

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1218th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 13 December 1961,
at 8.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 20:</i>	
<i>The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (continued)</i>	289
<i>Agenda item 19:</i>	
<i>Question of disarmament (concluded)</i>	289
<i>Agenda item 20:</i>	
<i>The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (continued)</i>	293

Chairman: Mr. Mario AMADEO (Argentina).

AGENDA ITEM 20

The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/4900 and Add.1, A/C.1/858, A/C.1/859, A/C.1/860, A/C.1/861, A/C.1/862, A/C.1/L.302, A/C.1/L.303, A/C.1/L.304, A/C.1/L.305) (continued)

1. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America) announced that the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union had prepared a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.307) concerning the disarmament negotiating body. He therefore proposed that, in accordance with the decision taken at the 1207th meeting, the Committee should suspend discussion on the Korean question and take up the draft resolution, in order to conclude its consideration of the question of disarmament.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the United States proposal.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 19

Question of disarmament (A/4868 and Corr.1, A/4879, A/4880, A/4887, A/4891, A/4892, A/C.1/856, A/C.1/L.307) (concluded)*

3. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America) said that he was happy to present, jointly with the Soviet delegation, a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.307) which should pave the way for the resumption of negotiations on general and complete disarmament. After intensive consultations the United States and USSR delegations had reached, in accordance with the desire expressed by the General Assembly in its resolution 1660 (XVI), agreement on the composition of a negotiating body which they hoped would be acceptable.

4. The disarmament committee provided for in the draft resolution would have eight more members than

*Resumed from the 1208th meeting.

the former Ten-Nation Committee. The new members had been selected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. He believed that they would be able to make a substantial contribution to the work of the committee, and took pleasure in welcoming them on his delegation's behalf. He also hoped that all States would contribute to the solution of the problem through active participation in the work of the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly and, when negotiations were completed, in the final arrangements for conclusion of a general disarmament agreement.

5. The preamble of the draft resolution reflected the desire expressed by the General Assembly for the earliest possible attainment of general and complete disarmament, the goal it had set itself in resolution 1378 (XIV). Under Section I of the draft resolution, the Assembly would lend its support to the joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations worked out by the United States and the Soviet Union (A/4879) and would recommend that the negotiations should be based upon those principles, thus approving the framework within which negotiations on general and complete disarmament were to take place. Section II of the draft resolution would continue the relationship between the negotiating body and the United Nations which had served so well in the case of previous negotiations on disarmament and on the discontinuance of nuclear tests. The delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union were confident that the Secretariat would be able to provide the new disarmament committee with the same competent services as in the past. Operative paragraph 2 meant that the negotiating States should seek to achieve the widest possible agreement without delay and should continue their efforts without interruption until agreement upon the total programme had been reached. Thus the parties to the negotiations should strive not only for total agreement, but also for the adoption and implementation of whatever specific disarmament measures could be quickly applied. Operative paragraph 3 meant that the report submitted to the Disarmament Commission not later than 1 June 1962 would be the first of a series that would continue until the parties to the negotiations were able to present the final agreement to the General Assembly.

6. His delegation wished to draw attention to one fundamental point of difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. His delegation still maintained that verification should ensure not only that agreed reductions took place, but also that the remaining forces and armaments did not exceed agreed levels at any stage. In agreeing to delete a sentence to that effect from the joint statement of agreed principles, the United States had acted solely to facilitate the resumption of negotiations, on the understanding that that concession in no way changed its substantive position.

7. The United States was ready to resume negotiations as soon as all parties, particularly the new mem-

bers of the disarmament committee, were prepared to do so. The place for the negotiations had also to be agreed among the members of the committee. The United States delegation, for its part, considered Geneva wholly appropriate.

8. The agreement just reached by the United States and the Soviet Union was encouraging, and his delegation hoped that it would be followed by other, more far-reaching measures. However, it must not be forgotten that a gigantic task still lay ahead and that it was necessary, *inter alia*, to find ways and means of applying the agreed principles for disarmament, reconciling the remaining differences between the two disarmament programmes proposed, and determining how the disarmament committee should function. The United States Government, for its part, would strive to make the negotiations a success, would carefully consider any fair and reasonable proposal contributing to general and complete disarmament, and would itself submit proposals to that end. So long as there was any hope, however faint, for success, it would spare no effort to attain the goal.

9. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed with satisfaction that the parties had reached agreement on the principles which were to govern the disarmament negotiations and on the composition of the negotiating body. In the light of the prevailing international situation, the draft resolution submitted jointly by the United States and the USSR was of particular political significance. His delegation therefore hoped that the Committee and the General Assembly would adopt the proposal unanimously.

10. The negotiations would, of course, be complex; agreement had not been reached on some points, including the very important question of control. However, the right course was to emphasize not what divided the parties, but what united them. If all those participating in the negotiations genuinely desired it, the question of disarmament could be settled on a mutually acceptable basis, thus solving the essential problem in the abolition of war.

11. For its part, the Soviet Government was prepared, as in the past, to make every effort towards the implementation of a plan of general and complete disarmament; the programme submitted to the General Assembly at the fifteenth session by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR (A/4505) would have an important place in the new committee's deliberations. Needless to say, the Soviet delegation would work with all members of the committee, and particularly with the United States delegation, in seeking a basis for agreement with the help of all relevant data supplied by the United States Government and by other Governments. The USSR hoped that close collaboration would come into being among all members of the committee and was confident, in particular, that the eight new members, which represented different continents and belonged to no military blocs, would make a valuable contribution to the negotiations. In that connexion the Secretariat must take the necessary steps, as rapidly as possible, to facilitate the work of the whole committee and, in particular, to give the new members access to the essential data so that they might be fully informed without delay. In his delegation's view, the disarmament committee should begin work at the earliest possible date, though the date and place of the negotiations must of course be determined by all its members.

12. In the opinion of Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico), the fact that disarmament negotiations had been broken off several times should not be construed to reflect on their value. Every such endeavour represented progress toward the common goal of general and complete disarmament, and—as the only means of avoiding a nuclear conflagration—must be pursued perseveringly whatever the difficulties. That was why the General Assembly had again urged on the great Powers every possible effort to ensure that negotiations were resumed and carried through to the conclusion of the widest possible agreements at the earliest possible date. It was gratifying, therefore, that the United States and the Soviet Union had been able to complete their joint statement of agreed principles (A/4879) and had at last agreed on the composition of the disarmament committee. In their joint statement, the United States and the USSR said, among other things, that efforts should continue without interruption until agreement upon the total programme had been achieved and that progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. He hoped that those encouraging statements would be put into practice.

13. The Mexican delegation was glad that the United States of America and the Soviet Union, in accordance with the wish expressed by the General Assembly in resolution 1660 (XVI), had reached agreement on the one question which was still pending at the current session. The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.307) not only concluded the First Committee's consideration of the question of disarmament; it was also the starting point for the immense task which the new negotiating body was to undertake. He hoped that the Committee would show its appreciation by adopting the draft resolution unanimously. He therefore proposed that the Chairman should declare that the draft resolution was approved by acclamation.

14. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom) emphasized the very great importance of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.307). The agreement reached between the United States and the Soviet Union augured well for the future.

15. The fact that the Soviet representative had frankly acknowledged the difficulties of the task was to be welcomed, as it was always better to face up to difficulties. The United States representative had also referred to the difficult problem of the retained armed forces and armaments. However, despite such obstacles, a solution was possible and essential.

16. The United Kingdom would consider it a privilege to take part in the work of the new disarmament committee. Those countries which would also have liked to take part in its discussions should not feel slighted, since the effectiveness of the new committee would suffer if the membership were too large. Furthermore, the selection of the new members had been based as far as possible on an equitable geographical distribution. He hoped that the disarmament committee would be able to rely upon the goodwill of all countries which were not on it.

17. The discussions should start at the earliest practicable date, but obviously a good deal of preparatory work was required in view of the complexity of the task; and for that a few weeks would certainly be needed. The meeting-place should present no difficulty; Geneva would be eminently suitable.

18. The agreement reached on the disarmament committee was only a beginning and the road would be long and difficult, but with resolute effort the objectives should be attained.

19. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Argentina) welcomed the draft resolution submitted jointly by the United States and the Soviet Union. The agreement had already dissipated some of the fears which beset mankind.

20. He was particularly glad to see that the membership of the disarmament committee had been increased through the addition of new States, including Brazil and Mexico. They could be of particular value in helping to bring about compromise solutions. However, some comment was called for on the way in which the members of the committee had been chosen, as it might well set a precedent. The Argentine delegation regretted that the names of certain countries which had later been deleted from the list of members of the committee had been banded about, and even mentioned in official United Nations documents. Argentina had never aspired to membership of the disarmament committee; nor had it asked to be mentioned in the documents submitted by one of the negotiating countries. It was therefore highly displeased by what it regarded as a gratuitous lack of consideration. Furthermore, if there was any discriminatory intention of classifying countries in two categories, the "viable" and the "non-viable", it would reject such a division as being contrary to the Charter and to the mutual respect which the countries represented in the United Nations owed to each other. The delegation of Argentina would in future decline to agree to any arrangements based on exclusions of such a nature.

Mr. Enckell (Finland), Rapporteur, took the Chair.

21. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland) welcomed the agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, which confirmed the principles of the joint statement (A/4879) and represented a new step along the road to disarmament. The Polish delegation was convinced that the new committee would do valuable work and would be able to present to the Assembly the text of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control, thus giving concrete shape to the idea which had been initiated by the Soviet Union and approved by the General Assembly at its fourteenth session (resolution 1378 (XIV)). The Polish delegation was also convinced that the eight new members of the committee, with their experience, would contribute greatly to the success of the work.

22. It was true that there were still some obstacles to overcome. In view of the international tension, the constant arms race might make it difficult to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament. The Polish Government, for its part, would spare no effort to contribute to the success of the negotiations.

23. Mr. DAINELLI (Italy) said that his country had always considered that the best approach to disarmament was never to neglect any possibility of negotiations and agreement on specific issues. Such an approach might not produce an over-all solution immediately, but it should enable that goal to be reached gradually. Accordingly, the Italian delegation welcomed the agreement represented by the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.307). It followed logically that the First Committee should now press for the implementation of the principles set forth in the joint statement by instructing the new negotiating body to carry them into effect.

24. The agreement on principles had been made possible by the painstaking groundwork done by the Ten-Nation Committee. The addition of eight new members, chosen from different parts of the world, augured well for future world co-operation, which was essential for the implementation of any disarmament system. Other countries, too, would undoubtedly have been able to make a constructive contribution to the work of the disarmament committee. Italy, for its part, could only assure them that it would do everything possible to hasten the establishment of a world system. In the meantime, it hoped that all Member States would help the disarmament committee with their suggestions and support.

25. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) expressed his satisfaction at the joint submission of the draft resolution. He hoped that a programme of general and complete disarmament would be presented to the Assembly as soon as possible. The task would of course be difficult, as had already been seen at Geneva. In particular, the Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament had not enjoyed the benefit of the great current of opinion of the non-aligned countries. That gap had now fortunately been filled.

26. During the previous discussions, difficulties had arisen each time the negotiators had focussed their attention on initial or particular measures instead of considering the essential point, namely, general and complete disarmament. Similarly, in future, the work should not be compromised by those who endeavoured to make arms control a stumbling-block to prevent the attainment of disarmament.

27. The arms race was still going on, but certain statements had implicitly threatened difficulties and procrastination. His delegation stressed the necessity of acting swiftly and not unduly dragging out the negotiations. Bulgaria would contribute as much as it possible could to the speedy conclusion of an agreement.

28. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) congratulated the United States and the Soviet Union upon having come to an agreement on the composition of the negotiating committee. It had been on the initiative of the Indian delegation that the General Assembly had adopted resolution 1660 (XVI) urging those two countries to reach agreement on that point. He was also gratified to see that the members of the disarmament committee had been selected with due regard to geographical distribution. As Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Zorin had themselves stated, the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.307), following the joint statement of principles (A/4879), was only a good beginning, and it would be idle to believe that the negotiations would be easy. Nevertheless, the agreements that had been reached augured very well for the future. Responsibility for the follow-up would rest primarily on the great nuclear Powers, but there was no doubt that the other countries that would be represented in the committee would do everything they could to contribute to the success of the negotiations. India, for its part, was fully conscious of the honour that had been conferred on it, as well as of its own responsibilities, and would spare no effort.

29. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that the agreement that had been reached had sounded the hour of great hopes and of great responsibilities. While there was some reason to be optimistic, the risks were greater than ever, for the balance of terror could not be maintained indefinitely. The responsibility borne by the great Powers was thus a crushing one.

30. Section II of the draft resolution, under which the Assembly would endorse the decision that had been taken by common agreement on the composition of the disarmament committee, signified that the representatives of those countries were the agents of the General Assembly under an irrevocable mandate granting them full powers, but also charging them with full responsibilities for the performance of the mission with which they had been entrusted. It would thus be wrong, once the Committee's decision had been endorsed by the Assembly, to speak of a composition reflecting certain interests or certain political trends. His delegation expressed its sincere wishes for the accomplishment of the disarmament committee's difficult task. It welcomed the attitude of the United States and the Soviet Union, and had noted their encouraging statements.

Mr. Amadeo (Argentina) resumed the Chair.

31. Mr. RONAN (Ireland) congratulated the United States and the Soviet Union on having reached agreement regarding the composition of a new disarmament committee; he also congratulated the other members of that committee. In spite of its difficult task and its heavy responsibilities, he hoped that the committee would, in a spirit of mutual co-operation and understanding, be able to reach concrete agreements.

32. The disarmament committee might consider establishing a committee of experts to negotiate the agreement on preventing the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, called for in the recent resolution adopted by the General Assembly (resolution 1655 (XVI)), which his delegation considered to be an essential prerequisite to wider measures of general and complete disarmament.

33. He also felt that the draft resolution should be adopted by the Committee by acclamation.

34. Mr. BURNS (Canada) welcomed the agreement that had been reached on the conditions for resuming negotiations on general and complete disarmament. His Government would be happy to collaborate in that task with the eight States who were neither members of NATO nor parties to the Warsaw Treaty, and who represented the major geographical areas of the world. Fully conscious of its responsibility, the Canadian delegation to the disarmament committee would approach its task with humility, but also with determination to contribute to the adoption of concrete measures that would permit reason to triumph over mistrust and over the mistaken belief that the nuclear power of a country was sufficient to ensure its national security. In order to succeed, the disarmament committee would have to avoid all dogmatic rigidity and attempt to work in a sincere desire for mutual understanding.

35. Mr. IFEAGWU (Nigeria) joined the preceding speakers in congratulating the United States and the Soviet Union on their agreement to establish a new disarmament committee. That occurrence had furnished new proof that agreement between the two major Powers resulted in unanimous agreement of the other States. Disarmament was extremely important for the new States of Africa, who could not, if the arms race continued, get the international assistance they needed to press their development with success.

36. In spite of the limitations of its scientific and technical knowledge, Nigeria felt that it could play in the disarmament committee the role of an impartial observer, in order to prevent the two camps from clashing with each other, as in the past, and to pre-

serve the unanimity that had been manifested in the joint statement of agreed principles.

37. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Mexico had proposed that the draft resolution should be adopted by acclamation.

38. In the absence of any objection, therefore, he would declare the draft resolution submitted by the USSR and the United States (A/C.1/L.307) to be adopted unanimously and by acclamation.

It was so decided.

39. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the agreement that had been reached and the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution opened the way for serious negotiations on general and complete disarmament. It was to be assumed that problems which were closely linked to that question but had unfortunately not been satisfactorily solved would continue to be studied in a spirit of co-operation and progress, despite existing obstacles.

40. In that connexion, he recalled that, on the resumption of the Geneva negotiations on 28 November 1961, his Government had put forward some new and clear proposals on the question of nuclear tests. Those proposals related to the speedy conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space, with mutual control exercised by national means of detection; a moratorium would have been established with regard to underground tests, pending agreement on a system of control over such tests as part of an international control system within the framework of the programme of general and complete disarmament.

41. Those proposals had demonstrated the willingness of the Soviet Union to abandon the testing of nuclear weapons, and paved the way for an immediate agreement on the prohibition of tests. Regrettable, the Governments of the Western Powers had made a new attempt to divert the negotiations into a path which had already led to an "impasse". Moreover, the Government of the United States had indicated its intention to continue its tests, was already conducting underground tests and was preparing other tests in the atmosphere. The Government of the United Kingdom had refused to enter into any such commitment, and the French Government had also failed to express its willingness to discontinue testing.

42. In submitting new proposals for an early agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests of all kinds, and subsequently in its statement of 4 December 1961, the Soviet Government had warned that if any of the Western Powers conducted tests it would be forced, in order to ensure its security, to conduct whatever tests it might deem necessary to consolidate its defensive capacity. Apparently, contrary to the hopes entertained by the Soviet Government, the Western Powers were not yet ready to tread the path leading to an agreement, and the Soviet Government might consequently find itself compelled to conduct tests. Nevertheless, it would as hitherto pursue its efforts to achieve an agreement.

43. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) regretted that, immediately after the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution agreed on by the two delegations, the Soviet representative should have chosen to inject an element of controversy by making a statement which in any event seemed to be out of order.

44. All members of the Committee would recall that the United Kingdom and the United States had on 18 April 1961, at the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests, offered the complete text of a treaty which would have envisaged the outlawing of all nuclear tests, subject to international supervision. Unfortunately, at the very time when the Geneva conversations were taking place, the Soviet Union had seen fit to break the moratorium which the United States and the United Kingdom had scrupulously observed, and to conduct an intensive series of nuclear tests, releasing into the atmosphere far more radio-active debris than the sum total of all other previous testing. For the Soviet Union, after having so flagrantly violated its solemn word, to propose a new moratorium without either inspection or control, was merely a piece of meaningless propaganda, and a set-back to international negotiations. In order to further the cause of peace, both a nuclear test ban treaty and a treaty on general and complete disarmament, with effective international controls, were required.

45. The General Assembly, which had recently adopted by a strong majority resolution 1649 (XVI), calling for a nuclear test ban treaty with effective international controls, would certainly not be misled by the latest proposal of the Soviet Union.

46. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom) apologized for finding it necessary to reply to the extraordinary statement of the USSR representative. The facts were too well known to need elaboration, and the United Kingdom delegation would simply confine itself to rejecting completely the implications of the Soviet representative's statement. Despite its desire to make progress in the talks on nuclear testing, the United Kingdom was unable to accept the Soviet Union's rejection of all measures of international verification and control.

47. It was moreover highly regrettable that the Soviet delegation had found it necessary, by making so unrealistic and uncalled-for a statement, to drag the Committee back at a moment when its hopes had been raised by the adoption of a constructive proposal. He hoped that the statement would have no bearing on the

later discussions on the wider question of disarmament.

48. Mr. GEBRE-EGZÿ (Ethiopia) expressed his satisfaction that Ethiopia had been invited to be a member of the disarmament committee, and said that his Government would do its best to contribute to the solution of that important problem.

AGENDA ITEM 20

The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/4900 and Add.1, A/C.1/858, A/C.1/859, A/C.1/860, A/C.1/861, A/C.1/862, A/C.1/L.302, A/C.1/L.303, A/C.1/L.304, A/C.1/L.305) (continued)

49. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of agenda item 20, and indicated that the representative of the Republic of Korea had asked for the floor.

50. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee should not begin to consider the question before a reply had been received from the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to whom an invitation had been extended on that very day, pursuant to the resolution adopted by the Committee at the 1217th meeting. Consequently, it would be out of order to hear a statement by the representative of South Korea at that juncture.

51. The CHAIRMAN recalled that on that very morning the Committee had decided to invite the representative of the Republic of Korea, and, under certain conditions, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to take part in the discussion. The representative of the Republic of Korea was consequently authorized to speak.

52. Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 38 votes to 17, with 12 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.