective relations with a number of Western and non-aligned States to a level commensurate with the requirements of our time.

One may say, and rightly so, that the new spirit of international relations has not yet succeeded in the full elimination of conflicts and tensions in different parts of the world, such as the Middle East, Cyprus and Africa. But neither can it be denied that, thanks to the relentless efforts to ease tensions, the conflicts in question have not escalated, and basically have not impaired the progress of the over-all processes of international détente. The latest Soviet-American statement on the Middle East is vivid testimony of the benefits of these processes and, at the same time, an encouragement to consolidate them further. For we all know that much still remains to be done to utilize the experiences gained in some areas of the international environment for the benefit of other nations and other spheres of human endeavour.

Poland views international détente as a historic necessity. Yesterday, a shift from the cold war, from danger of a global confrontation, towards détente could only have occurred through a basic change in the world relationship of forces. Today, détente is becoming the dominant trend, an all-embracing process restructuring international relations. It took more than a quarter of a century to obtain practical recognition of the need for, and the lasting validity of, that trend.

To us, inclusion in the Basic Principles of Relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the principle of peaceful coexistence, and recognition by them "of the imperative necessity of making the process of improving relations between the United States and the Soviet Union irreversible (S/11428, p. 88), has been an act of far greater political weight than any previous signs of East-West rapprochement. In the same vein, we welcomed the genuine and emphatic appeal "for the global relaxation of international tension and for the

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

participation of all countries on an equal basis in the solution of international problems" (A/31/197, p. 19), issued from Colombo, last year, by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries.

Thus, international détente has been universally accepted as a way and means to lasting peace.

Who can better or more comprehensively harmonize the actions of nations in the attainment of international détente than the United Nations? An eloquent and creative response to this query came from the overwhelming majority of 140 speakers in the general debate of the current session of our Assembly.

Among the purposes and principles of our Organization, the maintenance of international peace and security stands out as a paramount objective. It closely coincides with the main imperatives of the present era: to deepen and consolidate détente, making it irreversibly rooted in the texture of international relations, and bringing about effective arms reduction and disarmament measures. There can, in fact, be no more timely contribution on the part of the United Nations to the implementation of its Charter provisions than furthering an objective thus conceived. Moreover, since in present conditions there is no alternative to the policy of international détente save a nuclear conflagration, the time is ripe to take all possible political and military precautions to prevent the danger of nuclear war.

If the United Nations does not want to remain outside the main currents of international relations, it cannot afford to lose the chance which the Soviet proposal before us so clearly provides. It cannot afford to let the rejuvenating political movement of our century pass it by and leave the Organization with only those issues which, however important, will be secondary to the sine qua non conditions of any progress, in any field, namely, lasting peace and a feeling of security for all nations. The new proposal before us is an important step towards such an objective, since it combines, and takes due account of, the legitimate interests of all States.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

The proposed significant measure to prevent the danger of nuclear war would not only be conducive to a global reduction of tensions prevailing in the military sphere, but, **it would likewise** remove, in part at least, the spectre of an outbreak of nuclear war that is now haunting the world. Once this danger is diminished, it will be so much easier to discuss and arrive at other eagerly-awaited and long-overdue agreements.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

We also firmly believe that the strengthening of international détente would considerably speed up and facilitate the completion of the liberation of all colonial countries and peoples, including the elimination of racist régimes, vestiges of national oppression and inequality in international relations. For in the world of today evil forces, perpetrators of colonial, neo-colonial and other inhuman practices can and should be exposed and removed through the world community's intensified efforts towards peace in all areas. Only then can conditions be created to isolate and ultimately defeat them. Otherwise they will continue to profit by fishing in the troubled waters of international relations. The same applies to the elimination of the existing conflicts and areas of tension among States.

The present initiative also opens up new vistas for the materialization of the interrelated political gradation of our time - détente, disarmament and development. Any effective progress in this regard must begin with meaningful relaxation in the international atmosphere. But at the same time those three most important elements of the comity of nations today must be taken in parallel. A selective, expedient or disorderly approach to one or two of them can only upset the other. It is precisely through strengthening international security and consolidating processes of détente that we can succeed in creating a political foundation for the over-all progress of nations and the establishment of a new and just order in the world economy. Similarly, effective and mutually advantageous international trade will not flourish unless it is part of a broader policy of rapprochement.

There are other important factors of which the Soviet initiative is fully cognizant and which will determine future developments, once the proposed declaration and resolution are adopted. They include recognition of the political realities in the world, respect for equal security interests of all States, and their good will.

In order to appreciate properly the wide-ranging implications of these factors, all States should adopt an active and constructive stance in considering different initiatives for strengthening and intensifying positive political trends. They must not only think in terms of the exclusive totality of their sovereign rights, but also remember their paramount duties and obligations in the world, as an organic community of all mankind.

(Mr. Jaroszek, Poland)

That is how we view both the underlying intentions and the very substance of the important Soviet initiative. At this stage, reserving the right to offer our further contribution to the consideration of the item, I wish to reiterate the full support of the Polish delegation for the two documents so ably submitted to the Committee this morning.

Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): Last year, owing to special circumstances, I was prevented from participating in the work of the First Committee. I am glad to be here once again in what I feel is my real United Nations home. I am all the more happy to be here because you, Mr. Chairman, are presiding over our deliberations. I should like to congratulate you and your fellow officers of the Committee on your election, and to assure you of the unfailing co-operation of the delegation of Sri Lanka in an effort to bring the work of this Committee to a satisfactory conclusion.

I once remarked that when we approached the question of disarmament in this Committee one or other of the super Powers, or both jointly, and sometimes that august and exclusive body, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, would bring us a Christmas gift in some form or another. Sometimes it would be a non-proliferation treaty; on another occasion it would be a treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed. Last year, I think it had something to do with interfering with the environment. There was also the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons. But none of those was regarded by us as having any very serious impact on the real problem, that of general and complete disarmament.

This year we have a new item that has been submitted to this Committee on the initiative of the Soviet delegation, and presented in a very elaborate and eloquent manner by the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Troyanovsky. The item seeks to establish a link between the deepening and consolidation of détente and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war. The first question I asked myself - a question that my eminent and esteemed friend,

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

Ambassador Baroody of Saudi Arabia, himself asked today - was: why only nuclear war? What about conventional war? It is our obsession all these years with nuclear war that has distracted our attention from the real problem, general and complete disarmament.

Once again, détente is represented to us today as a new discovery. If one goes through the memorandum that explains the reasons for the inscription of this item, the draft declaration which forms annex I, and annex II, the draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war, one finds in them concepts that were discovered nearly 22 years ago and enunciated in the clearest possible terms. It has taken some among us an unduly long time to realize the importance of accepting those principles, acting upon them and abiding by them. If they had done so many years ago, we would not be here today discussing détente, because what is stated there is what détente meant.

For the benefit of my listeners I shall go briefly through the essential elements of the famous Bandung Declaration of 1959, adopted by the Asian-African Conference. The Conference, while viewing with deep concern the prevailing state of international tension in the world and the danger of atomic world war, adopted certain principles, and I shall refer to them briefly: respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations; recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small; abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country; abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the big Powers; abstention by any country from exerting pressures over other countries; refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country; the settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means such as negotiation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, as well as other peaceful means of the parties' own choice in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations; the promotion of mutual interest and co-operation; and respect for justice and international obligations.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

Now I must confess that the Asian-African Conference did not itself make a great discovery. It was not an expedition in search of virtue. The Charter had laid down those principles. Détente condenses in one word what the Charter of the United Nations has stated and what the Bandung principles amplified.

Do we then need a new declaration? And to whom is that declaration addressed?

I should like at this stage to refer to the Declaration adopted by the non-aligned summit Conference held in Colombo in August last year, which was referred to by the previous speaker. The non-aligned summit Conference dealt with the question of the relaxation of international tensions and devoted a few paragraphs to détente. The Conference welcomed in one paragraph:

"the progress so far achieved in the relaxation of tension between the great Powers. It took note of the decisions of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and expressed the hope that it would lead to further relaxation of international tensions and to progress in the field of disarmament." (A/31/197, annex I, para. 24)

It went on in the next paragraph to say:

"Détente, as proclaimed in official declarations, does not seem however to have reduced the struggle for influence which is going on in all continents or to have extinguished the hotbeds of tension." (Ibid.).

Other parts of the Declaration which dealt with détente are not so strictly relevant. I have read out the relevant portions of the Declaration.

It has also been stated by the previous speaker in this debate that détente is a historic development and is a historic imperative. Why is the responsibility being cast on the United Nations to contribute to that historic development when there are really only two Powers that can make any contribution to the realization of that development and to the progressive achievement of success in the application of the principles of détente? We would welcome the deepening and consolidation of détente, and if the words "international détente" are used, I take it that what is meant is a deepening and consolidation of détente between those two super-Powers and those countries that are associated with them on one side or the other.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

Speaking many years ago in the debate on disarmament, I pointed out that for more than 50 years the world had lived with the illusion that international peace and security could be achieved and the danger of war averted through disarmament. At the risk of being branded a heretic, I said that I must express my emphatic disagreement with that thesis and with the current approach to the establishment and maintenance of friendly and peaceful relations between States and the settlement of international disputes without recourse to war, which it seeks to validate. I pointed out that if we were to avoid war, the first requirement is that the causes of war be examined and measures taken to eliminate or mitigate them, and that it was by that means alone that the need for armaments, other than those required for maintaining international security, law and order, could be dispensed with and general and complete disarmament achieved. On that occasion I described the causes of war as the stupidity of nations, the lust for power, arrogant assumptions of superiority, whether racial or national, the exploitation by foreign Powers of internecine feuds and conflicts existing in other countries and interference in them by association with and active support of one or the other party to domestic disputes or civil war.

Now there is nothing in this draft declaration that offends against the statement that I made. But what I ask is why has it taken so long for them to realize this and do they deserve exceptional credit and gratitude from us for having made the discovery so late?

In 1971 I drew attention to the fact that 10 years had then elapsed since the joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations was presented to the United Nations by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States. That statement made clear what the goal of disarmament negotiations as conceived by those two Powers should be. The programme of general and complete disarmament, as defined in that joint statement, was one which would ensure that States had at their disposal only such non-nuclear armaments, forces, facilities and establishments as were necessary to maintain international order and security. It would seek the disbandment of armed forces, the dismantling of military establishments, including bases, the cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses, the elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical,

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction, the cessation of the production of such weapons and the elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction. These were the main features of the programme that those two Powers presented to the world 16 years ago.

What has been achieved by them in those 16 years and is it the absence of détente that has hampered them? Certainly one could answer, if one is trying to be philosophical, that here they could not agree and therefore they did nothing. We all know the reason, but to state that by merely paraphrasing the Charter in a declaration or a resolution, they are holding out to use the promise of achieving the objective, a promise which they held out to us 16 years ago, they cannot possibly convince us that the draft declaration and the draft resolution will serve that purpose.

To our mind, there are many things in this draft declaration and the draft resolution which are annexed to the memorandum, which are absolutely unexceptionable, but it is a distraction from the main subject to present this to us at this stage. We do not find fault with their impeccable intentions or with their statement. But we are afraid that while we announce these good and impeccable intentions, we are moving relentlessly and remorselessly on the road to hell.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

It has always been necessary for four specific steps to be taken if we are to avoid not merely a nuclear war but all kinds of destructive war.

The first is the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In 1963, when the Partial Test Ban Treaty was adopted, we were given the solemn assurance that within five years the two Powers would use their best endeavours to secure a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Their best endeavours have still failed to produce that comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We do welcome the news that negotiations are in progress between them to achieve an agreement of limited duration among the three Powers signatories to that Treaty to refrain from all testing, but we cannot agree that a mere temporary suspension of tests is sufficient.

We have also stated that the second item in the programme whose adoption would, we hope and are convinced, lead to international peace and security and the prevention of war is the categorical renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons.

Recently we heard from the Head of State of one super-Power the statement that that Power would use nuclear weapons only in self-defence. But self-defence would mean defence against an attack upon that country, its territories or its allies, whether that attack were nuclear or conventional. And there is the rub. Others have said they will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. Certainly, the first to use them will, I am sure, be also the last to use them. So there is not enough merit in any declaration that any country will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. What you want from those in possession of nuclear weapons is their total and categorical renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons. Only then can we feel secure.

Thirdly, we ask for the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the freezing of stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and finally, an agreed programme for the dismantling of the apparatus of nuclear terror. If you do not intend using nuclear weapons, why should you possess them?

There is also a distinction to be drawn between those who have hit the ceiling and gone through it and those who are still in the basement of nuclear-weapons production. It is idle to expect of them the same concessions and the same degree of agreement in regard to self-restraint one would expect from others. Those that are prepared to exercise self-restraint are in a position to do so because they have at their command a degree of superiority so

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

overwhelming that there is no conceivable possibility of others catching up with them in the race. In fact, there is no race at all - only at the top.

I have made these comments not in captious criticism of the intentions of the Soviet Union in bringing forward this item. But I do feel that we spend an inordinate amount of time discussing principles to which we are all pledged and addressing appeals to the wrong parties.

They are preaching to the converted. We have no nuclear weapons. We have no possibility of developing them. We have not the faintest prospect of attaining the degree of power they possess.

Take the present situation in regard to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), and the new agreement now being discussed. The limitations that have been proposed are, if I might say so with great respect for the super-Powers, ludicrous. What they are suggesting is that, instead of being capable of destroying the world twenty times over, they reduce that overkill capacity to ten times. Can anybody take such statements of intention seriously? What effect do they have on the state of international tension?

I do agree that if the two super-Powers can comply with all these appeals that are so fervently addressed to us, then certainly there is a prospect of our reaching that final goal we all so devoutly desire to attain.

As regards the draft declaration and the draft resolution, as also the memorandum that gives power to them, there are a few points to which I should like to draw pointed attention.

The memorandum states:

"Current developments in the world demonstrate that, as a result of the persistent and intensive efforts of peace-loving forces, the process of international détente and of the expansion of equitable and mutually beneficial co-operation among States determines to an increasing extent the pattern of international relations." (A/32/242, p. 1)

I do not know who these peace-loving forces are. I would presume that every Member of the United Nations belongs to the category of peace-loving forces and that there are no countries which have solemnly pledged themselves to the provisions of the Charter that can be described as war-loving forces. The document also says,

"There is a growing awareness of the need to renounce the use or threat of force ...". (Ibid.)

That awareness has existed ever since the United Nations was created; we were

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

pledged to take all measures to avoid the scourge of war, and that meant essentially to renounce the use or threat of force. Later, reference is made to the joint work of the 35 States that participated in the Helsinki Conference and produced a code of principles governing international relations, a code fully consonant with the requirements of peaceful coexistence. This also is referred to as a magical achievement, but it was discovered long before Helsinki, and stressed and emphasized.

There are one or two other points in this memorandum and in the documents which accompany it which cause me, at least, some confusion. But that may be due to my limited intelligence.

First of all, it says

"Hence the inevitable conclusion: it is necessary for all States - and first and foremost all nuclear-weapon States - to build their relations in such a manner as to reduce and ultimately eliminate the danger of a nuclear war anywhere in the world." (Ibid., p. 3)

Why should we not organize our relations in such a manner as to eliminate the danger of any war? Why only nuclear war? We should exert our efforts and co-operate with one another to eliminate conventional war. For our destruction, nuclear war is not at all necessary; conventional war is quite sufficient to erase us from the face of this earth.

I wish to draw attention to some of these matters because, through omission of reference to them, certain conclusions can be drawn which perhaps the authors of the document did not intend us to draw.

I must confess that I have not studied the draft declaration and the draft resolution very carefully, but a perfunctory reading of them causes me some surprise that the General Assembly be called upon to note with satisfaction that in recent years the trend towards international détente has become more widespread. The détente is confined to 35 countries, and mainly to two countries. We are prepared to note that, but certainly we cannot express satisfaction or get hysterical about it.

The draft declaration states:

"... a proclamation by the United Nations of its allegiance to détente follows directly from the obligation assumed by the States Members of the United Nations under the Charter to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours". (A/C.1/32/L.1, p. 1)

RII/6

A/C.1/32/PV.5
24-25

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

Who is preaching to whom? We have been living in peace with our neighbours all along, and we do not need another declaration of the United Nations as a substitute for the Charter or as a reaffirmation of the Charter. The Charter is there, and to state that we need a declaration is to imply that we have forgotten the Charter or have disavowed its provisions.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

I trust that the authors of this draft declaration will amend it therefore so as not to give rise to conclusions of heresy.

In the draft the General Assembly is called upon solemnly to urge "all States to continue and intensify their efforts" - and this is very interesting -

"To take decisive initiatives towards curbing the stockpiling of arms and implementing disarmament measures with a view to achieving the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control;" (Ibid.)

Those last few words have been always the excuse for inaction and the impediment to progress in regard to general and complete disarmament. Who is asking whom to curb the stockpiling of arms? Who is stockpiling arms? Is this a rhetorical question or is it seriously meant? I suggest that the two super-Powers get together, face each other, agree to stop the stockpiling of arms and adopt the four points we suggested a while ago.

There is yet another statement in the draft declaration which causes me considerable confusion. It states that the General Assembly solemnly urges all States

"To seek to ensure that the development of the spirit of détente is not impeded by considerations of bloc policies;" (Ibid.)

What are these blocs? I need an appendix to this draft declaration giving the definition of terms like "bloc policies". We do not belong to any bloc, unless one likes to call the non-aligned group a "bloc". We have no stockpile of arms, we have no warlike intentions. Our main purpose is to work towards peaceful coexistence in the hope that we can reduce and ultimately eliminate the threat of war.

There is also in the draft declaration a part which says that the General Assembly solemnly urges all States

"To measure their actions in relation to other States and in all parts of the globe against the requirements of détente;" (Ibid.)

I find it extremely difficult to understand what this measurement is and how we are going to use it.

(Mr. Amerasinghe, Sri Lanka)

I agree that States should

"... develop in every way equitable and mutually beneficial economic relations among all States on a fair basis ..." (Ibid.)

Whether they are called upon solemnly to do so or not is immaterial. I do not like the word "solemn". It means that if you are not solemn then you are not serious. I think we dropped that word from all our pledges and declarations.

To develop such relations is what we are trying to do through the new international economic order and the draft declaration is right in addressing that appeal to all States, particularly to the developed countries of the world.

If I have made these remarks, as I said, it is not in a spirit of captious criticism but only to say that declarations of this sort are no substitute for action and it is well known to us where the possibility lies of taking effective action to prevent not only nuclear war but even conventional war: it lies mainly with the two super-Powers. The other great Powers, the other nuclear Powers are miles away from them in their capacity to wage nuclear war or even conventional war on the scale on which those two Powers can.

I respectfully suggest to them, therefore, that they get down and talk seriously about SALT and general and complete disarmament with or without effective international control.

Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, permit me first of all to express my satisfaction at your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I should also like warmly to congratulate your Vice-Chairmen, the Ambassador of Hungary, Comrade Hollai, and the Ambassador of Finland, Mr. Pastinen, and also our Rapporteur, Mr. Correa from Mexico, upon their election as officers of the Committee.

(Mr. Puntsagnorov, Mongolia)

The position of principle of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic on the question of the deepening and consolidation of international détente and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war, included on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly at the initiative of the Soviet Union, has been set forth in the statement of the head of our delegation, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Dugersuren in the general debate in the Assembly. Today, in connexion with the discussion of this item in this Committee, I should like briefly to explain the main reasons why the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic supports this proposal.

In his significant statement the representative of the Soviet Union, Comrade Troyanovsky, convincingly demonstrated the timeliness of this issue. The Mongolian delegation attaches extreme importance to this initiative of the Soviet Union for it focuses the attention of the world community on the central issue of international life today, the problem of the further deepening and consolidation of the process of international détente and the protection of mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

In this specific initiative we see further proof of the deep humanitarianism of the foreign policy of the first socialist State in the world which, 60 years ago, proclaimed as its ideal, peace and disarmament and has struggled tirelessly for the attainment of that ideal. Now socialism, embodied in the community of socialist States, together with all peace-loving and progressive forces is exerting a decisive influence on the course of world events. Thanks to their consistent efforts it has become possible to turn from confrontation and tension to the normalization of relations and the development of co-operation between States with different social systems on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. It is precisely this, in our view, which constitutes the very core of international détente, something which has become a determining feature of the contemporary international scene.

Experience has proved that the easing of international tension is unquestionably in keeping with the interests of all peoples of the world, great and small, developed and developing, and it is quite natural that the consolidation and deepening of détente is favoured by all progressive forces in the world today.

(Mr. Puntsagnorov, Mongolia)

As is known a practical result of détente was the conclusion of a whole series of bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties in various areas of international relations. Among them pride of place properly belongs to the treaties and agreements concluded in the field of the limitation of the arms race and disarmament, which in particular have had a certain restraining effect on the nuclear arms race and have narrowed its scope. We should particularly point here to the Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, the Soviet-French agreement on measures to prevent the accidental or unauthorised use of nuclear Weapons, and also an agreement recently concluded between the Soviet Union and Great Britain on the prevention of the accidental outbreak of nuclear war.

(Mr. Puntsagnorov, Mongolia)

An important contribution to the consolidation of international tension has been made by the United Nations. With its active participation, a number of important declarations and resolutions have been adopted, treaties and agreements have been produced designed to limit the arms race and to bring about disarmament, among them the Convention on the Prevention of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques which was opened for signature this year. In conditions of détente, the national liberation movement of the peoples against imperialist aggression and colonialism has won new and outstanding victories. Détente has created favourable conditions for the acceleration of the social and economic progress of the developing countries and the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis.

We believe that these positive changes which are occurring in the world today, are just the beginning of the Profound process of creating stable foundations for the security of all States. Against this background, the legitimate concern of the world community has been aroused by the actions of reactionary and militaristic circles which are stepping up their attempts to halt the process of détente and to push the world backwards to the time of the cold war. Those circles encourage the arms race. They push for the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction, such as the neutron bomb and the cruise missile; they whip up military psychosis and attempt, on far-fetched pretexts, to intervene in the internal affairs of socialist States.

All this entails the danger not only of undermining the foundations of international détente, but also that of nullifying the results already achieved in the field of détente and disarmament. Hotbeds of local conflict, the artificial heightening of tension in various parts of the world by imperialist and other reactionary circles exert an extremely negative effect on the international atmosphere. The cause of détente cannot be hindered by the existence of the remnants of colonialism and colonial racist régimes.

In the circumstances what is urgently required is the further redoubling of the efforts of all States Members of the United Nations to consolidate and deepen the process of international détente so as to make it stable and irreversible. In our view, we should strive for the earliest possible peaceful

(Mr. Puntsagnorov, Mongolia)

settlement of military conflicts and the elimination of hotbeds of international tension, and also take measures in good time to avert the outbreak of new conflict situations. A rule of interstate relations should be strict observance of such fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter as non-intervention in internal affairs, mutual respect for sovereignty and independence and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. The political will of States should be concentrated on the implementation of multilateral treaties and agreements and also of the decisions of the United Nations that are designed to strengthen international security. This in turn would enhance still further the role of the United Nations as an active instrument for the harmonizing of the actions of States.

In our view the key issues in the consolidation of détente are the problems of limiting the arms race and of disarmament. While welcoming the progress made and the success achieved, we favour the adoption of new, even more effective measures in this extremely important area of international co-operation on a world-wide basis. That will no doubt be facilitated by the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and subsequently, we believe, the convening of a world disarmament conference.

The merits of the Soviet proposal lie in the fact that they raise the question of the deepening and consolidation of détente in indissoluble connexion and interdependence with the problem of preventing the danger of nuclear war. It is well known that in present circumstances, wars, even on the local scale, contain within themselves the seeds of further growth into a universal conflict involving the use of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war (A/C.1/32/L.2), submitted by the Soviet delegation, embraces a broad gamut of problems related to averting the risk of nuclear conflict, to limiting the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament. Of great significance in the weakening of the threat of nuclear war are the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of strategic nuclear armaments. The earliest possible conclusion of these talks, on the basis of the Vladivostok accord, would undoubtedly be conducive to the improvement of the international climate as a whole.

(Mr. Puntsagnorov, Mongolia)

Our delegation would like to stress the particular responsibility of all nuclear Powers to spare mankind the prospect of a nuclear holocaust. We think that the time has now come for all nuclear Powers to engage in talks on the joint elaboration of ways and means of solving the problem of nuclear disarmament. An effective barrier to the further improvement of nuclear weapons would be a general and complete prohibition of their testing. In this connexion we attach great importance to the talks between the USSR, the United States of America and the United Kingdom on this question. We support the assumption by all States of the obligation strictly to observe the principle of the renunciation in international relations of the use or the threat of force involving nuclear or conventional weapons. The conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, which has won wide support among Members of the United Nations, would be a perfect response to this objective.

The task of strengthening the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons by means of making the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons genuinely universal, and also by the adoption of additional measures, such as the creation of zones completely free from nuclear weapons, and so on, is a task which has assumed recently, greater timeliness and urgency. In order to deepen and consolidate détente, we must further broaden its sphere of action to all continents and regions.

The adoption of effective measures to eliminate the last remnants of colonialism, and the eradication of racism and apartheid will promote the attainment of this goal. In this connexion our delegation once again reaffirms the legitimate right of colonial peoples to struggle for their freedom and independence by all means at their disposal, including that of armed struggle.

The discussion in the General Assembly of the item on the deepening and consolidation of international détente and the prevention of the danger of nuclear war as a separate item reflects the fact that all States have a vital interest, as have all peoples of the world, in the strengthening and developing of the positive changes in the international scene which have occurred in recent years.

(Mr. Puntsagnorov, Mongolia)

An exchange of views on this key problem, together with a discussion of other aspects of the international situation, would undeniably promote the strengthening of the spirit of mutual understanding and co-operation among States. We express the hope that the thirty-second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations will make a new contribution to the cause of strengthening lasting peace on earth.

Mr. DHAN (India): Mr. Chairman, speaking for the first time in this Committee, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to extend to you our congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman of this important Committee. I wish also to convey to the Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteur our felicitations on their election and to all the officers of the Committee the assurances of our co-operation in the conduct of the business of this Committee.

It is only proper and fitting that we should consider as the first item the question of how to reduce tensions between countries and peoples, and how to avert the danger of nuclear war. We congratulate the delegation of the Soviet Union for having taken the initiative to have this item included on our agenda. We attach great importance to the substance of the various questions raised in this item, and we trust that there will be full and frank discussion of all their aspects.

For the present I intend to explain my delegation's general approach to this item. There is no doubt that we must all try to prevent a nuclear war, because its effects will not be confined to nuclear-weapon States but will extend far beyond their boundaries. Apart from this aspect of the matter, it has always been my delegation's view that nuclear weapons should be eliminated and, until their elimination, their use should be prohibited, since they are weapons of mass destruction. In our view, nuclear disarmament should be given the highest priority, because it is through nuclear disarmament that nuclear war can be prevented.

(Mr. Dhan, India)

At the same time, we should agree on a certain code of international behaviour which would reduce tensions between peoples and increase mutual confidence and security between nations. The Soviet Union has prepared a draft declaration (A/C.1/32/L.1) in this connexion. It is our opinion that the proposed draft declaration deserves careful consideration, with a view to ensuring that it will reflect the views and concerns of all countries.

It is true that as Members of the United Nations we are all under the obligation to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, whether or not we are physically near or far away from each other. The vast majority of countries in the world are not members of military alliances and also happen to be developing countries. They have on several occasions expressed their views on détente, on disarmament, on the solution of situations of conflict in the Middle East, Cyprus and southern Africa, and on the establishment of the new international economic order. Their opinions, being the views of the great majority, should be reflected in the draft declaration proposed by the Soviet Union.

The meaning of détente needs to be clarified to take into account the views of the non-aligned majority. The word "détente" has different connotations for different countries. In our view, détente should cover much more than the present condition of relations between the super-Powers, which we welcome. At the same time, we realize that the super-Powers, by virtue of their enormous economic and military strength, have a greater responsibility for maintaining international peace. The state of relations between them therefore assumes a special relevance for the rest of the world, and not only for Europe. Détente should therefore be extended to all parts of the world and be of benefit to all countries in the spirit of absolute respect for their national sovereignty. It is equally important that relations between other countries should be improved independently of super-Power relations. Furthermore, unless problems and disputes are resolved peacefully with due regard for justice and equality as well as security for all, there can be no extension of détente throughout the world.

(Mr. Dhan, India)

The non-aligned States have a special view regarding the presence of foreign military bases and troops in other countries. They are also opposed to any form of external interference in their internal affairs whether in the political, economic or cultural spheres. They are firmly of the opinion that they must exercise full sovereignty over their own natural resources. They consider that the maintenance of international peace and the prevention of war require the fulfilment of these conditions, as well as ending foreign occupation, guaranteeing equality of rights for all peoples, liquidating colonialism and racism, and eliminating inequality in international economic relationships. Above all, universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms should be at the centre of our collective efforts in building an interdependent world of peace, justice and equality for men, regardless of race or colour or creed.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/32/L.2) presented by the Soviet Union on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war also deserves very careful examination with due regard for the views and concerns of other States. We do not consider that enough steps have been taken to remove the nuclear threat. It is therefore important and urgent to concentrate all our efforts in the direction of permanently eliminating the danger of nuclear war. The nuclear-weapon States have a primary responsibility in this regard, and we therefore expect them to take the lead in this matter.

India is a non-nuclear-weapon State. It has on several occasions categorically declared that it will not manufacture nuclear weapons. For all practical purposes, therefore, India is a nuclear-weapon-free zone. But India will not be party to any arrangement that might result in curtailment of its sovereignty. India will also not be party to any treaty which is discriminatory and unequal and which is unable to prevent vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In conclusion, I must stress that responsibility for prevention of nuclear war rests mainly with the nuclear-weapon States. Any attempt to involve non-nuclear States in sharing this responsibility is unjustified and unworthy, because it will divert attention from the main source of danger of nuclear war. However, I should like to reiterate that, so far as my country is concerned, we have always stressed the view that the sooner the danger of nuclear war is eliminated once and for all the better it will be for all mankind.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.