

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1510th  
MEETING**

Friday, 27 October 1967,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 91:	
Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (continued)	
General debate (continued) .....	1
Organization of work .....	11

**Chairman: Mr. Ismail FAHMY**  
(United Arab Republic).

**AGENDA ITEM 91**

**Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (continued) (A/6663, A/6676 and Add.1-4; A/C.1/946)**

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I too shall speak in Spanish. To make it clear why I do so I shall say that as the representative of a Latin country I choose to speak in one of the two official Latin languages. Furthermore, I want to pay a tribute to our Latin American friends and to the millions of Italians who are proud citizens of Latin American countries.

[The speaker continued in Spanish.]

2. As a prelude to my brief statement I should like in the name of the Italian delegation to join in the well-deserved tributes and congratulations offered by so many speakers to the Latin American Governments on the successful conclusion of a Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America [A/C.1/946]. Allow me also to associate myself with the words of admiration and appreciation addressed to the Chairman of the Mexican delegation, Mr. García Robles. No one could be better qualified than the man who from the outset has played the major role in this remarkable feat, to open this debate in so constructive a manner and to explain so lucidly not only the complex negotiations that led to the signing of the Tlatelolco Treaty<sup>1</sup> but also the significance and the implications of the Treaty's articles and protocols.

3. It is true, as the representative of Mexico pointed out in his statement, that the item before us is *sui generis*, in the sense that it is purely informative in character, since actually the great majority of countries represented here

<sup>1</sup> The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America was signed at Tlatelolco, Mexico City.

belong to other parts of the world and do not possess atomic weapons. At the same time, however, we believe that the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is an important step towards strengthening world peace and an outstanding example of co-operation to achieve a goal of general concern to practically every country in the world. For that reason the Italian Government is profoundly gratified that the Treaty has been signed. We likewise believe that the success of the countries of Latin America affects and enriches each and every one of us, since it points the way towards an objective—general and complete disarmament—in which every country has a deep-rooted interest.

4. The Italian Government is all the more gratified because of the traditional ties that bind the Latin American countries and Italy so strongly that events and feats in the former part of the world are felt equally by my country and my people.

5. I do not propose to comment in detail on the provisions of the Treaty concluded at Mexico City on 14 February 1967. The Italian delegation has on various occasions outlined the basic principles which in its view should govern any instrument designed to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. We shall no doubt have to reaffirm these principles in the forthcoming debates in this Committee on the various reports of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament; and I should like to express my delegation's conviction that these principles are admirably defined in the provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The text before us testifies to the age-old political wisdom and juridical experience of the Latin American nations, which have succeeded in adapting the traditional legal doctrines to the original new formulas drawn up to solve the problems emerging with the nuclear age.

6. The text of the Treaty shows clearly how the subjects related to nuclear problems can be tackled and solved in a new and imaginative fashion in keeping with the demands of the countries concerned and the political and strategic situations in a particular part of the world. For all these reasons we heartily welcome the conclusion of this Treaty, which we feel sure will contribute significantly to the solution of the problems raised by the appearance of nuclear weapons in world history. This is a milestone along the road to world peace and we are indebted to the Latin American countries for the valuable contribution they have made to our common and determined struggle for world peace.

7. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): On behalf of the delegation of Pakistan, I associate myself unreservedly with previous speakers in congratulating the countries of Latin America

on concluding the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Speaking at the 1584th meeting of the General Assembly on 10 October 1967, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan said:

**“In the context of disarmament, Pakistan cannot but pay tribute to the Latin American nations for the great example they have set by concluding in Mexico, early this year, the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. That Treaty constitutes an act of the highest statesmanship which deserves to be emulated in other regions.” [1584th plenary meeting, para. 140.]**

8. I wish now to amplify those remarks. In doing so, I am conscious of the fact that the present item on our agenda is purely informative and therefore not deliberative. This was emphasized by the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, at the outset of his masterly exposition the other day [1504th meeting]. All the same, the assumption is naturally that the very inception of this item and the consequent present discussion have the purpose of preparing a climate of opinion in which some of the complex issues of disarmament may be clarified and the example set by the Latin American countries may be emulated in other regions of the world. Hence it is not enough for us to felicitate the Latin American countries on an achievement which is undoubtedly in the best juridical traditions of Latin America and its attachment to the principles of peace. It is also our duty, as the signatories of the Treaty explain the significance and scope of its provisions in this world forum, to express our own thoughts. It is hardly necessary for me to dwell on the uniqueness of this Treaty. There are four special distinctions of the Treaty which were very cogently brought out by the representative of Mexico and the speakers who followed him.

9. First, it is the instrument which creates the first militarily denuclearized zone in an inhabited part of our planet, and that of a continental size.

10. Second, it establishes a model for a complete and comprehensive control system.

11. Third, in doing so it consolidates the international safeguard system of the Atomic Energy Agency.

12. Fourth, at the same time it takes care not to close the otherwise widening horizons of technological development in the sphere of nuclear energy.

13. But there is another distinction of the Treaty which cannot fail to make a deep impression on our minds, and particularly on us in Pakistan. It is that this Treaty is the first major instrument of disarmament whose conclusion is due entirely to the initiative of a group of States which possess no nuclear weapons and which are classified as developing countries. Since my Government has had the honour of sponsoring the proposal for a conference of non-nuclear-weapon States, we cannot but be encouraged by the fruitful results which are thus shown to be attainable by the smaller Powers when they are animated by a common resolve to retain—and I use the language of the Preamble to the Treaty—“the privileged situation” of having their territories “wholly free from nuclear weapons”. We are convinced that there are great opportunities before the smaller Powers, acting in concert, to insure

themselves against the atomic menace and at the same time to collaborate in developing nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Should these opportunities be neglected by us, we would not be justified in apportioning the entire blame for the sterility of the disarmament negotiations on the nuclear Powers.

14. The military denuclearization of Latin America through the conclusion of the Treaty is a signal example of how non-nuclear-weapon States can co-operate successfully among themselves to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This subject is one of the three main questions for consideration by the Conference of non-nuclear-weapon States to be held in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2153 B (XXI) adopted last year.

15. In this context, it is pertinent to note that the Preparatory Committee for the Conference established by that resolution has included in the proposed agenda for the Conference the establishment of nuclear-free zones. Such zones are envisaged both as a measure of co-operation among non-nuclear-weapon States to prevent proliferation and as a method for assuring their security. The concrete example set by Latin America will be of special interest, therefore, to the Conference.

16. My delegation attaches great importance to the definition of nuclear weapons given in article 5 of the Treaty and to the control system embodied in articles 12 to 16 and article 18, paragraphs 2 and 3. The provision of the Treaty in regard to the application of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to the nuclear activities of the parties by multilateral or bilateral agreement with the Agency establishes an important precedent. Moreover, it is significant that the Treaty not only applies the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards to the production of nuclear weapons but also devises its own control system to cover activities relating to the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

17. We note the prohibition contained in article 18 of the use of any device which has a group of characteristics that are appropriate for warlike purposes. We are aware of the considered opinion expressed by some nuclear Powers that at the present and at foreseeable future stages of technology any nuclear device meant for peaceful use will not be free from this group of characteristics. This would mean that article 18 would permit the carrying out of a peaceful nuclear explosion by the contracting parties themselves only if and when future advances in technology permitted the development of devices for peaceful explosions which were not susceptible of use for weapons purposes. On the other hand there is the view that, considering the comprehensive safeguards provided in article 18 of the Treaty, its provisions do not prohibit the utilization of nuclear devices for peaceful purposes. We hope that that difference will be reconciled. At any rate, we are impressed by the inspection provisions of article 18, which appear to be comprehensive and which, if strictly applied, will minimize, if not entirely eliminate, the danger of the diversion to military purposes of devices ostensibly meant for peaceful purposes. We note with keen interest the remark of the representative of Mexico that special care was exercised to avoid any attempts to test or manufacture nuclear weapons under the pretext of carrying out such explosions for peaceful

purposes. The Treaty may therefore open the way to reconciling the peaceful uses of nuclear energy with the objective of the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. In that respect also the Treaty will provide a point of departure for the discussions in the conference of non-nuclear-weapon States on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

18. Finally, it is of the greatest significance that the effective control system defined in the Treaty will have at its disposal a permanent supervisory organ. My delegation welcomes the formulation of a definition of obligations for the signatories, which are all non-nuclear Powers. That definition, as was pointed out by Mr. García Robles, is undoubtedly the most complete that has ever been drafted in any global or regional instrument. We hope that the definition will give to all non-nuclear countries a new perspective in which to view the question of the balance of rights and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers. It is well known that that is one of the questions which have impeded progress so far on the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty.

19. As we all take note of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and of resolution 2033 (XX) of the General Assembly, which endorses the declaration<sup>2</sup> of the Organization of African Unity on the denuclearization of Africa, the question naturally arises in our minds of what prevents other regions of the world, outside the territories of the nuclear Powers, from concluding similar instruments establishing militarily denuclearized zones. It so happens that every region has characteristics of its own, its special circumstances, and there is a great difference between one region and another in the cohesion and like-mindedness of its Member States, in its capacity to devise new legal frameworks, in its freedom from major intra-regional disputes, in the degree of involvement with the mutual relationship of the nuclear-weapon Powers, and in the attitudes of the larger countries within the region.

20. Speaking of the region in which my country is placed, Pakistan cannot but regret that various circumstances should have prevented our region so far from taking an initiative for denuclearization similar to that taken by the Latin American region. This is not the time or the place to discuss the circumstances, particularly the intra-regional disputes, which may be cited as obstacles to the co-operation and initiative necessary to establish nuclear-free zones.

21. I conclude by expressing the hope that the example of the Latin American countries will refresh the thinking among Member States of other regions and promote more active realization of their common interest in preventing a ruinous nuclear arms race.

22. Mr. NABWERA (Kenya): On behalf of the delegation of Kenya I should like to join previous speakers in congratulating the Latin American States on their foresight in concluding a treaty prohibiting the dissemination of nuclear weapons. The conclusion of the Treaty in Mexico City at the beginning of this year was a very important historical event. It emphasizes that man is beginning to

think seriously about the survival of the human race. Latin America has made a bold move at a time when mankind is troubled about its fate. We live in a world in which man's cruelty to man has become more and more menacing. There are thousands of people today who are losing their lives in ideological and racial conflicts. Competing ideologies, imperialism and racialism have become the greatest threat to the survival of mankind. It is the hope of my delegation, therefore, that the precedent of the Latin American States will be followed by other States, so that the nuclear-free zones of the world will continue to expand.

23. Africa is keenly interested in the establishment of a nuclear-free zone of its own. We believe that, instead of wasting our very limited economic resources on the manufacture of nuclear weapons or of other expensive weapons, more attention should be paid to the improvement of the life and welfare of our people. However, in the case of Africa the situation is made difficult by the very fact that in the southern part of our continent we have régimes which are hostile to friendly relations between States and to the welfare of all the people. I refer in particular to South Africa and Portugal and, now, the illegal régime in Rhodesia. It will be difficult to turn our continent into a nuclear-free zone if some of the major Western Powers continue to pour large quantities of arms into South Africa, Portugal under NATO and Rhodesia, with its illegal régime. This piling up of arms creates a situation of insecurity. The achievement of a nuclear-free zone in Africa must therefore be based on guaranteed security for all the African States.

24. At present the security of Africa is menaced by the existence of régimes based on white supremacy in the southern part of the continent, to which I have referred. The recent threats uttered by the Prime Minister of South Africa against the Republic of Zambia are a reminder of the very serious situation that is bound to face Africa for a long time to come. It is the hope of my delegation, therefore, that those who support and nurture the white supremacist régimes—and I am speaking particularly of some of the major Western Powers—will ponder the consequences of their actions.

25. I should now like to turn to the Latin American Treaty. If this Treaty is to succeed, the co-operation of the nuclear Powers will be necessary. My delegation would like to think that this co-operation will be forthcoming, for part of the trouble today is that the major Powers spend a great deal of their economic resources on the arms race and in the search for satellite States, especially in the developing world. Unless this endless search for client States is checked, the establishment of nuclear-free zones like the Latin American will be undermined and for a long time will remain a mockery. It is the hope of my delegation that the Latin American experiment will be allowed to mature so that mankind can learn from the experience of Latin America what should be done in the whole world. My delegation believes that the beginning which our Latin American friends have made is a step forward in the right direction towards general and complete disarmament. Once nuclear-free zones are established it should be possible to proceed to the next step. That will be the dismantling of foreign military bases in those countries where they are to be found today. To be able to do this, the security of every

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 105, document A/5975.

State in every continent must be guaranteed. It is in this way that ultimate security for the whole world can be assured.

26. Let me conclude by once again applauding and congratulating our Latin American friends for having taken the step they have taken. We believe that there is no limit to the amount of economic and social development that each country or continent could undertake. The richest States today still have pockets of poverty and the distribution of wealth in all countries still leaves a lot to be desired. As we applaud our Latin American friends, let us therefore turn to those areas of need.

27. Mr. RUDA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation is taking part in the debate on this item with the justifiable enthusiasm we feel seeing an undertaking of such singular importance for international peace and security brought before the United Nations and witnessing an effort of such tremendous political and human implications, inspired by the loftiest ideals of Latin America, discussed by the world community.

28. Argentina has always followed a definite line in regard to international disarmament, and its peace-loving tradition has always been manifest not only in the specific field of disarmament but in that of the legal principle of preventing the use of force from jeopardizing international peace and security. We firmly believe in the need for measures which will deliver us once and for all from the peril of war.

29. The words of His Holiness Pope Paul VI when he visited the Organization still ring in our ears:

“... let the weapons fall from your hands ... especially the terrible weapons modern science has given you.”<sup>3</sup>

30. The idea of establishing a denuclearized zone in Latin America was inspired from the very outset by our desire for peace; and for this reason Argentina, true to its historical tradition, has participated in the various stages of the achievement of such a zone with faith and in a constructive spirit.

31. In the specific field of nuclear disarmament, Argentina gave proof of its eagerness to contribute to the elimination of the atomic danger as long ago as 1959 in Washington, when it successfully proposed the inclusion in the Antarctic Treaty of an article prohibiting all nuclear testing and the elimination of radioactive waste in the region of Antarctica; again when we promptly subscribed to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, signed in Moscow in 1963; and more recently, when we acceded enthusiastically to the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space [*General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI), annex*] under one of the clauses of which the States parties to it pledge themselves not to place any object carrying nuclear weapons in orbit round the earth.

32. Thus Argentina has always been fully alive to the magnitude and the vital importance of the nuclear disarmament problem and has at all times tried to analyse it in the

light of the great ideals which inspire the peoples of Latin America and with a clear perception of the hard facts of the historical situation we are in today. For it must be stressed that the destiny of our peoples, the lives of millions of our compatriots and the security of our countries are very closely dependent on disarmament and in particular on the agreement reached at Mexico City.

33. I shall not discuss the background of the initiative for the denuclearization of Latin America since it is well known to all the members of this Committee. Moreover, only a few days ago [*1504th meeting*] the distinguished representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, with his habitual clarity gave us a very precise account of the four years of patient negotiations which have culminated in so encouraging a result.

34. Today my delegation would like merely to state here that the signing of the Treaty of Tlatelolco has turned out to be one of the most significant historic milestones in the task of avoiding the proliferation of nuclear weapons and ultimately in the great purpose of bringing about general and complete disarmament.

35. The Treaty has achieved the distinction of being the first international instrument on denuclearization, and we hope it will serve as an example to States in other parts of the globe so that they too may give proof of the universal desire for a world altogether free from the devastating nuclear weapon. Thus all will have contributed as far as they were able to ending the arms race, and especially the nuclear arms race, and ensuring the consolidation of international peace and security.

36. The Treaty which has been given so favourable a reception here in the Committee spells the harmonization of different approaches to problems of such importance as definition of territory, zone of application, entry into force, systems of verification and control, and possible uses of nuclear energy.

37. The Argentine Government attached particular importance to the inclusion in the text of clauses safeguarding the peaceful development of nuclear energy.

38. In signing the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America at Mexico City, in accordance with article 28, sub-paragraph 1, my Government expressed its

“satisfaction at the inclusion in this instrument of articles that permit the peaceful development of nuclear energy, and especially article 18 which recognizes the right of the Contracting Parties, by their own means or in association with third parties, to carry out explosions for peaceful purposes, including explosions which may call for the use of instruments similar to those used in atomic weapons.

“The Argentine Government feels that such provisions to ensure the use of nuclear energy are indispensable to the process of development in Latin America and therefore must constitute the fundamental pre-condition for the establishment of an acceptable balance of responsibilities and mutual obligations on the part of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers on the question of non-proliferation.”

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., Twentieth Session, 1347th plenary meeting, para. 37.

39. Thus the Treaty maintains the possibility of using the atom for peaceful purposes, allowing the parties both to perfect nuclear technology and to enjoy the independence they need for carrying out operations connected with their economic and social development.

40. The Argentine delegation trusts that once satisfactory agreements have been arrived at, all the Powers possessing nuclear weapons will give their full co-operation with a view to effective fulfilment of the peace goals which inspired the signatories to the Treaty, and thus see their way to signing Additional Protocol II.

41. We also look forward to the early signature of Additional Protocol I by those continental or extra-continental States "having *de jure* or *de facto* international responsibility for territories situated in the zone of application of the Treaty".

42. My delegation would further like to recall to the Committee resolution 20 (IV) adopted unanimously by the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America and relating to territories subject to litigation or dispute. The resolution appears in the Final Act of the fourth session of the Preparatory Commission which approved the Treaty, and it is reproduced in document A/6663 issued several months ago at the request of the delegation of Mexico.

43. In resolution 20 (IV) the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America resolved to recognize the right of the Latin American States to represent territories involved, partially or totally, prior to the signing of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, in litigation or dispute between an extra-continental country and one or more Latin American States.

44. Thus exceptional importance was attached to the problem of those territories—which demonstrates the solidarity of Latin America on this question.

45. In Mexico the delegation of Argentina expressed its pleasure at the adoption of resolution 20 (IV), which aptly reflected the words of wisdom engraved in marble on the Mexican Foreign Office: "Respect for the rights of others signifies peace."

46. In conclusion I should like to refer specifically to the farsightedness and perseverance of Mr. García Robles in the negotiations connected with the preparation and signature of the Treaty. His services to the cause of international peace are a source of pride not only to Mexico but also to the Latin American community as a whole and to my Government in particular.

47. Mr. PARTHASARATHI (India): The item of the agenda under consideration has been brought forward in document A/6676 by the representatives of twenty-one Latin American States, signatories to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, in order to explain in the forum of the world Organization the significance and scope of the provisions of the Treaty as recommended in resolution 22 (IV) of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America.

48. We have listened with deep interest to the statements made on this item by the representatives of the Latin American Republics, particularly the comprehensive and lucid statement made by Ambassador García Robles in introducing the item to the Committee [*1504th meeting*] and the two statements of the delegation of Brazil [*1505th and 1508th meetings*].

49. There has always been widespread sympathy and support for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America and for the efforts made by the Latin Americans towards that end. No wonder then that the achievement of an acceptable Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America has evoked appreciation and congratulations from the membership of this Committee. My delegation would like to join other delegations in congratulating the Latin American delegations on their outstanding success in concluding this Treaty. We would particularly like to offer our felicitations to Ambassador García Robles for his dedicated and untiring efforts and skilful and tactful handling of the negotiations resulting in the conclusion of the Treaty.

50. India has from the beginning welcomed the efforts of the Latin American delegations in their endeavours to prepare a Treaty on this subject. India voted for General Assembly resolution 1911 (XVIII) on the Denuclearization of Latin America, as it voted, in the same spirit of understanding, for resolution 1652 (XVI) on the Consideration of Africa as a Denuclearized Zone and resolution 2033 (XX), on the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. India participated in the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America by sending an observer.

51. The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, in the words of our Secretary-General "... marks an important milestone in the long and difficult search for disarmament . . . . It provides . . . for the creation, for the first time in history, of a nuclear free zone for an inhabited portion of the earth", as quoted in a Press release dated 13 February 1967.

52. The Indian delegation expresses its profound gratification at this achievement. The Treaty, in our view, should help in the reduction of international tension. We hope that the conclusion of this Treaty will encourage the nuclear Powers to make serious efforts to work towards general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. As the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania stated,

"peace and security in our planet does not become any less threatened by unilateral measures, however positive, of the non-nuclear Powers" [*1507th meeting, para. 131*].

53. The Indian delegation welcomes the reference made in the preamble of the Treaty to the principle of an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations between the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers as contained in resolution 2028 (XX), because India attaches particular importance to the principles enunciated in that resolution.

54. We were happy to note the statement made by the representative of Mexico in which he said:

"To sum up, the provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, interpreted

in the light of the provisions of articles 1 and 5, with which they are expressly linked in the text of article 18 itself, do not permit of any interpretation that could give grounds for fearing either that they would leave a loophole for evading the absolute prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America, or that they could become an obstacle to the carrying out of such explosions.” [1504th meeting, para. 138.]

55. The Ambassador of Ghana, in his statement, said:

“Another interesting feature of the Treaty which is of great importance to us is that, while it prohibits the use of nuclear energy for military purposes, it provides for the use of nuclear energy for economic development.” [1506th meeting, para. 36.]

56. We would particularly like to recall the statement of the representative of Brazil in which he brought to the attention of the Committee the contents of the Brazilian note delivered to the Mexican Government on 8 May last. It states:

“It is the understanding of the Brazilian Government that the aforementioned article 18 allows the signatory States to carry out with their own means, or in association with third parties, nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, including explosions which may involve devices similar to those used in nuclear weapons.” [1508th meeting, para. 36.]

We are most gratified at the explanation given by the Brazilian delegation, and congratulate them on their clear position on this aspect of the Treaty.

57. It is the view of my delegation that the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, including the development of peaceful nuclear explosive devices, should not be prohibited by any treaty. Nuclear energy plays a decisive role in the mobilization of resources for economic and peaceful development. It must be utilized in every form, including the explosives that make possible not only great civil engineering projects, but also an ever-increasing variety of applications that may prove essential to speeding up the progress of our people. To India, this is a matter of vital importance. As a developing country India feels a pressing need for the continuing and steady development of nuclear science and technology for raising the economic standards of its millions of people. We do not deny that the technology involved in the production of a nuclear weapon is the same as the technology which produces a peaceful explosive device. But it should not mean that only the poor and developing nations should be denied all technology for fear that they may use it for military purposes. There could be international regulation under a non-discriminatory and universal system of safeguards to ensure that no country manufactures or stockpiles nuclear weapons while undertaking research and development of peaceful nuclear explosives.

58. Many Latin American delegations have spoken on the question of guarantees to be given by the nuclear Powers. The representative of Chile stated that:

“In order to ensure this [the full implementation of the Latin American Treaty], it is essential that other countries, morally and politically involved in the undertaking, do not wash their hands of this instrument. The prospect

of a future general agreement is not a valid argument for going slow with endorsement and support for a regional document already existing, complete, and effective.” [1506th meeting, para. 24.]

The obligations of the nuclear Powers in this respect are of paramount importance to the success of the Treaty, and we welcome the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, made at the 1508th meeting, in which he announced his Government’s decision to accede to the Protocols.

59. Before concluding, I should like to draw the Committee’s attention to article 30 of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which envisages that the Treaty shall be of a permanent nature and shall remain in force indefinitely, but that any party may denounce it by notifying the General Secretary of the Agency if, in the opinion of the denouncing State, there have arisen or may arise circumstances connected with the content of the Treaty or of the Additional Protocols I and II attached thereto which affect its supreme interests or the peace and security of one or more contracting parties. My delegation considers that this withdrawal clause in the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is a great improvement on other documents on arms control and disarmament.

60. Mr. PHRYDAS (Greece): Taking the floor for the first time in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself and the Greek delegation with the congratulations extended to you by previous speakers. The words of appreciation and esteem that have been spoken with reference to your personality and your qualities fully echo the impressions which my delegation has gained from its association with you in common work during the last years.

61. I wish, in addition, to congratulate Ambassador Tchernouchchenko and Mr. Örn on their election to the posts of Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, respectively, of this Committee.

62. It would hardly have been necessary to intervene in this debate in order to manifest joy and satisfaction at the conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. There can be no peace-loving State which would not rejoice at this achievement, and there can be no observer of international affairs who would not admire the foresight, the tenacity and the resolve of the States of Latin America which decided to make and achieved a break-through in a most difficult situation which exists not only because of the complexities of the problem of disarmament but also because of the divergencies of view on fundamental aspects of that problem.

63. If we take the floor, it is not only in order to express our appreciation of the efforts made by the Latin American States and of their achievement, but also to spell out some thoughts on the prospects for similar arrangements in the more general set-up of disarmament.

64. It is to the credit of the statesmen of Latin America that they undertook to take advantage of certain fundamental conditions which existed in their area and which could form the basis for an arrangement like the one we are hailing here now. The primary importance of the existence

of those conditions on the continent of Latin America in no way diminishes the importance of another factor which contributed to the conclusion of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, namely, the political will of the States of this continent. For there could have been no result whatsoever without the concurrence of both of these elements. This makes the document of Tlatelolco not simply an expression of romantic sentimentality, but an instrument of real usefulness for the security, economic development and progress of the continent.

65. The Greek delegation welcomes this Treaty and wishes that other like treaties, based on similarly solid foundations, could be concluded in other continents. But no service would be rendered to the cause of peace and security in the world if the concrete conditions prevailing in a given area were not thoroughly considered, and if the requirements resulting from them were not met, in setting up a similar arrangement elsewhere.

66. There is a difference between denuclearizing a vast continent and denuclearizing a small region. There is a difference between providing for the nuclear disarmament of a region situated far from the centre of confrontation of important groups of States, and providing for the nuclear disarmament of a region which is situated on the borderline of confrontation. There is a difference between a situation in which the existing balance of power will remain, and a situation in which the existing balance of power will be upset.

67. Disregarding these thoughts and trying to work out regional arrangements which would not be based on a real balance of power and solid safeguards would be a disservice to the cause of peace and security in the world. It would be a disservice to peace and security if in small regions denuclearization were undertaken without simultaneous measures of general disarmament in both the nuclear and conventional fields.

68. My delegation has put forward these few considerations in the hope that they may contribute to a better understanding of the possibilities and limitations which may exist for other areas of the world to take up the Latin American example and try to ban nuclear weapons in their turn. We feel that the importance of the undertaking of the Latin American States lies equally in the document which they have worked out and in the example they have set by establishing amongst themselves an atmosphere of trust and confidence in which they were able to work out practical solutions to most difficult problems.

69. We share the hope and the wish expressed in this Committee that this most important contribution of the Latin American region will further pave the way to a universal disarmament and to constant peace.

70. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): The delegation of Ceylon would like to associate itself with all those countries that have with unqualified approbation greeted the conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. With that illuminating clarity that distinguishes Latin thought and expression the representative of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles, has explained the provisions of the Treaty and the philosophy

that inspired it. Rarely has any action by a Member country or a group of Member countries evoked such wide, sincere, spontaneous and well-merited acclamation. The countries of Latin America have set an example which we hope will be emulated in other parts of the world until the fear of nuclear devastation is erased from our minds.

71. The Treaty demonstrates the sense of realism that pervades the Latin American policy and the capacity of Latin America for effective and positive co-operation in a highly contentious sphere. By concluding this Treaty the countries of Latin America have provided convincing proof of their genuine dedication to the cause of disarmament.

72. The Treaty, however, represents an act of renunciation on the part of Latin America alone. It will not exhaust the possibilities of nuclear intrusion for military purposes into the Latin American region until the Additional Protocols receive the requisite accessions. And here we should like to state that in addition to the architects and signatories of the Treaty to whom we today pay a tribute, we should also take into account the practical support that the Treaty has received from outside the area.

73. The Government of the United Kingdom, which does not receive many bouquets these days, deserves to be congratulated on being the first nuclear Power to announce its intention of signing Additional Protocols I and II of the Treaty under which it agrees to observe the provisions of articles 1, 3, 5 and 13 of the Treaty in territories for which it is internationally responsible and which lie within the area of application of the Treaty. The fact that it, like any other party to the Treaty, would be free to denounce it does not in the least diminish the value and significance of its adherence to the Treaty. If the existence of the right to denounce the Treaty is to be construed as invalidating the accession to it or limiting the value of such accession, we would have no international treaties at all in this world.

74. Those nuclear Powers which are in the happy position of not having to accede to Protocol I because they have no territories within the area of application of the Treaty and for which they are internationally responsible deserve congratulations for another reason that is not relevant to the purposes and substance of the Treaty, namely, that they have not in the past pursued policies in this region which would have invested them with international responsibility for any territories in the area. Protocol II provides them with an admirable opportunity of showing their devotion to the cause of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

75. In conclusion, may we say that we hope that this Treaty is a happy augury of the future trend of our efforts towards outlawing nuclear weapons and the realization of the still distant dream of general and complete disarmament.

76. Mr. BERARD (France) (*translated from French*): I would be loath to prolong the Committee's discussions, which are proceeding so satisfactorily, and I shall confine myself to a few words; my Government merely wishes to stress the importance and sympathy with which it views the matter we are discussing today.

77. When, just over a year ago, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America was instructed to approach the States having possession and the nuclear Powers with a view to ascertaining their position with regard to the denuclearization of Latin America, France was, I believe, the first to make its position known.

78. France stated that it would favour any attempt to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, provided such an attempt was inspired by the desire of the interested countries themselves.

79. Today, when those efforts have borne fruit and the Tlatelolco Treaty is a reality, the French Government expresses its satisfaction at witnessing the realization of the hopes with which it was associated very early on, and reiterates its sympathetic attitude towards the Latin American States that have succeeded in their undertaking. Thus it is most fitting that we should add our own to the many warm tributes already paid to the efforts of the Latin American countries, and in particular to the outstanding abilities of the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, Mr. García Robles, to whom my Government takes pleasure in paying special homage.

80. My delegation wishes to state that the French Government is studying with the greatest attention the political and legal implications of the texts submitted to it for signature. It is too soon, perhaps, to forecast the outcome of that study, but I am authorized to state that the message which France sent last year to the Mexican representative, who was kind enough to recall its contents recently and to describe them as positive in character, will continue to govern France's attitude.

81. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The item before us is a source of particular gratification on a matter of no little significance. The conclusion of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America marks an important first step in the effort to prevent the further proliferation of such weapons, and in the over-all aim to contain the nuclear danger.

82. We are grateful to the Deputy Foreign Minister of Mexico, Ambassador García Robles, for his lucid exposition of the Treaty and the background of its negotiation.

83. My delegation wishes to express appreciation of the meaning and purport of this Treaty and to pay tribute to the Latin American countries for their signal achievement in its conclusion.

84. The denuclearization of their sub-continent not only serves the interests of the people concerned but also, and more broadly, the cause of world peace and security.

85. Acknowledgement is due to Mexico for its persistent and painstaking efforts in the exercise of its diplomacy, to make the Treaty a reality.

86. This is a pioneer work of particular importance in the field of disarmament. As distinct from two other related Treaties—the Antarctic Treaty 1959 and the Treaty on outer space 1967, the Latin American Treaty is the first to

prohibit nuclear weapons in a populated area represented in the United Nations by twenty-one Member States. It is a bold step against the spread of nuclear weapons and represents pioneer work in the field of disarmament. It carries a strong reminder of the imperative need to halt the arms race in its frenetic course towards self-annihilation.

87. The Latin American countries have demonstrated their will to turn away from armaments and apply their resources to a better purpose—that of economic development. It is an example which, in its broader implications, should be followed by all countries and particularly the less developed countries. In a nuclear age national defence through armaments is growing unrealistic. In our present age heavily armed nations can hardly be considered as affording greater security to their citizens than other countries, but rather the reverse. Military expenditures on a large scale are increasingly becoming unnecessary and even harmful to the very purpose for which they are intended, namely the protection of peace and freedom in the country and the area concerned.

88. This is the message that is brought to the world by the courageous initiative and great accomplishment of the Latin American Treaty we are now discussing. It should mark the beginning of redoubled effort towards disarmament and, for the Latin American countries, a bright period of leadership in peace and intensive progress, by increasingly diverting their resources from military expenditure to economic development, which is so necessary for the peaceful progress of the area.

89. The Latin American peoples, by a distinctive blend of western civilization and anti-colonialist spirit and tradition and by their dedication to law and to freedom, have a special role to play in the cause of world order and peace.

90. A group of almost entirely homogeneous countries with an impressive voting power in the General Assembly can be of almost decisive influence at the present critical juncture of world developments. But the Latin American countries which are signatories to the Treaty should be assisted by other States, and particularly the nuclear Powers, by signing the protocol and by showing respect not only for the expressed terms of the Treaty, but also—and more importantly—for its intrinsic purpose and its essential aims.

91. In this respect we wish to warmly congratulate the United Kingdom for the intimation of its promptness to sign the Protocol. We hope that the other nuclear Powers will do the same.

92. The example of Latin America must be followed by Africa and the Middle East, which should also become denuclearized zones in the course of time. My delegation would lay particular emphasis on the Middle East, where a long-existing crisis is perilously developing and which constitutes now the gravest threat to world peace. It is particularly in this area where nuclear weapons should be prohibited.

93. As far as my little country is concerned, our firm resolve is not to receive in our territory nuclear weapons, nor to allow such weapons to be placed or stored on the soil of our island.



94. It is indeed time that all the peoples of the world should be awakened to the rapidly-growing threat of global destruction from the continuously spiralling arms race. Let the Latin American Treaty be a strong and effective reminder of this reality.

95. The precise and effective provisions of the Treaty regarding control and verification could well serve as a model for other disarmament agreements. Furthermore, the co-operation with the International Atomic Energy Agency provided for in the Treaty ensures an international safeguard system.

96. The Treaty, whilst preventing any nuclear explosions in the area, in no way interferes with the right to develop and apply nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The sincere co-operation of all States outside the region will, we hope, be willingly forthcoming so that the success and effectiveness of this Treaty may be fully assured and the Latin American countries deservedly encouraged in their commendable efforts towards world peace.

97. Mr. ARCHIBALD (Trinidad and Tobago): This being the first occasion on which my delegation has had the honour to address the Committee, may I take the opportunity to express our congratulations to you, Mr. Chairman, on your election to the Chair. Your record is known to all of us, and the particular familiarity which you possess of the problems before the Committee will surely assist you in performing your onerous duties to the full satisfaction of everyone.

98. May I also through you, Sir, express my delegation's pleasure at the elections of the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, in whom, because of their records and personalities, we place our complete confidence.

99. Trinidad and Tobago is one of the signatories of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. It was indeed one of our early undertakings, as an independent country, to participate in the discussions which resulted in the formulation of this supremely important agreement—supremely important not only for Latin America but also for the future, we dare hope, of all mankind.

100. It did seem to us when we first joined in the discussions, that Latin America, because of its own ancient traditions, its long experience in world affairs and the well-known role it has played in the United Nations since the beginning, was peculiarly well fitted to produce a treaty for a regional proscription of nuclear weapons, which could serve as a model for others embarking on a similar enterprise. We believe that, with all its human deficiencies, this indeed is what has been achieved by the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and we gladly join in noting, by this name, the birth-place of the accord.

101. It is not our intention today to discuss in detail the terms of the Treaty, but we do wish to emphasize that we understand its purpose as being to ban for ever the presence of nuclear weapons, and to maintain a close control on any potential ancillary thereof, from the Treaty zone.

102. In this connexion, we cannot avoid expressing our regret that our sister country of Guyana does not have the

option of signing the Treaty for certain reasons. We are obliged to point out that the omission of such a Territory within our geographical region must represent a weakness in our general provision for security against the nuclear threat.

103. My delegation has observed with pleasure the widespread welcome which has been given to the Tlatelolco agreement. Its central importance to the urgent task upon which the world is now engaged, in the first instance to put an end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, then to abolish them, and subsequently to proceed to general and complete disarmament, has been given its proper recognition, and this recognition provides new hope for the future.

104. Particularly noteworthy is the reception which the Treaty gained when its contents were made known to the members of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva earlier this year. May we conclude from this that the Latin American success has been greeted in most parts of the world not in a spirit of envy but with a desire to emulate it, with the aspiration to go and do likewise whenever this may become possible?

105. We wish to make particular mention of the provisions which deal with control and verification because we are of the opinion that it is here that the Treaty may well offer a significant contribution to nuclear arms limitation and the problem of progressive disarmament.

106. The point has already been made that the provision for the application of the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency by multilateral or bilateral agreement with the Agency has within it the seed of profitable expansion of the system of international safeguards, and my delegation supports that view. We also wish to add our support to the view that the Latin American Treaty, like all other measures seeking to limit nuclear weapon activities, is not intended to prolong a situation which gives a special privilege to any one or more countries. We see all agreements of this kind as a contribution to the final objective of general disarmament, with the twofold aim of freeing the world from the fear of destruction and using the emancipated resources to liberate our peoples from the misery and want which has been the lot of so large a majority of mankind since human history began.

107. My delegation is sanguine that those Governments to which particular reference is made in the Additional Protocols are aware of the contribution which it is in their power to make towards the attainment of the goals for which the Treaty is designed. Their practical co-operation would set the seal on our endeavours.

108. Thus, the statement made yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom that his Government is willing to sign the Additional Protocols in its capacities as a nuclear Power and as a Government with international responsibilities in the area, is to be most warmly welcomed.

109. It only remains for me to say that my delegation is indeed proud to have had a direct role in the negotiations and we take this opportunity to extend our deep appreciation to those five Latin American countries whose vision and courage first opened for us the road to the achievement of the Tlatelolco Treaty.

110. We should also like to pay tribute to our fellow negotiators. We hope it will not be considered invidious if we make particular reference to the distinguished leader of the Mexican delegation, who perhaps bore the heaviest personal burden of all.

111. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom in exercise of his right of reply.

112. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): We listened with great attention and expectancy to the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union [1509th meeting] to see how his Government would respond to the appeal to sign Additional Protocol II of the Treaty. He made it clear that his Government had postponed its decision on this matter. Such a policy is, of course, the sovereign right of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but I regret that—apparently to justify the negative nature of his statement—the representative of the Soviet Union saw fit to try to belittle the positive approach of my Government in agreeing to sign both Protocols and to question its sincerity. We are very willing to leave it to the countries of Latin America to make up their own minds on the sincerity of my Government's approach, and have no doubt about their judgement in this matter.

113. I must express my gratitude to the many representatives who have helped to maintain the freshness of what my friend, the representative of Ceylon, accurately—but I hope temporarily—described as one of our rare bouquets.

114. Another speaker has made mention of resolution 20 (IV) of the Preparatory Commission which, of course, is not part of this Treaty presented in document A/C.1/946 of 3 October 1967. The views of the United Kingdom on that resolution are well known.

115. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union in exercise of his right of reply.

116. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I did not expect that I would have to exercise my right of reply, as the comments made by the Soviet delegation on the position stated yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom were so clear and, as we thought, non-controversial that I did not think the representative of the United Kingdom would rise to challenge them and to say, moreover, that we wished somehow to belittle the contribution that the United Kingdom is making to bringing into operation the plan to create a denuclearized zone in Latin America.

117. We did not wish to belittle anything whatsoever. We merely noted and drew the attention of the members of the Committee to what the representative of the United Kingdom had said. And what he said was that the Government of the United Kingdom accepted the undertakings set out in Additional Protocol II not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the Contracting Parties of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. And then he went on to say, if I may quote him in the language of Shakespeare and Churchill:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

“Like all other Members of the United Nations, we have accepted the obligation imposed on us by the Charter to refrain from the threat or use of force, and I repeat once more that my country will not use any weapons at its disposal, either nuclear or otherwise, for the purpose of aggression.” [1508th meeting, para. 17.]

*[The speaker continued in Russian.]*

118. That sentence—the first of the two commenting sentences—we understand as having a direct bearing on the interpretation of the obligation that the United Kingdom intends to accept under Additional Protocol II. It understands that obligation to be equal to its undertaking under the Charter of the United Nations not to use force or threaten to use force.

119. But we know that during the past two decades since the establishment of the Organization there have been examples of how the United Kingdom understands the undertaking that it has accepted under the Charter. Suffice it to recall the year 1956—the attack of three States including the United Kingdom upon Egypt, the aggression in the Suez Canal region in which the United Kingdom took part.

120. That is why the fact that the Government of the United Kingdom understands its obligation under Additional Protocol II in the same spirit in which it understands its obligation under the Charter of the United Nations does not make the whole picture clear. That is the point we wish to make.

121. The next commenting sentence—and I shall again venture to read it out in English—was:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

“My Government would, of course, have to examine its commitment under this Protocol in the unlikely event of any aggression by a Contracting Party in which it was supported by a nuclear weapon State.”

*[The speaker continued in Russian.]*

122. This is a far more direct reservation—at least that is how we understand it, perhaps wrongly. It means that in certain specific circumstances the Government of the United Kingdom will withdraw its commitment and unilaterally resume the right to use nuclear weapons against one of the Latin American countries.

123. It is true that there is here the saving phrase “in the unlikely event.” But, from the point of view of law there is no distinction of principle between a more or a less likely event and, secondly, it is not really so very difficult to envisage such an event.

124. Indeed, let us assume that in one of the colonial territories in the Latin American region which are still under British domination, a struggle for liberation from colonial rule takes place. This is a lawful struggle. It has been recognized as lawful by a whole series of resolutions of the United Nations. Let us then imagine that one of the Latin American countries gives support to the people of that colonial territory in its struggle. That is perfectly legitimate assistance. The United Nations in a number of its

resolutions has called upon all of its Members to render moral and material assistance to peoples fighting for their liberation from colonialism.

125. Of course, we realize that in such a case the Government of the United Kingdom would necessarily accuse the Latin American country of aggression. The colonialists do that frequently. We need only recall the situation in which Zambia, which is providing fraternal assistance to several other African countries in their lawful struggle against colonialism, finds itself today.

126. Let us then suppose further that some nuclear State comes out in support of the Latin American country against which sharp accusations will be made by the United Kingdom. Of course, basing itself on United Nations resolutions, any nuclear Power can declare its support of that Latin American country, which is in turn supporting a people fighting against the British colonialists.

127. There you would have that “unlikely event”. If what is contained in yesterday’s verbatim record as having been uttered here by the representative of the United Kingdom, Lord Caradon, is in accord with the policy of the United Kingdom, then the United Kingdom would consider itself free of any obligations under Protocol II. For what purpose? In order, it would seem, to apply, or threaten to apply, nuclear weapons against the said Latin American country. As Members will see, that is how the situation stands. It is exactly as the Soviet delegation described it in this morning’s statement. Everything is very simple. Today you accept an undertaking and tomorrow you withdraw that undertaking.

128. And that is all we were talking about, not belittling in the least what was stated yesterday by the representative of the United Kingdom. We did not belittle, but followed, his thought, and now we have attempted to demonstrate the factual content of that thought.

129. That is really all I think I need say in exercise of my right of reply.

130. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom to exercise his right of reply.

131. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): What is at issue now is the sincerity of my Government and its intentions towards the Treaty. The verbatim record of Lord Caradon’s speech is available to all representatives and I am perfectly happy to leave it to them to make up their minds in their own time and by their own standards about the sincerity of the intentions of my Government without the advice and interpretation of the Soviet Union. Perhaps when the Soviet Union has also acceded to the Treaty it will be in a better position to give us a lecture on the subject.

### *Organization of Work*

132. The CHAIRMAN: We have exhausted the list of speakers in the general debate on item 91. Consequently the general debate on that item has come to an end. However, in order that members of the Committee may be familiar with our future programme, I would say that I intend to give the floor on Monday to the Ambassador of Mexico to offer some clarification of certain important points which were made during the debate. If by then the draft resolution on item 91 is formally introduced and the Committee is ready to act on it we will do so and thus we will be concluding item 91.

133. On the other hand if on Monday, in order that we may happily adopt the draft resolution on item 91, it is necessary to allow more time, the Committee will proceed to take up the next item, namely the Korean item, item 33 on the agenda, on the understanding that we will take up the draft resolution relating to item 91 when it is ready. If there is no objection I will take it that the Committee agrees with the statement of the Chair.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.*