

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



1994th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 23 November 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 97:	
World Disarmament Conference (<i>continued</i>)	1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 97

World Disarmament Conference (*continued*)*

1. Mr. BAYÜLKEN (Turkey): I should like to begin my statement by making two general observations which I believe are pertinent to the subject under consideration. The first observation is that a brief look at the disarmament efforts in the post-war era reveals quite clearly the close relationship between the international atmosphere and the success of disarmament measures. During the period from 1946 to 1960 the disarmament discussions were under the direct influence of the general, uneasy international atmosphere which reached the proportions of the so-called cold war. Consequently the discussions, which produced some very modest results, if any at all, were mainly concentrated on mutual recriminations very much lacking in the quality of real negotiations.

2. The only concrete achievement in this period was the Antarctic Treaty.¹ However, the easing of the tensions in international relations, particularly in and after 1963, paved the way for a breakthrough on several collateral disarmament measures. In 1963 the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty² was concluded and put into force. The outer space Treaty³ followed it. Then, in 1967, the Tlatelolco Treaty⁴ and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] were concluded. Last year we had the sea-bed Treaty⁵ opened for signature.

3. On the other hand, the two major nuclear Powers started negotiations to halt the nuclear arms race. Further-

more, in Europe we are happily witnessing positive developments towards the initiation of negotiations on mutual balanced force reductions.

4. The second observation I would like to make concerns the number and variety of forums in which disarmament problems have been dealt with. In 1946 the General Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission to deal with the problems raised by the use of atomic energy and atomic weapons, and also the Commission for Conventional Armaments to regulate and reduce conventional forces. In 1952 the General Assembly merged the two Commissions into a single Disarmament Commission. In 1954 a sub-committee composed of five Powers was established to work on a plan for comprehensive disarmament. Later on, we witnessed the holding of a number of conferences at Geneva. A conference of experts on the detection of nuclear tests⁶ was convened in 1958. In the same year there was another conference, that of experts on surprise attack.⁷ In 1959 the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament was set up. In 1961 the General Assembly established the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament which was enlarged a year later to include eight more countries, becoming the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

5. At present we have three forums dealing with the disarmament question: the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the annual debate in the General Assembly. In the future we might also have an additional forum for discussing the question of mutual balanced force reductions in Europe.

6. From these two observations I do not think it would be erroneous to draw the conclusion that the creation of a favourable political climate, which is likely to inspire more confidence and thus to initiate the necessary political will, has a more direct bearing on the success of disarmament discussions than the forum in which they are being discussed.

7. Turkey has always supported any initiative that would contribute positively towards efforts to end the arms race. It will be recalled that, to this end, we voted at the twentieth session of the General Assembly in 1965 in favour of the Soviet Union's proposal to convene a world disarmament conference. Turkey's basic approach to the question was expressed this year by my Minister for

* Resumed from the 1992nd meeting.

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 402 (1961), No. 5778.

² Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

³ Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (resolution 2222 (XXI), annex).

⁴ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

⁵ Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof (resolution 2660 (XXV), annex).

⁶ Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests, held from 1 July to 21 August 1958.

⁷ Conference of Experts for the study of possible measures which might be helpful in preventing surprise attacks, held from 10 November to 18 December 1958.

Foreign Affairs in the statement he made in the General Assembly, in which he said:

"I think that I need not repeat my country's readiness to assist in all initiatives in the field of disarmament, provided that such initiatives achieve concrete and positive results." [1954th meeting, para. 129.]

8. In a favourable international atmosphere and with these thoughts in mind, we welcome the initiative taken by the Soviet Union to convene a world disarmament conference. If this initiative is crowned with success it will constitute a significant step in achieving general and complete disarmament. However, we should not overlook the fact that failure to reach a successful outcome in this conference might cast a shadow on future disarmament efforts. These considerations lead my delegation to believe in the necessity of making adequate preparations with a view to creating the proper conditions beforehand.

9. In order to make adequate preparations, it is indispensable that Governments should undertake prior consultations. These exploratory consultations should bring out the common denominators of the various views on the different questions relating to the conference. Experience in this field dictates the requirement for adequate preparation and concerted action. The World Disarmament Conference convened under the League of Nations from 1932 to 1934 produced no result owing to the lack of adequate prior consultations and preparations to harmonize conflicting views in order to avoid negative effects on the Conference. As a result, the Conference then not only failed to achieve any positive results; its failure also caused a further deterioration of the political atmosphere.

10. Disarmament in all its aspects is of concern to the entire international community, and all Member States should be able to participate in the preparatory work of the conference. However, if priority is to be given to the questions of nuclear disarmament, then it is only realistic to say that the nuclear Powers, which have a special responsibility in the cessation of the nuclear arms race, should spare no effort in contributing to the success of the preparation of the conference.

11. Another important question in connexion with the world disarmament conference is the relationship between the conference and the disarmament forums which already exist. While it is important to define the link between the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the proposed conference before the conference convenes, care should be taken not to hamper the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in any way. A conference covering as wide a field as the world disarmament conference obviously cannot examine with equal attentiveness the increasing complexities and the technicalities of the whole range of disarmament questions, and thus the link between the conference and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should not be of a substitutive nature but rather a complementary one. The suggestions made on this aspect of the question by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik, in his introductory speech [1978th meeting] may serve as a useful basis of consultations on this question.

12. Finally, my delegation also shares with many other delegations the view that such a conference would more effectively serve the purposes of the Disarmament Decade if it were convened within the United Nations. With the People's Republic of China taking its seat in the United Nations, the capacity of the family of the United Nations to cope with major issues has now been enhanced. At such a stage, we believe, it would be in compliance with our efforts to strengthen the United Nations if the conference were convened within the framework of our Organization.

13. Disarmament is too important a question to leave any avenue unexplored. We should be bold enough to try every step that might bring us closer to our goal, and while doing so, wise enough to protect scrupulously the progress we have already achieved.

14. Mr. GALINDO POHL (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This year the United Nations is considering the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference. It is not the first time that our Organization has weighed such a proposal, but over the course of the last few years the General Assembly has been dealing with specific disarmament questions, generally in the form of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that meets regularly in Geneva, and sometimes the General Assembly has more or less successfully, depending on the issues, recommended the signing of certain treaties.

15. However, a global treatment of the important question of disarmament has been found wanting and countries not members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have only rarely, and then on specific questions, been given an opportunity of defining their positions. The item entitled "World Disarmament Conference", submitted for consideration this year by the Soviet Union [A/8491], opens the door to a systematic and comprehensive study of disarmament problems and at the same time offers a forum to all parties concerned, that is, to the entire international community, regardless of their size, their economic and military strength, or their systems of government.

16. Disarmament is of international concern and therefore requires an international forum, although with specific features we recognize it as a problem of each region or subregion. But without minimizing the need for specific and restricted agreements, the establishment of world policy in this matter would be particularly beneficial so that this immense question could be dealt with through some process whereby international tensions would be reduced, open conflicts could end and so that we might encourage the fulfilment of the entire system of collective security advocated by the Charter of the United Nations.

17. Disarmament deals with nuclear disarmament, but it also deals with conventional weapons; it is a matter of concern to the great Powers, but it is also a matter of concern to the smaller and middle-sized nations. The policy of armament is a result of the ineffectiveness of the system of collective security proposed in the Charter of the United Nations. It is a national substitute for collective security. If we could achieve collective security, then the policy of armament would have lost the cause that generated it and would thus have become obsolete and been relegated to the museum that houses the outdated objects of history.

18. The problem of disarmament has to be measured in terms of two co-ordinates. One is causal: collective security; the other is ultimate: the speeding up of the rate of development.

19. With regard to the relation of cause and effect, "armamentism"—if I may coin an expression—is linked to a lack of security, which, in turn, is engendered by the incomplete, inconsistent, hesitating and very often timid way in which the terms of the Charter of the United Nations have been applied for 26 years. The organ of action, the Security Council, has been unable to fulfil its mandate because it has not operated in a normal way, that is, with the substantive agreement of the five States occupying permanent seats on that body.

20. A vicious circle has been created between disarmament and security. There is no disarmament because there is no security, and there is no security because there is no disarmament. That vicious circle can only be broken by acting upon the causes, and the causes of armamentism are in this case the non-existence of a system of collective security.

21. Furthermore, both in theory and in practice we have recognized the influence of the politics of disarmament on the development rate. For example, through international treaties, Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany have considerably reduced their military expenditures and as a result have devoted much of their national product to productive investments, which, in turn, has speeded up development. Other countries of similar technological development have not followed a similar policy and, therefore, we note the paradox—which basically is no paradox—that two countries which lost the Second World War are today great economic Powers in their respective regions, and even in the world.

22. The continuing policy of "armamentism" is due at this moment to a weakness in applying the system of collective security, a weakness which lies not in the formalized agreements but in the means of rendering them effective. This aversion to disarmament cannot be blamed on the mere blindness of Governments or on chauvinistic whims. It so happens that since collective security is inefficient, both so far as the great Powers are concerned and in all regions and subregions, so each State considers that it must itself ensure one of its own fundamental obligations, that is, the obligation to preserve its own existence.

23. The final proof of the full validity of the system of collective security would be the achievement of disarmament, which to be defined in the usual terms of United Nations instruments would have to be general and complete. Disarmament must be studied and negotiated in close relationship with the means of strengthening and, to go even further, of ensuring the full effectiveness—without equivocation or hesitation—of collective security, as provided for in the Charter. Otherwise we should be acting on the effects and not the causes and would have to fall back into the repeated, and almost traditional, futility of effort. The failure of almost all disarmament conferences, both those that were advocated by the League of Nations in the 1930s and those held under the auspices of the United Nations at various levels, has been due to the fact that they

dealt with disarmament itself, without placing it in the right causal perspective. To act directly on disarmament is like trying to cure delinquency by merely prosecuting criminals with judges and police, overlooking the social causes that generate such crimes. So, too, on the international level we need a new approach to these problems, and for that the techniques of sociology might be very enlightening.

24. Disarmament has a direct effect on development. No government, if given the choice between "armamentism" and development, would choose the former; but very often governments have to establish a balance between security and development, and therefore divert a good part of their resources to security, which, if seen from the purely and exclusively national standpoint and apart from collective security, become manifest in weaponry and military expenditures. "Armamentism" is the bastard child of insecurity. In the past it was resorted to for survival and the preservation of national States, but today, in the light of the new world that we confront and in the light of the existence of an international community struggling to consolidate itself within a juridical system, security based on armamentism, and particularly on nuclear arms, becomes more and more fictitious; it becomes nothing but an onerous burden on the economies of States, and precariously and incompletely replaces collective security. Thus, as in many other cases, the international community must make a 180° turn in its approach to these questions of disarmament, security and development.

25. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has made slow but steady progress in the fulfilment of its mandate, but we note that the policies of balance among the great Powers still appear in all the agreements, arrived at, that in those agreements there is no clear-cut and defined expression of the policy of collective security. At this time the smaller and medium-sized nations are given the responsibility and the opportunity of leading a movement for collective security to replace the policies of balance. Last year in the First Committee [1733rd meeting] my delegation specifically referred to the relationships and the historical antagonisms that have appeared between those two policies.

26. When we speak of disarmament we often allude to the great Powers but, when all is said and done, the medium-sized and small nations, too, are at times dragged along by the vortex and vicious circle created between insecurity and arms, and just as there is a micro-climate, so there is micro-security and micro-armamentism.

27. The great Powers are accused of being negligent in questions of disarmament, but the middle-sized and small nations, within the relativity of circumstances, also have a role and a responsibility in this matter. A world disarmament conference would give the smaller and middle-sized nations a chance to take collective note of their role in this problem. On the world level the goal is to take the lead to obtain collective security, and on the regional and subregional level it is to reach the limited agreements that will reduce tensions and allow for the investment of funds that are now devoted to arms to productive matters instead, all this within the framework of the system advocated by the United Nations Charter.

28. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has just published a book entitled *The Arms Trade with the Third World*,⁸ which contains figures, data and comments on that other type of dependency of the developing countries on the developed countries, namely, the purchase of weapons. Through this book the Institute makes a very valuable contribution to the global and documented treatment of the trade in weapons. The historic part of the book is particularly enlightening on international activities to regulate or restrict the trade in weapons and the failures that have been met with thus far in all efforts to do so.

29. Admirable projections are made regarding the impetus to development that would follow the end to competition in nuclear weapons. But we must also take into account the domestic resources of all countries and their growth if true collective security were achieved and if the entire question of national security based on armaments were to become obsolete. Thus, the middle-sized and small nations are given a possibility of drawing upon many resources which would be derived from collective security and therefore make obsolete the old policies of self-security through military alliances.

30. Pessimists doubt whether the right moment has arrived to speak seriously of this question and bring up the many failures of the recent and distant past. But both pessimism and optimism should be based upon proof by facts. Today's world is constantly changing, and so rapidly that what was declared impossible yesterday becomes feasible today.

31. The proposed conference, therefore, cannot be replaced by any *a priori* judgement, and only by holding it can we measure the degree of maturity achieved in the last few years by the international community with respect to these subjects.

32. In the vast question of disarmament the United Nations faces two tasks: one, to encourage a serious and comprehensive study and, two, to negotiate stages and targets and to obtain progressive agreements to achieve it. The worst that the United Nations could do would be to assume a half-hearted stand on the matter. In 1970 the United Nations drafted a beautiful Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)]. But that instrument has not doused the fires—three or four at present—that seriously threaten world peace. If the United Nations continues to accept bilateral diplomacy instead of the diplomacy of the United Nations, it could be too late, and it might find itself in a position of performing only a therapeutic role when its true role must be preventive. Some voice must be raised to point out the inaction of the United Nations in the three or four places in the world where confrontations are taking place. And let it not be said that there was a consensus on the matter. I speak on behalf of my country, which is not satisfied with inaction since it increases insecurity, since it is conducive to armaments, since it shelve the true search for collective security, defined by the Charter, and thus diverts investments from their true and natural use, namely, development and the arts of peace.

33. My country feels that the moment is propitious for the international community to avail itself of a wide forum

where the problems of disarmament can be thoroughly discussed, where we can establish the relationship between disarmament and security, where we can compare those of disarmament and development, where we can assess the criteria for limited regional and subregional arrangements and where we can lay down the main directives for a continuing series of disarmament steps to be carried out over the next 10 or 20 years. The case is all the more urgent since the economic burdens of armament in many countries are constantly growing and they can turn out to be as burdensome on a small economy with conventional weapons as they are on a large economy engaged in a nuclear race. But this purely economic approach does not free the great Powers from their political and human responsibilities due to the breakneck accumulation of nuclear weapons, since such weapons might wipe out humanity, if not wittingly, perhaps through accident, whereas other States would suffer limited damage merely through the stagnation of their economy or its slow development.

34. What can we expect from a world disarmament conference? A sudden end to armaments? The full effectiveness of collective security? The speeding up of development? The end of the nightmare of a nuclear holocaust? All that is very beautiful, perhaps too beautiful. Perhaps it is too much to expect from the holding of a single conference. To set it as our target for the world disarmament conference would merely be to transplant our glorious individual dreams to the international community. We cannot of course deny the international community the right to dream—and we wish that the international community would at some time dream freely, because good dreams have a beneficial effect on life. But the fact of the matter is that at this positivistic moment the international community seems to have lost the very capacity to dream.

35. What then would be the positive results that we might expect from a world disarmament conference? We believe that they might well be the following: to assess the recent experiences gathered from conflicts and insecurity and the work done by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; to reduce to a common denominator the awareness and the ideas of all members of the international community without distinction; to give priority to international and national concern over disarmament questions; to identify specifically the ties between disarmament, collective security and the speeding up of development; to lay down universal directives for regional and subregional agreements; and finally, to set in motion a systematic and gradual process to deal with disarmament, considered as a single unit.

36. The conference could be planned and studied in the light of those staggered objectives, modest though they be, but feasible none the less. A world disarmament conference could, therefore, contribute to creating a general awareness of these problems and, particularly to generating a new approach to the question—one more in keeping with the present stage of development of the human sciences. In such a way it might pinpoint the collective awareness of the world and stimulate a stock-taking on the part of the international community, all in the light of the principles and norms of the United Nations Charter.

37. It will be noted that in all this I have not referred to the Disarmament Commission. That is due to the fact that

⁸ Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1971.

that Commission, composed of all Members of the United Nations, would not, in our judgement, be the most appropriate forum at this time. The Disarmament Commission's era as a relevant world forum has either passed or is passing; and that moment was wasted, particularly by those countries which for many years refused to support it, despite the constant urgings of many delegations in the First Committee and in the plenary of the General Assembly.

38. Of course, that Commission might be of some use were it to be reactivated, but it could in no way replace a world disarmament conference.

39. We favour a world disarmament conference, so long as it is prepared and convened by the United Nations, as an undertaking of the United Nations, and as a way of invigorating the system of collective security advocated in the Charter of the United Nations.

40. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): In proposing [1978th meeting] to defer discussion of the item entitled "World Disarmament Conference" until the arrival of the delegation of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Garcia Roblés of Mexico rendered an invaluable service, because, as I said from this rostrum on 7 October 1971 in the general debate, the People's Republic of China, with its economic, scientific and technical development,

"is a giant that must have its bit to say in the settlement of the world's problems if we wish this settlement to be permanent." [1956th meeting, para. 91.]

41. I am happy, therefore, to welcome the presence among us of the worthy representatives of the great Chinese people and of its Government, with which Rwanda has just decided, on 12 November 1971, to establish diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level. The contribution of the delegation of the People's Republic of China in this debate on the question which is of such obvious importance for the future of mankind will, we are sure, be most valuable.

42. By sponsoring the draft resolution contained in documents A/L.631 and Add.1, Rwanda wishes to stress the importance it attaches to peace and its desire to see mankind as a whole safe from the catastrophes threatening it because of the unbridled arms race.

43. The fundamental importance of the disarmament problem is obvious to all, we think, especially today when all States, large and small, are engaged in an infernal spiralling arms race aimed at replacing for the true concept of peace by that of a balance based on mutual terror. In so doing they are feverishly allocating tremendous expenditures for military purposes in order to "deter" the imaginary "enemy", while the true enemy threatening mankind which must be confronted is that obsession which pushes mankind to its own suicide by diverting from truly positive goals more than \$200,000 million a year and a large number of scientists to destructive purposes.

44. It is true that since the end of the Second World War praiseworthy efforts have been made to promote disarmament. We have only to recall various resolutions adopted in

the United Nations, including treaties signed pertaining to some sectors of disarmament—for example, General Assembly resolution 41 (I) of 14 December 1946, relating to the need to take urgent measures for the reduction of armaments and the elimination of atomic weapons; resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959, relating to general and complete disarmament; the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water; resolution 2030 (XX) of 29 November 1965, relating to the convening of a world disarmament conference; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, declaring the decade beginning in 1970 as a Disarmament Decade; resolution 2661 A (XXV) of 7 December 1970, urgently calling upon Governments of the nuclear-weapon Powers to bring about an immediate halt in the nuclear arms race and to cease all testing as well as deployment of offensive and defensive nuclear-weapon systems; the Treaty signed this year prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof; and to this list we should like to add the bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic arms.

45. A careful study of all those treaties and resolutions reveals their fragmentary and incomplete nature, although they have created and brought together the necessary conditions and climate for the convening of a world disarmament conference. However, everybody knows that the United Nations, within the framework of which those treaties and resolutions were worked out, still does not fully reflect universality. As I was saying a few minutes ago, the delegation of the People's Republic of China has only now entered our Organization; the two Germany's are still absent; the two Koreas and the two Viet-Nams are not represented; nor is Switzerland seated among us.

46. Furthermore, certain States have still not adhered to some of the aforementioned treaties. As for the committees set up pursuant to some of those resolutions I mentioned—for example, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament—most frequently they are under the domination of the great Powers. My delegation is in duty bound to recall that responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world must not be the monopoly of some States, because there is no more specious argument than the one according to which the most heavily armed countries should occupy a favoured place in an institution which seeks not war but peace—as if the happiness of people could be established at sword-point rather than on the basis of a common will and determination to live together in a climate free of fear and threat.

47. My Government, which belongs to the world of the non-aligned countries, is legitimately proud to stress the value which our Chiefs of State, always faithful to the spirit and principles of the historic Bandung meeting,⁹ attached to the question of general and complete disarmament in the important resolutions adopted at their Conference at Cairo in 1964 and at Lusaka in 1970.¹⁰

⁹ Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung from 18 to 24 April 1955.

¹⁰ Second and Third Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo from 5 to 10 October 1964 and at Lusaka from 8 to 10 September 1970.

48. In proposing the convening of a world disarmament conference of all Member and non-member States, large and small, to consider directly the ways and means to put an end to the arms race and the destruction of existing weapon stockpiles, Rwanda and all non-aligned countries are faithful to the traditional principles guiding their foreign policy of peace and positive co-operation among nations.

49. No one can doubt that in the century in which we live peace and war are of concern to all, and it would be illusory to think that by stocking nuclear weapons, for instance, one is better protected from defeat, because any modern war, waged with the technological means devised by human ingenuity, would vanquish all and leave no victors. It would be the total destruction of mankind in a fraction of a second.

50. My delegation therefore thinks that we should oppose the age-old saying to the effect that he who desires peace should prepare for war. We say that peace can only be achieved by the total and unconditional elimination of all means of waging war. We are convinced that all peoples of the world which we represent here want peace. By voting in favour of draft resolution A/L.631 and Add.1, relating to the world disarmament conference, we shall have taken an extremely important step on the road leading towards the true progress of nations.

51. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 11 December 1964, when speaking in the general debate at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, the Chairman of the Cuban delegation, Commander Ché Guevara, referred to the idea of convening a world disarmament conference. He stated that, if such a conference could achieve the goals that he defined in his speech, it would "represent one of the most important developments in the history of mankind" [1299th meeting, para. 106].

52. My delegation has consistently followed a policy of support for the idea of holding such a world conference to deal with all the problems of disarmament, a conference open to all States. For this reason, my country supported the agreements and decisions previously adopted by the General Assembly on this matter, as well as those of the conference of Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries.

53. Cuba wishes to reiterate its position of principle favouring general and complete disarmament, the destruction of all nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the total prohibition of the manufacture of all new weapons of mass destruction and of all tests. The consideration of pertinent measures to achieve such goals is obviously a matter of basic interest to all States. For that reason, my delegation welcomes the initiative of the Soviet Union in proposing consideration of the question this year, and we also welcome the submission by that delegation of a draft resolution calling for a world conference to examine the question of disarmament.

54. It is a known fact that in the past, one of the fundamental problems that justified the support of many countries for the holding of this type of conference was the continued and illegal exclusion of the People's Republic of China from the work of this Organization. But the

consideration that we are now giving this subject has the advantage that the General Assembly has now restored to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights, and its delegation is here with us. Yet, there are still other States which are barred from participating in the work of the United Nations and whose assistance is essential for consideration of any disarmament questions. In this regard, my delegation would like again to draw the attention of the Assembly to the importance of taking decisions to put an end to the policy of discrimination which the Government of the United States has fostered and applied against the German Democratic Republic. Its participation in activities to reach general and complete disarmament is, to my delegation, of basic importance.

55. Cuba has always stated, and today repeats, that general and complete disarmament must be achieved in such conditions as to ensure and safeguard the independence and security of all States, great or small. We have, likewise, constantly repeated the inalienable right of peoples subject to foreign aggression, or living under constant threat of aggression, to turn to any means to ensure their own defence. The present situation of the world continues to demonstrate the existence of threats and of power politics used against the sovereignty of many States. At the very moment when the General Assembly is considering the possibility of holding a world disarmament conference, in Indo-China as well as in other parts of the world, imperialist aggression continues against a number of peoples. At this very moment, not only does Yankee aggression against the three peoples of Indo-China continue, but bombings are resumed against the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and new contingents of the puppet army of Saigon, organized, protected and directed by the United States armed forces, are invading the territory of Cambodia.

56. At a moment when the General Assembly is weighing steps to improve the world situation and to encourage peace and security, the American Government continues to exercise all types of pressure on the countries defending their sovereignty, continues to wage a ferocious and criminal war of aggression against the people of Indo-China and still holds dozens of aggressive military bases all over the world.

57. For all these reasons, as far as the Cuban delegation is concerned, general and complete disarmament is very closely linked to the need to put a final end to the aggressive capacity of the United States, the only Power that at present is using its forces and its weapons in a war of aggression. That is why I would like to recall the words spoken from this same rostrum in 1964 by Commander Ché Guevara when dealing with this identical matter. He said:

"... it must be clearly established that all States are under an obligation to respect the present frontiers of other States, and to refrain from all aggressive action, even with conventional weapons.

"In adding our voice to the chorus of the world's peoples that demand general and complete disarmament, the destruction of all atomic weapons, and a complete ban on the production of new thermo-nuclear devices and on atomic tests of any kind, we believe it is necessary to stress that, in addition, the territorial integrity of nations

must be respected and the mailed fist of imperialism restrained, for the latter is just as dangerous when it holds only convention weapons." [*Ibid.*, paras. 103 and 104.]

58. Mr. ROY (Philippines): The United Nations is coeval with the atomic age, during which man for the first time acquired the power to exterminate his own species. From the very beginning of its existence, therefore, the United Nations has been acutely aware of the crucial importance of disarmament in the attainment of the primary aims of the Charter: international peace and security and better conditions of life conducive to a new international order in which the inalienable rights of men and of nations could be more effectively promoted.

59. As a founding Member, the Philippines shared fully the profound concern with disarmament that has pervaded the United Nations almost from the moment of its birth. In 1959 we gave full support to the General Assembly when it expressed that concern in its resolution 1378 (XIV) on general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

60. Little real progress towards that unanimously approved goal was made, however. When President Marcos of the Philippines addressed the General Assembly at its twenty-first session in 1966, he noted:

"One of the most ironic facts of our civilization is that while yearly we convene here in the General Assembly to speak of peace, we have witnessed at the same time the proliferation of . . . weapons of mass destruction. Nations and Powers seem to be bent upon increasing their capability for war rather than upon utilizing their strength for the attainment of international peace. . . . we have gone back to the heresy of traditional politics: that in order to achieve peace, we must prepare for . . . war." [*1411th meeting, para. 9.*]

61. Last year, during the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Mr. Romulo, expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of substance in the Disarmament Decade. We therefore suggested the formation of a committee of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Decade which would, among other things, undertake appropriate preparations for a world disarmament conference.¹¹

62. The idea of a world disarmament conference is, of course, not a new one. In 1957 the General Assembly adopted unanimously a resolution inviting the Disarmament Commission to consider the advisability of recommending that a special session of the General Assembly or a general disarmament conference be convened at the appropriate time [*resolution 1011 (XI)*]. The Disarmament Commission itself in 1965 adopted a resolution welcoming the proposal by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964, for the convening of a world disarmament conference to which all countries would be invited and recommended that the General Assembly give urgent

consideration to that proposal at its twentieth session.¹² The General Assembly responded by endorsing the proposal of the non-aligned countries adopted in its resolution 2030 (XX).

63. We all know that the proposed world disarmament conference did not take place. The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization for 1965-1966,¹³ reported that little progress had been made on the preparatory work for the holding of the conference. Not long after that report, the preparatory steps came to a complete standstill.

64. Two important considerations figured in the deliberations of the General Assembly in 1965 on a world disarmament conference. The first was the desirability of having countries not Members of the United Nations participate in disarmament negotiations, and the second was the need to make the world aware of the problems of disarmament, their importance and implications, in the hope that from such awareness faster progress in the disarmament negotiations could be achieved. Those considerations remain valid and cogent today.

65. Our proposal last year for a committee of the General Assembly for the Disarmament Decade envisaged as an important element the necessity to broaden public understanding of the need for disarmament. Thus, we suggested the publication of a periodic newsletter on the Disarmament Decade, detailing activities by Member States, by the United Nations and its agencies and by non-governmental organizations in support of the Disarmament Decade. In making that suggestion, it was our purpose to foster an atmosphere of urgency in the development of disarmament negotiations, because we felt then, as we do now, that in spite of some accomplishments in Geneva and elsewhere, not much progress in real disarmament was being achieved.

66. A world disarmament conference, to our mind, would not only create an atmosphere of urgency, but would also make the public aware and informed of the goals and objectives of the disarmament negotiations.

67. In 1965, it was considered that a world disarmament conference would be more meaningful, significant and fruitful if all countries could participate in such a conference. We still subscribe to this idea today and have welcomed the significant progress that has been achieved recently towards the goal of universality in the membership of the United Nations with the seating of the People's Republic of China in our midst. But let it be remembered that there are other countries, not yet Members of the United Nations, which could make useful contributions to a world disarmament conference. It is our hope that by the time the proposed conference is convened further progress in universality may be achieved and that these countries will by then already be Members of the United Nations.

68. A disarmament conference virtually and vitally affects every country in the world and it is only fitting that all

¹¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, First Committee*, 1749th meeting.

¹² *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1965*, document DC/224.

¹³ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1A*.

countries wishing to participate in such a conference should be welcomed. The progress made towards the principle of universality in the United Nations clearly points the way to the universality of participation in a world disarmament conference.

69. In supporting disarmament proposals we have at the same time maintained our consistent belief that disarmament is an indispensable condition to accelerated and more equitable world economic and social development.

70. Last year, the Philippines initiated a proposal which resulted in the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 2685 (XXV) on the economic and social consequences of disarmament. This resolution sought the adoption of appropriate measures to ensure that the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade shall be fully understood and utilized in as practical and comprehensive a manner as possible in order that an appropriate portion of the resources released as a consequence of progress towards general and complete disarmament would be used to increase assistance for the economic and social development of developing countries. Under this resolution the Secretary-General has been requested to submit a report on the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Development Decade in time for consideration by the General Assembly at the first biennial review of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade [resolution 2626 (XXV)], to be made in 1973.

71. The Philippines also voted last year in favour of an initiative by Romania which was embodied in resolution 2667 (XXV) on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security. The fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of this resolution are noteworthy and read as follows:

"Deeply convinced that the elimination of the enormous waste of wealth and talent on the arms race, which is detrimental to the economic and social life of all States, would have a positive impact, especially on the developing countries, where the need for skilled personnel and the lack of material and financial resources are most keenly felt,

"Convinced that a halt in the arms race, a reduction of military expenditures and concrete progress towards disarmament would greatly facilitate the achievement by nations of their economic and social goals and would contribute effectively to the improvement of international relations and the maintenance of world peace and security".

72. Pursuant to this resolution the Secretary-General has submitted to the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly a report contained in document A/8469, produced with the assistance of qualified consultant experts, on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of mounting military expenditures.

73. It does not appear necessary at this time to delve into the substance of this report as there will be ample

opportunity to do so in the First Committee when the corresponding item pertaining to the report comes up for discussion. Suffice it to say now that one of the unanimous conclusions embodied in the report is that

"A halt in the arms race and a significant reduction in military expenditures would help the social and economic development of all countries and would increase the possibilities of providing additional aid to developing countries." [A/8469, para. 120 (3).]

74. In 1970, in a document known as the "Declaration on peace and disarmament",¹⁴ the Nobel Peace Prize Laureates—Lord Boyd Orr, Lester B. Pearson, René Cassin, Philip Noel-Baker and Linus Pauling—after referring to a number of treaties in the 1960s which show progress towards disarmament bewailed the fact that:

"Unfortunately, despite these successes, there is increasing diversion of enormous resources and energy, both human and physical, from peaceful economic and social pursuits to unproductive and uneconomic military purposes."

75. The Nobel Peace Prize Laureates also quoted the Secretary-General as follows:

"The world now stands at a most critical crossroads. It can pursue the arms race at a terrible price to the security and progress of the peoples of the world, or it can move ahead towards the goal of general and complete disarmament, a goal that was set in 1959 by a unanimous decision of the General Assembly on the eve of the decade of the 1960s. If it should choose the latter road, the security, the economic well-being and the progress not only of the developing countries, but also of the developed countries and of the entire world would be tremendously enhanced."

76. Indeed, happily for the Philippines and other developing countries and for the world at large, the idea that disarmament has a link or interdependence with social and economic development has steadily gained ground and recognition.

77. In his policy statement of 8 October, Mr. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Philippines delegation, referred to the proposed world disarmament conference and linked it to the two major undertakings of the United Nations in the 1970s. He said:

"A world disarmament conference would be a major step towards giving meaning and substance to the Disarmament Decade, now running concurrently with the Second United Nations Development Decade. In two years the Assembly has not otherwise succeeded in taking any other new initiatives on a scale or of a content sufficient to justify the designation 'Disarmament Decade', or adequately to emphasize the interdependence between a Disarmament Decade and the Second Development Decade." [1959th meeting, para. 81.]

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94.

78. It is in this context that the Philippine Government welcomes the inclusion in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly of the item entitled "World Disarmament Conference", proposed by the delegations of Rwanda and the Soviet Union.

79. Having thus stated our position in favour of a world disarmament conference, it is our earnest hope that such a conference, if convened, should succeed. Hence, the need for adequate preparation before the conference. The conference should be planned with expertise and care after intensive studies by a preparatory committee established for this purpose. The preparatory committee should not only be representative of the geographical regions of the world but should also include Member States actually involved in disarmament negotiations, as well as those countries with technological and industrial capacity in the production of armaments, particularly of the sophisticated varieties capable of mass destruction.

80. In order for the world disarmament conference to have an organic relation to the United Nations, it is suggested that the Secretary-General or his representative should take charge of the preparatory steps in co-ordination with the preparatory committee. He should undertake consultations on the timing, financing and agenda of the conference.

81. The goal of the conference should be agreement on the important priority problems of disarmament. Nuclear disarmament looms as the most urgent question on the agenda, and judging from his reports and pronouncements, the Secretary-General would be the very first to accord such priority to nuclear disarmament.

82. The problem of general and complete disarmament also deserves high priority. My delegation attaches particular importance to this problem as a goal of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Last year we expressed our regret in the First Committee [1749th meeting] that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament failed to come to an agreement on the subject of a comprehensive programme for disarmament in spite of the fact that some delegations in the Committee on Disarmament had stressed the urgency of its task if it was to comply with its mandate under resolution 2602 E (XXIV).

83. Judging from the latest report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8437] no appreciable progress was achieved this year or last year on the comprehensive programme for disarmament, since the Conference merely continued its discussion of the question of general and complete disarmament during the 1971 sessions, taking into account General Assembly resolution 2661 (XXV). And yet this resolution particularly indicated an abundance of working papers on a comprehensive programme of disarmament and urged the Committee on Disarmament to make more intensive efforts to bring about a faster pace towards the achievement of disarmament measures, considering that the General Assembly had declared the decade of the 1970s as the Disarmament Decade.

84. It is this lack of progress in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that impels my delegation to suggest that a comprehensive programme of disarmament be accorded high priority in a world disarmament conference. Adequate preparation should include commensurate time given to the participants in the conference to study the problems involved and to formulate their solutions to such problems.

85. The Philippines, profoundly concerned as it has always been with the Charter's principal goal of ensuring peace and international security, hopes that a world disarmament conference will materialize soon, in contrast to the unsuccessful proposal for a world disarmament conference in 1965. The holding of such a conference is a political decision and, as such, it is clearly a matter of political will on the part of Member States. It may not therefore be amiss to direct an appeal to those who have voiced reservations regarding the holding of a world disarmament conference to reconsider their position.

86. Let us have the conference and let us give maximum meaning and substance to the Disarmament Decade by linking it constructively to the Second United Nations Development Decade.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

