

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1634th  
MEETING**

Monday, 9 December 1968,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 94 and 96:	
Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament ( <i>continued</i> )	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament ( <i>continued</i> )	
Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament ( <i>continued</i> )	
Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament ( <i>continued</i> )	
Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1
Organization of work . . . . .	4

**Chairman:** Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

**AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 94 AND 96**

**Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231; A/C.1/L.443, A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-8, A/C.1/L.445 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.446, A/C.1/L.448/Rev.2, A/C.1/L.449)**

**Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231; A/C.1/L.447 and Add.1-3)**

**Elimination of foreign military bases in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (*continued*) (A/7189-DC/231)**

**Memorandum of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament (*continued*) (A/7134, A/7223; A/C.1/974, A/C.1/L.443)**

**Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: Final Document of the Conference (*continued*) (A/7224 and Add.1, A/7277 and Corr.1 and 2, A/7327, A/7364; A/C.1/976, A/C.1/L.449-452)**

1. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): My delegation has adequately

explained the Soviet Union's position on disarmament questions during the debate in the First Committee. At the present stage, I should only like to make a few comments regarding our votes on the draft resolutions now before the Committee.

2. The non-aligned countries members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, together with some other countries, have submitted a draft resolution [A/C.1/L.448/Rev.2] stressing the need to exert further efforts to reach agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control and containing a request to the Eighteen-Nation Committee to activate its work to that end. The draft specially draws the attention of the Government of the USSR concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament of 1 July 1968 [A/7134]. The Chairman himself stressed the importance of the Memorandum when he invited the Committee to proceed to vote on the draft resolutions [1632nd meeting].

3. My delegation would emphasize once again that the specific and realistic proposals contained in the USSR Government's Memorandum offer a good basis for further disarmament negotiations and for consolidating and building on the successes achieved as a result of the elaboration and signature of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII), annex]. To reach agreement on, and put into effect, any of the disarmament measures set forth in the Memorandum would be a further contribution to the strengthening of the international security of all States, nuclear and non-nuclear alike. The USSR representative in the Eighteen-Nation Committee will make every effort to that end.

4. I should like again to draw the attention of the First Committee, and consequently of the General Assembly, to the fact that the question of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is given top priority in the USSR Government's Memorandum. The debate on disarmament questions in the First Committee, too, has shown that many States regard such prohibition as one of the most important measures that could be taken to strengthen their security and as the next major step in the sphere of disarmament following the conclusions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

5. It will be remembered that the Soviet Union submitted to the General Assembly at the twenty-second session a draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons<sup>1</sup> proposing that States should solemnly undertake to refrain from using nuclear weapons, threatening to use them and from inciting other States to use them. Such a

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 96, document A/6834.

prohibition would be of enormous international significance. It would act as a restraint on any State which might consider using nuclear weapons against other States and would thus strengthen the peace; moreover, it would provide a solid basis for other disarmament measures.

6. In its Memorandum, the USSR Government proposes that such a draft convention should be discussed as a matter of first priority and that there should be an exchange of views on the convening of an international conference to sign an appropriate convention. The conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be of particular importance—one can truly say of historic importance—for safeguarding international security and would also furnish an excellent starting point for nuclear disarmament measures, thereby opening broad prospects for the peaceful use of the atom for the benefit of mankind. The USSR delegation believes that the General Assembly should recognize the urgency of the question of prohibiting nuclear weapons and the need to conclude a convention on the subject, and should call for an early constructive solution of this problem. The matter should be taken up without delay by the Eighteen-Nation Committee.

7. I note with satisfaction that during the debate in the First Committee many delegations recognized the importance of the USSR Government's Memorandum and advocated the implementation of the measures to contain the arms race and achieve disarmament proposed in it.

8. My delegation will not insist that a vote should be taken on its own draft resolution [A/C.1/L.443], and will vote instead for draft resolution A/C.1/L.448/Rev.2.

9. A number of States—Poland, Hungary, India, Mexico, Sweden, the United Arab Republic, and others—have submitted a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-8) requesting the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of a group of experts, a report on the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. My delegation has already expressed support for this draft resolution. It trusts that the adoption of this draft and of the measures it calls for will further strengthen the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the prohibition of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, will promote strict compliance with it by all States, and will encourage those States which have not yet done so to accede to the Protocol.

10. As regards the amendments to this draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.445 and Add.1, my delegation is firmly opposed to the preparation of a report on the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons being used to revise or sabotage the Geneva Protocol, or to disseminate the mistaken idea that the Protocol is "out of date". Looked at objectively, that is precisely what the amendments in question are aimed at, whether their sponsors so intend or not. That being so, they cannot but be regarded as an attempt to divert the group of experts from the task assigned to them by the General Assembly, namely, to prepare a report on the effects of the possible use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. The experts are being asked to give their attention not to this major task, but to such irrelevant matters as the "nature" of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

11. Because of these weighty considerations, the USSR delegation will vote against the amendments.

12. The delegations of Brazil, Burma, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, India, Libya, Mexico, Nigeria, Sweden and the United Arab Republic have submitted a draft resolution on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests [A/C.1/L.447 and Add.1-3].

13. As everyone knows, the Soviet Union is firmly in favour of prohibiting all testing of nuclear weapons and is ready to negotiate forthwith on the prohibition of underground nuclear weapon tests on the basis of using national means of detection to ensure that the prohibition is enforced. All that is needed to achieve agreement on the question of banning underground nuclear testing once and for all is a political decision to that effect. We are deeply convinced that this is so.

14. That being the position of its Government, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution.

15. The First Committee has before it several draft resolutions dealing with the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States.

16. The Soviet Union's position with regard to the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapons States is well known, having been stated repeatedly in the United Nations, and in particular in the First Committee at the present session.

17. The Soviet Union is opposed to dividing the world into nuclear and non-nuclear States. The policy of juxtaposing the two is fallacious, primarily because, if such a division should become a factor of international life, the result would be to undermine the United Nations and to impair the development of international relations and international co-operation, including the solution of problems relating to international peace and security, disarmament, economic and social progress, and concerted action by States to achieve the common objectives proclaimed in the United Nations Charter.

18. Attempts to draw a line of demarcation between States on the arbitrary criterion of whether or not they possess nuclear weapons fail to take account of the political and social realities of the modern world. With such an approach, a group of nuclear, or non-nuclear, or about-to-become nuclear, States will include both reactionary and progressive countries, imperialist and socialist countries, racist-colonialist countries and freedom-loving countries fighting against colonialism, etc.

19. It is obvious that to introduce such political confusion into the United Nations system and international relations would play into the hands of aggressive imperialist régimes which find themselves isolated and which want to divert the peoples from combatting imperialism, colonialism and racism, strengthening international peace and security and developing international co-operation.

20. Since the declaration and various resolutions adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States take as their starting point precisely such a division of the world into nuclear and non-nuclear Powers and since they are in reality aimed at shaping and institutionalizing a bloc of non-nuclear States and juxtaposing it to the nuclear countries, the Soviet Union is unable to support either the declaration or many of the resolutions of the Conference.

21. My delegation views the draft resolutions relating to the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, and the resolutions of the Conference itself, in the light of whether they further the purposes of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or, on the contrary, make them more difficult to achieve and provide support for countries which invoke various pretexts for not acceding to the Treaty. It seems obvious that those who fail or refuse to see this point are, either deliberately or unwittingly, aiding—to give but one example—the aggressive revanchist circles of Western Germany to disguise their burning desire to lay their hands on atomic weapons. The peoples of Europe remember clearly that twice within a single generation German imperialism plunged Europe and the world into the bloodbath of world wars. This is something the peoples of Europe and the entire world will never forget; they will not allow the West German revanchists to commit the same crime against the world and humanity for the third time.

22. In this connexion, it should be recognized that some of the Conference's resolutions—a fact which is reflected in some of the draft resolutions before the Committee—can be used to hinder or, at the very least, greatly to delay the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

23. There is another circumstance which should not escape notice. Some of the non-nuclear Powers which are avoiding signing the Treaty have been exhibiting certain alarming tendencies. These countries are endeavouring to obtain substantial privileges and advantages with regard to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; they demand additional security safeguards; but they refuse to assume any obligations themselves and do not accede to the Treaty. My delegation deems this position to be unrealistic and untenable.

24. In accordance with the provisions of the Treaty, the signatory States will naturally be in a more favoured position with regard to enjoying the benefits and privileges provided for in the Treaty for parties thereto.

25. We must ensure the earliest entry into force of the Treaty in the interests of all the parties to it, which could then proceed to work out specific measures to develop the peaceful uses of the atom. Moreover, the entry into force of the Treaty would greatly enhance the security of all States, nuclear and non-nuclear alike.

26. The USSR delegation also wishes to point out that a number of the resolutions adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States lack a solid foundation and were adopted without due preliminary consultation with those specialized agencies and international organizations to which they are addressed. As we all know, some of the specialized agencies and the United Nations Development Programme have already drawn attention to this point.

27. For these reasons, I believe that these resolutions of the Conference must be very carefully scrutinized. My delegation therefore has no objection to a number of the Conference's constructive resolutions being sent, for careful consideration, to the Governments of States, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the specialized

agencies and other international organizations to which these resolutions are addressed. It is firmly convinced that this is the right and businesslike thing to do. First, all these organizations and States should carefully examine those resolutions of the Conference which I have termed constructive; and the General Assembly should not hastily adopt resolutions giving effect to all the Conference's resolutions and recommendations without exception.

28. We regard as completely unacceptable proposals to the effect that a special organ or machinery should be set up to implement the Conference's decisions or that the United Nations Disarmament Commission should be transformed into the implementor or, as the English and Americans have been saying, a watchdog of the implementation of these decisions. It will readily be seen that such tasks and functions are entirely alien to the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

29. For these reasons, my delegation opposes the draft resolutions on the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States in documents A/C.1/L.451, A/C.1/L.450 and A/C.1/L.449.

30. At the same time, I would point out that the Soviet Union is far from rejecting all the resolutions of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. I have indicated the constructive approach which, I believe, should be taken towards them. My delegation feels that, in order to ensure a serious and businesslike consideration of those resolutions of the Conference which are helpful, the General Assembly must adopt a resolution which commands the support of nuclear, as well as non-nuclear, Powers. Precisely this way of dealing with the questions relating to the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States is proposed in the draft resolution submitted by Bulgaria and Hungary [A/C.1/L.452].

31. My delegation supports this draft resolution.

32. In conclusion, I would state that the Soviet Union has always regarded disarmament questions not from the viewpoint of expediency, but as a world-wide problem which in our day is of enormous significance for all peoples and countries, and indeed for all of mankind. The struggle for disarmament is one of the main guidelines of USSR foreign policy. Those who on various pretexts evade solution of the disarmament problem and who seek to obstruct the implementation of such agreed-upon instruments as the non-proliferation Treaty should grasp one simple fact: the Soviet Union is no more interested in progress towards a solution of the disarmament problem and the solution itself than is any other State, for the future of all States—great and small, nuclear and non-nuclear—will in large measure depend on that solution.

33. My delegation naturally realizes that the solution of disarmament questions is fraught with difficulty and requires strenuous efforts. There is a great deal of important work to be done. In order to maintain international security, we must continue and intensify our efforts to achieve agreement on those questions, so that the world may be freed of the threat of war and the enormous funds and resources being spent on the arms race may be used for raising levels of living and enhancing the well-being of mankind.

34. Now that, owing to the collective efforts of many States, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has been elaborated and concluded, the world has one more tool in its hands for dealing with disarmament problems and for achieving its main goal—general and complete disarmament.

#### *Organization of work*

35. The CHAIRMAN: I think I should try to outline the schedule for the remaining time available before the present session of the General Assembly closes. We all know that there are only two weeks before us.

36. In accordance with previous agreements, my proposal would be that tomorrow, Tuesday, we should have only one meeting, in the afternoon, when we could proceed to vote on the draft resolutions which have been submitted on the item under consideration. There are before the Committee at this moment the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/L.444, L.445, L.447, L.448/Rev.2, L.449, L.450, L.451 and L.452. My intention would be that tomorrow afternoon we should proceed to vote, and I hope we shall be able to dispose of these items.

37. One must take into consideration also the fact that the First Committee should transmit a report to the General Assembly. We have not up to now been able to transmit any report to the General Assembly in order that it might discuss and take decisions on the basis of the deliberations of our Committee.

38. I am, of course, always available to the sponsors of the different draft resolutions. I understand that consultations are proceeding on some of the draft resolutions so perhaps tomorrow we shall be in a position to know whether the draft resolutions to be voted upon will be those I have mentioned or fewer.

39. Proceeding on those lines, that would give us the possibility of going on to consideration of the following items, and I would hope that we could complete consideration of item 25, the Korean question, between Wednesday, 11 December, and Friday, 13 December. That would enable the Committee still to have a few meetings to dispose of the other two items—International Co-operation on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and Examination of the Question of the Reservation Exclusively for Peaceful Purposes of the Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor. Consultations are also proceeding on the latter item. I sincerely hope that they will be fruitful and that they will enable the Committee to dispose of the item as soon as possible. That would leave the last two or three days of next week for consideration of the outer space item.

40. That is the schedule I wanted to outline to the Committee.

41. I understand that the representative of Chile would like to speak on the subject.

42. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): The Chairman has explained that his intention is, if possible, at a single meeting tomorrow, 10 December in the afternoon, to dispose of draft resolution A/C.1/L.444 and Add.1-8,

L.445 and Add.1, L.447 and Add.1-3, L.448/Rev.2, L.449, L.450, L.451 and L.452; and he said there may be unofficial, friendly consultations now going on.

43. I would like to inform him, as one of the sponsors of draft resolution L.451, that we are indeed at this moment making friendly and unofficial contacts with a view to reconciling divergent points of view. Hence my concrete proposal, which I do not think is at variance with the Chairman's idea—quite the contrary in fact—would be that if these contacts bear fruit, they should be given time, and if it were not possible to vote on all the draft resolutions tomorrow afternoon, 10 December, the voting on them might be arranged for 11 December, in the morning or the afternoon. This would be without prejudice to the possibility of beginning the debate on the Korean question on 11 December; and later, on the two or three working days of next week we would take up the problem of outer space.

44. What I would like to say seriously on this subject, on behalf of my delegation which is a sponsor of one of the draft resolutions [*A/C.1/L.451*], is that we are in contact not only with other sponsors but with as many members as possible to see if we can find a solution that will command a large majority in this Committee and subsequently in the General Assembly.

45. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon): Before the representative of Chile made his proposal I was about to seek clarification from the Chairman, and if he has some comment to make on that proposal perhaps that will answer my question.

46. My question is this: since the Chairman has already indicated that it is his intention that the Committee should proceed to vote tomorrow, do I take it that he will allow delegations to explain their votes before the vote is taken?

47. I should like to put it on record that my delegation has hesitated to make its views known on the draft resolutions before the Committee, in particular, draft resolutions A/C.1/L.450, L.451 and L.452, in the knowledge that consultations were going on and that there was every hope that, although the positions have up to this stage seemed to be worlds apart, there was some possibility that a compromise solution acceptable to the overwhelming majority of the Committee might be found.

48. Notwithstanding the fact that the hope could be false and that the positions might be maintained, I should like a clear answer from the Chairman on whether explanations of vote will be allowed, in the event that no agreement is reached, before the vote, so that my delegation may decide its position in the light of that fact.

49. The CHAIRMAN: I believe that the suggestion made by the representative of Chile and substantially supported, if I understand correctly, by the representative of Lebanon is fully consistent with the suggestion I made to the Committee. I said I understood there were some consultations going on and that tomorrow we would be in a position to know how many of the draft resolutions which I mentioned would be submitted to the vote, in the hope, which is substantiated and supported, I would say, by what the representatives of Chile and Lebanon have said, that there might be a possibility of merging the draft resolutions

indicated by those two representatives, namely, A/C.1/L.450, L.451 and L.452. I think all members of the Committee will have listened with interest to what the representative of Chile suggested—and, I would say, also with some hope that what he suggested will materialize.

50. I would say that those consultations could go on until tomorrow afternoon; and, as I said, I am available to the sponsors of the different draft resolutions. We shall then be in a better position to know exactly on which of the draft resolutions we shall be requested to vote, and at that moment I think the delegations which desire to explain

their vote will be in a better position also to know on which draft resolutions they wish to do so.

51. If those explanations are satisfactory to the Committee, and if I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides that the schedule I have outlined should be followed.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.*