

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1337th  
MEETING

Friday, 15 November 1963,  
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 26:</i>	
<i>Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.328 and Add.1-2 (continued) . . . . .</i>	131
<i>Agenda item 74:</i>	
<i>Denuclearization of Latin America (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate and consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 (continued) . . . . .</i>	131
<i>Agenda item 27:</i>	
<i>Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	
<i>General debate and consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.330 and Add.1 (continued) . . . . .</i>	133

*Chairman:* Mr. C.W.A. SCHURMANN  
(Netherlands).

## AGENDA ITEM 26

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/5408-DC/207, A/5488-DC/208, A/C.1/891 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.328 and Add.1-2) (continued)\*

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.1/L.328 AND ADD.1-2 (continued)

1. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria) requested a brief suspension of the meeting in order that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.328 and Add.1-2 might hold further consultations.

*The meeting was suspended at 10.40 a.m. and resumed at 11 a.m.*

2. The CHAIRMAN said he had been informed that a revised text of the draft resolution had been agreed upon and would be circulated as soon as possible; agenda item 26 would therefore be taken up again at the next meeting.

## AGENDA ITEM 74

Denuclearization of Latin America (A/5415/Rev.1, A/5447 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.329) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.1/L.329 (continued)

3. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) said that he would not repeat what the Paraguayan Minister for Foreign Affairs had said in his address to the General Assembly on 23 September 1963 (1212th plenary meeting) concerning the conditions which, in the view of his Government, must be satisfied by any arrangement for the denuclearization of Latin America. He wished to emphasize, however, that the present discussion in the First Committee represented only a preliminary stage in the efforts to denuclearize Latin America, and that the actual negotiations on a denuclearization agreement would have to take place within the framework of the Organization of American States and in accordance with the provisions of such regional agreements as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Rio de Janeiro on 2 September 1947; he noted, in that connexion, the reference to "regional agreements" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.329.

4. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

5. Mr. QUINTERO (Panama) said that the effort to denuclearize Latin America was in keeping with the General Assembly's policy of seeking agreement on less complex issues while working towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. He recalled in that connexion resolution 1653 (XVI), which declared the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons to be a direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and resolution 1665 (XVI), which called upon the nuclear Powers to refrain from relinquishing control of nuclear weapons or transmitting the information necessary for their manufacture to non-nuclear States. Although resolution 1665 (XVI) had been criticized because it in effect set the seal of approval on the so-called "nuclear club" and did not call upon the nuclear Powers to refrain from installing, storing or testing nuclear weapons in the territory of other States, he none the less felt that it had value as a precedent for draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 on the denuclearization of Latin America. At the same time, even greater importance should be attached to resolution 1653 (XVI), and to resolution 1652 (XVI) which called upon Member States to refrain from using the territory, territorial waters or air space of Africa for the testing, storing or transporting of nuclear weapons.

6. It was contended by some that any agreement concluded pursuant to the draft resolution under consideration would have only symbolic significance, since no Latin American country had nuclear weapons or was in a position to manufacture them in the foreseeable future. It must be borne in mind, however, that such an agreement would commit its signatories to refrain not only from manufacturing but also from acquiring, storing or testing nuclear weapons. The argument

\*Resumed from the 1335th meeting.

that the agreement would be rendered ineffective if any nuclear Power refused to recognize it was equally invalid, since the signatories would not require the permission of any outside Power in order to prohibit the installation, testing or storing of atomic weapons in their territories. Indeed, as the Mexican representative had pointed out, any individual State, however small, could bar nuclear weapons from its territory simply by enacting a law or issuing a decree.

7. It was held in some quarters that the Latin American countries would gain little security by denuclearizing their territory if there remained contiguous or neighbouring countries or territories under the jurisdiction of Powers not participating in the denuclearization agreement. Nevertheless, if the Latin American States declared themselves denuclearized, the non-Latin American Powers holding sovereignty over such territories, or exercising or claiming the exercise of some sort of jurisdiction over areas constituting an enclave in the national territory of certain Latin American States, would be under a much stronger moral obligation to refrain from establishing nuclear installations in those areas. Moreover, the Latin American States might try to induce non-Latin American Powers with territories, bases or jurisdictional concessions in the region to adhere to a multilateral Latin American denuclearization pact and undertake not to install or use atomic weapons in the areas concerned.

8. Panama was prepared to participate in any Latin American or inter-American conference—including a conference in which extra-regional Powers with territories or special interests in Latin America took part—organized in order to reach comprehensive regional agreements which, in turn, could form the basis for the ideal of the universal and permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons. The non-Latin American Powers participating would obviously have to be equally prepared to undertake the obligations assumed by the Latin American States. In that connexion, he could not understand the position of certain representatives who on the one hand insisted on the principle of unanimity and said that denuclearization of Latin America was not possible without the express consent of every State in the Latin American sub-continent, while saying on the other hand that a denuclearization agreement could be achieved only through the Organization of American States. Since some Latin American States were not members of that Organization and it was not known whether the new States of the region would adhere to it, such States would be unable to join in the unanimous consent if they could not participate in the conference at which the denuclearization agreement would be drawn up. He was likewise unable to understand the position of those representatives who held that the agreement on the denuclearization of Latin America should be reached through the Organization of American States and at the same time that it should contain provisions imposing legal obligations on all States having interests in the region.

9. His delegation shared the view, expressed by the Mexican representative (1333rd meeting), that the requirements for the denuclearization of each region were primarily the concern of the States of that region and that the representatives who had mentioned specific requirements had intended chiefly to state those which they considered indispensable for a possible denuclearization of their own regions. He felt, however,

that a number of the requirements which had been mentioned were met in the case of the present initiative for the denuclearization of Latin America. That initiative had come from Latin American countries; moreover, there existed at present no atomic installations in Latin America. As to adequate verification, although he could not speak for other Latin American States, Panama would consent to the adoption of the most effective system of inspection in every part of its national territory, provided that such inspection was not unilateral and was not used as a pretext for intervention or interference in the life of the country. His delegation also welcomed the idea of a total denuclearization of Latin America—viz., denuclearization of all the territory from the Rio Bravo to Cape Horn, of all the Latin American island States, of the new States of the Caribbean which had expressed a desire to join the Latin American group, and of all the nearby island territories which had not yet attained independence.

10. While his delegation welcomed the idea of unanimity or totality, it did not consider it an indispensable requirement: any State could unilaterally denuclearize its own territory or could enter into an international agreement with other States to such an end, by virtue of the sovereign equality of States.

11. Some persons had expressed doubts as to the competence of the United Nations to urge the States of any given region to "denuclearize". Any apprehensions on that score could, however, be set at rest not only by the moderate wording of the draft resolution but also by the statements of the Brazilian representative (1333rd meeting) and the Ecuadorian representative (1336th meeting). Those statements had made it clear that any action on the denuclearization of Latin America could be taken only by the Latin American States themselves, in assertion of their sovereign rights; the United Nations could only encourage States to implement the purposes and principles of the Charter, and recommend any agreement which could relieve international tension and help to prevent the spread of conflicts.

12. While draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 was merely procedural and the specific aspects and problems of denuclearization would be discussed at a special conference to be called for that purpose, he wished to make clear some of his country's aspirations with regard to denuclearization measures. Any undertaking by Latin American States "not to manufacture, receive, store or test nuclear weapons or nuclear launching devices" should be understood in the broadest sense; not only should the Latin American States refrain from such action, but they should also forbid any other State or organization to take such action in the territory under their sovereignty. Moreover, the expression "nuclear weapons or nuclear launching devices" should likewise be interpreted in a broad sense, prohibiting not only the use of deadly weapons but also any nuclear explosions or storage of radioactive materials which might contaminate the denuclearized areas, even if it was claimed that such explosions or storage had no military purpose.

13. Mr. OKILO (Nigeria) said that his delegation, which had already expressed its view in favour of nuclear-free zones, was always ready to support the creation of such zones wherever practicable and had warmly welcomed the initiative taken by five Latin American States in April 1963 towards declaring Latin America a denuclearized zone. While noting

with pleasure that that concept was making headway, even in quarters which had felt unable to support General Assembly resolution 1652 (XVI) on the denuclearization of Africa, Nigeria regretted that draft resolution A/C.1/L.329 omitted any reference to the last-named resolution, which represented a landmark and a useful precedent in the Assembly's discussion of the issue.

14. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) said that his country had always been faithful to the idea of the solidarity of the American continent, with its great spiritual values. The American Republics had learnt at an early stage that, if they wanted to avoid war, they must take as their motto: "Prevention is better than cure". They had therefore also learnt to give expression to their feeling of solidarity in the practical form of alliances and treaties based on the common heritage of American public and private law.

15. Faced with the nightmare of nuclear war, all mankind had a duty to put a stop to man's efforts at self-destruction. It was unquestionably that consideration which had impelled the Heads of State of five American Republics to issue their declaration calling for the denuclearization of Latin America (A/5415/Rev.1). The Haitian Government had hastened to respond to that invitation, which called for the mobilization of all the hemisphere's spiritual and moral forces in order to protect the American world from nuclear pollution. The details of how such denuclearization should be achieved would have to be worked out by a conference of American nations convened by the Organization of American States. In the meantime, the Committee could give to that undertaking the moral support of world opinion by voting in favour of the draft resolution before it.

16. Mr. BAGDELLEH (Tanganyika) said that he wished to reply briefly to charges which had been made at an earlier meeting (1335th meeting) by the representative of South Africa—and also, most regrettably, by the representative of the United States, a country with which his Government entertained very friendly relations—to the effect that his delegation had acted irresponsibly in repeating allegations made in the Fourth Committee by a petitioner whose sources were lacking in authority.

17. In view of the gravity of the matter, his delegation had made an inquiry and had found that the source on which the petitioner had relied was an article in The Washington Post of 1 October 1963 which, under the heading "U.S. Atom Test to be Made in S. Africa Mine", had referred to a nuclear experiment to be undertaken at a depth of more than 10,000 feet underground under the direction of South African and United States university professors, with the object of detecting a certain type of fundamental nuclear particle—the mu-meson.

18. On behalf of his delegation, he had already accepted the United States representative's assurance that the experiment was entirely unconnected with an atomic explosion. However, he wished to assure representatives that, should it be found that any United States newspaper on which he relied published unreliable and irresponsible articles or headlines, his delegation would have to hire U-2 aircraft in order to discover precisely what was going on in South Africa.

19. The matter had been reported to his Government, which would decide whether to lodge a formal protest in the light of that statement in a responsible United

States newspaper, or to seek common action with the other independent African States, pursuant to the resolution on disarmament adopted at the Summit Conference of Independent African States, held at Addis Ababa in May 1963, the text of which was annexed to the report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.<sup>1/</sup>

## AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons: report of the Secretary-General (A/5518, A/C.1/L.330 and Add.1) (continued)

### GENERAL DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A/C.1/L.330 AND ADD.1 (continued)

20. Mr. NGOKO (Cameroon) said that, although it had not so far taken part in the relevant debates, his delegation was fully aware of the vital importance of general and complete disarmament—with which all the items so far discussed were ultimately concerned—and was prepared to do everything in its power to assist in solving the problem. It wished to pay tribute to the Eighteen-Nation Committee for its endeavours in that field, and in particular to congratulate the non-aligned countries on the constructive role which they had played in that body. The fact that so far progress had been slow and the results achieved unsatisfactory was ascribable not to the Committee but to the complex and delicate nature of its task. His delegation had therefore fully supported draft resolution A/C.1/L.326 and Add.1 on the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests, and congratulated its sponsors. His country had also warmly welcomed the recent agreements to which the United States and the Soviet Union had been parties, and would support any further constructive proposals by those two States for collateral measures which would prepare the way to general and complete disarmament under international control.

21. The position of the Cameroonian Government and people on disarmament was well known and quite unequivocal. The Head of the Cameroonian State, Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, had been one of the thirty Heads of African States who had adopted the resolution on general and complete disarmament at the Summit Conference of Independent African States. In his address to the General Assembly on 17 October 1963 (1244th plenary meeting), Mr. Ahidjo had stressed that world peace was the supreme blessing and that the nuclear arms race had conclusively revealed the fatal flaw in the old argument that "he who wants peace prepares for war"; although the partial test ban treaty had shown that the major Powers fortunately seemed to have become aware of that flaw at the eleventh hour, it was only a beginning, and mankind could not rest until all nuclear testing—other than that for peaceful purposes—had been effectively banned and complete disarmament under proper control achieved. Referring to the immediate future, Mr. Ahidjo had urged that the proposals recently made by the United States, the Soviet Union and others should be studied in a positive spirit and that the Eighteen-Nation Committee should resume work as soon as possible.

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1963, document DC/208, annex 1, sect. G (ENDC/93/Rev.1).

22. Cameroon had been one of the twelve countries which by 17 September 1963 had replied to the circular note addressed to Member States on 8 February 1963 by the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1801 (XVII). That number was not large, but it was encouraging to see that all the replies favoured the principle of convening a conference for the signing of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for war purposes—although they differed as to the urgency of such a conference. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that all the replies had antedated the conclusion of the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water and the publication of the latest report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

23. The Cameroonian delegation shared the fear that such a conference might fail if it were convened prematurely. However, the happier turn which events had recently taken suggested that the time had now come to resume negotiations. The President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Khrushchev, had described the partial nuclear test ban as a first step towards the settlement of basic international problems and had called for further efforts to follow up that initial success. The time had therefore come to ask the Eighteen-Nation Committee to study, as a matter of urgency, the question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, and to report to the General Assembly at its nineteenth session.

24. Cameroon, a peace-loving country, had neither the means nor the ambition to own weapons of mass destruction and was utterly opposed to the use of force as a means of settling conflicts between States. It welcomed the great Powers' recognition that nuclear war was an absurdity, but would like the many words spoken on that subject to be followed up by deeds. It would therefore wholeheartedly support every effort made to banish war—conventional or nuclear—from the face of the earth. The settlement of disputes through negotiation, the formal condemnation of all aggression, general and complete disarmament under international control, and a happy and a prosperous world freed from the "nuclear umbrella"—such were Cameroon's objectives. That was why his country had been happy to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.330, which it hoped would be adopted unanimously by the Committee and by the General Assembly.

25. Mr. OKILO (Nigeria) said that his Government had already, in the Eighteen-Nation Committee, in the First Committee at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, and again at the 1325th meeting of the Committee, made clear its views on the item under discussion; it regarded such a convention as useful and would participate in any conference—in which he hoped that the essential co-operation of the nuclear Powers would be forthcoming—held with that aim in view.

26. In the circumstances, the best course would be to refer the question to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, as recommended in draft resolution A/C.1/L.330, which he hoped would be approved unanimously.

27. Mr. JOHNSON (Liberia) said that the debate in the Committee had clearly revealed the great desire to save mankind from the holocaust which would result

from the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons in the event of war. His delegation felt that the question of convening a conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of such destructive weapons should without any doubt be a matter of immediate concern to the United Nations, and that the body best suited to undertake a speedy and effective study of that subject was the Eighteen-Nation Committee. He therefore hoped that draft resolution A/C.1/L.330, of which his delegation was a sponsor, would receive the First Committee's unanimous support.

28. Mr. GAGLI (Togo) said that after the signing of the partial test ban treaty, the establishment of a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow, the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1884 (XVIII) calling upon all States to refrain from placing weapons of mass destruction in outer space, and the adoption by the First Committee of a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.326 and Add.1), requesting the Eighteen-Nation Committee to continue its negotiations to achieve the objectives set forth in the preamble of the partial test ban treaty, it appeared that good progress was being made on the problem of general and complete disarmament.

29. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 1653 (XVI), the Secretary-General had consulted the Governments of Member States in order to ascertain their views on the possibility of convening a special conference for the purpose of signing a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for war purposes. The Togolese Government had replied that it seemed preferable to postpone considering the calling of such a conference until the final results of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament had become known. While it was asserted by some that little or no positive result had been achieved by that Committee, the African States, including Togo, believed more in the power of discussion than in brute force for the settlement of conflicts. The various international meetings and conferences held since the end of the Second World War had probably prevented the outbreak of a third world war.

30. Togo, like all other countries, desired peace and security; it wanted the right to live without fear of destruction, a healthy existence for future generations, and a peaceful world in which the weak would be secure and the strong would be just.

31. While his delegation supported in principle the idea of convening a conference of the kind envisaged in resolution 1653 (XVI), it felt that careful preparation and some rethinking of the general problem of disarmament were essential to its success. Until now, discussions on disarmament had dealt with the symptoms rather than the causes of the problem. The answer was not a "nuclear umbrella" or a non-aggression pact. So long as rival military blocs like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Treaty Organization continued to exist and policies were based on mutual distrust and fear, no disarmament conference could accomplish anything of practical value.

32. If the proposed conference was to do more than duplicate the efforts of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, it must be held at the level of Heads of State or Government. His delegation supported the Soviet proposal for a top-level meeting of the Eighteen-Nation Committee, whose first task, however, should be the signing of an agreement

abolishing the present military blocs. Although the enhanced moral force of the United Nations resulting from the growing number of newly independent, non-aligned Member States made that objective seem feasible, it must be borne in mind that the Organization lacked the material means of enforcing its decisions. His delegation therefore shared the views expressed by the Indian representative (1321st meeting) concerning the need for a permanent United Nations peace

force. It felt that, before the proposed conference was convened, it was essential to create a basis for agreement—through negotiations on a bilateral basis and in the Eighteen-Nation Committee—on the establishment of such a peace force, the abolition of military blocs, and the signing of a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons for war purposes.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.