

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.147
21 June 1963
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday 21 June 1963, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. M. LACHS

(Poland)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. E. HOSANNAH

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV

Mr. G. GUELEV

Mr. G. YANKOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS

Mr. S.F. RAE

Mr. R.M. TAIT

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. L. SIMOVIC

Mr. M. ZEMLA

Mr. F. DOBIAS

Mr. V. GOTMANOV

Ethiopia:

Ato M. GHEBEYEHU

India:

Mr. A.S. MEHTA

Mr. S.B. DESHKAR

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVELLETTI

Mr. A. CAVAGLIERI

Mr. C. COSTA-REGHINI

Mr. P. TOZZOLI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO

Miss E. AGUIRRE

Mr. J. MERCADO

Nigeria:

Mr. M.T. MBU

Mr. L.C.N. CBI

Poland:

Mr. M. LACHS

Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Mr. A. SKOWRONSKI

Romania:

Mr. G. MACOVESCU

Mr. E. GLASER

Mr. N. ECCOBESCU

Mr. O. NEDA

Sweden:

Baron C.H. von PLATEN

Mr. S. LÖFGREN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. C.A. GRINEVSKY

Mr. V.A. SEMENOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN

Mr. M.S. AHMED

Mr. M. KASSEM

Mr. S.E. IBRAHIM

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

United Kingdom:

Sir Paul MASON
Mr. J.G. TANCURDIN
Mr. J.M. EDES
Mr. R.C. BEETHAM

United States of America:

Mr. C.C. STELLE
Mr. A.L. RICHARDS
Mr. D.E. MARK
Mr. R.A. MARTIN

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Poland): I declare open the one hundred and forty-seventh plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Before we proceed to our business for today, the Committee will permit me to mention two events of different dimensions and, perhaps, of a different calibre. One is the signing yesterday of a Memorandum of Understanding between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with regard to the establishment of a direct communication link. The two co-Chairmen, signatories of that agreement, have requested the Secretariat to circulate the document (ENDC/97) and it should now be in representatives' hands. I know I shall be expressing the view of all assembled here if I congratulate our two co-Chairmen on signing this agreement, though I think the Committee will share my view also when I say that we would have liked them to have signed yesterday a much more substantive and much more important agreement.

In connexion with the other event to which I referred, I wish to convey to our Soviet colleagues the sense of our deep satisfaction at, and to congratulate them on, the successful landing of the two astronauts, Valentina Tereshkova and Valery Bykovsky. Valentina Tereshkova, the first woman who has defied Newton's laws, has forty-eight times orbited the globe and looked down upon us so many times, thus acquiring the right, as it were, to look down on us for good. She has, I believe, proved that woman can be even superior to man -- not only equal to him.

This great achievement of man's genius, I believe, places us even more behind schedule than we have been so far. It shows how far man has advanced in the mastery of nature's secrets, while we have not been able to end man-made evil. That, indeed, should be an additional stimulus for our work, as we should not lag behind technical and scientific progress for the dangers involved are becoming ever more serious.

We shall pass now to our business for today, and I call upon the first speaker, the representative of the United States.

Mr. STELLE (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate my delegation with your congratulations to the Soviet delegation, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people on the safe landing of the Soviet astronauts. We here wished them happy landings while they were in orbit; we are glad those landings were happy.

I should like to read into the record today a statement issued yesterday by the President of the United States on the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding Regarding the Establishment of a Direct Communications Link (ENDC/97). The statement reads as follows:

(Mr. Stelle, United States)

"Today, in Geneva, the representatives of the Governments of the United States and the USSR, at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Conference, signed an agreement which will establish a direct communications link between their respective capitals.

"This age of fast-moving events requires quick dependable communications for use in time of emergency. By their signatures today, therefore, both Governments have taken a first step to help reduce the risk of war occurring by accident or miscalculation.

"This agreement on a communications link is a limited but practical step forward in arms control and disarmament. We hope agreement on other more encompassing measures will follow. We shall bend every effort to go on from this first step."

It seems to us that this agreement, which marks the first of what we earnestly hope will be many to follow, should be both a good omen to this Conference and an incentive to move on to further agreements. Let us put this agreement in its proper perspective. It shows clearly that it is possible to negotiate and reach understanding on matters of mutual interest in the field of disarmament and arms control. It should be, we believe, an encouraging sign to all of us that both sides, in quiet, unostentatious negotiations, were able to come to agreement on this issue. But our ability to reach agreement on this should not mislead any of us to think that somehow the long difficult road ahead of us has suddenly become straight and smooth. There are many intricate, complex and important problems which will have to be solved before we are able to reach our goal of general and complete disarmament. The agreement signed yesterday should help us to move on towards that goal with the feeling that it is possible, given good faith and willingness, to reach agreements on all sides, to reach additional and -- as you said Mr. Chairman -- more important agreements in this Conference.

As President Kennedy pointed out so cogently in his speech of 10 June, the agreement for a direct communications link is a step in the direction of achieving lasting peace by avoiding on each side the dangerous delays, misunderstandings and misreading of the other's actions which might occur in time of crisis.

At the same time, as the President pointed out, we must move on to our goal of assuring a "genuine peace", a peace which he described as:

"Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons of war.

Not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave", (ENDC/95, p.1)

but, as he said:

(Mr. Stelle, United States)

"... the kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living -- and the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and build a better life for their children -- not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women -- not merely peace in our time but peace in all time." (ibid., p.1)

The President went on to point out a central fact of the world in which we live, and a fact which makes our work here urgent and important. This fact is the new face of war in the nuclear age. The President said:

"Total war makes no sense in an age where great Powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the Allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn." (ibid.)

Those are words which should have great meaning for all of us here who are deeply engaged in the problems of negotiating an agreement which can bring that peace of which the President spoke, and end the threat of nuclear war. Unhappily it is the tremendous threat of devastation which today keeps a shaky peace in the world, but it is our job both to end the threat and to ensure the peace. This task will require more than words. As our Soviet colleague has well said "it is only through deeds that we can change the world." Those deeds, Mr. Chairman, must come from both sides.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian):

First of all, I should like to thank our Chairman, the representative of the Polish People's Republic, and the representative of the United States, for the congratulations on the successful conclusion, after many days, of the space flight of the Soviet cosmonauts, Valentina Tereshkova and Valery Bykovsky, and their happy return to earth.

I should also like to note the fact of the signing yesterday of the Memorandum (ENDC/97) on the establishment of a direct communications link between the Heads of the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States. Although this agreement represents only a very modest step and is a measure, the significance of which no one is inclined to exaggerate, nevertheless the very fact of the achievement of such an agreement shows that, given goodwill and the desire of both sides to achieve any aim, that aim can be quickly achieved. We hope that this agreement will serve as an example and a stimulus to efforts in regard to more important and serious measures relating to disarmament.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

In view of the fact that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is today suspending its work until the end of July, we should like to make a few general remarks on the questions under consideration by the Committee. We think that a sober analysis of the situation which has come about in the Committee is necessary in order that we may hope that the situation will change after the recess and that we shall begin to make progress.

While regarding general and complete disarmament as the principal means of ensuring lasting peace, at the same time the Soviet Government has always attached, and continues to attach, great importance to measures aimed at the lessening of international tension, the consolidation of confidence among States and facilitating the implementation of general and complete disarmament.

The Soviet Union has submitted to the Committee an important proposal, easy to implement, for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries (ENDC/77) and a draft declaration on renunciation of the use of foreign territories for stationing strategical means of delivery of nuclear weapons (ENDC/75). At the same time the Soviet Union warmly supported the proposals submitted to the Committee by other countries for the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world and, on its part, addressed to the Governments of the Mediterranean countries and to the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom a proposal to declare the area of the Mediterranean Sea a denuclearized zone (ENDC/91).

The achievement of agreement on the implementation of proposals relating to so-called collateral measures would undoubtedly play a great positive role in improving the existing international situation and creating an atmosphere of confidence in the mutual relations between States. Let us take, for example, the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries. The Soviet Union's proposal for the conclusion of such a pact has become widely known and has received a favourable response and support in many countries. Can there be any doubt that the conclusion of the non-aggression pact proposed by the Soviet Union would have a great positive influence not only on the mutual relations between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries, but also on the development of the international situation as a whole? We have already quoted a number of statements in favour of the conclusion of such a pact, which have been made within the Committee and outside it. These statements show that people realize the great importance of a non-aggression pact for the consolidation of peace and that the proposal for the conclusion of such a pact is being ardently supported.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

We have already had the opportunity in the Committee to explain in detail and to justify our proposal for a pact, and at the same time to show the complete groundlessness of the arguments put forward by the Western Powers against the conclusion of a non-aggression pact. Consideration of this Soviet proposal in the Committee has very clearly revealed that the Western Powers have no serious grounds upon which to justify their refusal to accept the Soviet proposal for a pact.

The Soviet Union has also submitted to the Committee a draft declaration on renunciation of the use of foreign territories for stationing strategical means of delivery of nuclear weapons. Here again the Western Powers were unable to put forward any serious arguments against the adoption of this Soviet proposal and limited themselves to rejecting it out of hand. Nevertheless, we can say with complete certainty that if States assumed an obligation not to station strategic means of delivery of nuclear weapons on foreign territories and strictly complied with that obligation, the world would be much more peaceful and the threat of a conflict between the nuclear Powers would be perceptibly reduced. The withdrawal of the most powerful weapons from the foreign territories where they are now located would allay many of the suspicions which the other side cannot help feeling at the present time in regard to the intentions of the United States and its allies.

The proposals for the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world have received a positive response and the widest support of most of the countries of the world. In the circumstances when nuclear weapons are threatening to spread all over the globe, this question acquires particular significance and urgency. Denuclearized zones, created in various parts of the world, especially in the areas where international tension is greatest, such as in Central Europe and the Mediterranean, would substantially reduce the sphere of preparations for a nuclear war, would raise barriers against the spread of nuclear weapons and would considerably reduce the likelihood of an outbreak of a thermonuclear conflict. The creation of such zones, encompassing specific areas and whole continents, would save the peoples of these zones from the threat of nuclear extermination and would make an invaluable contribution towards improving the international situation and towards the cause of general and complete disarmament.

We can say with complete justification that the idea of creating denuclearized zones has passed the test of time and has fully proved its vital capacity and necessity. This is shown by the proposals for the creation of zones free from nuclear weapons in various

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

parts of the world and by the support these proposals have received in many countries of the world. In Europe and in Africa, in Asia and in Latin America, everywhere the people are decisively opposed to the territories of those countries becoming the field of a nuclear missile war and are insistently demanding the adoption of measures against the nuclear danger.

As we see from the discussion in the Committee of the question of creating demuclearized zones, the Western Powers are seeking every opportunity to sabotage the proposals on this question. In regard to the proposals for demuclearized zones, as well as in regard to other proposals aimed at lessening international tension and creating confidence, the Western Powers are taking a position which simply amounts to unwillingness to contribute to the solution of the problems set before the Committee by the peoples and governments of the majority of the countries of the world, which are extremely perturbed by the very dangerous development of events in recent times.

The existing policy in the United States and the United Kingdom aimed at building up armaments, expanding nuclear striking forces and equipping the Federal Republic of Germany and other NATO partners with nuclear weapons is not compatible with the policy of disarmament, with the task of lessening international tension, creating international confidence and ensuring the conditions for achieving agreement on disarmament questions. Preparations for war and measures for the improvement of the international situation are mutually incompatible. It is precisely for these reasons that there has been no progress in the work of the Committee, either on the disarmament questions or on measures for lessening international tension.

We are compelled to note that there is an obvious deadlock in the negotiations, both in regard to general and complete disarmament and in regard to other questions under consideration by the Committee. If the Western Powers maintain their present position on the main questions of international policy, on questions relating to war and peace, then the prospects for the future work of the Committee and for further negotiations on disarmament and on measures to improve the international situation appear to us to be very gloomy.

When referring at one of our recent meetings to the absence of "any appreciable results" (ENDC/PV.144, p.36) in the discussion by the Committee of measures aimed at lessening international tension and eliminating or reducing the threat of a nuclear missile war, the representative of Italy, Mr. Cavalletti, tried to ascribe this to the fact that

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

the Committee had "no precise agenda" (ibid.). At the same time he admitted that in the course of our discussions on these collateral measures "... proposals were put forward concerning a large number of problems; and replies were given on both sides to objections and to questions" (ibid.). But that is just how it should be in a discussion under any procedure. So from the standpoint of procedure the Committee's work went on normally, since there was full discussion of all the questions under consideration. The fact that the Committee's work, as Mr. Cavalletti put it at our meeting of 14 June "has not ... advanced on a concrete and fruitful basis" (ibid.) is certainly not because of the agenda or the procedure for the discussion of items. The whole point is that the Western delegations had no desire to reach agreement either on measures aimed at eliminating, or at least reducing, the threat of a nuclear missile war or on measures aimed at lessening international tension. Mr. Cavalletti, you are looking in the wrong place for the reason why the discussions carried on by the Committee have led to no results.

The reasons for the unsatisfactory work of the Committee lie, of course, not in the agenda or in the procedure for the discussion of items. The reason why our work has produced no results is that the Western Powers continue to adhere to the policy "from a position of strength" and are continuing their preparations for a nuclear missile war. That is the only possible way to explain such facts in the behaviour of the Western Powers as their refusal to accept the Soviet Union's proposal for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries, their refusal to accept the Soviet declaration on the renunciation by States of the stationing of strategical means of delivery of nuclear weapons on foreign territories, and their refusal to accept the various proposals for the creation of demuclearized zones in various parts of the world and so on and so forth.

That is where you will find the real reasons for the lack of results in our work, Mr. Cavalletti. If you wish to know, the very procedure for the discussion of items, which turns out to be not to your liking, Mr. Cavalletti, is the direct result and consequence of the unwillingness of the Western Powers to agree on these measures.

At our meeting, of 14 June, the representative of Italy, Mr. Cavalletti, spoke about the necessity of "avoiding fatal mistakes" (ibid., p.37), by which he had in mind, of course, a nuclear missile war. Thus, war is a "fatal mistake", Mr. Cavalletti tells us, which must be avoided; but the measures he proposes cannot to any extent bar the path to war.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

It is impossible to eliminate the threat of war by purely technical measures; no technical experts can invent a panacea which would save humanity from the dangers of a nuclear missile war which are lying in wait for it behind every corner, behind every nook of world politics. These dangers are the consequence and direct result of the policy "from a position of strength". These war dangers are indissolubly and inevitably connected with the armaments race and the military preparations of the Western Powers. Consequently, "fatal mistakes" will be eliminated only when the causes creating a situation fraught with grave possibilities of military conflicts and a nuclear war are eliminated. These causes are well-known -- the Western Powers' policy "from a position of strength", military preparations and the armaments race as the material prerequisites of such a policy.

We know in advance what the reaction of the United States representative, Mr. Stelle, will be to these bitter but true words. Perhaps he will repeat the appeal to the need "to avoid unnecessary irritants and purely theoretical hostility" (ibid., p.41), but what we do not tire of speaking about here is not a manifestation of theoretical hostility but a sober analysis of the reasons for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in the Committee, of the reasons for lack of progress in the negotiations on disarmament.

At the last meeting devoted to collateral measures, the United States representative, Mr. Stelle, again emphasized (ibid., p.42) that no one had any doubt about the intention of the Western Powers, as regards their attitude towards the problem of disarmament, to leave everything as it is and to continue the armaments race. That could be seen very clearly in his remark that we must take the world as it is without trying to change it. He again stated that the proposals contained in the draft declaration (ENDC/75) submitted by the Soviet Union are one-sided and that they would change the existing military situation and are therefore unacceptable. We have analyzed this position of the Western Powers with exhaustive thoroughness and we have shown that it is unfounded. We have pointed out that the measures proposed in the Soviet draft declaration are not one-sided and cannot be regarded as lacking elements of reciprocity.

If we were to adopt the standpoint of the Western Powers, which object to any measures aimed at real disarmament under the pretext that they would change the military situation and would lead to a break-up of the existing structure of the armed forces of the NATO bloc, which they consider it necessary to maintain until the very last stage of disarmament, then no room at all is left for disarmament.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

How can one speak of real disarmament if the Western Powers propose (ENDC/3C) to disarm in such a way that during the whole of the first stage inflated armed forces, including land armies, navies and air forces, would be retained, as would 70 per cent of all armaments, including missiles; all the accumulated nuclear weapons would be left intact and their stockpiles would continue to grow; and all military bases on foreign territories, those sources of military conflicts and provocations, those springboards for aggression, for nuclear attack, would be retained? When we point out to the representatives of the Western Powers that this is not disarmament and that their plan leaves everything as it is, they reply that we must not overburden the first stage with disarmament measures, that everything must be done gradually and without haste and that we must start with the simplest, easily feasible measures which do not change anything from the standpoint of putting an end to the armaments race and eliminating the threat of a nuclear missile war.

We are told that the measures contained in the Soviet draft declaration are one-sided. But that assertion does not correspond to reality. The only people who can talk like that are those who are not thinking of disarmament but of continuing the armaments race, those who are not thinking of equal conditions of security for the countries, but of securing a military advantage for one of the sides -- not to mention the fact that the obligation to renounce the use of foreign territories for stationing strategical means of delivery of nuclear weapons applies equally to both sides and is not one-sided.

We are told that these measures do not include reciprocity or "adequate compensation". We have shown that also this argument of the Western Powers is completely unfounded. We have drawn attention to the fact that the elimination of military bases on foreign territories would give the countries where such bases have been eliminated a guarantee of safety from nuclear annihilation.

The agreement of the Western Powers to accept the declaration proposed by the Soviet Union and to assume an obligation to renounce the use of foreign territories for stationing strategical means of delivery of nuclear weapons would be a step in accordance with the ideas and views expressed by President Kennedy in his speech of 10 June (ENDC/95) this year at the American University in Washington.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

What can we say about the position of the Western Powers, which refuse to agree to the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries? Would it be possible to convince any one that the arguments with which the Western Powers cover up their refusal to conclude such a treaty are reasonable? It is precisely at the present time when there are a number of acute unsettled political problems which could be used by aggressive forces for the purpose of starting armed conflicts, that the conclusion of a non-aggression pact is reasonable; it would be in the interests of the European nations and of all mankind, since it would bind the hands of those who are nurturing aggressive plans in the centre of Europe.

See how great is the importance which the representatives of the Western Powers ascribe to the agreement (ENDC/97) signed yesterday for the establishment of a direct communications link between the Heads of the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States. They welcome this agreement, believing that the establishment of such a link will help to avoid "fatal mistakes" (ENDC/PV.144, p.37) and eliminate the "danger of war". (ibid.) But if this is really the aim of the Western Powers, if they really wish to avert a war, then why do they oppose the conclusion of a non-aggression pact? After all, in these days, when there is no disarmament, when the arms race is continuing and when there are influential aggressive forces capable of unleashing a war, the conclusion of a non-aggression pact would be the best and most effective way to achieve this aim, namely, the elimination of the danger of war.

We see a strange, paradoxical situation: when the need for a non-aggression pact is quite obvious, when a non-aggression pact could be a substantial barrier in the path to war, the Western Powers avoid a pact. The Western Powers should agree immediately to the conclusion of such a pact. That would be a great step on their part, a deed in support of the ideas and views expressed by President Kennedy in his speech of 10 June 1963 at the American University in Washington.

Equally unfounded are the objections of the Western Powers to the proposals for the creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world. Agreement by the Western Powers to the creation of a denuclearized zone in central Europe, (ENDC/C.1/1) in the area of the Mediterranean Sea, (ENDC/91) in Africa (ENDC/93/Rev.1) and in other parts of the world would also be in keeping with the ideas and views expressed by President Kennedy on 10 June this year in his speech at the American University of Washington.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

As we noted at the meeting last Friday, (ENDC/PV.144) President Kennedy, in his statement of 10 June, expressed concern at the continuation of the "cold war". In this connexion he called for a re-examination of United States policy in regard to the Soviet Union. This appeal met with a very positive response in our country. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, said:

"We are deeply convinced that the appeal of the President of the United States for the improvement of relations between States and for the elimination of the "cold war", for the improvement of relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States will be supported by an absolute majority of the American people; the peoples of the Soviet Union have always stood and stand on these positions."
(Pravda, 15 June 1963)

In assessing in a positive way President Kennedy's appeal to put an end to the policy of the "cold war" and to ensure true peace and security throughout the world, the Soviet Union is waiting for the President's words to be translated into deeds. This would make it possible to eliminate many difficulties in accomplishing the tasks entrusted to the Committee. If there is to be serious progress in the cause of disarmament, radical changes in policy will be necessary. We should like to see in President Kennedy's speech of 10 June a step in that direction.

The Committee is suspending its work until the end of July. We hope that our Western colleagues will use the recess in order to think over the situation which has come about in the Committee, to analyse the discussions which have taken place and to reconsider their positions in regard to the proposals submitted by the Socialist countries on the questions before the Committee in the light of President Kennedy's statement. We hope that his appeal on behalf of peace and disarmament will be followed by practical deeds which will enable us to break the deadlock in the negotiations both in regard to general and complete disarmament and in regard to measures aimed at the lessening of international tension and the creation of confidence between States. The Soviet Union, for its part, will continue to make every effort within its power to facilitate the fulfilment of the task entrusted to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to take this opportunity to express the wish that the members of this Committee will use the forthcoming recess not so much for rest as for a fruitful preparation for the forthcoming round of negotiations. We hope that a rest and, above all, reflection on the questions on which we are working, with due regard to President Kennedy's statement of 10 June, will create favourable possibilities for achieving progress in accomplishing the very important tasks set before the Committee.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

I should like to express our gratitude to the United States representative, Mr. Stelle, for the efforts he has made as co-Chairman to help bring about businesslike conditions and a favourable atmosphere for the work of the co-Chairmen, and for the work of the Committee as a whole.

I should also like to express our gratitude to the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Epstein, and to the entire staff of the United Nations Secretariat serving the Committee. The presence here of the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations reminds us of the profound interest in disarmament which is constantly being shown by the United Nations and its Secretary-General. We should also like to thank the interpreters and translators who have displayed great effort, energy and knowledge, in their highly responsible task of facilitating, if not mutual understanding, at least mutual comprehension, and wish them a well deserved rest.

Baron von PLATEN (Sweden): First I should like to congratulate the Soviet Union on its fine success in the cosmos. My delegation would like also to congratulate the United States and the Soviet Union on negotiating, agreeing fairly quickly on and signing yesterday the agreement on the communications link (ENDC/97). My feelings may be summed up in the French saying: L'appétit vient en mangeant. We are all hungry for more agreement and success on more and broader issues.

As members of this Committee will remember, at our meeting of 10 June I requested the Secretariat (ENDC/PV.142, p.35) to collate and summarize the various proposals which had been put forward during our term after Christmas by the non-aligned delegations in their constant efforts to aid and facilitate true negotiations and useful compromises, necessary for final agreement on a nuclear test ban treaty. The Secretariat has already presented us with a synopsis of those suggestions (ENDC/96). I should like to thank the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Epstein, and the Secretariat, for the very splendid work they have done in this context. The disposition of the subject matter and the choice of quotations seem to me to be done with great skill. It is now our fervent hope that this document will be studied carefully by the delegations representing the nuclear Powers at this Conference. Equally we hope that this document will be kept in mind and readily at hand during the forthcoming high-level tripartite discussions in Moscow.

(Baron von Platen, Sweden)

Turning our eyes to the future, those Moscow negotiations, for very obvious reasons, are the centre of our attention and our hopes. We hope that the nuclear Powers now, at long last, will succeed in reaching a test ban treaty. Indeed, we more than hope, we expect that they will succeed. If at any time agreement seems doubtful and difficult, they will know and remember that a great many proposals and practical suggestions are embodied in the synopsis which is circulated today as a conference paper. Here, as we have said before, are some elements which could serve as a fairly comprehensive basis for discussions aimed at reaching a fair and reasonable nuclear test ban treaty.

I should like to add a few words about the future work of this Committee. I think we shall all agree that the debate here for the past few months has often been somewhat sterile. We have not been spared repetitions and propaganda-like statements on subjects rather alien to the task entrusted to us. I venture to express the hope that the co-Chairmen, during the recess, will devote attention to the practical arrangements for our work. I am fully aware that political problems complicate our task. However, by improved organization our work in this Conference might well be facilitated. The organizational reforms might bear upon subjects like pre-determined annual plans for work and recess, more frequent informal meetings, meetings occasionally perhaps on a higher level, and technical studies of pertinent problems.

I would avail myself of this occasion to say that I, like the spokesman for the Soviet Union, wish all my colleagues and the Secretariat a good holiday and also opportunities for good and useful work. I should like to thank in particular the Secretariat for their kind attention and the splendid work they have done -- the Secretariat including, of course, our magnificent interpreters.

Finally, I again wish the nuclear test talks in Moscow speedy and full success.

Mr. HASSAN (United Arab Republic): It gives me pleasure to associate myself and my delegation with the other delegations which have preceded me in welcoming the signature yesterday by the leaders of the Soviet and United States delegations to this Committee of an agreement (ENDC/97) to establish a direct communications link between the capitals of their two countries.

Coming as it does before the forthcoming meeting in Moscow of the high-ranking special representatives of the leaders of the three nuclear Powers, the signature of this initial accord may be indicative of the readiness of those leaders to take the necessary political decisions which they feel may be necessary to break the deadlock which confronts this Conference. We hope that this spirit of realism and accord will prevail at the Moscow meetings as well.

(Mr. Hassan, United Arab Republic)

The joint memorandum presented by the delegations of Ethiopia, Nigeria and the United Arab Republic on 10 June 1963 attached special importance to the various suggestions of the non-aligned members of this Committee concerning a test-ban treaty.

Paragraph 4 of the memorandum says:

"Various non-aligned delegations to our Committee during the last three months produced many valuable ideas and thoughts which are well known to the nuclear Powers, and which aimed at breaking the deadlock in the Geneva test-ban negotiations about the number of inspections as well as about the method of discussing the quote figures in relation to the study of the modalities of inspections." (ENDC/94, p.2)

The three African delegations went on to appeal to the nuclear Powers to give attention to those non-aligned ideas and thoughts.

At the request of the representative of Sweden the Secretariat has now presented us with a valuable summary (ENDC/96) of those same ideas and thoughts referred to in our memorandum. We think that there is a possible advantage in collating all those recent ideas and suggestions in precise and summarized form in order to make them more easily accessible to the negotiating parties. It may not be without value to focus attention -- as this summary does -- on those non-aligned constructive suggestions which, in the last analysis, may prove to offer the basis for a good and lasting solution to the test-ban question. The summary contains suggestions made during the whole period from last February to those made most recently in the joint memorandum of 10 June, and they constitute in our opinion the crystallization of timely and constructive viewpoints reflecting the thinking of world public opinion about the latest phase of the test-ban problem.

We are sure that at their forthcoming meetings in Moscow the high negotiating parties should be able to draw upon the non-aligned common fund of ideas and suggestions which this working paper tries to make directly available to them. I avail myself of this opportunity to thank the Secretariat of our Committee for its valuable help in the preparation of this working paper as well as for its continuing and unfailing efforts which have contributed to the smooth running of the work of this Conference.

Mr. CHRISTOV (Bulgaria) (translation from French): On the occasion of the return to earth of the cosmonauts Valery Bykovsky and Valentina Tereshkova I should like to offer the warmest congratulations of the Bulgarian delegation to the delegation of the Soviet Union for this latest and brilliant success of Soviet science and technology.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

This exploit of the two Soviet cosmonauts has given us a final and magnificent demonstration of the creative power of human genius and of the limitless possibilities of peaceful human endeavour. That is why the feeling of admiration with which we followed this new Soviet venture in space is mingled with a feeling of gratitude to the Soviet scientists, technicians and workers and to the young cosmonauts, Valentina and Valery, for having given us this proof, which increases our confidence and which should confirm once more that man, in constantly pushing back the frontiers of the impossible, will always be able to solve the most difficult problems, even those of general and complete disarmament.

We therefore hail the cosmic exploit of Valery Bykovsky and Valentina Tereshkova as a great new step in the conquest of extra-atmospheric space, as a harbinger of further peaceful victories over the forces of nature and as another great service, rendered by the Soviet Union in the cause of peace.

In addition, on behalf of the Bulgarian delegation I should also like to congratulate our two co-Chairmen on the agreement (ENDC/97) which they have signed for the establishment of a direct link between Moscow and Washington. We all know, of course, that this agreement does not dispose of all the difficulties and does not eliminate all of the dangers, but it is none the less an agreement and we like to believe that it will soon be followed by others on the great problems of general and complete disarmament.

Having said that, and since we are on the point of suspending our proceedings, I shall take the liberty of bringing up a few questions which it seems natural to raise before the recess in a debate that has lasted for more than four months. These questions all relate to the problem of general and complete disarmament and to its status at a time when we are about to adjourn. Although the members of the Committee will leave, each to his part of the world, the problem of disarmament will remain. It will remain not as much within these walls and in the piles of verbatim records which have accumulated, as in the form of a most tangible reality, and will continue to weigh heavily on a world prey to justified anxiety. Nor is it out of place to recall that this weight has become heavier as the efforts made so far to solve this problem have resulted in failure.

What are, in the view of my delegation, the various aspects of the discussion and the reasons for this failure?

The problem which at the present time is at the centre of the concern of mankind and which poses itself dramatically to all of us is undoubtedly the problem of nuclear disarmament. This problem -- or to be more precise, the problem of eliminating the danger

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

of a nuclear war -- has been described by the delegations of the socialist countries and those of the non-aligned countries here as the No. 1 problem, the key problem of disarmament. The possibility of achieving general and complete disarmament in our day and age is indissolubly linked to the imperative necessity of eliminating the danger of a nuclear war at the very beginning of the disarmament process.

It would also be no exaggeration to say that in view of its importance, the nuclear problem has become not only the key to disarmament but also the key to the entire international situation; it is inseparable from the acute problem of the armaments race and it casts its shadow in the tension characterising international relations. In view of the importance of this problem, we feel it indispensable to determine exactly where the discussion of the subject now stands. This leads us first of all to ask ourselves what are the positions of the two great nuclear Powers on which the solution ultimately rests.

The position of the Soviet Union was formulated in the most pertinent terms early in the discussion. It was explained at length and in detail during the debates. It was confirmed once more the day before yesterday by the Soviet representative and I shall confine myself to citing what Mr. Tsarapkin said on 19 June:

"... we will secure the result that the problem of eliminating the danger of a nuclear war will be solved at the very beginning of the disarmament process, and this is a very important point, a very serious measure, which is necessary in the earliest stage of disarmament". (ENDC/FV.146, p.29)

Throughout the discussion the delegations of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have concentrated on measures of nuclear disarmament, with the object of eliminating the danger of a nuclear war. In this connexion, we must emphasize the exceptional importance of the Soviet proposal for maintaining a strictly limited number of certain types of missiles, exclusively on the territories of the Soviet Union and the United States, until the end of the second stage of disarmament, a proposal known as the "Gromyko proposal". (A/FV.1127, provisional p.38-40 - ENDC/2/REV.1, Art. 5)

The discussion of this question under item 5(b) of the agreed agenda (ENDC/1/Add.3) showed that with this compromise proposal the Soviet Union has gone a long way towards meeting the proposals of the Western Powers and that this proposal offers a realistic and perfectly feasible solution to the crucial problem of eliminating the nuclear danger at the very outset of the disarmament process.

What, by contrast, is the position of the United States and its allies? The delegations of the Western countries often state that they, too, realize the seriousness of the nuclear threat. One need not doubt the sincerity of statements about what is

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

perfectly obvious, but that is not the question. The question is whether the proposals contained in the United States draft (ENDC/30) and supported by the Western delegations are capable of eliminating the danger or not. But it has been amply demonstrated that the United States proposals for halting the production of fissionable materials for military purposes and transferring a certain quantity of Uranium 235 -- the only proposals submitted as nuclear disarmament measures for the first stage -- are in no way in keeping with the need to eliminate this danger. This is so apparent that no Western delegation has ever claimed that the measures proposed by the United States eliminate or, at least, reduce the danger of nuclear war.

Another much debated problem is that of the cessation of nuclear tests. The position on this matter are well-known. Relying on scientific evidence, the Soviet Union and the other socialist delegations went to great pains to strip the problem of its mystery and to reduce it to realistic scientific and practical terms. The fact is that nowadays national means are amply sufficient for detecting and identifying seismic events and there is no need for on-site inspection. But the Western Powers have stuck to their former view, according to which agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests is dependent upon admission by the other side of inspection teams to its territory.

Yet other problems were discussed in the context of collateral measures for relieving international tension. Proposals made by the Soviet Union -- notably the declaration on the renunciation of the use of foreign territories for the stationing of strategic means of delivery of nuclear weapons (ENDC/75), the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries (ENDC/77), and the creation of denuclearized zones (ENDC/91) -- were considered at length without result. The measures proposed by the delegations of the socialist countries were rejected and in the case of the non-aggression pact the delegations of the Western countries even refused to discuss it.

We should like to conclude these observations by adding some comments on the methods of negotiation adopted in this Committee by the two sides. In this respect our proceedings were characterized by two salient features: the spirit of compromise, initiative and flexibility shown by the Soviet delegation and the other socialist delegations. This was the spirit behind the Gromyko proposal and the proposals for

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

reducing international tension. On the Western side, by contrast, no change was made in the familiar proposals formulated in the United States draft of 18 April 1962 (ENDC/30) and no new proposal for disarmament measures was made.

It might be said that the Western Powers view negotiation as a demand that the other party accept their conditions and adjust its disarmament proposals to those of the West. We were given an illustration of this method the day before yesterday by the Canadian representative. Having proposed certain amendments to article 22 of the Soviet draft treaty (ENDC/2/Rev.1), Mr. Burns stated:

"Until the Soviet Union acknowledges those facts and alters its plan accordingly, progress in this field with our negotiations will be difficult, if not impossible." (ENDC/PV.146, p. 8)

One might point out that the United States has proposed certain measures for averting the danger of a war through accident or miscalculation (ENDC/70). Concerning this argument, and independently of any other consideration, we would like to say that these measures are not in line with disarmament, but with armament and the control of armaments. They tend to lead us into absurdity, as if we were supposed to concern ourselves not with the elimination of the nuclear danger and with general and complete disarmament, but with accumulating the dangers and then making efforts to control dangers we ourselves have created.

At this point we should ask, more insistently than ever: What obstacle has impeded progress in our discussion? This question has often been asked and one might say that it has been in the background of our Committee's proceedings from the beginning.

The answer is not difficult: what is hampering discussion and a solution of the disarmament problem is the basic approach of the Western Powers to these problems, what has often been described as the "Western philosophy" of disarmament. Our discussion and certain events of recent months have been very instructive in this respect. The tactics and attitudes of the Western delegations in this Committee and the policy of the Western Powers outside it have shown that, far from reconsidering this philosophy, they tend virtually to put it into practice.

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

According to the basic tenets of this philosophy, the best and sole guarantee for peace and security is the balance of terror, the existence of the nuclear deterrent force. The Bulgarian delegation, like many other delegations, has consistently argued that this was a completely false conception likely to vitiate from the very outset any disarmament negotiation and that it was prepared to accept compromises so as to facilitate a rapprochement in the positions. However, any compromise between general and complete disarmament and general and complete armament under the control of a deterrent force, nuclear weapons and missiles, as suggested in certain statements of the Western representatives, ought to be considered as excluded. Our true object is not to regulate and limit armaments or to organize a controlled state of war, but to establish in our time and as soon as possible a world order from which war will have been banished.

What were the reasons given by the Western delegations throughout the discussion of all the problems under consideration here for opposing a realistic solution of the problems of general disarmament? Both as regards the proposals for eliminating nuclear weapons or their delivery vehicles or military bases on foreign territories, and as regards the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw treaty countries, the reasons are always the same and the motivation -- sometimes disguised and sometimes clearly revealed -- is always the same: the wish to retain the nuclear force and the military structure of the Western countries as they exist at present.

This would be all very well if we were doing nothing more than talk about disarmament at a conference! But we cannot forget that outside this Conference the armaments race continues at an increasingly threatening tempo; and that it is precisely during the last few months while our discussion has been going on that the leaders of the NATO countries have taken decisions concerning the creation of multilateral forces, the introduction of nuclear submarines into the Mediterranean and others leading to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the growth of the danger of a nuclear conflict.

In these circumstances, it is not difficult to understand why our efforts have remained sterile. There are things which cannot be reconciled, whose simultaneous existence is not conceivable, just as it is inconceivable to mix fire and water. It is

(Mr. Christov, Bulgaria)

not possible to implement a plan of general and complete disarmament if one wishes, as the Western delegations indicate they do, to retain nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. One cannot speak of disarmament and wish to preserve military structures intact; one cannot claim that one wishes to build a world free from the danger of war and at the same time conceive of this world as irrevocably divided into opposing blocs, just as one cannot seek a détente and at the same time oppose the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries.

The reasons and arguments advanced in support of such attitudes have no connexion with a constructive search for agreement on the problems of disarmament. They arise out of the policy of positions of strength and the cold war.

The delegations of the socialist countries have devoted much of their efforts to proving that the methods of the policy of positions of strength are obsolete in the nuclear age, that the road of the cold war is a dead end, and that it is impossible to carry on a fruitful discussion of general and complete disarmament on the basis of positions and ideas which are no longer in keeping with the realities of the modern world.

In the speech which has been quoted here many times, the President of the United States addressed the American people in these terms:

"... every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward -- by examining his own attitude towards the course of the cold war and towards freedom and peace ...".
(ENDC/95, p.2)

We hope that this appeal will be heeded and that certain delegations seated at this table -- and particularly that of the United States -- will review their attitudes with regard to the problems of peace and the cold war, that is, with regard to the genuine possibilities of reaching an agreement on disarmament, so as to respond to the aspirations of a humanity which fervently desires to be freed from the constant threat of nuclear annihilation.

Mr. SIMCVIC (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): The forthcoming recess in the work of our Committee is also for the Czechoslovak delegation an occasion for making a brief review of the results of the negotiations during the past months.

(Mr. Simovic, Czechoslovakia)

The Committee has held nearly 150 meetings. A great number of statements have been made, numerous working papers have been submitted and hundreds and thousands of pages of verbatim records completed. We have spent many hours and days studying the most varied sources and arguments in our search for possibilities of reaching agreed solutions.

Unfortunately, however, the results of our work, with the exception of the agreement signed yesterday between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on the establishment of a direct communications link (ENDC/97), which we welcome of course, are still very unsatisfactory. This is a matter for regret, in particular because the direction which future international development will take depends to a large extent on whether our work bears tangible fruit. Will it go in the direction of creating ever-increasing stockpiles of deadly nuclear weapons, of further intensifying international tension or in the direction of creating an atmosphere of confidence in relations between States and of favourable conditions for the peaceful life of the peoples, in the direction of peaceful co-existence, as we call it, which is gaining more and more adherents in the West?

As I said in my first statement in this Committee on 17 May last, (ENDC/PV.133, p.6) we are, in accordance with the character of our people, convinced optimists. We sincerely believe that the time will come when the sense of reality will prevail also in regard to the solution of outstanding international problems and when the forces of peace will finally triumph over the forces of war.

Why is it that our work so far has produced only such insignificant results? It seems to us that it is because not all the delegations are equally anxious to achieve progress in the negotiations. We are compelled to note that the Western delegations speak as though they were not aware of the urgency of a solution to the question of disarmament and, in the first place, of the need to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war, as world public opinion is demanding with growing insistence. Instead of contributing to the solution of the problems before us, instead of putting forward constructive proposals as the socialist delegations have been doing, they have been piling up more and more obstacles in our path and, contrary to the task of the Committee, they have

(Mr. Simovic, Czechoslovakia)

thereby been holding up the disarmament negotiations. Although in this room we hear them utter many beautiful words and assurances that they are in favour of disarmament, unfortunately their words are sharply at variance with the practical policy of their governments.

How can one call a contribution to our negotiations on disarmament that which was the subject of discussion at Nassau and in Ottawa? Are the disarmament negotiations being helped by the continued nuclear tests of the United States and France and the active support which the Western Powers are giving the West German militarists in their yearning to join the "nuclear club" and to be given access to nuclear weapons?

These steps by the Western Powers reflect in practice their feverish clinging to nuclear weapons. This is expressed also in their approach to the main question forming the subject of our negotiations -- the question of general and complete disarmament. In spite of all their numerous utterances, so far we have not heard a word from the Western Powers about when exactly, in their opinion, the world is to be rid of the threat of a thermonuclear war. Under the United States proposal, this would not happen in stage 1 or even after the completion of the disarmament programme. Furthermore, the Western Powers have not yet given us a direct reply as to whether or not the international armed force would be equipped with nuclear weapons.

How can such a position be in keeping with the conclusion reached by United States President Kennedy, namely, that the stockpiling of nuclear weapons does not provide a reliable guarantee of assuring the security of States? (ENDC/95, p.1) Nuclear weapons should not be a means for intimidating peoples. In fact they are a dangerous source of tension and of conflicts in the world and are fraught with the serious threat of a military conflagration which would bring the peoples untold suffering. The only logical conclusion to be drawn from this is that, in view of the special nature of nuclear missile weapons, the security of individual countries and of the whole world can be ensured only by the implementation of radical measures aimed at eliminating the threat of a nuclear war. We are convinced -- and in spite of all their efforts the Western delegations have not succeeded in making us change our opinion -- that precisely the Soviet Union's proposals open up a reliable way in that direction.

(Mr. Simovic, Czechoslovakia)

The fact that the Western Powers are unwilling to renounce nuclear weapons has also determined their intransigent position in regard to the cessation of nuclear weapon tests and other collateral measures. Here again, for all the efforts made by the socialist delegations, it has been impossible to achieve any progress in the negotiations, notwithstanding the existence of all the necessary objective conditions.

The delegations which have already spoken here in connexion with the forthcoming recess have expressed a number of views concerning what the Committee should give its attention to after the resumption of its work. All the delegations without exception should continue to consider the solution of the disarmament problem as a whole as their primary task. At the same time they should also direct their efforts towards the immediate solution of individual collateral questions. We have already had the opportunity in this Committee to emphasize that the question of the cessation of nuclear tests is now ripe for a decision in view of the fact that the problem of detection and identification can be reliably solved through the use of national means, supplemented by automatic seismic stations. We also see great possibilities for the negotiations in regard to achieving agreement in the field of collateral measures. We are convinced, for example, that the signing of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries would go a long way towards improving the general situation in international relations and creating favourable conditions for the solution of other important questions.

In order that our future negotiations may be successful, it is essential that the Western Powers should display a sufficient measure of goodwill and desire to agree. Very often, for instance, they speak of the so-called balance of forces. As everyone knows, we do not share the Western Powers' philosophy on this question for reasons which I have already mentioned several times. But since the Western Powers speak so often about balance, could they not direct at least a part of their efforts towards achieving a balance of goodwill in the negotiations?

If we weigh up the present position, we see that so far only the socialist delegations have displayed goodwill and a maximum striving to meet the views of the other side, and

(Mr. Simovic, Czechoslovakia)

that the pointer of the balance in this direction shows undoubtedly in their favour. How many such proposals have been submitted by the Soviet Union alone in the past months! The representative of the Soviet Union spoke very convincingly about that at our last meeting (ENDC/PV.146, p.27). Anyone who has been following our work objectively must recognize that the delegations of the Western Powers have not made a move in one single instance to meet the position of the socialist countries. But that has not prevented them from demanding still further concessions from the socialist delegations.

If, after the Committee resumes its work, the Western Powers intend to adhere to a similar line, we can hardly expect to achieve any positive results.

The Czechoslovak delegation, like the delegations of other countries, is waiting with interest to see whether the realistic words spoken by President Kennedy in his statement of 10 June 1963 will be reflected in the practical policy of the United States. If that should really happen, the future negotiations on disarmament would take place in much better and more encouraging conditions than all the previous negotiations. We shall soon be able to have proof of this in connexion with the Moscow negotiations on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests.

The forthcoming recess will give us an opportunity to weigh up again all the proposals and arguments which have been submitted in the course of the negotiations of our Committee which have taken place so far, and to consult with our Governments on our positions on the questions under discussion. We hope that the Western delegations will avail themselves of the recess in order thoroughly to reconsider their present positions in a constructive spirit.

I should also like to associate myself with the words of high appreciation and gratitude expressed by other delegations with regard to the assistance we have received from the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Epstein. I should also like to thank all the Secretariat staff for the valuable services they have rendered us in the course of our work.

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI (Burma): Before going into the prepared part of my statement, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to associate this delegation with others in congratulating the Soviet Union on its latest achievement in space, an achievement of which the Soviet peoples have every right to be proud.

Today, as we are about to go into recess, I should like to express a few of this delegation's views on certain aspects of our work here. Firstly, we should like to welcome the announcement of the conclusion of an agreement on the establishment of a direct communications link between the Heads of Governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union (ENDC/97), not only because it is the first practical measure that has been achieved at this Conference, but also because of the significance of the function it could play in the ensurance of peace by those two great Powers. We hope that that modest achievement will act as an incentive to spur them to greater efforts in the attainment of agreement on more substantial measures.

It is unnecessary for me to say that the world in general, including all of us gathered here, values highly the existence of this Committee, being fully aware of the importance of the function it could fulfil in mankind's search for peace. But this Committee does not derive its value from its mere existence; its value can only be measured in terms of the work we have done and the achievements we have accomplished here. Our search for disarmament is indeed a race against armaments, in which time is certainly not on our side. With every passing day, the mounting crescendo of the arms race which goes on in search for security, but which, by its very nature, is founded on elements of insecurity, poses new problems for this Committee and confronts it with fresh obstacles. We feel therefore that the advancement of concepts and the movement in positions by either side, although essential to the progress of our negotiations, will prove their true value only when they in turn can lead to practical measures.

At the outset of this session we had every reason to feel that a test ban agreement was in sight, because the position of the two sides had never before come closer in the history of negotiations on a test ban. But time proved that our expectations had as yet to be fulfilled when we were confronted with an impasse and a period of long vigil while direct exchanges were going on between the nuclear Powers.

Our hopes were again rekindled when we heard that high-level talks would take place in mid-July to break the impasse. We look forward to these forthcoming

(U Maung Maung Gyi, Burma)

negotiations as a sincere attempt on the part of both sides to find a solution. We were indeed gratified by the spirit in which President Kennedy announced that news, when he said:

"... both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as our own ..." (ENDC/95, p.4)

We were happy also to hear the words of the representative of the Soviet Union, commenting on President Kennedy's speech, when he said:

"His appeal to break the vicious and dangerous circle in which the people have found themselves as a result of the cold war cannot fail to meet with the approval and support on the part of all men of goodwill.

President Kennedy's speech inspires the hope that the efforts being made both within and outside our Committee to improve the international situation, to create an atmosphere of confidence among the countries, and to embark upon the practical implementation of disarmament measures, will not be in vain." (ENDC/PV.144, p.35)

That is what the representative of the Soviet Union said. We therefore hopefully anticipate that these talks that are going to take place will yield some positive results; perhaps what is needed is the political courage of their conviction on the part of both sides to bridge the remaining gap that exists between them.

It has often been said, both within and outside this Committee, that the rewards of a test ban agreement are immeasurable, because a test ban — among other things — would prevent the further pollution of the air we breathe, would inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear Powers, would freeze the existing knowledge in nuclear arms technology and would halt the present trend of the nuclear arms race. There is, therefore, every reason to feel that whatever risk may exist would be relatively infinitesimal when compared to the risks that will involve humanity at large if there is no timely agreement on a test ban. It would seem to us that without a test ban agreement we could not expect much in our efforts on disarmament. A test ban may well be needed as a test case of mutual good will and trust between the great Powers in their goal of general and complete disarmament.

We do not harbour any doubts that the nuclear Powers will persevere and do their utmost in their search for a compromise during the forthcoming talks. We would suggest that it might perhaps be useful for them to review the proposals and

(U Maung Maung Gyi, Burma)

suggestions offered, jointly or singly, since February by the delegations of the non-aligned Powers, the latest being the joint memorandum of the delegations of Ethiopia, Nigeria and the United Arab Republic (ENDC/94) which we consider to be a sincere attempt on the part of our African colleagues to contribute towards a solution. It is thought that the consideration of those non-aligned Power proposals and suggestions by the nuclear Powers in the context that would be relevant to those negotiations ought to be helpful in their search for a compromise and should by no means conflict with or intrude upon those talks.

The time and tide of circumstances and events permit of no further delay in a test ban agreement, because the issue that confronts entire mankind is not a question of war or peace, but may well mean a matter of extinction or survival; today a test ban is timely, tomorrow it may be late.

Mr. BURNS (Canada): The Canadian delegation wishes first of all to express, as other delegations have done, great satisfaction that final agreement has now been achieved on the establishment of the direct communications link between Washington and Moscow (ENDC/97). The need for reliable and rapid means of communication between those capitals has been acutely felt in the past, and we warmly welcome the decision to set up the facilities required. The nations of the world can breathe a little more easily as a result. It is the first measure discussed by the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee which has resulted in definitive agreement and, as such -- as other speakers have said this morning -- it provides tangible proof that when we can identify specific measures of mutual interest which will decrease the dangers of the arms race agreed solutions can be rapidly negotiated. I would emphasize the phrase "of mutual interest". We should be encouraged by this experience in our future work, and the Canadian delegation hopes that in the field of collateral measures, particularly those designed to reduce the danger of accidental war, the agreement will serve as a precedent and as a stimulus to further and more far-reaching action.

We listened with attention to the speeches which were made this morning. We should like to say that we feel that the statements of the representatives of Sweden and the United Arab Republic and, just now, of our Burmese colleague, have continued the useful work which their delegations have done throughout this session particularly in searching for a solution to the development of a treaty on a nuclear weapon test

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

ban. We feel and we hope -- as do others -- that the results of the talks in Moscow will be favourable. If they are, the non-aligned delegations will reserve a measure of the credit.

We listened to the speech made by the representative of the Soviet Union and we found the first and last paragraphs quite interesting, and I might even say encouraging; but I am afraid that as far as the major and middle part of his speech is concerned we could hardly say the same thing. As I listened to it, I thought of the frequent ideas which one sees expressed in journalism and in fiction of machines taking on a life of their own and acting in a way sometimes not to the benefit of mankind. I wondered whether, in this case, the multigraph machine of the Soviet Union had not taken on a life of its own and had simply repeated past speeches of the Soviet Union and written out today's speech of its own volition. I say that because there was hardly anything said in the middle part of that speech which had not been said before; no argument advanced which had not been replied to by one or other of the Western delegations; and no unjustified assertion repeated on this occasion which had not been refuted by us at one time or another.

Our Czechoslovak colleague, in his speech, made an observation (supra.pp.25-26) to which I think one should take exception: that was that there have been no points of compromise or no moves from the Western position to try to reach agreement on any subject throughout. I would recall to this Committee that the Canadian delegation, in one of the early meetings of this session, gave a list (ENDC/79) of the moves which had been made by one side or the other on this disarmament question, not only since the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee started meeting, but since the Ten-Nation Committee started meeting, showing that there had been moves from both sides to reach the position of greater agreement which we have now achieved.

I should like to mention in that connexion the latest move, which was made by the representative of the United States on 19 June when he announced (ENDC/FV.146, p.23) a change in article I of the Working Draft of Part I of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World (ENDC/40/Rev.1) to meet the views of the Soviet delegation and the socialist delegations, in which it was agreed that the brackets should be removed in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 2 of that article, and the wording changed so that there would be an obligation for the

"Prohibition and elimination of all nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction; cessation of the production and prohibition of the manufacture of such weapons;"

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

That is a move towards the meeting of the views of the other side and one which has not been acknowledged in any way by the other side since it was made.

Before going on to discuss what might be done on the question of the programme for discussion of collateral measures in our future meetings when we resume, I have something to say about the procedure that we are to adopt. I note that Mr. Tsarapkin has said (supra. p.11) that the solution of procedural questions will not in itself solve questions of substance. Of course that is so, but I believe that our work -- which is difficult enough as it is -- should not suffer because of additional difficulties of a procedural nature.

At our last meeting I said (ENDC/PV.146, pp.8-9) that the Canadian delegation thought that the members of this Committee, and particularly the major Powers, should take time during the forthcoming recess to review outstanding problems. Practically every other speaker has made the same point. Wherever appropriate they could adopt fresh positions in order that during our next session we can progress both in general disarmament and in collateral measures. Since February the Conference has spent considerable time discussing those collateral measures, but I believe it is generally recognized that present conference arrangements for those discussions are not at all satisfactory.

Perhaps I might briefly review the situation. Document ENDC/C.1/2 -- listing proposals for agenda items in two columns, one for the Soviet Union and one for the United States -- was submitted by the two co-Chairmen to this Conference approximately fifteen months ago. During the greater part of the period since then the co-Chairmen have been unable to agree on a method for the orderly examination of the items on their respective lists. As a result, the collateral measures Committee has not met since last July. Last April we agreed -- purely as a temporary arrangement as I understood it -- that as a way out of the procedural impasse collateral measures should be considered in plenary session and that each delegation should be free to talk about whatever collateral proposals it chose. At the time it seemed the only solution possible but, as a result, the debate on that aspect of our work has been disorganized and confused. Since we are welcoming this morning agreement on a direct communications link, I shall not be so pessimistic as to say we have failed to make any progress whatsoever. However, as far as the discussion in this Conference goes, it is only too clear that we have failed to develop a common approach to the various items which have been examined. In fact, at the meetings devoted to collateral measures representatives rarely discussed the same subject.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

The Soviet Union and its allies have placed great emphasis on their draft declaration concerning the withdrawal from foreign territories of strategical means of delivery of nuclear weapons (ENDC/75). In my view, the debate has shown that that subject more appropriately belongs in the context of the next item on the agenda (ENDC/1.Add.3) for our discussion of general and complete disarmament, that is, item 5(e) relating to the question of military bases.

At our Friday meetings the question of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world has been raised, and the non-aligned members of the Committee have expressed particular interest in the establishing of such zones in Africa (ENDC/93/Rev.1) and Latin America (ENDC/87). However, the examination of the subject has never passed beyond a preliminary stage, and that has been due in part to the lack of an agreed agenda.

The Western representatives have sought to focus attention on measures designed to reduce the risks of war by accident (ENDC/70). However, there again, while outside the conference room agreement on one measure has been reached, our Friday debates have not yet brought about a common position between the two sides on action in this field. Again this failure to make progress may be attributed in part to the lack of organization in our work. The socialist representatives have wished to give priority to discussion of their proposal (ENDC/77) for a non-aggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries, while Western members, as we all know, consider that this Committee is not the appropriate forum for that subject.

Consideration of other proposals which delegations have from time to time advanced has been impossible because of the lack of an agreed agenda. For example, Canada and others -- including some of the non-aligned countries -- have on several occasions urged that attention be given to the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. We remain convinced that early action in that field would be an important step in checking the development of new and more deadly types of weapons.

At this point I should like, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, to add my congratulations to those expressed by other speakers to the Soviet Union and to its successful astronauts who have just completed safely and soundly their unprecedented travels around the earth. We are very happy that they have landed safely, and we repeat the congratulations we offered on a previous occasion to the scientists who have made this feat possible. However, we think that this new feat will draw

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

attention again to the need for preserving outer space for peaceful uses and for finding an agreement as early as possible to keep weapons of mass destruction out of it — an agreement which we think could be made without difficulty between the two possessors of the means of putting people into orbit around the earth.

I have touched on these various collateral measures and proposals to show how disjointed and tentative our discussion of them has been. To my mind we must amend our unsatisfactory procedure if we are to make progress in this field. Resolution 1767 (XVII) of the General Assembly called on us to persist in our efforts to reach agreement on collateral measures, and we are all conscious of the tremendous value such agreement could possess in clearing the way for general disarmament. Therefore the Canadian delegation hopes that during the recess at least the procedural question which has hampered our discussion of collateral measures can be resolved. We should hope that when this Conference reconvenes at the end of July the co-Chairmen would be in a position to submit new joint recommendations for an agenda for the collateral measures Committee. I believe that possibly other representatives, including those from non-aligned countries, could usefully submit, either orally or in writing, their views on subjects they would like to see included on this agenda. If that were done it would be one of the most urgent tasks of this Conference at its resumed session to adopt an agenda for the Committee of the Whole. We should hope that that would permit the resumed session to work effectively on the subject of collateral measures and to report significant progress to the eighteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

In drawing up a new agenda for the collateral measures Committee it would be useful, I think, to remember the point made by the representative of the United Arab Republic at a recent meeting (ENDC/PV.142, p.11 et seq.) concerning the interrelationship between various proposals which have been made. When these items are approached in complete isolation from one another progress may be slow and questions of priority become difficult to solve. If, on the other hand, the possibility of developing agreements which would cover several measures is kept in mind it may prove an easier task to draw up an agenda acceptable to all.

The Canadian delegation would like to associate itself with those delegations which have previously thanked the representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Epstein, and the Secretariat, the interpreters, the translators and all the United Nations staff members who have worked so hard and so effectively in rendering the mechanics of our discussions here easy and convenient.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

I should like to close, Mr. Chairman, by wishing you and my other colleagues in the Conference a pleasant recess. We hope that rest and recreation will stimulate new view-points and new ideas, resulting in more flexibility which will permit this Conference at its next session to make substantial progress towards the accomplishment of the tasks which we have been assigned. I look forward to working with you all again in five weeks' time.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): On behalf of the Mexican delegation, I wish to express our satisfaction at the agreement arrived at between the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union for the establishment of a direct communications link between them (ENDC/97). It is our wish and hope that this agreement on one specific matter may be followed by other agreements on other specific matters, which will contribute to lessening international tension, halting the arms race and facilitating the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons tests -- which will in turn pave the way towards our main objective, general and complete disarmament.

One general condition essential to the progress of any negotiation is the creation of a favourable atmosphere free from constant mutual recriminations. The attempt to place all responsibility for the present dangerous international situation on the opponent is an entirely negative factor which makes international understanding difficult and aggravates the cold war.

Statesmen of great responsibility have repeatedly asserted that it is necessary to translate good wishes and the best intentions into deeds. We all hope that what is preached will be practised. We believe that the concrete deed which best translates the noblest ideas is of a bilateral or collective nature a reciprocal attitude, an agreement. The most important concrete deed the great Powers could offer us would be an agreement on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests as a result of the negotiations which will soon take place in Moscow. This requires, as President Kennedy said, a change in attitude. This change in attitude must be reciprocal and mutual, just as the interests of all the Powers in maintaining peace are mutual.

President Kennedy said in the speech he made in Washington on 10 June:

"In short, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race. Agreements to this end are in the interests of

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

the Soviet Union as well as our own -- and even the most hostile nations can be relied upon to accept and keep those treaty obligations, and only those treaty obligations, which are in their own interest." (ENDC/95, p.4)

And he added:

"Let us re-examine our attitude towards the cold war, remembering we are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment." (ibid.)

The division of the world into two parts -- on the one hand the traditional democracies, and on the other hand the people's democracies -- is at the root of many of our difficulties. The effects of this division are present everywhere in the world; we find them constantly obstructing our progress in each of our States and in the United Nations. They have made the task of the Governments difficult, have made international agreement impossible on many occasions and, what is worse, they have greatly harmed the common man both physically and spiritually by imposing sacrifices upon him and filling him with despair and fear.

Yet, we ought to try to return to the spirit in which the United Nations was established. The Charter was drawn up not to perpetuate the discords of a divided community but rather to guide a community united in the noblest aims of progress. If the capitalist world and the communist world could convince each other of just one thing -- that neither is planning the destruction of the other -- the apprehensions which divide them would be removed and as a result there would be created the only factor truly indispensable for uniting them in the service of the higher interests of mankind, which are far above any political economic and social doctrine.

There must be some formula capable of producing this result; means have always been found for attaining an objective when there was a will. In the statement from which I have just quoted, President Kennedy also said:

"Our problems are man-made. Therefore they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants." (ibid., p.2)

If this will does not exist and if either or both of the two worlds should place the objectives of national policy higher than the purposes of the United Nations and consider that these objectives cannot be attained without the annihilation or destruction of the other world, then we would have to recognize that the very concept of a universal community has failed. The disastrous conflict which would ensue would be the utter negation of our purposes.

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

In the present dangerous international situation, the peoples of the world are watching the attitude of the great Powers with fear and doubt. The course we are following in accordance with the public's wishes, or in spite of them, is not that leading to peace, and there is already a universal feeling that we must change our course and our methods.

We all recognize the existence of certain legitimate principles, but we believe that it is possible to solve the most complex problems without prejudice to those principles and without the need to continue to make charges which world public opinion regards as useless, monotonous and sterile. Nothing is to be gained for mankind by the persistent tendency always to place all the blame on the adversary.

We know that no people is unworthy or intrinsically evil. Still, the purpose of the policy of recrimination, which keeps mistrust alive, is to make us believe that there are such peoples, and by constantly exposing them to arbitrary accusations it fosters in them a feeling of animosity and intransigence. What people, what nation or what Government can honestly claim to have a monopoly of justice and truth? What unprejudiced mind can believe that error and evil are to be found only in one's opponents? The world is not divided into good and bad peoples. They all make a plurality of nations, obeying diverse spiritual impulses, conditioned by different historical developments and influenced by different philosophical schools of thought. If, instead of persisting in one-sided judgments of others, we try to understand each other and recognize in the national voice of each people the universal physiognomy of man and the common essence which is part of the heritage of all mankind, only in this spirit shall we be able to create an atmosphere conducive to negotiation, to agreement and to the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

President Kennedy said in the same speech:

"No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue." (ibid., p. 3)

He then referred to the Soviet Union and to the United States and said:

"We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle with suspicion on one side breeding suspicion on the other and new weapons begetting counter-weapons." (ibid., p. 4)

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

I realise that no one would be inclined to sacrifice principles which he considers sacred and inviolable, but between this inadmissible extreme and the other -- which is equally difficult to accept -- of a stratification of attitudes, there is a wide margin for the fruitful application of the true spirit of negotiation and for the mutual concessions which this spirit implies. There is now, nor should there be, any plan or proposal which is indispensable or sacrosanct. As I said on another occasion, we are certain that as regards each problem it is possible to attenuate, without prejudice to the principles of justice and honour, the rigidity of originally opposed attitudes. With regard to many problems the opposing views are neither absolutely true nor absolutely false on either side. With sincere effort we can reach common ground where understanding is possible. The periodic reassertion of irreconcilable attitudes and recriminations will never shorten the distance.

If in the past the argument had prevailed that "the reality is such and such it must remain", then mankind would have remained static in ignorance and error. In the course of history the ideas of liberty, justice and peace gradually triumphed over vested interests and over anachronistic attempts to maintain unchanged certain practices and concepts that were incapable of adjusting themselves and of surviving. On 10 June, President Kennedy said:

"And history teaches us that enmities between nations ... do not last for ever". (*ibid*, p.2)

We congratulate the Soviet Union on the happy completion of the mission of the two cosmonauts. The exploration of outer space by cosmonauts of both the United States and the Soviet Union means the peaceful conquest of the forces of nature for the benefit of mankind, as was said a few moments ago by the representative of Bulgaria. (*supra*, p.19)

I believe it would be timely to make today the same recommendation as I made to this Committee just before our first recess on 14 June 1962. In order to save time I shall quote only a few paragraphs from the verbatim record of the Meeting of 14 June, that is, the day before the beginning of our recess:

"Another point that the nuclear Powers might consider during the recess is the proposal made by the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs at the beginning of our discussions, and supported by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, to the effect that the great Powers should undertake not to

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

place in orbit, or to station in space, devices with nuclear weapons. To place in orbit a satellite equipped with a nuclear warhead or any other means of mass destruction is tantamount to a permanent threat to use force. It amounts to hanging a tremendous sword of Damocles over all peoples. That would be a violation of the Charter and of the general principles of international law, and would offend the moral conscience of all mankind. A ban on placing in orbit or stationing in outer space weapons capable of causing mass destruction, or special devices serving as vehicles for such weapons, should be agreed on by the nuclear Powers even before the first stage begins, outside the framework of general and complete disarmament.

"In the opinion of the delegation of Mexico, a ban on placing such weapons or devices in orbit or stationing them in outer space should be negotiated separately, and not be dependent on the elimination of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles. This problem should also be separated from the problem of other methods of launching, or other delivery vehicles, such as pilotless aircraft, military aircraft, warships, submarines and artillery systems which can be used for this purpose.

"The question of placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit, or of stationing special devices in space which can serve as vehicles for these weapons, is in my opinion a question sui generis, of a different nature from those I have already mentioned in connexion with other vehicles, and which therefore also requires treatment sui generis." (ENDC/PV.56, pp.51,52)

On 19 March 1962 the United States had submitted to this Conference its Declaration on Disarmament: A Programme for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World (ENDC/6) which provides in Part E concerning the peaceful use of outer space that

"(a) The placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction shall be prohibited." (ibid. p.5)

This same idea, reinforced with the aim of establishing co-operation in outer space activities, was reaffirmed by the United States delegation in Part D of document ENDC/30, where it is stated:

"The Parties to the Treaty would agree not to place in orbit weapons capable of producing mass destruction" (ENDC/30, p.10)

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

We find a correlating notion in the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union (ENDC/2/Rev.1). In Chapter III, article 14 concerning restrictions on the movement of means of delivering nuclear weapons, it is stated that

"... the placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of any special devices capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction ... shall be prohibited." (ENDC/2/Rev.1, Corr.1)

We believe that this is not a mere fortuitous coincidence. The great Powers realize the grave problem that such a measure as the placing into orbit of nuclear weapons would represent for the security of States.

At our meeting on 19 June the representative of Canada stated:

"As for measures which would reserve outer space for peaceful purposes only, item 5(h), the measures proposed in the two draft plans before the Conference are very similar in scope. The Canadian delegation has referred to this question on several occasions in the past and continues to believe that early action which would prohibit the placing of weapons of mass destruction in orbit should be agreed upon quickly and that such a prohibition could be put into effect even before agreement on a programme of general and complete disarmament. This is an area which we are convinced should be studied carefully during the recess with a view to exploring the possibility of tangible progress when we reconvene." (ENDC/PV.146, p.10)

In order that during the recess, as I suggested a year ago, the nuclear Powers, if they see fit, should consider the possibilities of agreement in other fields, such as those related to collateral measures, I wish to submit for their consideration and for the consideration of all the members of this Conference an outline of a draft treaty which prohibits the placing in orbit of nuclear weapons. It is a draft treaty which I request the Secretariat of this Committee to be kind enough to circulate among all the members of the Conference, including, naturally, the representatives of the nuclear Powers.*

So as not to take more of the Committee's time, I shall not read out the preamble or the articles of this draft. However, I believe that the spirit underlying it can be easily grasped by a reading of article I:

* Circulated as document 98.

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

"1. Outer space and the celestial bodies shall be utilized exclusively for peaceful purposes. Accordingly, every military measure, among others, such as the placing in orbit and the stationing in space of nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction or of vehicles capable of delivering such weapons, is prohibited. Tests of the said weapons of destruction, or of any other warlike device for military purposes, are likewise prohibited, as is also the stationing or placing in orbit of bases for launching weapons of any type whatsoever.

"2. Nothing in this treaty shall prevent the employment of military personnel or equipment, provided that they are used exclusively for scientific research or for some other peaceful purpose."

The working document which will be circulated to the members of this Conference contains the complete text of the draft treaty I am submitting on behalf of the Mexican delegation. Its 12 articles express, in our view, ideas and objectives which answer the universal desire to keep outer space free of nuclear weapons.

The Mexican delegation wishes to associate itself with what has been said by other representatives and to express its gratitude to Mr. Epstein, the representative of the Secretary-General in this Committee, and to his staff, as well as to the interpreters, the verbatim reporters and all the other persons who have so efficiently assisted us in our work.

Mr. MBU (Nigeria): My delegation would like to be associated with the many expressions of congratulations to the Soviet Union on its recent exploits in outer space. Of particular interest to the world is the fact that one of the cosmonauts was a lady. She is not only courageous but she deserves the title of Queen of the Cosmonauts. It is the hope of my delegation that this astounding feat in the field of science will be matched by equal progress in the political field. These technological and scientific feats in the exploration of outer space underline the necessity for progress in our work and, if I may say so, they introduce a note of urgency for such progress. Therefore, I trust that the Committee will not be found lacking in its continued and unflinching search for agreement or agreements in connexion with the various tasks entrusted to us by the United Nations and the world.

My delegation also would like to express its satisfaction at the signing yesterday by Mr. Stelle and Mr. Tsarapkin of a memorandum of understanding (ENDC/97) between the United States and the Soviet Union on the establishment of a direct

(Mr. Mbu, Nigeria)

communications link. Without doubt, this agreement is a landmark in the history of our negotiations here since it is our first agreement. However, we do agree with the co-Chairmen who concede that this is a modest agreement and should not induce complacency in our work but should serve as a spur towards further efforts.

It is the sincere belief of my delegation that there is an issue on which agreement is long overdue. I refer, of course, to the cessation of nuclear weapon tests; universal concern about it has been made manifest, and political and psychological considerations have made it a necessity both for the lessening of international tension and for the progress of our work. That is more, considerations of a technical, military and economic nature, we have been told, have made it not only a necessity but almost a sine qua non that agreement of a test ban must be reached now. It is therefore our hope that the impending high level talks between the nuclear Powers in Moscow will bear the much awaited fruits.

The nuclear Powers now have a superabundance of ideas and suggestions aimed at helping them towards agreement. They have the various ideas and suggestions made by the various delegations -- especially the eight non-aligned delegations -- either submitted formally in the Committee or informally. They have also the recent attempt by the three African delegations -- Ethiopia, Nigeria and the United Arab Republic -- towards breaking the present impasse in our negotiations. It is the hope of my delegation that the three Power memorandum (ENDC/94) will receive the close and detailed study from the nuclear Powers which it deserves. We trust that it will help them when they embark on their high-level talks in Moscow.

May I express the hope that the talks in Moscow in July will not be predestined like so many of their predecessors. The world has waited long enough for an agreement on this much-discussed subject and we would submit, with great respect, that the nuclear Powers have no longer any justification for withholding such an agreement from the world indefinitely. We expect action as a result of the Moscow talks, not words -- a willingness to agree and a preparedness for mutual accommodation and compromise. We hope the nuclear Powers will not disappoint the hopes of humanity.

As this is our last meeting before we begin our recess I should like to express the gratitude of my delegation to the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, the interpreters, the verbatim reporters and, indeed, the entire staff of the Secretariat, who have contributed in no small measure to the smooth working of our Committee.

(Mr. Mbu, Nigeria)

My delegation would like also to express the hope that our colleagues will have a well deserved rest. We trust, however, that in between sun bathing, et cetera, representatives will give very careful study to the various subjects before us so that we shall be able to record more agreements like that signed yesterday.

Mr. MENTA (India): We in the delegation of India should also like to join with the other speakers both in congratulating the Soviet Union on the successful completion of the latest feat of its two cosmonauts, as also in expressing our deep gratification at the completion of the agreement on the setting up of a direct communications link between Moscow and Washington which was signed here yesterday (ENDC/97). It is a matter of particular satisfaction that this agreement should have been concluded before we went into another period of recess. This agreement, apart from being the first modest step forward in the tasks before us, has another important significance inasmuch as it highlights the fact often stressed here before that, with good will and good faith on both sides, there could be no insurmountable difficulties in reaching agreement speedily on mutually advantageous and, if I may say so, universally beneficial measures in the interest and cause of world peace.

In fact this agreement serves as a direct pointer to the responsibility for realization on both sides that all approaches to the various issues before this Committee, complicated as they undoubtedly are, hinge primarily on the basic spirit of good will and confidence in the good faith of the other side. We fervently hope that the same spirit as displayed in reaching the present agreement will prevail in the important high-level talks which are shortly to take place in Moscow.

There is, as has already been pointed out by other speakers, no lack of helpful and constructive suggestions made in our Committee since the beginning of the present session, especially from the delegations of the non-aligned countries. The latest in this series is the very thoughtful Memorandum (ENDC/94) submitted jointly by the delegations of Ethiopia, Nigeria and the United Arab Republic, and it is to be hoped that all these suggestions will be given favourable and due consideration in the forthcoming talks.

We here in the Committee, and the world at large, therefore look forward with great expectation to the success of these talks. With this encouragement we should be able to continue our labours in the same spirit and move forward speedily towards the attainment of our objectives when we resume here again at the end of next month.

(Mr. Mehta, India)

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate our delegation in paying tributes to Mr. Epstein, the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and all members of the Secretariat of the Conference for their hard work and never failing co-operation, and, at the same time, wish all our colleagues in the Committee and the Secretariat a pleasant and useful working recess.

Mr. HOSANNAH (Brazil) (translation from French): The Brazilian delegation has always urged in this Committee the adoption of concrete measures, even if only of a limited scope, for it considers that this is the best way of creating a basis of agreement and of demonstrating to each of the opposing groups the sincerity and good faith of the other side and so of contributing to the lessening of international tension.

The Brazilian delegation has never concealed its disappointment with the slowness of the Committee's work and has even ventured to criticize it on many occasions. It is, therefore, all the more happy to say with what great satisfaction it took note of the statement made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union concerning the agreement (ENDC/97) they had reached on the establishment of a direct line of communication between the Governments of two of the greatest nuclear Powers.

We are certain that such an agreement, tending to lessen the risk of war by accident or miscalculation, will mark the beginning of a series of other practical measures which, extending little by little, will make it possible -- we hope -- in a not too distant future to reach a more general and at the same time more specific agreement on the problems directly connected with disarmament.

It is with this conviction, this hope and the certainty that the agreement announced yesterday augurs a favourable climate for the talks due to open soon in Moscow that I should like to add the Brazilian delegation's congratulations to those of the representatives who spoke before me and, I believe, to those of the whole of world public opinion.

Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania): The delegation of the Romanian People's Republic wants to express its warmest congratulations to the Soviet delegation on the full success of the two Soviet cosmonauts in coping with the task entrusted to them by the Soviet Government. Valentina Tereshkova and Valery Bykovsky have unfolded new secrets hidden until now by nature, and have offered them to man.

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

The legend about Prometheus has changed its meaning. For having stolen fire from heaven and for having brought it down to earth Prometheus was bound to a rock and left to suffer tremendous tortures. The hero Soviet cosmonauts have met with the love, respect and admiration of all the world. Their success ought to be a source of inspiration for our Committee, which must understand that while struggling in order to master more and more of nature's secrets man needs peace, not war -- that he needs his entire creative power to be dedicated not to destruction and death but to building up a flourishing life and creating material and spiritual values for the benefit of all those who, with their hands and with their minds, help to create them.

As this stage of our negotiations draws to a close, the two co-Chairmen have signed a memorandum of understanding (ENDC/97) between the Governments of the Soviet Union and of the United States relating to an agreement on a direct communications link between Moscow and Washington. That is an achievement to be noted, but how small it is when compared with the efforts of this Committee on the big issue of general and complete disarmament.

Before leaving this Conference room, the delegation of the Romanian People's Republic would like to thank the Secretary-General of the United Nations who, by virtue of the presence of his representative Mr. Epstein, has shown the importance he attaches to the negotiations in this Committee. We should also like to thank the interpreters, the verbatim reporters and all the other members of the Secretariat who, during these past four months, have worked so intensively. We wish all of them pleasant vacations.

The delegation of the Romanian People's Republic would like to express its best wishes to the two co-Chairmen, to the Chairman presiding and to all the delegations which have been assembled for so long here, where negotiations have been taking place without success on the essential issues of our time and of the future.

The CHAIRMAN (Poland): I should like to speak as representative of Poland. We are about to conclude our deliberations and thus to terminate another stage in our debate. In the light of the balance sheet, my delegation would like to express its views on what has been done during the recent weeks of the work of this Committee.

We feel bound to voice our deep regret at the lack of progress made on what is the essential issue before us. The other day, I referred to questions concerning general and complete disarmament; today I wish to refer to what have been labelled

(The Chairman, Poland)

"collateral measures". We have had no reason to complain about a lack of proposals in that sphere, and yet to our great regret we have not moved forward, although the need for some decision on these various subjects before us has been and is ever more obvious.

Let me take as an example the many proposals concerning nuclear-free zones. No one can deny that the idea has gained ground on all continents, and initiatives have been taken in relation to all of them. Could one claim legitimately that that is pure coincidence? I believe that no one could assert that; it is the result of a logical sequence of events, of sound and constructive reaction on the part of those who are concerned with the very security of their countries and with the vital interests of their own nations. How else could one explain that the very same thought that is shared today was shared yesterday by statesmen assembled in Addis Ababa, by Governments in Rio de Janeiro, Quito, Santiago, La Paz, Helsinki, Prague, Warsaw and other places? It is no mere coincidence; as I have said, it is the result of a logical and historical progress. Would it not have been advisable -- I would even say imperative -- to enter into serious negotiations on that subject? Instead, unfortunately we have been offered explanations and arguments which one could hardly consider to be convincing. What is more, as has been shown over and over again in the debate, those arguments against the creation of nuclear-free zones were mutually exclusive and even conflicted with one another.

What I am concerned with is that we have been prevented from entering into an important chapter in the programme of disarmament; we have been prevented from entering into real and fruitful negotiations. We do not abandon hope, however, and we trust that those proposals will be reconsidered so that we can really discuss them on their merits.

In the meantime -- and this is another point which I should like to make at this last meeting of ours -- I think it is essential that nothing should be done during the recess that could contribute to a deterioration of the present situation, particularly in Europe. The risks are great; nuclear weapons may spread. They may spread in a way which would make agreement on their abolition much more difficult than it is today.

Turning to another subject, we of the Polish delegation believe that the topic of a non-aggression pact between the two alliances is one which deserved more serious consideration than has been given to it in the past. We hope that when this

(The Chairman, Poland)

Committee meets again it will give it the attention it really deserves. That is why it is essential to concentrate on what are the most important points on our agenda, with a readiness to abandon self-righteousness and subjective approaches; otherwise, I fear there may be little chance of progress in the future. My delegation refuses to subscribe to such a prospect and it will, as in the past, do its best to contribute to the constructive work of this Committee in the future.

Ato M. GHEBEYEHU (Ethiopia): I am really very sorry for having taken the floor at this time, but I assure members that I will be brief.

First of all, I should like to associate myself with all those delegations which have preceded me in congratulating the Soviet people and Government on the happy and historic landing of the two cosmonauts.

We are now to end the work of our Committee for some time, after having spent a considerable time on very many useful meetings which have no doubt helped us in many ways in our endeavours here. The signing of the memorandum of understanding (ENDC/97) on a direct communications link between Moscow and Washington is one of the outcomes of our deliberations here. That outcome, in the belief of our delegation, serves as a unique precedent for realism and sincerity in the future. That is why our delegation warmly welcomes this bold step taken and congratulates the Soviet Union and the United States.

We hope that when our Committee reconvenes on 30 July it will start anew with added endeavours to do away with past obstacles and problems in a spirit of mutual confidence which, naturally, will envisage concrete solutions; for no obstacle and no problem is without solution.

In conclusion, we should like to convey our gratitude to Mr. Epstein, the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and the whole staff of the Secretariat for the hard work with which they have assisted our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Poland): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): First of all, I should like to thank for their warm congratulations all the delegations which have congratulated the Soviet Union on the successful conclusion of the space flight of the Soviet cosmonauts, Bykovsky and Tereshkova.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

Now I should like to deal with a different matter. So far as I gathered from the interpretation, today the representative of Mexico put forward a proposal (supra. p.40) that we should single out from the general problem of disarmament the question of the use of outer space for military purposes, that is, the question of prohibiting the placing in orbit of means of delivery of nuclear weapons or of space devices with nuclear weapons and that this question should be dealt with separately, in isolation from the general problem of disarmament.

In this connexion the Soviet delegation would like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the close relationship existing between the problem raised today by the representative of Mexico and the general problem of disarmament, particularly the question of the elimination of military bases on foreign territories, which is why these two questions should be dealt with simultaneously. The Soviet Union's position in this regard was exhaustively expounded in the Soviet Government's statement of 15 March 1958 (A.3818) and our position in this regard is still the same.

Sir Paul MASON (United Kingdom): Very late though it is, I want to say three things on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation.

First of all I wish to join other delegations in expressing warm congratulations to our two co-Chairmen on the final reaching of agreement on the establishment of a direct communications link between their two Governments (ENDC/97). I have had occasion in the past to say that this is a matter which we in the United Kingdom regard as an important one. I have had occasion also to say that it is a measure with which the United Kingdom may wish to be associated in due course.

In the second place, I wish to join in expressing warm congratulations to our Soviet colleague and his Government on the very distinguished and happily achieved feat of the two astronauts.

In the third place, I wish to convey the thanks and gratitude of the United Kingdom delegation to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and to all the Secretariat and the technical services working under him to achieve the technical possibilities of our work. They certainly deserve a rest, even if it is perhaps doubtful to what extent the representatives do.

I should like to add one last thought. The fact that it has been decided that this Conference is going to adjourn for several weeks obviously means that we have relatively little time left to achieve anything substantial and constructive