



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. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): The idea of convening a world disarmament conference was raised, it will be recalled, at the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union together with other disarmament measures for which the Soviet nation intends to press as part of the policy of peace and friendship among peoples which it has been consistently pursuing for 54 years.

2. For more than a quarter of a century, thanks to the efforts of the socialist and other peace-loving States, the peoples of this globe have been spared a world war. However, during this period the forces of aggression and militarism have unleashed more than 30 wars and armed conflicts of varying size, meaning that for virtually the whole of this period there has been a chain of armed conflicts which have flared up now in one part of our planet and now in another. The world remains in a constant state of tension, and for all these years imperialism has demonstrated the immutability of its reactionary and aggressive nature.

3. The arms race unleashed by the aggressive imperialist circles has a highly negative effect on all aspects of international life. It exacerbates relations among States, creates conditions of instability and tension, engenders an ever more serious threat to universal peace and poses the continuing danger of nuclear-missile war.

4. In addition to its adverse political aspects, the arms race has negative economic and social effects. The Moloch of war annually swallows up vast material resources and the physical and intellectual labour of millions of people, depriving nations of tremendous opportunities for accelerating their economic and social progress, raising their levels of living, combating want and disease and promoting cultural advancement.

5. Experts have estimated that in 1970 military spending by all the countries of the world reached the astronomical figure of \$200,000 million. The countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization accounted for more than half of this amount, \$103,000 million. While producing vast

profits for the military-industrial monopolies and the militarists, the arms race in the capitalist countries causes serious harm to the vital interests of the masses. It is one of the main reasons for the rising taxes in capitalist countries, the inflation, declining levels of living and restricted spending on the most urgent social and economic needs.

6. Military expenditure also represents a significant burden on the peoples of socialist countries who, in order to maintain their defensive capability at the necessary level and to defend the cause of peace, are compelled to devote considerable material and human resources to defence.

7. The arms race has a particularly unfavourable effect on the socio-economic position of the developing countries, which for various reasons are being drawn more and more strongly into this race. We realize that a number of developing countries are obliged to bear heavy military expenditure in order to repel the aggression of imperialist forces and to defend their freedom and independence.

8. Developing States spend relatively small amounts on military requirements as compared with global military outlays. Yet in recent years the rate of increase in military expenditure in the developing countries has significantly overtaken the growth rate of their gross national product. This trend is alarming. As may be seen from the pamphlet *World Military Expenditures, 1970* published by the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the military expenditure of all the developing countries amounted to \$27,000 million in 1970. To give a clearer understanding of what such a figure represents for the developing countries, we may recall that it is four times greater than the sum of all international aid to the developing countries. In other words, despite an extreme shortage of financial and other resources, the developing countries are compelled by the actions of the forces of aggression and reaction to engage in heavy unproductive spending.

9. The arms race is a source of severe hindrance to all peoples, a fact of which mankind has already had sufficient proof. It is intolerable that enormous resources and productive forces should disappear each year in the abyss of military preparations. It is essential in the vital interests of all the peoples of the world that our planet and its inhabitants be saved from the arms race.

10. Of course, it would be unrealistic to suppose that the ending of the arms race would be a universal panacea and that all problems in all countries would automatically be solved. Disarmament alone will not produce such a miraculous result unless it is accompanied by fundamental socio-political transformations. But a reversal or even the simple limitation of the arms race will help to lower the

pitch of international tension, make it considerably more difficult to unleash a world war and aid in the realization of plans for peaceful construction in the interests of peoples.

11. We consider the problem of disarmament to be not only in need of solution but also to be solvable. Of course, the path to disarmament is highly complex and difficult. Yet no difficulties should stand in the way of the international community in its striving towards disarmament, since the practical significance of disarmament questions is so great as to justify fully the efforts needed to solve them.

12. Past experience shows that there is a real possibility of arriving at agreements responsive to the vital interests of all peoples. International treaties have been concluded on the cessation of testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, on the peaceful uses of outer space and on the prohibition of the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor. The Soviet Union and the United States have reached agreement this year on measures to reduce the danger of intercontinental nuclear war. A draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [A/8457, annex A] has been submitted to the General Assembly, and we hope that it will be adopted in order to become the first agreement on practical disarmament measures. These agreements are only the first steps on a long and difficult road towards the final goal of general and complete disarmament, but the fact that they have been taken is highly significant.

13. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is a party to international disarmament agreements and played an active role in preparing them, and we know how difficult it was to bring these agreements into being. The fact that they exist, and also the widening of the circle of parties to them, prove that, where the will exists—even in a divided world with countries having diverse social and political systems—practical steps in the field of disarmament are possible, and difficulties which at first appear insuperable can be overcome. On the basis of accumulated experience, therefore, and of the realities of the nuclear missile age, only one conclusion is possible: disarmament talks must not only be continued, but continued with great persistence.

14. It is with this conclusion in mind that the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic fully supports the initiative of the Soviet Union in calling for a world disarmament conference. We consider it necessary to revitalize negotiations on disarmament and to find new forms for them. This idea is given expression in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.631 and Add.1], which speaks of:

“... the urgent necessity of resolutely intensifying the efforts of States with a view to the adoption of effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of other weapons of mass destruction, and for the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control”.

15. Of course, the convening of such a conference is in no way intended and must not be allowed to limit the consideration of disarmament matters to the confines of such a conference alone. We would fully welcome the convening of the conference of the five nuclear Powers suggested by the Soviet Union to discuss the pivotal problem of disarmament, nuclear disarmament. Disarmament negotiations will also continue on a bilateral basis. Discussion of the problems connected with the halting of the arms race and with disarmament will undoubtedly continue in the United Nations and in such appropriate bodies as the Committee on Disarmament. The more constructive negotiations there are on disarmament, the better.

16. It is our deep conviction that no one form of discussion of disarmament matters should be set off against another. One should not restrict oneself to any one form of consideration if there is a possibility of using others, since they too may help in reaching positive results and thus have a beneficial influence on disarmament talks being carried on through other channels, and help to solve the problem as a whole. We must take advantage of all possible opportunities to find ways and means of halting and reversing the arms race. A world disarmament conference may present a significant opportunity in this respect.

17. We are convinced that disarmament questions are of equal importance for large and small countries, and for all peoples. Disarmament is a common concern of all humanity. This problem cannot be fully solved by the efforts of individual States. It requires collective action by all countries, which they can and must undertake irrespective of the size of their territory or population, their economic strength and their military potential.

18. It is very important that all nuclear Powers should shoulder their special responsibility for finding an early solution to the problem of nuclear disarmament and should take all possible measures to ensure the success of the world disarmament conference, including joint action to create the conditions necessary for reaching agreement on these matters.

19. At previous sessions of the General Assembly the representatives of a number of countries expressed the wish that disarmament talks should be more broadly based. The initiative of the Soviet Union is fully in accord with those wishes, and adoption of the proposal to convene a world disarmament conference would provide an opportunity for discussions on the broadest possible basis.

20. Since disarmament demands truly world-wide efforts, the effectiveness and success of the conference will depend to a significant extent on its universality: on the range of participation in it. It is essential that all States, whether or not they are Members of the United Nations, should have the opportunity to take part in the joint consideration of disarmament problems and in the search for practicable and generally acceptable means of solving those problems. A precondition of undoubted importance for the success of the conference is that all militarily significant States, and particularly all the nuclear Powers, should take part. We express the hope that the People's Republic of China, for the restoration of whose rights in the United Nations the

socialist and other progressive countries, including the Byelorussian SSR, strove for many years, will be included in this joint task and will make a helpful contribution towards the convening of a world disarmament conference.

21. The convening of such a major conference will undoubtedly require a corresponding amount of preparatory work. At the same time we consider that the amount of care required has no direct bearing on the length of this preparation and this should not be used as an excuse for delaying a decision on the convening of the conference. It seems to us that in the year which separates us from the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly there could be various kinds of bilateral and multilateral consultation between States, in the course of which they could reach agreement in principle on the time and place of the conference, its agenda, periodicity, financing and other organizational matters.

22. The question of the agenda for the conference is one of considerable interest. In our opinion, no limitations should be set here: any disarmament question which a majority of the participants in the conference considers it necessary to discuss should be included in the agenda. The whole range of disarmament questions, concerning nuclear and conventional weapons, partial disarmament measures and general and complete disarmament, could be discussed at the conference. The kind of representative forum which a world disarmament conference should be would provide all States without exception with the opportunity to express their views on any disarmament matter, and to take part in the search for practical and mutually acceptable measures to limit and halt the arms race and bring about disarmament.

23. The soundness and the constructive and serious intent of the new Soviet peace initiative have met with a wide international response. The Soviet proposal is receiving support from the progressive circles of the world community. The outstanding importance to the cause of peace of the convening of a world disarmament conference has been pointed out by scientists and public figures from various countries who took part in an enlarged meeting of the Disarmament Committee of the World Peace Council. In their message to the twenty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly they urged the Assembly to adopt a decision on the specific questions connected with the preparation of a world conference on disarmament, which would provide an opportunity for wide-ranging discussion and for the preparation of a strategy for the implementation of practical measures to bring about disarmament.

24. As the general debate has shown, and as may be seen from the discussion now taking place, the idea of convening a world disarmament conference is widely supported by Members of the United Nations. All the representatives who have so far spoken have expressed themselves in favour of the conference. It has also been supported by non-members of the United Nations, including the peace-loving German workers' State, the German Democratic Republic. There has only been one sceptical statement in this connexion, from the United States Secretary of State, but we would like to hope that it will remain the only such statement and that the United States will adopt a more constructive position.

25. In conclusion, permit me to recall the words of the founder of the Soviet State, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who said: "An end to wars, peace among the nations, the cessation of pillaging and violence—such is our ideal . . ." <sup>1</sup>

26. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, guided by this Leninist ideal, considers that the convening of a world disarmament conference could make a substantial contribution to this noble cause and calls upon all delegations to support the initiative of the Soviet Union and approve the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Rwanda.

27. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Year after year, during the debates in the General Assembly, the politicians of the entire world and the representatives of the States Members of the United Nations come to this rostrum to explain the reasons why they are in favour of disarmament; year after year, too, the Secretary-General makes an appeal, which has recently become anguished and moving—an appeal to countries to put an end to the dizzying arms race, which is threatening to extinguish life on our planet. And every year, despite those appeals and expressions of good intentions, we receive ever more alarming reports which confirm the increase in the arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons and the increase up to intolerable extremes of expenditure for military purposes, which has now reached the astronomical figure of \$200,000 million a year.

28. The picture is discouraging. The world, careening towards its own destruction, appears to have reached the point of no return. Despite this, and despite the limited successes and the bitter frustrations known to our Organization, the Spanish delegation wishes to associate its voice with those who clamour for general and complete disarmament, under adequate international control, as the indispensable prerequisite for a lasting and universal peace based on justice, and my delegation would not do this were it not convinced that disarmament, in addition to being a desirable objective, is a task that is not only possible but necessary and urgent. It is true that our failures have been creating pronounced scepticism, owing perhaps to the fact that the item has been tackled too many times from the perspective of a doctrinaire and utopian pacifism, which all too often comes down to purely rhetorical approaches.

29. However there is another approach to the problem, which offers us a different perspective and gives us its true dimensions. That is the approach stemming from the fact that disarmament is a political reality which we shall of necessity have to face, requiring a will, a forum and machinery for negotiation, which in our opinion are also political.

30. Of those three prerequisites the most important, because it lies at the very foundations of negotiations, is the political will to disarm, which today, unfortunately, is completely lacking, particularly in those countries which have the largest arsenals, that is to say, the great nuclear Powers. Nuclear disarmament has become a dialogue of the deaf between the international community, which is calling for disarmament, and the nuclear Powers, which continue

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works* (Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1963), vol. 21, p. 293.

to rearm, relying on reasons of an alleged balance, when what is at stake are rather reasons affecting prestige or power: in other words, political reasons.

31. The atomic weapon, which the great Powers consider a necessity, is a monstrosity that has fallen on the earth, enslaving the economy, mortgaging political developments and creating conditions of suspicion and distrust which have made impossible a full measure of coexistence among the members of the international community, although such coexistence is essential if there is to be true peace. Apparently the world has learned to live with the atomic weapon, clinging to the mirage of the balance of terror as the only short-range salvation, and it has not known how—or has not wished—to take the political decision to come to grips openly with the problem of disarmament.

32. But coexistence with the atomic weapons, which has been imposed on us by the nuclear Powers, cannot and must not continue. There are no valid reasons for compelling the world to live under this permanent threat. The old political, ethical and legal systems are no longer capable of providing adequate answers to the problems created by nuclear weapons, nor can they any longer justify the intolerable existence of such weapons.

33. In the world of nuclear weapons in which we now live, the ethical justification of war is no longer possible, nor is the legal regulation of armed conflicts in which weapons of mass destruction are used. Nor would it be appropriate to revert to the old concept, which considered war an instrument of international politics. Ethics, the law and politics can offer but a single answer today to the challenge implicit in the nuclear weapon—disarmament.

34. The second prerequisite for disarmament is the existence of an adequate political forum that can serve as a framework for negotiation. The Spanish delegation considers that, without prejudice to the established collateral machinery or to any machinery that may be set up, such a forum already exists: our Organization. It is not that we are attempting to overestimate the capacity of the United Nations for action and decision, which calls for the co-operation of its Members, particularly those to which the Charter has assigned special powers and responsibilities; but we believe that disarmament cannot be achieved outside the framework of the world Organization. For disarmament, which is an essential component in building peace, must be the result of a collective undertaking, since peace itself has been transformed into a task for all, and because disarmament must progress side by side with the establishment of a system of collective security within the framework of the purposes and principles of the Charter and with a transformation of the unjust economic and social conditions under which the peoples in the developing countries live. In carrying out that co-ordinated task, no forum, in our opinion, can take the place of our Organization, the ultimate and supreme goal of which is peace.

35. Finally, as a third condition, disarmament requires an adequate political machinery to make possible its achievement. My delegation considers that the universality of this Organization and the necessity for collective participation in the task of disarmament are prior assumptions which call for setting up a political machine that will also be universal,

within the framework of our Organization, and this, in our opinion, would be a world disarmament conference. My delegation has already come out in favour of convening such a conference, which would make it possible to explore all the possibilities and utilize all the initiatives directed towards disarmament. Negotiations concerning disarmament which should crystallize in proposals and eventually in treaties that would incorporate commitments and concrete plans could be carried out very effectively within the framework of a world conference where such treaties could be negotiated by the same Powers that would later be called upon to subscribe to them. Moreover, the conference would provide a solemn and perhaps unique opportunity for all countries, large and small, to participate in the elaboration of a common philosophy and to help create a world public opinion in favour of disarmament. The non-aligned countries have declared this in the conferences held at Belgrade, Cairo and Lusaka,<sup>2</sup> and the United Nations, in General Assembly resolution 2030 (XX), in endorsing the proposal of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, recommended the convening of a world disarmament conference open to the participation of all States, so that all could make their voices heard on an item on which depends our own survival.

36. With respect to the appropriate channels through which to establish such a conference, its working methods and procedure for negotiation, my delegation considers that it may perhaps be premature to take a decision on these points now. Possibly, however, it might also be appropriate to take as our point of departure the ideas and initiatives that States themselves may submit, in order to thereby build up a body of ideas that could provide a solid foundation on which we could build in the future. In this sense, we have an exceptionally sympathetic attitude towards the suggestion by the delegation of Egypt [*1985th meeting*] that the Secretary-General be requested to ascertain the views of Governments and prepare a report to be examined at the next session of the Assembly.

37. Mr. CHIAO (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In its speech of 15 November [*1983rd meeting*], the delegation of the People's Republic of China made clear the Chinese Government's basic stand on the question of disarmament. Now I would like to make some remarks on the proposal of the Soviet delegation for convening a world disarmament conference.

38. In the first place, China has always been in favour of disarmament. But, in our opinion, it should not be said in a vague way that the question of disarmament is of paramount importance. It would not do to put the blame for the arms race on all countries, and it would not be correct indiscriminately to demand disarmament by all countries alike. The actual state of affairs at present is that imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism are continuing to pursue their policies of aggression and war, and that many Asian, African and Latin American countries and some medium and small countries are being subjected to threats and aggression. Those countries cannot but build and strengthen their own defence forces in order to prevent

<sup>2</sup> Conferences of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1961, at Cairo in October 1964 and at Lusaka in September 1970.

and resist foreign aggression, interference, subversion and control.

39. For instance, the peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia are engaged in a war against United States aggression and for national salvation; the Palestinian and other Arab peoples are engaged in a struggle for their right to national existence and for the recovery of their occupied territories; Guinea and some other African countries are engaged in struggles against the colonialists' armed aggression and threats of subversion; and the peoples of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea (Bissau), Zimbabwe, Azania and Namibia are engaged in struggles for national liberation against white colonialist rule and racial oppression. They have taken up arms simply because they are compelled to do so, and it is not at all a question of an arms race.

40. At present, the question of paramount importance to the peoples of those countries and regions is not, of course, disarmament, but the defence of national independence and sovereignty and the winning of the right to national existence. The idea that all countries must adopt measures for disarmament without distinguishing between the aggressors and the victims of aggression, and between those who threaten others and those who are threatened can only lead the question of disarmament into a wrong path and benefit imperialism.

41. Secondly, a quarter of a century has elapsed since the end of the Second World War. To date, the two super-Powers are still stationing ground, naval and air forces—well over a million—and have established thousands of military bases abroad. It is those super-Powers which have obstinately rejected the prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons, feverishly developing nuclear weapons and contending with each other for nuclear superiority; and they are doing this in order to press forward with their policies of blackmail, expansion, aggression and war. The threat to world peace and the security of the peoples of all countries originates precisely from those two super-Powers.

42. In these circumstances, it is entirely just for the peoples of the world and all peace-loving countries to demand that those two super-Powers withdraw to their own countries all their forces stationed abroad and dismantle all their military bases on foreign soil, and to demand the adoption of effective measures to prevent nuclear war. The General Assembly of the United Nations is in duty bound to take effective, and not perfunctory, earnest and not superficial, measures to satisfy these just demands and prevent the danger of a new world war, particularly of a nuclear war.

43. As early as 31 July 1963, the Chinese Government issued a statement advocating the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons, and proposing a conference of heads of government of all countries of the world to discuss this issue. In that statement the Chinese Government proposed the following:

“All countries in the world, both nuclear and non-nuclear, solemnly declare that they will prohibit and destroy nuclear weapons completely, thoroughly, totally and resolutely. Concretely speaking, they will not use nuclear weapons, nor export, nor import, nor manufac-

ture, nor test, nor stockpile them; and they will destroy all the existing nuclear weapons and their means of delivery in the world, and disband all the existing establishments for the research, testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons in the world.”

44. This proposal of the Chinese Government has received the support of many countries. Regrettably, however, the two nuclear Powers have thus far failed to make a positive response. Instead, since the 1960s the two nuclear Powers have concocted the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and so on. These agreements, which some people laud as intended for nuclear disarmament by accumulative means, are in essence a camouflage for their own nuclear arms expansion in the name of nuclear disarmament, a means for consolidating the nuclear monopoly of the two super-Powers and carrying out nuclear threats and nuclear blackmail against the Asian, African and Latin American countries as well as other medium and small countries. Their main idea is: “Only I can have nuclear weapons; you are not allowed to have nuclear weapons.” This is of course unreasonable. In the absence of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, it is impossible to expect the other countries, which are subjected to the threats of the two nuclear Powers, not to develop nuclear weapons for the purpose of self-defence.

45. Thirdly, in order to take the first step towards the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, one must grasp the key question and not be entangled in subsidiary issues. First and foremost, the countries possessing nuclear weapons should undertake the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other and, particularly, should undertake not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries or nuclear-free zones. It should not be difficult to undertake such obligations if one truly has the desire to avert a nuclear war and move towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. Many countries are now demanding the establishment of nuclear-free zones or peace zones. These are just demands, which China supports. However, truly to free these zones from the threat of nuclear war, it is necessary, first of all, for all the nuclear countries to guarantee that they will not use nuclear weapons against these countries and zones and will withdraw all their nuclear forces and dismantle all their nuclear bases and nuclear installations from these zones. Otherwise, it will be totally impossible to establish nuclear-free zones or peace zones, and the danger of nuclear war will still exist.

46. The two nuclear super-Powers have not only produced and stockpiled large quantities of nuclear weapons in their own countries but have also established nuclear bases on the territories of other countries; their planes carrying nuclear weapons fly in the air-space of other countries and their warships carrying nuclear weapons ply the oceans all over the world. This poses a grave menace to the security of the people of all countries. The Japanese people have had their own experience in this respect. Therefore, if the nuclear Powers truly do not have the intention to engage in nuclear threats and really want to achieve nuclear disarmament, they should dismantle all their nuclear bases abroad and withdraw all their nuclear weapons and means of delivery from abroad. Otherwise, how can you expect

people to believe that you have any desire for nuclear disarmament?

47. Fourthly, China is compelled to develop nuclear weapons because it is under the nuclear threat of the two super-Powers. We develop nuclear weapons solely for the purpose of self-defence and for breaking the super-Powers' nuclear monopoly and finally eliminating nuclear weapons. China's nuclear weapons are still in the experimental stage; the experiments are only carried out within the territory of our own country and are confined within necessary limits. China will never be a "super-Power" pursuing the policies of nuclear monopoly, nuclear threats and nuclear blackmail, neither today nor ever in the future.

48. On the occasion of China's first nuclear explosion, the Chinese Government solemnly declared to the whole world, and I reaffirmed in my speech of 15 November on behalf of the Chinese Government, that China would at no time and in no circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons. We always mean what we say. We stand for the thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war. But confronted with the danger of foreign aggression, including that of a sudden nuclear attack, the Chinese people cannot but intensify their preparations against war. Our preparations against war are entirely defensive in nature. Our consistent policy is: We will not attack unless we are attacked; if we are attacked, we will certainly counter-attack. We sincerely hope that an agreement can be reached on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. However, before the realization of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, we cannot give up the necessary self-defence.

49. Fifthly, the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, the prevention of nuclear war and the elimination of nuclear threats are matters affecting the peace and security of all countries of the world. On such issues of great importance, all the countries of the world, big or small, nuclear or non-nuclear, should have the same say; no handful of countries has the right to brush aside the majority of countries in the world and arbitrarily hold a conference to deliberate and make decisions on such matters. I hereby reaffirm once again on behalf of the Chinese Government that China will at no time agree to participate in the so-called nuclear disarmament talks among the nuclear Powers behind the backs of the non-nuclear countries. China has a few nuclear weapons, but she will never join the so-called club of nuclear Powers.

50. The Chinese Government has consistently stood for the convening of a world conference to discuss the question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. The convocation of such a conference must be truly conducive to nuclear disarmament and the reduction of nuclear war threats and must not be used to cover up nuclear arms expansion and increase the threat of nuclear war; it must help to push forward the struggle of the peace-loving people of the world for the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and not serve to lull and deceive them.

51. Such a conference must have a clear aim, that is, to discuss the question of complete prohibition and thorough

destruction of nuclear weapons, and as the first step, to reach a solemn agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons by all nuclear countries at any time and in any circumstances.

52. The Chinese Government also maintains that in order to realize the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which possess large quantities of nuclear weapons should, first of all, issue statements separately or jointly to openly undertake the obligation first, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and in any circumstances and not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries and against nuclear-free zones; and secondly, to dismantle all nuclear bases set up on the territories of other countries and withdraw all their nuclear armed forces and all nuclear weapons and means of delivery from abroad.

53. As for the level of the conference, we still hold that it should be attended by the heads of government of all countries, but we are also prepared to hear and consider different opinions. As to whether it should be convened inside or outside the United Nations, this question is open for discussion and consultation among all.

54. Sixthly, in the opinion of the Chinese delegation, the Soviet delegation's proposal for convening a world disarmament conference has neither set out a clear aim nor put forward practical steps for its attainment. If the Soviet proposal were to be acted upon, such a world disarmament conference would inevitably become a permanent club for endless discussions that would solve no substantive problems, which will result in perpetual arms expansion alongside perpetual disarmament talks. This is not in keeping with the desire of the people of all countries, and we cannot agree to it.

55. International disarmament talks have been going on for many years now, innumerable meetings have been held and innumerable declarations, statements and agreements have been published. The United Nations has passed a great number of resolutions. Although many Member States have favoured these resolutions out of good intentions and in the hope that they may give an impetus to disarmament, the hard facts are that these resolutions remain but empty papers that are utilized by the two super-Powers to hoodwink world opinion.

56. The Chinese delegation holds that we should sum up the historical experience of the past 20 years and more and draw the necessary conclusions. We should not allow the United Nations to become a tool for implementing the policies of certain big Powers. To meet their political needs at a given time, those Powers have resorted to various means in order to secure a majority for the adoption of some high-sounding draft resolutions. However, after the resolutions have been adopted, the super-Powers have continued and even intensified their arms expansion and war preparations. The result of this can only be that the greater the number of resolutions adopted, the lower will be the prestige of the United Nations.

57. The time has now come to change this inglorious situation. We should endeavour to make a new start. None

of us should act rashly and make hasty decisions on such a major problem as disarmament. We should consult each other fully and continue the discussions to find a way truly conducive to disarmament and avoid discussions that lead to no solutions or decisions that are not put into effect, for this can only further disappoint the people of the world.

58. Therefore, the Chinese delegation proposes that the Soviet draft resolution for convening a world disarmament conference not be put to a vote at this session of the General Assembly.

59. Mr. VINCI (Italy): It is, indeed, a good omen for the future—as stated by many previous speakers—that the question of convening a world disarmament conference is being discussed at a significant moment in the history of the United Nations, namely, when, the People's Republic of China having taken its rightful seat, new and wider prospects are hopefully being opened up to us towards real and effective disarmament and thus towards security and peace for all.

60. We have just heard the views and position of the Chinese delegation, as stated by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Chiao, and my delegation will not fail to study them carefully, as I am sure other delegations are also willing to do.

61. To build peace means, among other things, to work for disarmament and to commit ourselves to the pursuit of the best means to attain it. In this regard it seems to me that the debate on the Soviet proposal [A/8491], which is drawing to its end, is a positive response to our expectations. By focusing our attention on the main problems with which we are confronted it can prepare the ground for constructive action.

62. By proposing the convening of a world disarmament conference, draft resolution A/L.631 and Add.1, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Rwanda, points to the need to proceed along the path towards disarmament in conformity—in our view—with guidelines traced by the whole international community. It could not be otherwise, since disarmament concerns the destiny of mankind as a whole and not of a restricted number of Powers. We could not agree more with the view forcefully expressed on this point by so many delegations. And being fully aware of this main requirement, we certainly adhere to the basic purposes of the draft resolution, which are consistent with those contained in a previous resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority of this Assembly six years ago.

63. I refer to resolution 2030 (XX), which already indicated the expectations which a world disarmament conference raised among so many peoples. In our opinion, we are now close to a stage at which its convening could represent the crowning of all efforts undertaken in order to give meaningful content to the Disarmament Decade and to have a world-wide impact upon it.

64. The proposal has in fact been put forward at a moment when far-reaching changes are taking place on the international scene. It is true that the dangers of war are still hanging over us, especially in two sensitive areas of the

world. But elsewhere substantial progress may be seen in the move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation, to use President Nixon's words. I refer, of course, to the announced visit of the President of the United States to Peking, and later to Moscow, to the agreements on procedures to be followed in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), as well as the agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union on measures to reduce the risk of nuclear warfare and to improve direct communications<sup>3</sup>—all initiatives which we welcome wholeheartedly.

65. I wish to refer also and especially to Europe, where the earlier period of cold war has been replaced by a process of *détente*, which is most significantly epitomized by the plan for a conference on European security and co-operation. We look forward to this conference which, with the participation of the United States and Canada, should take up the essential problems of coexistence in Europe, respect for the territorial integrity of all States, the renunciation of the threat or use of force and the free movement of men and ideas.

66. We are convinced that a world conference could concurrently give a new impetus, from the psychological point of view as well, to the discussion on disarmament, provided the following three conditions are met: first, that the conference is properly prepared; secondly, that its preparation is carried out by a qualified and representative body, as provided for in resolution 2030 (XX), of 1965, fully respecting the principle of universality, which implies that no special role is entrusted to the nuclear-weapon Powers as such; thirdly, that interference in the work of the already existing negotiating bodies and forums—whose function the world conference cannot replace—is avoided.

67. We believe, as do many other delegations, that the conference on disarmament should be held under the auspices of the United Nations. Because of its structure, because of the long experience acquired by the Secretariat in the field of disarmament, the United Nations could ensure the success of the conference; it could, moreover, ensure for it the principle of universality which is congenial to its institutional functions and has been so significantly enhanced during this session by the presence in our midst of representatives of the People's Republic of China.

68. The problem of the specific goals which the world conference should pursue has been raised many times in the course of our debate. In our opinion, the definition of these aims could be closely considered in the preparatory phase of the conference. We would like, however, to underline that, as our Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Aldo Moro, pointed out in his speech in the general debate [1954th meeting], one fundamental goal should emerge from the Soviet proposal: general and complete disarmament.

69. This should be the main objective of the conference and at the same time an inspiring, basic idea behind the consultations leading to its convening. I hardly need to point out the great importance my delegation attaches to general and complete disarmament as a major factor for establishing a new and more humane international order

<sup>3</sup> Signed at Washington on 30 September 1970.

based on the principles of the Charter. The action by Italy in this Assembly and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is self-explanatory in this regard. In this connexion, I should like to thank my good friend Mr. Akwei, of Ghana, and other colleagues who have recalled our delegation's action. However, I cannot refrain from pointing out that, in spite of the guidelines set forth by various resolutions of the General Assembly—and I refer in particular to resolutions 2602 (XXIV) and 2661 (XXV)—no real progress has been achieved so far in gearing negotiations on disarmament to what should be their ultimate and fundamental goal. Because of a spirit of mistaken realism, which could be interpreted as a passive acceptance of old patterns of power policy, the objective of general and complete disarmament has been overshadowed as if it were a remote and unattainable ideal. This explains why the Conference has confined itself to negotiating partial and collateral measures.

70. May I make clear what I have in mind. We certainly appreciate and do not underestimate these measures. We should, however, accept them as isolated and fragmentary elements of a great design, which we seem unfortunately unable to complete because the necessary will and inspiration are lacking.

71. In other words, faced with the prospect of the dreadful catastrophes which might be produced by the increasing human control over the forces of nature if those forces are employed for purposes of warfare, we must adopt a global approach to the problems of disarmament in order to set up a new, lasting and just order.

72. The time is ripe for resuming our work on general and complete disarmament with a new impetus as one of the main targets of United Nations activity. The participation of China could provide an important impulse in that direction. I hope that a decision will be taken accordingly.

73. A practical global programme of disarmament can be worked out if we adopt an appropriate method for keeping a constant link between the final objective and the partial measures which can gradually be negotiated. We have suggested such a method by submitting to the General Assembly and to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament proposals for an organic programme of disarmament, which, while giving priority to nuclear disarmament, would lead to general and complete disarmament under the guarantee of effective control systems. The basic purpose of this programme is to define in a preliminary way the measures that can be implemented immediately and to trace at the same time the guidelines and principles that would inspire further measures in conformity with criteria to be applied to all the following stages of disarmament, without interrupting the present work in the various sectors.

74. Such a method, which we consider is still valid for the achievement of real progress towards general and complete disarmament, is based mainly on the concept of balance. This implies, first, the need to avoid any measure which might be prejudicial to the interests of some countries and advantageous to others; and secondly, the recognition of the links existing between the different measures. It is in the light of this concept that, in our opinion, the

interrelation between nuclear and conventional disarmament should be carefully considered.

75. As I have already mentioned, we acknowledge the priority of the measures aimed at halting the nuclear weapons race between the major nuclear weapons Powers. We are convinced, however, that nuclear and conventional disarmament should be dealt with, in a balanced manner and in the same context, in forums where both nuclear and non-nuclear States are represented.

76. In this connexion, I wish to refer to the statement made on 18 November in this hall by the representative of France. Mr. Kosciusko-Morizet said:

“... if the most serious danger is the atomic danger, it is because, over and above its power to annihilate the universe, the nuclear weapon possesses infinitely harmful political consequences. It crystallizes hegemonies. It consolidates the political division of the world. It encourages the endless prolongation of local conflicts in which conventional weapons are used.” [1989th meeting, para. 26.]

He went on to say in the same statement that “if true nuclear disarmament were to come about, measures for conventional disarmament would have to be drawn up and put into effect by many States to offset the imbalance which nuclear disarmament might involve.” [Ibid., para. 29.]

77. We certainly agree with these considerations. At the same time they strengthen our conviction that disarmament cannot be conceived as the sole interest of the nuclear-weapon States. It concerns the whole international community, first, because it is objectively and indissolubly linked with conventional disarmament; and secondly, because not only the nuclear-weapon States, but all nations which are affected by the existence of nuclear weapons and are in no position to avoid the frightful consequences of their use, are entitled to have their say when the issue is nuclear disarmament.

78. By applying the same concept of balance, an appropriate connexion between a global and regional approach should be maintained in the field of conventional disarmament. In this regard I wish to point out that we are participating, in the most constructive spirit, in the consultations which are under way for a mutual balanced reduction of military forces in Europe. We also believe, however, that regional disarmament measures, though contributing to the creation of a climate of *détente*, risk losing their effectiveness within a relatively short time if they remain restricted to a regional framework alone. In order to be really effective, regional measures should be accompanied at a certain stage by armament limitation measures (for example, ceilings on the level and types of arms and on the number of military units), measures which should also be applied to the most important military Powers, thus assuring the necessary balance in a global context. In this connexion, I would like to recall that, within the framework of an organic programme of disarmament, we have underlined the usefulness of carrying out appropriate studies in order to analyse the problems of conventional disarmament from its possible approaches,



global and regional, and I wish to express the hope that these studies may be soon undertaken within the framework of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

79. The need to maintain this link between nuclear and conventional disarmament, on the one hand, and between global and regional disarmament on the other, is in itself sufficient to justify a comprehensive approach to all problems of disarmament along the lines we have suggested. Permit me to say that only this comprehensive approach would allow a world conference to establish guidelines for action, aimed at assuring a systematic co-ordination of the activities under way in various international forums.

80. I have spoken of the objectives we have in mind. Let me now turn to the preparatory work for the conference and the intervening period. The preparation of a world conference, in order not to disappoint the expectations placed in it, demands from all of us an effort of continuous and effective co-operation. This will certainly require time.

81. Meanwhile, we have to assure a fruitful development of the negotiations which are being carried out in the various fields of disarmament and of armaments limitation. Keeping in mind the greater perspective of a world conference, we must pursue, step by step and with firm determination, the goals that can be attained in the more immediate future. We must above all maintain the existing bodies, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The positive, however limited, results achieved by this organ, in which Italy has had the privilege of participating for many years, proves how important its contribution is to the cause of disarmament. The draft treaties it has succeeded in producing unquestionably mark an important turning point in the evolution of the international community. We warmly hope that China and France will associate themselves with the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament so that it may yield more fruitful results and, we would hope, work for the success of the world conference, thus playing a major role in its preparation.

82. We are also confident that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will intensify its efforts to find adequate solutions to the serious and urgent problems which still remain unsolved. Without dealing with the items under discussion in the First Committee, I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to some of these problems.

83. The question of suspending nuclear underground tests in order to complete the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty of 1963<sup>4</sup> is still awaiting a solution. A number of proposals have been put forward in 1971 by many members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, including Italy, in order to tackle this problem in a constructive spirit: they prompt us to hope that more determined efforts will be made, particularly by the nuclear Powers, with a view to reaching final agreement.

84. Among the measures to be agreed upon in order to halt the nuclear weapons race, the cut-off of fissionable

materials for military purposes remains, in our opinion, of paramount importance.

85. In the field of chemical and bacteriological weapons, the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction [*A/8457, annex A*] constitutes a major event in the history of disarmament negotiations. It is in fact the first real measure of disarmament prepared by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament up to the present time. It is particularly satisfying for us to note that a number of suggestions submitted by our delegation have been incorporated in the text, although we cannot fail to remark that we should have preferred a more effective solution for the verification problem.

86. With regard to the prohibition of chemical weapons, I would like to express my heartfelt wish that the negotiations under way to reach an agreement may be pursued with renewed determination by all members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. More detailed views on these subjects will be expressed by my delegation in the First Committee.

87. Since Italy is exercising the chairmanship of the European Communities, may I, before concluding, be allowed to inform this Assembly that negotiations between the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency on the conclusion of a verification agreement under article III of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*] were opened at Vienna on 9 November. We believe that these negotiations may open encouraging prospects for the implementation of the non-proliferation Treaty as an instrument not only for the prevention of war but also for the building of peace. Its essential aim, in fact, is not only to avoid any risk of diverting fissionable materials to military purposes but also to transform nuclear energy into a source of economic and social progress for the benefit of all peoples and to give momentum to nuclear disarmament. Therefore there is a close connexion between article III and articles IV, V and VI of the non-proliferation Treaty, stressing specific responsibilities for both the nuclear and the non-nuclear Powers.

88. The example of the non-proliferation Treaty shows that an important link can be established between disarmament or weapons-control measures on the one hand, and the development of our society at a higher level of civilization and welfare on the other. We believe that this link can be assured on a more systematic basis.

89. Speaking before this Assembly on 22 October 1970, during the commemorative session of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Aldo Moro, stated:

“The twenty-fifth anniversary provides us with an opportunity to co-ordinate systematically the United Nations Disarmament Decade and the Second United Nations Development Decade, in such a way that the resources to be released as a result of agreements on reducing or limiting armaments can be devoted to the needs of the third world.

<sup>4</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

“If there is this kind of co-ordination, an international development strategy can be prepared to combine national efforts with international co-operation in order to raise more swiftly the living standards of the developing countries.” [1879th meeting, paras. 14 and 15.]

90. We are confident that these concepts—as well as the views and proposals of all those taking part in this debate—will be kept in mind during all discussions and consultations for the preparation of a world general conference on disarmament. There should be a joint effort of all peace-loving countries to make this conference the most significant event of the Disarmament Decade. We cannot do less if we wish to live up to the principles and purposes of the Charter and meet the expectations of all peoples throughout the world.

91. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil has accorded careful consideration to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation proposing the convening of a world disarmament conference [A/L.631 and Add.1].

92. My delegation, among others, has often advanced the opinion that the nuclear arms race is a central problem of our time and has expressed its concern at the fact that no effective steps have been taken so far to halt and reverse the accumulation and progressive sophistication of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, which are indeed the most important underlying causes of international tension and despair. The fear is thus kept alive that by some unfortunate quirk of fate the present trends towards a *détente* may yet suffer a reverse and mankind may be suddenly and inescapably confronted with an acute crisis, with its ominous nuclear implications.

93. For more than a year now, international life has been conspicuously marked by vigorous diplomatic efforts, which, justifiably or not, give rise to the hope that international tensions will at last be allowed to peter out and that the problems inherited from the immediate post-war period will finally be settled. However, there has been no truly significant progress in the field of negotiations on disarmament.

94. In the view of my delegation, therefore, the task now before us is quite clear. The international community should strive to profit fully from the momentum generated by recent moves towards international understanding and accommodation, and should redouble its joint endeavours towards disarmament. Within this framework, my delegation considers that the fact that the General Assembly decided to discuss once more the possibility of holding a world disarmament conference is a promising development. The General Assembly should evaluate such a possibility on its own merits, due attention being paid to the implications that the success or failure of a world conference might have not only in the field of disarmament but also in international life at large.

95. My delegation holds that a world conference could be an effective forum for a joint evaluation of the usefulness of collateral and non-armaments measures already agreed upon, for speeding up the sluggish pace of the disarmament negotiations and, we would hope, ushering in a new and more productive phase for the international community,

leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In addition, a world conference could draw up guidelines for the future work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time the possibility of achieving concrete results at that conference, in the form of agreements or conventions, should not be eliminated *a priori*.

96. Like any other large-scale international conference, a disarmament conference will require adequate political and technical preparation if its chances for success are to be maximized. In this connexion, my delegation welcomes the suggestion put forward by the delegation of Egypt that the General Assembly could “request the Secretary-General to obtain the opinions of all States on the modalities of the conference, particularly on questions related to its time, place, agenda, its level of representation, and its relationship with the United Nations”. [1985th meeting, para. 24.]

97. The current debate offers an opportunity for a preliminary review of those and other issues and for the adoption of a decision to pursue the active consideration of the question of convening a world conference. Final decisions on this matter will be possible after problems concerning the procedural aspects of the conference are settled and after the General Assembly is satisfied that the conference would be politically productive and technically feasible. In this context the General Assembly could at the appropriate time seek the assistance of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. As a body of the Assembly in which participation is open to all Member States, the Disarmament Commission would make available a forum where all preparatory work could be reviewed from a political standpoint, thus relieving the work-load of the General Assembly itself. Moreover, at a later stage the reconvening of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States could be envisaged so that it could work both as a preparatory body and as a sessional organ of the conference. My delegation believes that such a procedure could be of help in the negotiations among the non-nuclear-weapon States themselves and between them and the nuclear States.

98. I should perhaps make it clear that my delegation is of the opinion that a world conference should in no way adversely affect the work of either the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or the First Committee of the General Assembly. All care should be exercised in order to avoid steps that could weaken or by-pass the existing United Nations machinery in the field of disarmament. On the contrary, that machinery should be fully utilized in the preparation of a world conference. For instance, the Committee on Disarmament—as a body in which the main political trends in the field of disarmament are represented—could give some thought to the replies to the consultations that would be carried out by the Secretary-General. At an appropriate time that Committee on Disarmament could also play an important role in the preparation of a conference by providing it with comments, analyses and working papers.

99. Besides avoiding raising false hopes, a world conference should serve as a focus for current disarmament efforts and should in no way be utilized as a pretext for transforming the substantive disarmament debate into a discussion on how to go about disarmament negotiations.

100. One of the very attractive features of the proposal under consideration is that States would participate in this world conference on an equal footing. Procedures that could detract from this approach should therefore be avoided: more specifically, preparatory consultations among States or between the Secretary-General, on the one hand, and certain States, on the other, should follow in an objective manner the requirements of the negotiations. Therefore, from the beginning, the nuclear Powers should be treated as such, that is, as States possessing nuclear weapons. In the context of a world conference they should not be treated, for example, as permanent members of the Security Council, since that approach could give rise to questions as to their rights and prerogatives vis-à-vis other participating States.

101. My delegation is convinced that a disarmament conference could only be held under the auspices of the United Nations, and this not only for reasons involving the prestige of our Organization, reasons which have often been invoked in the course of the debates, but also, and more importantly, because this would be the only way to ensure that the proceedings of the conference and its possible results would conform strictly to the purposes and principles of the Charter, thus guaranteeing respect for certain political considerations dear to all Member States and particularly important for the medium-sized and small Powers. Moreover, a decision to that effect would facilitate the co-ordination of the preparatory and substantive work of a world conference with the existing United Nations machinery for disarmament.

102. Let me add forthwith that a decision to hold a world conference under the auspices of the United Nations would not necessarily prejudice another important issue, namely, that of whether or not such a conference should be open to the participation of all States. My delegation believes that participation of States in this as in other disarmament forums should be subject to the exigencies of the negotiations. We would be prepared to consider this matter again once a clearer picture of the agenda of the proposed meeting is available.

103. Finally, my delegation contends that it is still premature to take any stand on the possibility of having a conference meeting periodically. Let us allow the preparatory work to proceed; let us give priority to the consideration of more concrete and pressing questions raised by this item, and leave the issue of the periodical meetings to be dealt with in the future, when our work is more advanced than it is now.

104. These have been my preliminary comments on the present item, and I reserve the right of my delegation to intervene at a later stage on the occasion of the debates on a specific draft resolution on this matter.

105. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): Speaking on the agenda item concerning a world disarmament conference, I should like to reiterate at the outset, our growing concern about the ever-spiralling arms race. My delegation has already explained the Netherlands preoccupations in detail in the First Committee's general debate on disarmament [*1831st meeting*]. On that occasion we stated that the world should

not fall victim to a sense of euphoria resulting from some limited successes in the field of disarmament, but that we should not lose sight of the fact that the spread of arms, both horizontal and vertical, is getting worse instead of decreasing.

106. We are therefore in agreement with what is set out in the first operative paragraph of the Soviet draft resolution [*A/L.631 and Add.1*], in which the urgent necessity of intensifying our efforts is proclaimed. Our efforts should not be confined to reaching measures related to the cessation of the nuclear arms race. We should try to curb the conventional arms race as well.

107. Let me now comment on the idea of convening a world disarmament conference.

108. As other representatives have pointed out before me, it is a long time since the matter of a world disarmament conference was extensively discussed by the General Assembly. In fact, it was six years ago, and the discussion led to the adoption of resolution 2030 (XX) of 29 November 1965.

109. At that time, the Netherlands delegation expressed doubt whether a world conference of over a hundred States could act as a suitable negotiating body on concrete measures of disarmament. We also stated that in our view the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament—now called the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament—had to be considered as the most appropriate forum for the detailed discussion of problems of general disarmament and of partial measures.<sup>5</sup>

110. Notwithstanding our reservations with regard to the general idea of a world disarmament conference, we voted in favour of resolution 2030 (XX). We recognized that under certain well-defined conditions such a conference might serve a useful purpose by stimulating a general discussion on disarmament among the greatest possible number of participants.

111. Our participation in the work of the Committee on Disarmament since 1969 has strengthened our conviction that results in the field of disarmament can be achieved only through protracted and patient negotiations. The records are there to prove that this conviction is not without foundation. It took two years of strenuous negotiations to conclude the non-proliferation Treaty. The 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*] could be finalized only after two years of deliberations. Negotiations on a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and on their destruction started actively in 1969. The result of those negotiations is now, two years later, before the General Assembly.

112. For the reasons I have just explained, the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs stated in the course of

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, First Committee*, 1374th meeting, para. 29.

the general debate in the General Assembly on 1 October last:

“General and complete disarmament under adequate international control should remain our firm goal; but here, too, I should like to counsel modesty in order to achieve concrete progress. It has not been huge international gatherings, but the quiet and expert framework of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva that has made it possible to break the back of many highly technical and complex disarmament problems. For this reason the Netherlands Government attaches great value to the continuation of the proceedings of this negotiating forum. I express the hope that in a not too distant future all nuclear Powers will participate in the work of this Committee.” [1948th meeting, para. 123.]

113. We have been told by the supporters of a world disarmament conference and of the draft resolution in documents A/L.631 and Add.1 that the work of the Committee on Disarmament is to continue unhampered while preparations are made for a world disarmament conference. This reassurance has, indeed, been included in the draft resolution now under consideration. Operative paragraph 5 requests the Committee on Disarmament to make further efforts to work out measures for the curtailment of the arms race and for disarmament. Those measures would, according to the wording of paragraph 5, contribute to the success of the world disarmament conference.

114. We are grateful for that reassurance. We draw from it the conclusion that there is no misunderstanding among us on the value and importance of the Committee on Disarmament, in one form or another, as a negotiating forum. However, operative paragraph 5 of the draft before us highlights the question of the proper role of a world disarmament conference. The last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution seems to suggest that a world disarmament conference should be devoted to the elaboration of disarmament measures. Surely such an idea must be regarded as far too ambitious. Would it not be more realistic to suggest that a world disarmament conference should confine itself to the approval of disarmament measures that have been worked out carefully after due preparation? If that suggestion were adopted, the question why that role can no longer be assumed by the General Assembly seems justified. Have past practices really proved to be unsatisfactory, in the eyes of the sponsor?

115. If a world disarmament conference is to be held, however, it will be essential to prepare such a conference most carefully. Let us examine, for a moment, our experience in preparing a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. The first resolution on the question of the human environment [resolution 2398 (XXIII)] dates from 3 December 1968. At that time it was decided that the Conference would be convened in 1972. The Secretary-General was requested to submit a report on the preparations for the conference, with a possible date, location and agenda as well as the financial implications involved. In 1969 a Preparatory Committee was established. The Preparatory Committee reported to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and the latter requested the Secre-

tary-General to convene further sessions of the Preparatory Committee during 1971 [resolution 2657 (XXV)]; more preparatory work is to be done in 1972.

116. Another example of careful preparation of an international conference of great importance is laid down in resolution 2750 C (XXV) on the convening of a conference on the law of the sea in 1973. This resolution even allows for the possibility of postponing the conference if the General Assembly, at its twenty-seventh session, should determine the progress of the preparatory work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction to be insufficient.

117. In preparing a disarmament conference, agreement should be reached not only on the date and the agenda, as suggested in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution but also on the framework, participation, location, preparation, duration and financial implications for the participating States. Operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution mentions United Nations assistance in the convening of a conference. We believe such a limited role for the United Nations to be insufficient. It is our conviction that a world disarmament conference should, like the other international conferences I have just mentioned, be clearly placed in the framework of the United Nations machinery. The General Assembly should not detract from the main responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament matters. Such a detraction would be contrary to the solemn pledges made during the commemorative session last year, and indeed be at variance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. In our view, the United Nations framework for a disarmament conference could, if the General Assembly in due course so desired, easily be reconciled with the principle of universality, to which several delegations appear to attach great importance.

118. In conclusion, I should like to sum up my delegation's position.

119. First, the Netherlands delegation shares the profound concern of many others over the continuing arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race.

120. Secondly, a world disarmament conference might serve a useful purpose, if all militarily important States—and especially all nuclear-weapons States—were to participate in such a conference.

121. Thirdly, such a conference needs to be prepared carefully not only with regard to its timing and agenda, but also with regard to framework, participation, location, etc.

122. Fourthly, a world disarmament conference should be held within the framework of the United Nations, thus emphasizing the main responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

123. Fifthly, the preparation of a world disarmament conference should not hamper the work of the Committee on Disarmament, although the structure, composition and procedures of the latter might be readjusted.

124. The PRESIDENT: I have two more names on my list of speakers: Lebanon, on the matter under debate; and the

Soviet Union, in exercise of its right of reply. I call first on the representative of Lebanon.

125. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): The proposal advanced by the delegation of the Soviet Union to hold a world disarmament conference is indeed constructive and in accordance with the traditions of the Russians, who, although under a different political system, proposed the first multilateral Conferences on disarmament, the International Peace Conferences, held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907. It is also in agreement with the purposes and principles of the Charter and with past resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the subject of disarmament. Above all, it is in response to the will of peoples everywhere—a will which asserts itself against war and armaments and for peace and disarmament.

126. It is fitting to recall that the Washington Naval Conference of 1921 spoke of a 10-year “holiday”, and that the London Naval Conference of 1930 spoke of a five-year “holiday”. Although the objectives of the two Conferences were limited, we can notice that, instead of progress, there was a regression in the time of the “holiday”. Conversely, we speak today of the 1970s as the Disarmament Decade. It is our duty, therefore, to employ these 10 years to secure a “permanent holiday” from the dangers of armament for the peoples of the world. We might well use the well-known literary title of Ernest Hemingway’s, *A Farewell to Arms*.

127. The scope of the dangers of the arms race is elementary common knowledge. These dangers range from the killing of the single individual to the extermination of life itself on this planet. No one, anywhere, can escape the calamities of massive nuclear bombardment and radiation. It is the realization of the frightening possibility of wholesale annihilation that is destroying human values and leading man to despair. If we were to determine the principal cause of youth’s revolution in all of its social, moral, and political dimensions, we could not but recognize that the threat of a nuclear holocaust is at the root of their despair, unrest, and frustration. The insecurity which pervades the youth of the world is a reflection of its revolt against war and armament.

128. Today, we agree under the Charter—as was agreed even in the Pact of Paris of 1927—that war must be prohibited as an instrument of national policy. To prohibit war means prohibiting the means by which it is waged, halting the arms race, and reducing—and even destroying—the stockpiles of arms. Indeed, it means prohibiting their future production, use, stockpiling and distribution—especially in the case of weapons of mass destruction.

129. The objective of disarmament is therefore global, for what is to be achieved is international peace and security. It follows, then, that the international community must channel its forceful and uninterrupted efforts towards the fulfilment of that objective by encompassing the participation of all United Nations Members and others in this collective effort.

130. Often we are reminded of the progress that has been made in the last 12 years in the field of disarmament. Laudable resolutions have been passed by this Assembly, and several international agreements arrived at. It is not

necessary to enter into details on these matters; we need merely cite them as illustrations: the Antarctic Treaty;<sup>6</sup> resolution 1378 (XIV) of 20 November 1959 on general and complete disarmament; the outer space Treaty;<sup>7</sup> the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, of 1968; the sea-bed arms control Treaty of 1970; the Treaty of Tlateloco,<sup>8</sup> which declared Latin America as a nuclear-free zone; and the proposed convention now before the General Assembly on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons and of their destruction, and other collateral agreements.

131. We are all equally aware of the hopeful signs which characterize the present-day talks among the major Powers—especially between the two super-Powers. Such talks have resulted in a reduction of tensions, a promotion of international *détente*, a fostering of international co-operation, and an enhancement of the chances for broader international peace and security. In this area, we can cite the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks now proceeding in Vienna between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the proposed talks between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Warsaw Pact Governments on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe. The progress already achieved is indeed worthy of praise. In addition to their valuable intrinsic objectives, these agreements help to promote trust among the signatory Powers. They also encourage further steps towards disarmament. It is our duty to encourage the parties concerned to continue progressing along these lines, for the path they are following is the right one. Their efforts, if sustained, broadened and accelerated, may lead humanity to a brighter and more hopeful future. They do realize, however, as we all do, that the agreements already arrived at are limited in scope. They are generally recognized to be peripheral, partial, or collateral. They do not address themselves directly to the fundamental problem—that of general and complete disarmament. In fact, the various talks presently under way are equally insufficient and fall too far short of the desired objectives.

132. At present, we do not seem to lack the appropriate international legal system necessary for action. What is lacking is the will to move forward swiftly. We have at our disposal both the Charter and its executive vehicle—the United Nations. Moreover, the United Nations has become more representative than the League of Nations ever hoped to be. The participation of the People’s Republic of China in our deliberations will add more impetus to our future work. During its 25 years of existence, the United Nations has become better equipped to handle major problems, especially those of disarmament. To the Charter, it has added many resolutions, declarations, and legal instruments which have better elucidated and defined its purposes and principles, and which have reflected the growing will to forge ahead.

133. At this stage of historical development, all nations—large and small, powerful and weak—are becoming more

<sup>6</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 402 (1961), No. 5778.

<sup>7</sup> 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).

<sup>8</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

involved in the discussions of the problems of disarmament. They are participating more actively in the process of decision-making and in the implementation of United Nations resolutions. Furthermore, the joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations made by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1961<sup>9</sup> contain a provision calling for the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date on general and complete disarmament. Article 26 of the Charter calls for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments aimed at the maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. Resolution 2030 (XX) of 29 November 1965 called for the convening of a world disarmament conference. Resolution 2602 E (XXIV), of 16 December 1969, proclaimed the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade. Significantly this decade was to be concurrent with the Second United Nations Development Decade, a point that has often been emphasized.

134. Similarly, the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in 1964 and the third such conference, held at Lusaka in 1970, endorsed the proposal for holding an international conference on disarmament. Most recently, the ministerial consultative meeting of non-aligned nations, held in New York, further endorsed this proposal.

135. Proceeding from the considerations I have just advanced, my delegation supports the proposal for the holding of a world disarmament conference [*A/L.631 and Add.1*]. We consider that the United Nations provides the most suitable framework for preparing for and conducting such a conference, the objectives of which must be directly related to the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter and the decisions of which must be in harmony with the trends of thought which have already emerged and continue to emerge from our debates, and from the activities of the General Assembly and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Indeed, these two organs will have to keep playing a primordial role in the preparation of the agenda and the definition of exact objectives for the conference, and must also actively participate in the elaboration of proposed agreements concerning the various aspects of disarmament. For we must remember that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament remains, at the present time, the best forum for meaningful negotiations, although its structure may have to be reviewed.

136. We view a world disarmament conference not merely as a deliberative forum, but essentially as a decision-making body. Long discussions and unnecessary arguments can be reduced to the required minimum. The Secretary-General will be required to consult with the Member Governments and the next General Assembly will be called upon to review the outcome of their consultations. At that point, the date, location and agenda of the conference can be established. In the meantime, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, following further recommendations of the General Assembly, can devote a large measure of its attention to the necessary preparatory work.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 19, document A/4879.*

Furthermore, bilateral and multilateral consultations will be necessary among the principal military Powers in order to ensure the success of the conference.

137. My delegation, however, is deeply apprehensive about the notion that the conference may have to hold periodic meetings. It may then develop into a permanent deliberative body, thus perpetuating the existence of the armaments problem and consolidating the power of the powerful nations and condemning the weak to permanent impotence. We are at the threshold of the Disarmament Decade. At its conclusion, we must produce our balance sheet and show real profit and tangible progress. We realize that the task of the conference will be enormous—it must deal with the prohibition of the use of nuclear arms; the reduction and destruction of existing nuclear, chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons; the limitation of conventional arms and their progressive elimination. We can foresee that it will not be possible to attain our total and global goals by the end of this decade. But this should not deter us from accomplishing as much as possible in the time available to us. It therefore becomes imperative to set time-limits for concrete and constructive achievements. A conference with an unlimited time schedule will defeat its own purposes and will lead us into the wilderness of endless and protracted debates while the need is to accelerate the process of disarmament in order to remove the dangers of war that are forever hanging menacingly over mankind.

138. It follows, then, that we must pass through three definite stages—preparation for the conference, the achievement of substantial progress during the balance of this decade, and the conclusion of the unfinished business thereafter. During the next ten years, disarmament must go hand in hand with development. This is the objective of the United Nations and of mankind itself. We must stop squandering \$200,000 million annually for the production and deployment of arms, and must instead divert our resources to the promotion of progress in the world. The greatest threat to international peace and security resides in the unbridled arms race. To avert world catastrophe and enhance the prospects for peace, the United Nations must boldly seize the opportunity offered to it in order to realize through the world disarmament conference a comprehensive programme for complete and total disarmament.

139. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the exercise of his right of reply.

140. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot but express regret at the negative attitude towards the Soviet proposal for the convening of a world disarmament conference displayed in the statement made today from this rostrum by the head of the delegation of the People's Republic of China.

141. This has been the second voice of negativism raised against the Soviet proposal since the opening of the General Assembly on 21 September. The first was that of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers [*1950th meeting*]. Thus the Assembly has had the opportunity to hear the curious Sino-American duet of negativism with regard to the Soviet proposal for a world disarmament

conference. This duet struck a sharply discordant note by comparison with the statements of the overwhelming majority of delegations at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, both in the general debate and plenary discussions on the Soviet proposal for a conference, and in the First Committee, which has long been discussing a wide range of disarmament problems.

142. I could have passed over this duet. Let them sing to themselves against the Soviet proposal. But it is impossible to pass over the attempt in the Chinese representative's statement to distort the position of the Soviet Union on disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. We are not accustomed to remaining silent when our position is distorted and when we are slandered. In his speech today the representative of the Chinese People's Republic did all he could do to distort the position of the Soviet Union with regard to disarmament and, quite simply, to erase a fact which is known throughout the world.

143. I am one of the participants in the Soviet Union's long struggle for disarmament both within and outside the United Nations. The pointless attempts to distort and to cast aspersions on the position of the Soviet Union are in vain. It is clear how groundless such attempts are from the fact that, as early as 1946, when the People's Republic of China did not even exist, the Soviet Union was the first to propose here, in the United Nations, that atomic weapons should be outlawed forever and stockpiles of such weapons destroyed.

144. Although it possesses nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them, the Soviet Union has for many years and to this very day been persistently and consistently carrying on a lone struggle among the nuclear Powers for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen-based weapons, for a halt to their production, for the destruction of all stockpiles and the banning of tests of such weapons and for the scrapping of all military hardware.

145. In 1959 from this very rostrum, the rostrum of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union put forward a proposal for general and complete disarmament which met with the widest support among the nations of the world. The basis of the Soviet disarmament programme, its very key-stone, is the banning and complete destruction of all nuclear weapons and of all associated weapons delivery systems.

146. It is well known that the Soviet Government is also striving for the implementation of such measures for the limitation of the nuclear arms race as the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world and the dismantling of foreign military bases on alien soil. The Soviet Union has long since dismantled its bases on Chinese soil, as the Chinese delegation is well aware.

147. Recently, after the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which confirmed a programme for peace, security and co-operation among peoples, the Soviet Union proposed the convening of a conference of the five nuclear Powers: the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the People's Republic of China, France and the United Kingdom, to discuss the question of nuclear disarmament. Alone among the nuclear Powers which we contacted, France

supported this Soviet initiative. Another took a negative position, and then the two remaining Powers of the five hastened to explain that the convening of a conference of the five nuclear Powers in the circumstances then obtaining was an academic question.

148. Thus, the nuclear Power which rejected the Soviet proposal helped to cover up the unwillingness to co-operate of the other two nuclear Powers which for 26 years, both within and outside the United Nations, have opposed disarmament, opposed the ban on the use of nuclear weapons and opposed general and complete disarmament. It can hardly be doubted that both these Powers will warmly thank the Chinese representative for his statement today.

149. Finally, there was included in the General Assembly's present agenda an item proposed by the Soviet Union [A/8491] concerning a world disarmament conference which may turn out to be a crucial international event and give a new and powerful stimulus to disarmament negotiations. Everyone knows, and it is very clear to the Chinese representatives also, that during the 26 years since the war there has been no world conference on disarmament. Everything has been tried. The Soviet Union and its friends, the other socialist countries, Members of the United Nations and genuine proponents of disarmament have made every effort to secure results. Something has been achieved, but the achievement is small and ineffectual. Opposition from the forces of imperialism prevented us from reaching our goal. And now the statement made today from this rostrum by the Chinese representative to the effect that he is opposed to a vote on the Soviet proposal plays right into the hands of those imperialist forces who do not wish such a conference to be held. That is the true effect of the Chinese delegation's first steps in the United Nations. Can anyone say that the Soviet Union, in proposing all these measures and in carrying on in the United Nations a tireless principled struggle for disarmament, is prompted by self-interest and not by the interests of the entire socialist community, of all the peoples of the world? Can it be that what the delegation of the People's Republic of China termed in its statement the "nuclear monopoly", i.e. the possession by the Soviet Union of nuclear weapons, did not play what I have no hesitation in calling a decisive role in saving many countries, including the Soviet Union itself and the People's Republic of China, from becoming the object of imperialist nuclear aggression while giving them the opportunity to develop along the path of independence, prosperity and socialism?

150. That is the true position of the Soviet Union with regard to disarmament, those are the indisputable facts. Anyone who tries to deny these facts is either pretending not to know the Soviet Union's position or is deliberately distorting it for his own self-seeking ends.

151. Judging from the statement by Mr. Rogers, the United States of America has shown no enthusiasm for the Soviet proposal either. Mr. Rogers threw up a smoke-screen of scepticism, and the head of the Chinese delegation added clouds of negativism while distorting the Soviet Union's position. So now we have a duet, a duet of negativism, as I have said.

152. Thus the proposal of the Chinese delegation that there should be no vote at this session on the Soviet draft resolution concerning a world disarmament conference is the best possible present one could give to the imperialists who have been fighting for 26 years against disarmament.

153. We in the Soviet delegation are not surprised by the Chinese representative's statement. We have grown accustomed to this sort of thing. It is no secret that for many years the Chinese leaders have been seeking in every way to slander the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. Peking pours out a steady stream of slander and monstrous fabrications against the Soviet Union.

154. The Soviet Union, as I have already stated, adopted at the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union a programme of peace, international co-operation and emancipation of peoples. This programme received very wide support from all the progressive and peace-loving forces of the world. But the Chinese leaders, in pursuit of their own ultra-chauvinistic and supremacist goals and objectives, turn everything upside down. They deliberately pretend not to notice the goals which the Soviet Union successfully pursues in the international arena and at the United Nations, goals which are concerned with bolstering the national-liberation, anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist movement, promoting peace, strengthening the security of peoples and furthering the cause of disarmament, democracy and socialism.

155. Recently one special method employed by the Chinese leadership to continue its campaign of hostility against the Soviet Union has been tedious propaganda on the demagogic theme, which is entirely alien to Marxism-Leninism, of a struggle against two super-Powers. The term "super-Powers" has been borrowed from imperialist propaganda.

156. As was pointed out more than once before the arrival of the Chinese delegation in the United Nations, the division of the modern world is not a division of States into super- and non-super Powers. The only correct, scientific division is the distinction between socialism and imperialism, between progress and reaction, between the forces of peace and the forces of war. That is the socio-political division of the modern world. It is not the division in which the Chinese delegation would have us believe.

157. However, the Peking leaders and now their representatives in the United Nations, together with imperialist propaganda, have created and are persistently spreading their demagogic fable about two super-Powers, which they claim are settling the fate of the world behind the backs of all countries and all peoples. No one will believe this tale, no matter how hard people may try and no matter who may try to spread it about from this rostrum and others in the United Nations.

158. Recently they have shamefacedly transformed this formula. They are now hiding this myth behind the new formula, that of one or two super-Powers. This unfortunate repetition evokes ironic smiles among the delegates. Given time, the Chinese delegates, too, will be convinced of this.

159. The Soviet people, its Party and Government, together with all peace-loving peoples, have fought and will continue to fight these slanderous fabrications. History shows that a campaign of slander against the Leninist peace-loving policy of the world's first workers' and peasants' State, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, has been going on since the earliest days of its existence, since October 1917. However, such a policy has never won the victor's laurels for those who in the past and today have raised slander and anti-Sovietism to the status of a State policy. It has not won laurels for the Peking leaders either, and it will not bring them success here, in the United Nations.

160. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, speaking at the twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, stated:

"We resolutely reject the slanderous inventions concerning the policy of our Party and State which are being spread from Peking and instilled into the minds of the Chinese people. It is all the more absurd and harmful to sow dissent between China and the USSR considering that this is taking place in a situation in which the imperialists have been stepping up their aggressive actions against the freedom-loving peoples. More than ever before the situation demands cohesion and joint action by all the anti-imperialist, revolutionary forces, instead of fanning hostility between such States as the USSR and China."

161. That was and remains the fundamental policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet State towards the People's Republic of China.

162. Frankly, we expected, and we still hope that the Chinese representatives came to the United Nations as serious representatives of a serious State to work seriously with the delegations of all the peace-loving countries, including the delegation of the Soviet Union, for the purposes of strengthening peace and international security, for disarmament, for the development of fruitful co-operation on an equal footing between States in a joint struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism. However, their very first statement shows that they prefer to play in this Organization the role of those who bring joy and comfort to the imperialist forces. I am sure that all those who are able to understand current reality and who can honestly look truth in the face will realize that the Chinese leadership's policy of anti-Sovietism and the position expressed in the first and today's speeches by the delegation of the People's Republic of China are of benefit and use only to the imperialists, racists and colonialists, the enemies of peace, disarmament, democracy and friendship among peoples, the opponents of socialism and the socialist States. Such a policy brings joy to the hearts of the imperialists. For them it is a heaven-sent gift, and we do not have to go far to find examples.

163. Only recently, on 18 October, it was reported in the *Washington Post* that the commander of the United States armed forces in the Pacific, Admiral McCain, speaking to newsmen at the Pentagon, expressed great joy at the policy of Chinese leadership, which gave rise to differences of opinion and discord between the People's Republic of



China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This military-minded admiral, with the cynical candour of a militarist, expressed his enmity towards the Soviet Union and his joy at the dissension between the People's Republic of China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, by saying words to the following effect: "Thank God the communist Powers in Asia are not getting along together."

164. And on 11 November, the day of arrival at the United Nations of the delegation of the People's Republic of China, the New York newspaper the *Daily News*, which is well known for its permanent and unremitting hostility towards the Soviet Union, printed its advice and recommendations. Advice to whom? To the United States delegation, to Mr. Bush. What does this newspaper say? The United States delegation, advises the newspaper, should set Red China and Soviet Russia at each other's throats in the United Nations at every opportunity. This is the advice given by United States propaganda, by "almighty" propaganda, if I may use the term, to the United States delegation here in the United Nations. We shall see whether the United States delegation will follow this advice.

165. However, judging by the statements of the Chinese representative, he is following the very course that imperialist propaganda has long had in mind for him.

166. All this quite indisputably shows who gains from anti-Sovietism and slander against the Soviet Union. Who gains from dissension and discord between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China. The only ones to gain are the imperialists and the aggressors. Such open declarations as those of the United States admiral and the anti-Soviet tabloids speak for themselves. They plainly show who is helped and whose cause is served by those who have set themselves the goal of spreading slander and wild fabrications against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its peace-loving policy, a policy of friendship and co-operation between peoples with equal rights, which represents the salvation of mankind from the threat of calamitous thermonuclear war.

167. I am compelled to draw attention to the following fact. Both the first and today's statement from this rostrum by the Chinese representative were clearly at variance with the main points made in the telegram of greetings sent by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress and the State Council of the People's Republic of China to

the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the occasion of the fifty-fourth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, an anniversary which we celebrated only recently. In this congratulatory telegram, the need is stressed, and I quote: "... for supporting and developing normal relations between China and the Soviet Union. These," it is stated in the telegram, "are the common aspirations of the peoples of both our countries and are responsive to the essential interests of the peoples of the world".

168. It is not hard to see that the substance of the Chinese representative's statements from this rostrum conflicts with the declaration from the Chinese authorities which I have just quoted.

169. The question naturally arises of what the position of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations will really be with regard to the Soviet Union and its proposals. Will the delegation of the People's Republic of China act to support and develop normal relations between the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, not only elsewhere but in the United Nations system and in the struggle to achieve disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, or will the Chinese representatives use the United Nations for further anti-Soviet attacks to the advantage of the common enemy of the Soviet and the Chinese peoples and the peoples of the whole world, namely, imperialism.

170. The Soviet delegation would like to state formally to the Chinese representatives that the language of anti-Sovietism, of slander and ill-will is not appropriate in the United Nations. Only the business-like co-operation and the sincere efforts of all the States Members of the United Nations in the interests of the lofty goals of the United Nations Charter can lead to an increase in its effectiveness and assist in the strengthening of universal peace and security, in the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament and nuclear disarmament and in the development of friendship and co-operation between peoples. We are in favour of such co-operation. And the sooner the Chinese representatives understand this elementary truth, the better it will be for the cause of peace, for the United Nations and for they themselves.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*

