

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT

DEPT. OF POLITICAL AND  
SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS  
DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS DIVISION  
REFERENCE LIBRARY  
ENDC/PV.157  
21 January 1964  
ENGLISH

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

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 21 January 1964, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS

(Canada)

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. J. de CASTRO

Mr. E. HOSANNAH

Mr. J. LENGYEL

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. LUKONOV

Mr. G. GUELEV

Mr. D. TEHOV

Mr. V. IZMIRLIEV

Burma:

Mr. James BARRINGTON

U SAIN BWA

U MAUNG MAUNG GHI

U HTOON SHEIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS

Mr. S.F. RAE

Mr. A.E. GOTLIEB

Mr. R.M. TAIT

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. L. SIMOVIC

Mr. M. ZEMLA

Mr. V. VAJNAR

Mr. T. LAHODA

Ethiopia:

Mr. Agate AGEDE

Mr. S. TEFERRA

India:

Mr. R.K. NEHRU

Mr. A.S. MEHTA

Mr. K. KRISHNA RAO

Mr. K. NARENDRANATH

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI

Mr. E. GUIDOTTI

Mr. S. AVETTA

Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Mexico:

Mr. E. de SANTIAGO  
Mr. Manuel TELLO M.  
Miss Ofilia REYES RETANA

Nigeria:

Mr. L.C.N. OBI

Poland:

Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI  
Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN  
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI  
Mr. J. GOLDBLAT

Romania:

Mr. V. DUMITRESCU  
Mr. E. GLASER  
Mr. N. ECOBESCU  
Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Sweden:

Mr. P. HAMMARSKÖLD  
Mr. C.G. EKLUND  
Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN  
Mr. A.A. ROSCHIN  
Mr. I.G. USACHEV  
Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. AHMED OSMAN  
Mr. M. KASSEM  
Mr. S.E. IBRAHIM  
Mr. Abdel SALAM

United Kingdom:

Mr. Peter THOMAS  
Sir Paul MASON  
Mr. J.G. TAHOURDIN  
Mr. J.M. EDES

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

Mr. A.L. RICHARDS

Mr. D.S. MACDONALD

Mr. R.A. MARTIN

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Director of the  
U.N. European Office:

Mr. Georges PALTHEY

Deputy Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

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

The first part of this meeting, as has become customary on the resumption of the Conference, will be open.

I now call on Mr. Protitch, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who will address the Conference on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Mr. PROTITCH (Special Representative of the Secretary-General): Once again it is a privilege, on behalf of Secretary-General U Thant, to welcome the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to the European Headquarters of the United Nations.

During the recess in the work of the Conference, the eighteenth session of the General Assembly has given detailed consideration to the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee (ENDC/115) and has provided an opportunity for all Members of the United Nations to review the work of the Committee and to make recommendations to facilitate its task, and also to make important contributions to the solution of various problems in the field of disarmament.

The General Assembly adopted five important resolutions concerning disarmament: on outer space, on general and complete disarmament, on the convening of a conference to prohibit nuclear weapons, on a nuclear test ban, and on the denuclearization of Latin America. These resolutions were adopted by acclamation or by overwhelming majorities. In voting for and adopting these resolutions the Members of the United Nations, including of course the members of this Committee, have accepted a continuing responsibility for the implementation of their provisions.

The texts of three of these resolutions and the letter of the Secretary-General transmitting them are before you in document ENDC/116. These resolutions entrust the Eighteen-Nation Committee with specific responsibilities and request the Committee to submit reports to the next session of the General Assembly or at an earlier date. The texts of the other two resolutions also have been transmitted by the Secretary-General for your information in document ENDC/117.

(Mr. Protitch)

During the recently-concluded session of the General Assembly, Members expressed their sense of deep satisfaction with three important developments relating to disarmament -- the agreement on the partial test ban treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1), the establishment of the direct communications link between Moscow and Washington (ENDC/97), and the agreed resolution to call on all States to exclude nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons from outer space (ENDC/117). The work of the General Assembly proceeded in a hopeful atmosphere and in a spirit of mutual accommodation and goodwill that was fostered by these agreements and by the conciliatory statements and positions of the major nuclear Powers in the Assembly.

The year that has passed has witnessed more real progress in the relaxation of tensions and towards the achievement of measures of disarmament than any year since the founding of the United Nations. The increasing atmosphere of detente and the steps taken so far in the field of disarmament give solid grounds for hopes that additional concrete steps might be taken in 1964. Such hopes are strengthened by the recent unilateral decisions for the reduction of military budgets and the cut-back of armed forces and armaments. If the progress of the past year is continued in this new year, future generations may well look back on 1963 as the turning point in relations between the Powers.

The period of recess has provided the opportunity, not only for the General Assembly to review the work of the Conference, but also for the participants in the Conference to review their own positions. The resumption of the Conference provides the occasion for the presentation of new proposals and for new ideas and approaches by the parties. Certain initiatives by the major Powers are already known, and there is confident hope that more will be forthcoming in the course of negotiations in the flexible machinery of this Conference, and in reciprocated acts of individual Powers.

In these auspicious circumstances, the Secretary-General is convinced that all the participants in this Conference will make a major effort, taking full advantage of the favourable atmosphere, towards further progress in the solution of the most important problem of our time -- the achievement of disarmament and just and lasting international peace and security.

I extend to all of you the earnest good wishes of the Secretary-General for success in your work.

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): After the representatives of the Press and the photographers have withdrawn, the Conference will proceed to the second part of the meeting, which, as usual, will be held in private.

The meeting was suspended at 3.12 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): At our one hundred and fifty-sixth meeting, on 29 August last, the Conference decided to recess for the eighteenth session of the General Assembly and to reconvene no later than one week after the termination of the consideration by the General Assembly of the nuclear testing and disarmament items. At an informal meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, held at the United Nations in New York on 22 November last, the Conference decided to reconvene at the Palais des Nations in Geneva on 21 January 1964, which we are now doing on time.

I should like to greet all the representatives and delegations to our Committee and to welcome in particular the representatives who are at this Conference for the first time. I would mention Ambassador Agede of Ethiopia, Ambassador Nehru of India, Minister de Santiago of Mexico, and Ambassador Dumitrescu of Romania. I should also like to welcome some former colleagues of ours who have not been with us for some time but whom we are very glad to have with us again: I refer to Mr. Foster, the leader of the United States delegation, and Mr. Naszkowski, the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland.

Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): Let me first ask the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to convey on our behalf to the Secretary-General the thanks of my delegation for the words which the Special Representative has so well addressed to us today.

May I also join the Chairman in extending greetings to the delegations, many of whose members have been here before? I should like also to join the Chairman in welcoming the new members to this Conference: Ambassador Agede of Ethiopia, Ambassador Nehru of India, Ambassador Dumitrescu of Romania, and the others who are here for the first time.

This Committee has distinguished itself from many similar conferences which have been held since the end of the Second World War. It has helped to achieve a measure of agreement along the difficult road to lasting peace.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

My country has suffered a grievous loss since the last meeting of this Committee. President Kennedy's efforts contributed immeasurably to the steps towards peace made during the last three years, and this seems a fitting occasion to recall them. The supreme importance which President Kennedy attached to the great issues of world peace was evident from the outset of his administration. In his inaugural address he said:

"Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us. Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms - and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations."

Early in his administration President Kennedy proposed the creation of a special new agency just to deal with the disarmament problem. Pursuant to his instructions the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations (ENDC/5) was negotiated with the Soviet Union.

In an historic address to the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly on 25 September 1961, President Kennedy presented a United States plan for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. After further development that proposal was presented to this Committee on 18 April 1962 as an outline of basic provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world (ENDC/30).

President Kennedy will probably best be remembered in his own country for his unswerving pursuit of a test ban agreement -- a modest step, perhaps, but one which was achievable in today's world. He characterized it as "the logical place to begin", and he gave it his attention from the very beginning of his Administration. When his first proposals were not accepted, he instructed his representative in this Committee to present a revised proposal for a comprehensive ban and a new proposal for a limited ban. The United States-United Kingdom draft treaties of 27 August 1962 (ENDC/58 and ENDC/59) were the result. After less than a year's study by this Committee the limited draft treaty formed the basis for an agreement in which all of the Governments represented here have now joined (ENDC/100/Rev.1).

It was at President Kennedy's direction that the United States negotiated an agreement last June on a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow (ENDC/97), and it was at his direction that the United States proposed a United Nations resolution against the orbiting of nuclear weapons in space (ENDC/117).



(Mr. Foster, United States)

That, in broad outline, was President Kennedy's strategy of peace and some of the steps towards the achievement of the objectives of that strategy taken during his Administration.

We have suffered a grievous loss in the assassination of a leader whose vision and determination led to the achievement of so much in so short a time. Yet the choice between peace and war is not the decision of any one man or any nation or any group of nations. This Committee has contributed significantly to the measure of agreement that has been achieved to date. Deliberations in this Committee assisted the two co-Chairmen in reaching the agreement for the establishment of a direct communications link between Washington and Moscow. Much of the groundwork for the limited nuclear test ban treaty was laid during the course of lengthy discussions at this Conference. Almost all members of this Conference had supported the proposal for a limited nuclear test ban prior to the beginning of the Moscow negotiations. Proposals to keep outer space free from nuclear weapons were patiently but persistently urged upon this Committee, principally by the representatives of Canada and Mexico. The unanimous co-sponsorship of the United Nations resolution by all the participants in this Conference contributed immensely to its adoption by acclamation.

Thus, each and every participating delegation can point with justifiable pride to the achievements of this Conference in the past. But it would be a serious mistake to let self-congratulation lead to self-complacency. All of this is but a modest beginning. As President Kennedy himself noted, the nuclear test ban treaty "is a milestone -- but it is not the millennium".

In his inaugural address President Kennedy said: "Let us begin." President Johnson, in his address before the Joint Session of the United States Congress on 27 November 1963, said: "Let us continue." "This," Mr. Johnson said, "is our challenge -- not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfil the destiny history has set for us."

President Johnson has made explicit his own intention to carry on the policies of the Kennedy Administration in the field of arms control and disarmament and in the quest for peace. He made this clear in addressing the United Nations General Assembly on 17 December 1963, when he said:

"If there is one commitment more than any other that I would like to leave with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and the strengthening of peace ...

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"We know what we want:

"The United States of America wants to see the cold war end; we want to see it end once and for all.

"The United States wants to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them.

"The United States wants to press on with arms control and reduction ...

"President Kennedy, I am sure, would regard as his best memorial the fact that in his three years as President the world became a little safer and the way ahead became a little brighter. To the protection and enlargement of this new hope for peace I pledge my country and its Government." (A/PV.1284, pp.39, 40).

Some of you heard those words as they were spoken. They were spoken by a man whose interest in peace, like that of the man he succeeded, is unfaltering. In the year-end exchange between President Johnson and Chairman Khrushchev, Mr. Johnson reaffirmed this pledge when he stated:

"The American people and their Government have set the strengthening of peace as their highest purpose in the year. ... the time for simply talking about peace, however, has passed -- 1964 should be a year in which we take further steps toward that goal."

In my discussions with him just before leaving Washington, President Johnson made it absolutely clear that he would spare no effort towards that end in the year ahead.

1964 has already witnessed Soviet and United States announcements of reductions in military expenditures and agreement on the need to deal peacefully with territorial disputes. The intention of the United States delegation during the coming months will be to continue and redouble our efforts to achieve, step by step, a halt in the arms race and, ultimately, general disarmament. We will continue on the basis of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles to "seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date."

(ENDC/5, p.3).

In this regard, I should like to read at this time a statement from President Johnson to this Committee dated 21 January 1964:

"There is only one item on the agenda of this Conference -- it is the leading item on the agenda of mankind -- and that one item is peace.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"Already this Conference has led to more concrete and effective results than any disarmament conference in modern history. Your efforts and deliberations laid the groundwork for the nuclear test ban treaty, for the communications link between Washington and Moscow, and for the United Nations General Assembly action against nuclear weapons in space.

"Today your search begins anew in a climate of hope. Last year's genuine gains have given us new momentum. Recent Soviet and American announcements of reduction on military spending, even though modest, have brightened the atmosphere further. Let us pray that the tide has turned, that further and more far-reaching agreements lie ahead, and that future generations will mark 1964 as the year the world turned for all time away from the horrors of war and constructed new bulwarks of peace.

"Specifically, this nation proposes five major types of potential agreement:

"First, as Chairman Khrushchev and I have observed, the use of force for the solution of territorial disputes is not in the interest of any people or country. In consultation with our Allies, we will be prepared to discuss means of prohibiting the threat or use of force, directly or indirectly -- whether by aggression, subversion, or the clandestine supply of arms -- to change boundaries or demarcation lines; to interfere with access to territory; or to extend control or administration over territory by displacing established authorities.

"Second, while we continue our efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control, we must first endeavour to halt further increases in strategic armaments now. The United States, the Soviet Union and their respective Allies should agree to explore a verified freeze of the number and characteristics of strategic nuclear offensive and defensive vehicles. For our part, we are convinced that the security of all nations can be safeguarded within the scope of such an agreement and that this initial measure, preventing the further expansion of the deadly and costly arms race, will open the path to reductions in all types of forces from present levels.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

"Third, in this same spirit of early action, the United States believe that a verified agreement to halt all production of fissionable materials for weapons use would be a major contribution to world peace. Moreover, while we seek agreement on this measure, the United States is willing to achieve prompt reductions through both sides closing comparable production facilities on a plant-by-plant basis, with mutual inspection. We have started in this direction -- we hope the Soviet Union will do the same -- and we are prepared to accept appropriate international verification of the reactor shut-down already scheduled in our country.

"Fourth, we must further reduce the danger of war by accident, miscalculation or surprise attack. In consultation with our Allies, we will be prepared to discuss proposals for creating a system of observation posts as a move in this direction.

"Fifth, and finally, to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to nations not now controlling them, let us agree:

- (a) That nuclear weapons not be transferred into the national control of States which do not now control them, and that all transfers of nuclear materials for peaceful purposes take place under effective international safeguards;
- (b) That the major nuclear Powers accept in an increasing number of their peaceful nuclear activities the same inspection they recommend for other States; and
- (c) On the banning of all nuclear weapon tests under effective verification and control.

"Each one of these proposed steps is important to peace. No one of them is impossible of agreement. The best way to begin disarming is to begin -- and the United States is ready to conclude firm agreements in these areas and to consider any other reasonable proposal. We shall at all times pursue a just and lasting peace -- and with God's help, we shall achieve it."

That is the end of President Johnson's message. I ask the Secretariat to circulate that message as a document of this Conference.<sup>1/</sup>

(Mr. Foster, United States)

In 1962 this Committee began its work. In 1963 the Committee played an important rôle in the first steps taken towards a safer and saner world. In 1964 my delegation is dedicated to keeping up the momentum and accelerating the forward movement. We strongly hope that this year will be the year in which we learn to walk towards peace, in peace. Having taken the first steps forward, let us continue.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): First of all I should like to associate myself with the previous speaker in expressing gratitude to Secretary-General U Thant for his message to the Committee, wishing us success in our work. We also associate ourselves with the words of welcome addressed by our Chairman, Mr. Burns, to our new colleagues who have come here to participate in the Committee's work, namely, the representatives of Ethiopia, Mexico, India and Romania, as well as to those who have returned to take part in the Committee's work after an absence of some time. I refer to Mr. Foster, the head of the United States delegation, and Mr. Naszkowski, the head of the Polish delegation. We associate ourselves with the words of our United States colleague, who expressed a high appreciation of the role and efforts of Mr. Kennedy, the assassinated President of the United States, in the matter of reducing international tension. We note with satisfaction that President Johnson intends to follow this policy of the late President Kennedy.

It may be noted with satisfaction that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament is renewing its work in an atmosphere of a certain relaxation of international tension. The conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (ENDC/100/Rev.1) has caused great satisfaction throughout the world. In the thunder clouds hanging over the world there appeared a first rent, through which a ray of hope shone forth. This agreement was soon followed by another. At its eighteenth session the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously recorded the agreement of States to refrain from placing in orbit any objects carrying nuclear weapons (ENDC/117).

Thus, a good beginning has been made and the way has been opened for further progress in this direction. These measures were followed by other actions by States in the same positive direction. At the December session of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a law on the budget of the Soviet Union for 1964 was adopted. This law provides for the reduction of the military expenditure

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

of the Soviet Union from 13.9 milliard roubles expended in 1963 to 13.3 milliard roubles allocated for 1964, that is a reduction of 600 million roubles. This means that the military expenditure of the Soviet Union for 1964 has been reduced by 4.3 per cent in comparison with the military expenditure for 1963.

Furthermore, in December last year Mr. Khrushchev reported to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that we are now considering the possibility of a further reduction in the numbers of the armed forces of the Soviet Union.

The positive significance of these steps taken by the Soviet Government is acknowledged by everyone.

In his replies to questions put to him by Mr. Shapiro, Chief Correspondent of the American agency "United Press International" in Moscow on New Year's Eve (ENDC/118), the Head of the Soviet Government, Mr. Khrushchev, pointed out that it would be a good thing if other States acted in a similar way. We have duly noted and are following carefully the measures taken by the United States Government to reduce its military budget for the next financial year by \$ 1 milliard, that is, to carry out a reduction by about 2 per cent in comparison with the military expenditure of the United States approved for the current financial year. We note with satisfaction that the policy which Mr. Khrushchev described as a policy of mutual example is being understood and approved by the other side. Hence there is ground for hope that this policy of mutual example will find its confirmation in realistic and practical measures on both sides, which will undoubtedly contribute to a further improvement of the international situation.

Thus, we have every reason to say that the present negotiations in the Eighteen-Nation Committee are being renewed in more favourable circumstances than before. This, of course, facilitates the Committee's task, but it also imposes greater responsibility upon it. Now we must forge further ahead, developing and intensifying the trend towards the relaxation of international tension and towards disarmament.

The main question, problem number one, which our Committee is called upon to solve is to come to an agreement on a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament. In this question there is a new situation which opens up favourable possibilities for reaching agreement. In our times, the core of the problem of disarmament is to eliminate the threat of nuclear war. It is essential from the very outset of disarmament to eliminate this threat and to make it impossible in practice.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

In seeking a mutually acceptable solution to this problem, the Soviet Union proposed to begin by destroying the means of delivery of nuclear weapons, simultaneously with the elimination of foreign military bases (ENDC/2). Incidentally, this idea was first proposed by a Western Power. Having met with the refusal of the Western Powers, under various pretexts which we do not consider to be valid, to agree to the complete elimination of all means of delivery of nuclear weapons in the first stage of disarmament, the Soviet Union, in order to make it easier to reach agreement on this important question, proposed that a strictly limited and agreed number of missiles of specified types and categories should be retained by the United States and the Soviet Union in their own territories until the end of the second stage of disarmament (ENDC/2/Rev.1). All other missiles were to be eliminated.

At the eighteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Soviet Government took yet another step which, in the opinion of many delegations participating in the session, was of considerable significance for clearing the way towards general and complete disarmament. We proposed (A/PV.1208, provisional, p.71) to retain the "nuclear umbrella" until the end of the third stage of disarmament, that is, to leave the Soviet Union and the United States an agreed quantity of certain categories of missiles with nuclear warheads until the end of the programme of general and complete disarmament. It should be pointed out that, under the Soviet Union's proposal, all the missiles retained by the Soviet Union and the United States would be placed under control, including direct control at the launching sites, until they are destroyed when general and complete disarmament has been accomplished.

This new proposal by the Soviet Union makes groundless the objections previously put forward by the Western Powers to the proposal for a "nuclear umbrella" and eliminates all their doubts and fears. This new situation opens up before the Committee favourable opportunities for achieving rapid agreement on one of the most important questions of nuclear disarmament.

We should like to point out that the new proposals of the Soviet Union regarding the retention of the "nuclear umbrella" until the end of the disarmament programme have been put forward in addition to a whole series of other proposals by the Soviet Union on the question of general and complete disarmament, which were made in 1962 and 1963 and were aimed at the earliest possible achievement of agreement on disarmament problems. Our latest proposal on the question of reducing the numbers of the armed forces of the principal military Powers has led to the positions of

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

the two sides being brought very close together in this regard. We should like to hope that the United States side will take a step to meet us, and then full agreement will be reached on the question of the numbers of the armed forces.

We should also like to point out that, on the question of the reduction of conventional armaments, thanks to the efforts of the Soviet Union, we can now note the existence of common viewpoints in regard to the method and extent of the reduction of conventional armaments at all three stages of disarmament. If the Western side in its turn were to make the necessary efforts, substantial progress could be achieved at this session of the Committee in preparing a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Besides the problem of general and complete disarmament, we are also faced with the important task of reaching agreement on individual partial measures that would help towards reducing international tension and slowing down the armaments race. In this connexion we should like to draw attention to the need for the earliest possible agreement on the question of the reduction of the total numbers of the armed forces of States and of their troops in foreign territories. As we have already pointed out, favourable opportunities have now arisen for settling this important problem on a reciprocal basis, without waiting for agreement on general and complete disarmament. The Soviet side is prepared to agree to a further reduction of the total numbers of its armed forces, provided that the Western side shows willingness to take a similar step.

Of great importance for the lessening of international tension is the solution of the question of withdrawing or, at first, reducing the number of foreign troops in Europe. The Soviet Union has on a number of occasions stated that it is prepared to reach an agreement on the basis of the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other countries. If, however, the Western Powers are as yet not prepared for this, it might be possible to agree at first to reduce the number of these troops in foreign territories on a reciprocal basis and thereby prepare the way for their complete withdrawal from the territories of foreign States to within the boundaries of their own national territories. The USSR is prepared to effect this reduction in the territory of the German Democratic Republic and other European States, if the Western Powers begin to reduce the number of their troops in the Federal Republic of Germany and in other countries.



(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

The implementation of these measures would lead to the normalization of the situation in Europe, where the danger of the outbreak of another war is particularly great.

There is a possibility of reaching agreement on another very important question relating to partial measures, namely, the question of reducing military budgets. Being anxious to put an end to the unrestricted growth of military expenditure, the Soviet Union has on a number of occasions proposed the reduction of military budgets. Showing initiative in solving this important question, the Soviet Union, as I said at the beginning of my statement, has unilaterally reduced its military budget for 1964 by 600 million roubles. We note with satisfaction that the United States is also taking measures in this direction. Thus, there are favourable pre-conditions for an agreement on a further reciprocal reduction of military budgets.

The Soviet Union continues to regard as very important the achievement of an agreement on the question of concluding a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty countries. The conclusion of such a pact would not upset the existing balance of forces between the two groups and, at the same time, would introduce into international relations an important element of stability and calm. Since the Soviet Government put forward a proposal (ENDC/77) for the conclusion of such a pact, the idea has met with wide support from many other States. Moreover, the conclusion of such a pact is called for by the commitments recorded in the joint communique of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom of 25 July 1963 (ENDC/101).

The creation of denuclearized zones in various parts of the world would play an important part in further reducing international tension and ensuring general security. The idea of establishing such zones has met with universal acceptance and approval. Proposals have been made to establish atom-free zones in central and northern Europe, in the Mediterranean area and in the Balkans, in Africa and Latin America and in other parts of the world. In supporting the plans for the establishment of the above-mentioned denuclearized zones, we should like to draw attention to the particular significance of establishing such zones in regions where the danger of the outbreak of nuclear conflict is especially great, namely in central Europe, in northern Europe, in the Balkans and in the Mediterranean area. The establishment of denuclearized zones in those particular regions is of the greatest significance for the maintenance of universal peace.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

In connexion with the rapid increase of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their dissemination, the question of preventing further dissemination of such weapons has now become particularly important and urgent. It is the duty of all States to do everything in their power to avert the threat of the further dissemination of nuclear weapons. It is essential to close all the channels, not only the direct, but also the indirect channels, through which nuclear weapons may fall into the hands of those who have twice in this century caused the conflagration of world wars and are now endeavouring to obtain nuclear weapons.

As measures for reducing international tension, practical steps must be taken to prevent surprise attacks. To this end, the Soviet Union has put forward a proposal (ENDC/113) to establish a network of observation posts in the territory of States belonging to the two opposing groups of countries, in conjunction with specific measures for lessening international tension and decreasing the danger of war. Such measures are the reduction of the numbers of foreign troops in the territories of European States and the obligation not to place nuclear weapons in Western Germany and in the German Democratic Republic. The Soviet side considers that, unless these specific measures for the relaxation of international tension and the limitation of armaments were taken, the establishment of observation posts could not lead to achieving the desired aim, that is to say, to the growth of confidence among States and thereby to a lessening of the danger of war. The establishment of such a system of posts would be useful only in conjunction with specific measures for reducing the possibility of the outbreak of military conflict in Europe.

These are, in brief, the tasks which confront the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. We would render a poor service to the cause of the struggle for disarmament if we closed our eyes to the fact that public opinion in many countries of the world, just like public opinion in the Soviet Union, is dissatisfied with the Committee's earlier activities. Although the Committee has been conducting negotiations on disarmament questions for nearly two years, the practical results of these talks are quite insignificant. Confidence in the Committee's work may be seriously undermined if we continue to mark time and if we fail to reach agreement on the practical questions of disarmament. The time for empty and fruitless talk has passed. Every effort must be made to achieve positive results, both in preparing a treaty on general and complete disarmament and in reaching agreement on individual disarmament measures and the relaxation of international tension.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

The Soviet side would like to express the hope that the Eighteen-Nation Committee, which is confronted with a serious and responsible task, will fulfil the hopes of the peoples, will help to dispel the thunder-clouds hanging over mankind and will work to bring about a clear sky over our planet. At the present time the Committee has great opportunities for doing so. We hope that these opportunities will not be lost and that we shall be able to announce to the world new agreements which will ensure a more stable peace and greater security for the peoples.

Mr. Thomas (United Kingdom): In his statement this afternoon, the leader of the United States delegation referred to the grievous loss which his country has suffered since the last meeting of this Committee by the death of President Kennedy. We cannot even now fully comprehend the magnitude of that loss, but it is one in which we all share. President Kennedy's contribution to the steps towards peace was indeed great, and I was glad that Mr. Foster took the opportunity this afternoon to remind us of the measure and determination of his efforts.

I am sure too that I speak for all my colleagues when I say how grateful we of the United Kingdom delegation are to the representative of the United States for reminding us this afternoon that President Johnson has made explicit his intention of carrying on the policy of President Kennedy's Administration in the fields of arms control and disarmament and in the quest for peace. May we extend through the United States delegation our warm and respectful good wishes to President Johnson on the heavy burden he has inherited? His interest in our work here has been demonstrated in eloquent and encouraging terms by his message to us today.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

We are also heartened by Mr. Foster's reaffirmation of the intention of the United States delegation to continue and indeed, as he said, to redouble its efforts during the coming months to achieve step by step a halt in the arms race with the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. We were equally encouraged to hear the leader of the Soviet delegation reaffirm his Government's intention to achieve the objectives which we all have in common.

For our part, I should like to reaffirm that agreement on collateral or confidence-building measures and, above all, on general and complete disarmament itself remain the essential objectives of the United Kingdom Government. General and complete disarmament under effective international control is of course our ultimate objective. We are dedicated to its achievement. We shall continue to work towards it with all our efforts.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you will permit me at this point to quote a passage from a recent speech by the British Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, which sums up the basic attitude of the United Kingdom delegation to the negotiations which we have now resumed. Speaking on 29 November at Grantham in Lincolnshire — which, incidentally, is in the constituency of my predecessor at this Conference, Mr. Godber — the Prime Minister said:

"... all the ingenuity and penetration of British diplomacy must be used to find ways and means ... to reduce the tensions between East and West, and to contrive agreements which will gradually but surely achieve a transition from confrontation by force to continuing negotiation to create a climate of confidence in which the world can begin to turn from war to peace."

This, then, is the reason why we of the United Kingdom delegation find ourselves once again in this familiar setting and in the company of many old friends and colleagues.

We should like to take this opportunity, if we may, to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, whom we thank for his message, and through him to U Thant, to all representatives and to the staff of the Secretariat, our greetings and best wishes for the New Year.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

We should also like to be associated, if we may, with the welcome which you, Mr. Chairman, conveyed in your opening remarks to Mr. Foster and Mr. Naszkowski, who have not been in Geneva for some time now and whom we are delighted to see back with us again. I know that both Mr. Foster and Mr. Tsarapkin, whom we are all so glad to see in Geneva again, can rely on the Committee's support and co-operation in the discharge of their great responsibilities as our co-Chairmen. To both of them go our best wishes not only for a happy New Year but also for a productive one.

I should also like, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to join you in welcoming all those representatives who are participating in the Conference for the first time, and in particular, as you mentioned, the representatives of Ethiopia, India, Mexico and Romania. Just as we all benefited from the wisdom and experience of their predecessors, so we shall all benefit from the fresh approach which I am sure our new colleagues will bring to our work here.

Indeed, we shall always look for fresh ideas in this forum from wherever they may come, and regard them as a stimulus to greater effort. We need these ideas and should examine them with care. But even bright ideas cannot replace hard and patient work. By patient work we and those who have preceded some of us have already achieved some results. The Conference has now held five sessions since it opened in March 1962. In the last six months or so of that time we have been able to welcome agreement on several collateral measures, unilateral, bilateral or multilateral in character, which may help to increase international confidence and to slow down the arms race which we all deplore. I refer, of course, to those matters mentioned by President Johnson in his message to us today (ENDC/120) — the establishment of a direct communications link last summer between Washington and Moscow (ENDC/97), the partial test ban treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1) the United Nations General Assembly resolution of 17 October (1884 (XVIII)) designed to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space (ENDC/117), and the various measures which the United States and the Soviet Union propose to take on a unilateral basis and which have been aptly described as "restraint by mutual example".

I should be the first to admit that it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the precise role played by this Conference in bringing about all these measures. Some people may be tempted to believe that this Conference has played

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

no role at all, that these measures were the results of developments unconnected with and quite outside the control of this Conference and that they would have been taken regardless of whether or not this Conference had been in existence. But that clearly is not the view to which President Johnson subscribes. In his message which we heard today he paid tribute to the efforts and deliberations of this Conference, which, as he described it, laid the groundwork for these advances. We entirely share that view, as indeed did the last session of the General Assembly. Moreover, we believe that this Conference can exert an even greater influence than hitherto if, before we settle down to work in what will be our sixth session, we pause to consider how we can best exploit the present relatively favourable international atmosphere, and in particular how we can make the best use of the time at our disposal. These are, of course, primarily questions of procedure and method which, if I may, I propose to examine later in my statement. At this point I only wish to suggest that a new approach to these questions may well help us to move forward and to carry out the mandate given to us by the General Assembly in resolutions 1908 (XVIII) and 1910 (XVIII).

I should first like to say a few words about our long-term and short-term objectives. I think that we all recognize that our basic long-term task, and indeed our dominant task, is to reach agreement on a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Although we have in the past at times concentrated, quite rightly, on preliminary or collateral measures, and although I hope we shall devote much attention to them in this and forthcoming sessions, we must never lose sight of the fact that general and complete disarmament remains our all-important goal. We must also remember that, whatever some of us may be tempted to say at times for debating purposes, and however much others of us would like it to be otherwise, there is no quick or easy solution to any of the disarmament problems with which we are confronted.

That is the real reason why we have not yet made much progress. It is not a question of bad faith on one side or the other. Great national interests are at stake for all participants. Governments cannot be expected to take things on trust in these matters or to accept outline proposals without discussing, in advance and in depth, the details of their application. The sheer complexity of the issues involved requires a determined, concentrated and detailed effort if progress is ever to be achieved. That would be so, even in the most favourable international climate. It is all the more so in the present international

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

atmosphere, in which tension is only beginning to relax. I therefore suggest that we must continue, like the sculptor, to chip away at the block of disarmament, however laborious and time-consuming a task this may appear to be. As Edmund Burke, in his Reflections on the Revolution in France, wrote, "Our patience will achieve more than our force".

We believe that the time has come to give priority in our discussions to certain key issues involved in any treaty on general and complete disarmament. Let us get away from too much general debate and let us concentrate instead on fundamental problems such as verification, peace-keeping in a disarming and disarmed world and, above all, nuclear disarmament in all its aspects. Let us particularly devote a good deal of attention to what in our view are two profoundly important aspects of disarmament: the destruction of nuclear delivery vehicles, and the problem of fissile material. Her Majesty's Government and the United Kingdom delegation have had much to say on both these questions in the past. We shall have more to say about them in the future. Let us also consider whether we could not make at any rate some start with the physical destruction of weapons. This would be a real demonstration of our determination to turn the rising graph of armaments downwards.

So much, then, for our long-term and essential objective of general and complete disarmament. But while we must, as I have said, continue to work patiently towards that objective, we must at the same time seize every opportunity to reach various short-term objectives in the field of collateral measures. Here the question uppermost in our minds at present is, what measures or what measure would be a logical follow-up to the collateral measures which have already been agreed -- in particular, as Mr. Tsarapkin referred to it, the Moscow Treaty?

The answer to that question may well be found in the bold and imaginative message which President Johnson has sent to us this afternoon. For its part, the United Kingdom delegation warmly welcomes the President's message. We believe that it will give a new impetus to the Conference and will lead, as the President hopes, to a year of progress in 1964. May I, therefore, pledge the readiness of the United Kingdom delegation to explore in detail the various suggestions made by the President? We hope that the Committee will do so as a matter of urgency and in the same spirit as that in which these proposals have been put forward. Obviously the leader of the Soviet delegation has not had time to study these proposals, as he

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

only heard them for the first time this afternoon; but we shall of course await with particular interest the considered response of the Soviet Government to the President's message and to the suggestions which it contains.

In general it seems to the United Kingdom delegation that the arms race could be limited by an agreement whereby the nuclear Powers would undertake not to allow control of nuclear weapons or nuclear knowledge to pass into the hands of third countries, and whereby non-nuclear countries would undertake not to manufacture nuclear weapons or otherwise acquire any control over them. In our view this would be the logical corollary to the Moscow Treaty. Another obvious corollary would be a renewed effort to reach agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty with adequate and effective verification arrangements. Another possibility would be for us to consider further measures to reduce the risk of war through accident or miscalculation -- in particular, as has been mentioned already this afternoon, observation posts, so as to diminish the fears which exist about the danger of surprise attack in Europe. Both our Prime Minister and our Foreign Secretary, Mr. Butler, have made clear in recent public statements the importance they attach to these measures.

I suggested earlier that we should consider the possibility of adopting a new approach to our procedures and methods of work. We have, of course, considered this possibility in the past. My colleagues will recall that the United Kingdom and other delegations have on a number of occasions urged the Committee to consider methods of improving the way in which we conduct our business, but so far no positive action in this respect has been taken.

I think it is common ground between us that we wish to see our deliberations proceed in as businesslike, or as workmanlike, a manner as possible. We in the United Kingdom delegation believe that the best way of making progress on a number of crucial issues would be to reduce the number of formal debates and to enter into factual and objective discussions of the key problems involved. We believe that such discussions should be on the basis not of a formal agenda but of working papers designed to bring out the main points at issue.

In our view this could best be handled by private discussions in working groups of delegates and other experts as appropriate. The terms of reference and the composition of such groups would of course be a matter for consideration by



(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom):

the Conference. For our part we should prefer them to be open-ended: that is to say, we should not wish to debar anyone from attending. On the other hand, some delegations might prefer not to join in on certain subjects under discussion. For example, the Committee may consider that a selective approach to, say, nuclear matters might be desirable. We ourselves are entirely flexible on this point; and, as I have said, while such discussions should in our view be open to all members of the Conference, we do not think that all members need necessarily attend all of them.

The titles of these groups do not matter in the least. They could be called working groups, working parties or sub-committees. The number of such groups, the number of times when they should meet, and the co-ordination of their meetings with plenary meetings of the Conference would, of course, be another matter for further consideration, discussion and, I hope, decision by the Committee. But the establishment of such groups would, we believe, be a practical and commonsense approach to some of the basic problems of general and complete disarmament. For example, we have already suggested that the difficult problems involved in the verification of the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, which were analysed in the United Kingdom paper entitled "The Technical Possibility of International Control of Fissile Material Production" (ENDC/60), require an early and serious examination in a working party on the lines I have suggested. The representatives of Sweden and the United Arab Republic have also suggested, both in this Committee and in the General Assembly, that this question of nuclear disarmament should be studied in this way. To take another example, representatives of Brazil have long advocated the establishment of a working group or sub-committee to examine verification questions.

I cite these as only two examples of the kind of subjects which could be tackled in this way. There are, of course, many other issues, some of which the Soviet representative mentioned in his speech this afternoon. I am sure there are many which my colleagues may feel would be equally susceptible to such treatment, and we look forward to their suggestions; for we remain convinced that if working parties could be set up they would produce results which would be an invaluable, and perhaps indispensable, basis for the political decisions which all disarmament measures will ultimately require. I hope, therefore, that the Committee as a whole, and in particular our co-Chairmen, will give serious and sympathetic thought to these suggestions.

(Mr. Thomas, United Kingdom)

In concluding my remarks this afternoon, I should like to end on a note of cautious optimism. I think all of us would agree that the year 1963 and the first few weeks of 1964 have witnessed encouraging developments from the point of view of this Conference. Indeed, we believe that a new chapter in our work here has now been opened. We believe that, with good will and patient effort, this new chapter could make better reading than the chapters which have gone before. It is now our task to get down to the work of composition.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I should like first of all to associate myself with the welcome which you, Mr. Chairman, and the other delegations have addressed to the heads of delegations taking part for the first time in our Conference or to those returning after an absence, and to reciprocate by expressing my sincere hope that we shall accomplish good and fruitful work.

The noble words, inspired by a high sense of responsibility, which we have heard from the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and from yourself, Mr. Chairman, together with President Johnson's message to this Committee and the important speeches made here by the representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, constitute in my opinion a very encouraging start to this session of our Conference. I think that with these messages and speeches our Committee has already achieved something, namely the establishment of a cordial and constructive atmosphere, and that it has already set foot on the right path.

As a matter of fact, our discussions have always, or almost always, been relaxed and calm. I even think that both in the conference room and outside it, friendly and sympathetic relations were established between us, the result of a shared determination and a common obligation to succeed in our task. But it seems to me that today even more than in the past, our Committee has at once found without fumbling an appropriate tone and an atmosphere which can lead to a successful outcome of our work.

Each time the Disarmament Conference resumes after a recess, general interest in it revives, and hopes and expectations become focussed on Geneva. I think that today, for a number of reasons, the interest and hope of the whole world are concentrated on us more than ever.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

The limited but very important agreements achieved within the framework of this Committee last year have restored our credit after a long period of disappointing stagnation. Furthermore recent official moves seem to open up tangible prospects for further progress. Thus, while not indulging in the optimism which is almost de rigueur on these occasions, I really believe that the auguries are favourable for the resumption of our work after a recess that we might have wished to be shorter. We should like this Conference to become a permanent framework for contacts between East and West, a continuous dialogue, a regular meeting place for mutual consultation with the active participation of representatives from the non-aligned countries.

What are the factors which encourage us to be optimistic? There have been several. In February of last year when we met again here, the Cuban crisis had given proof of the determination of both sides to avoid conflicts which with existing armaments could have incalculable consequences for the very existence of humanity. During the past year this feeling and this determination have been clearly confirmed by action, agreements and declarations of great significance. First it should be pointed out that at its last session the United Nations General Assembly devoted itself almost entirely to the problem of disarmament. The very extensive and detailed discussions on this subject which took place in New York showed that, in general, our efforts during past sessions were appreciated. The United Nations has once more encouraged this Committee to pursue its task unremittingly. The voice of the United Nations expressing the ardent desire of the whole world for peace and security has become more forceful, and clearly points the way to a duty which none of us would wish to evade.

During the General Assembly's last sessions, not only was there an exchange of views on disarmament but positive results were achieved which we should particularly welcome. I refer to the various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, and more particularly to those concerning the denuclearization of Latin America and the prohibition against putting weapons of mass destruction into orbit (ENDC/117).

As Mr. Foster said today, this Committee's work contributed constructively to the agreement finally concluded in New York. The Western delegations had proposed such a measure in 1960, and last year a number of non-aligned delegations, particularly the Mexican, warmly supported this initiative. The agreement which we desired is now an accomplished fact, and the Italian delegation is sure that this Committee as a whole will wish to express its appreciation to the co-authors.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

In addition to the heartening encouragement we have received from the United Nations as a whole, another valuable stimulus has come during recent months from many heads of States and eminent persons. We have received a particularly solemn appeal from an authority that does not recognize the force of arms but only the power of human dignity and fraternity. I refer to the message of peace delivered by the head of the Roman Catholic Church from the very place where, for the first time in the world's history, peace was preached to all men of good will and love towards all men, even one's enemies.

As to the Great Powers, the United States of America, after suffering a loss which filled the world with grief and consternation, quickly recovered from this painful shock and, to honour the immortal memory of its President, carried on under its new and distinguished Chief the active policy for peace bequeathed by President Kennedy. Mr. Foster reminded us today of President Kennedy's faith in the cause of peace and of his efforts to promote the relaxation of tension. The Italian delegation listened with sincere emotion to Mr. Foster's words about President Kennedy, and wishes to assure the Chairman of the United States delegation that the memory of that noble and historic figure will remain deeply engraved in the hearts of the Italian people.

Mr. Foster assured us that the United States Government is resolved to pursue President Kennedy's policy, thus adding the weight of his voice and authority to the action already taken by his Government in this direction. I have in mind particularly President Johnson's State of the Union message to Congress and the message he sent us today. The State of the Union message as a whole is not only a document of very high political and moral importance but also provides for a positive and important measure in the realm of disarmament, namely the unilateral decision to curtail very considerably the production of fissile material for military purposes.

Mr. Tsarapkin also reminded us today that, for its part, the Soviet Government wished to mark the New Year by reassuring declarations and the positive gesture of making a sizeable cut in its military budget. This welcome initiative provides another indication of the atmosphere in which we are resuming our work.

Although I cannot enumerate the other positive moves recently made by other Governments, I think it my duty to point out what has been done by my own. Italy did not remain inactive in creating a favourable climate for this Conference. The new Italian Government, based on the widest participation of political, democratic and popular elements in the country, as one of its first acts solemnly reaffirmed

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

its determination to play an active part in improving the international situation, in securing disarmament and in consolidating peace. This has been clearly stated both in our Government's declared programme, approved by a large parliamentary majority, and in specific and definite pronouncements by the President, Mr. Moro, and the Foreign Minister, Mr. Saragat.

The Italian Government regards this Conference at Geneva as crucially important for East-West relations and for improving the international situation. Its work is followed by the Italian Government with the closest attention and with the most lively and sincere hopes for success. Italy will continue, as it has done in the past, but with even greater energy, to do everything possible, in full agreement with its allies, to promote the rapid conclusion of agreements on disarmament. As in the past, and if possible with still greater determination and with an increased feeling of urgency, we in Italy, in co-operation with our allies and the non-aligned countries, wish to further by every means available an agreed, controlled and balanced reduction of armaments until they are totally eliminated. The main purpose of our policy is to ensure the free existence and development of our people - and of all peoples - by more reliable and less burdensome means than a precarious equilibrium in armaments and the grim balance of terror, so that the wealth now being squandered on arms may be devoted to the well-being and progress of all. We are confident of attaining these ends if our good will is matched, as we hope it will be, by a positive response on the part of our Eastern partners in these negotiations.

Of course we are aware of the great difficulties which still persist, and of the mutual mistrust that still divides us notwithstanding the first glimmer of light and the first positive results already achieved. Of course there are still serious problems to be solved between East and West, and these Italy views with serenity, feeling completely at one with its allies - a feeling which nothing can shake or diminish. So, together with our allies, we are willing to seek appropriate ways of overcoming these difficulties through patient and careful negotiations, which will perhaps be arduous at times but always conciliatory and relaxed.

This is particularly true of the problem of disarmament. Only by continuous negotiation, without allowing ourselves to become discouraged, can we make constructive progress towards our goal. This is our task in the forthcoming months. It will be remembered that our Conference at first met with difficulties regarding working methods which delayed progress. On this point the United

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

Kingdom representative has referred today to the problem of constituting working groups and technical study groups. He was quite right to do so and I am in full agreement with him. My delegation has always been in favour of intensifying our studies with greater participation by delegations, particularly the delegations of the non-aligned countries. We regard, as I believe do all my colleagues, the co-operation of the non-aligned delegations as an essential factor in our work and a guarantee of success.

Moreover, the Western delegations have always favoured a realistic approach that would be conducive to rapid and progressive results. We regard such a method as the only one capable of achieving immediate even if limited success, and of eventually furthering the attainment of general and complete disarmament.

Experience has confirmed the justice of our view. The immense repercussions of the Moscow Treaty (ENDC/100/Rev.1) and the hopes it has raised have demonstrated the value of partial agreements. These are particularly important because they help to break down the wall of misunderstanding which stands between us. Lack of understanding breeds mistrust; mistrust breeds tension; tension breeds armaments - a sinister and dangerous spiral. Unquestionably, at the present stage one of the main concerns on both sides is the possibility of a surprise attack. I have read a most interesting book on Soviet strategy by Marshal Sokolowsky in which the author says a great deal about the danger of a surprise attack from the West. We in the West know very well that this fear is completely without foundation; but on our side, I hope also without justification, we fear a surprise attack from the East. For this reason, and in order to dispel these fears, which are possibly groundless but nevertheless exist, the West has for long stressed the advantage of concluding immediate agreements that would provide appropriate guarantees against the possibility of surprise attack.

The Western thesis now seems to be shared by the Communist countries, which have also put forward the idea of establishing observation posts. This is a field in which we might find it possible to come to an understanding and reach agreement and I consider that it should be explored by the Committee as a whole. Italy is in favour of the reciprocal establishment of observation posts on condition that they have no covert political purpose and that they are of genuine and equivalent military utility on both sides.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

These are the general principles which should be later developed and worked out in a practical way. Doubtless definite proposals will be advanced on both sides, and our task at this session will be to compare and study them, examine the points they have in common, and consider whether agreement is possible.

The agreement already reached on a direct line between Moscow and Washington (ENDC/97), the establishment of observation posts, and other similar measures that have already been suggested by us or might be added later, are measures that as a whole are designed to achieve a single purpose, namely the improvement of reciprocal knowledge. It must be made clear that there is no question of planning insidious espionage activities, and I hope that the Soviet delegation will not again be unjust enough to accuse us of such intentions. On the contrary, the aim is to widen mutual understanding and do away with any danger of ambiguity and error, so that by better knowledge of each other and the constant exchange of information we may find the best way of reaching a sincere and final understanding.

Apart from this first and urgent task, all the other problems which we have already discussed without reaching a conclusion should be re-examined in further detail, particularly in the nuclear sphere. The Moscow Treaty is the foundation stone on which we must build. Of course, we shall have to study the fresh proposals which Mr. Gromyko submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations (A/PV.1208, provisional, pp.56 et seq) and which Mr. Tsarapkin has again mentioned today. They deserve the most careful consideration in the light of the Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations (ENDC/5).

As for us, we continue to think that nuclear disarmament should be tackled by a whole series of important and precise measures which together will put an end to the production of fissile material by both sides, prevent the spread of atomic weapons, and create an extensive, efficient and controlled system to limit and reduce progressively the dangers of nuclear war until their complete elimination.

This is, I repeat, a gradual, progressive and realistic approach to the problem, but it is the only one which in our opinion can be successful in this delicate, vital and dangerous domain.

Of course, as always, we are open to any new proposals which the Soviet delegation and others may submit on any matter. In this connexion I must mention

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

the last Soviet proposal put forward on 31 December 1963 in a personal letter from Mr. Khrushchev to the Heads of all States about the peaceful settlement of territorial disputes. The letter Mr. Khrushchev sent to the President of Italy, Mr. Moro, is still being studied by the Italian Government, and I therefore cannot make any statement today about the substance of the proposals; but the spirit in which it is being examined by the Italian Government has already been manifested, I think, by all the official declarations made by my Government and also by what I said at the beginning of my statement. Obviously every peace-loving nation, and Italy is one of them, can but give an affirmative answer in principle to the question whether it is ready to renounce the use of force and to employ peaceful means for the settlement of territorial disputes. The great majority of present-day States, including Italy, have already subscribed formally and definitively to this binding principle by signing the Charter of the United Nations, and a government which, like the Government of Italy, is based on free democratic institutions must continue to support this principle of peace with confidence and enthusiasm.

Thus the idea which inspired Mr. Khrushchev's letter meets with our complete approval. As always, we are firmly opposed to any aggression for whatever reason and in whatever form, including indirect aggression, subversion and any insidious activity which in any way threatens the security of States. To this end, we think that it would be both necessary and profitable to hold a debate here in Geneva on organizing definite systems and appropriate procedures for resolving disputes. In saying this we pin our hopes first and foremost to the power of the United Nations to mediate and intervene, and to the possibilities open to it of establishing an international peace force and of developing collective sanctions.

Much remains to be said, of course, at this moment when we resume our activities, and many problems both important and pressing have not even been mentioned in my statement; but we are on the threshold of our discussions and, rather than try your patience now, I should prefer to make known our point of view later. What is important above all at this juncture is that the Eighteen-Nation Committee, in resuming its work, should re-affirm to the world its unshakable faith in the cause of peace and disarmament and formally pledge itself to pursue this task firmly and with greater determination. That is the general attitude and message which the Italian delegation wished to endorse today.



Mr. De CASTRO (Brazil) (translation from French): Allow me first of all, on behalf of my delegation, to convey my very sincerest thanks to the Secretary-General, U Thant, for the message which he has transmitted to us through his Special Representative in this Committee and in which he expressed his best wishes for the accomplishment of our task and his confidence in the result of our mission, and asked us to do our best in defence of that cause on which humanity's very survival depends.

Further, I should like to associate myself with the welcome extended by the Chairman to new members of this Committee, namely Ambassador Agede of Ethiopia, Ambassador Nehru of India, Ambassador Dumitrescu of Romania and Mr. de Santiago of Mexico. My welcome also goes out to the United States representative, Mr. Foster, who has already had occasion to work with us and whom his former colleagues are happy to find among us again today.

Lastly, I associate myself wholeheartedly with the condolences and feelings of profound emotion expressed by previous speakers with regard to the tragic loss the world has suffered with the death of President Kennedy. This loss has hit us all, just as it has hit the cause of peace. Yet, at the same time, we can be absolutely certain that the name of such a great worker for peace as President Kennedy will be engraved for ever on the façade of the building of peace which is being erected by our efforts and with the support of public opinion throughout the world.

It is with optimism, satisfaction and hope that the Brazilian delegation is resuming its participation in the work of the Disarmament Conference. My Government is indeed convinced that in the past few months there has been an acceleration in the process of mutual understanding, which has already made possible the setting up of a direct line of communication between the Governments of Washington and Moscow (ENDC/97), the signing of a treaty on the partial banning of nuclear tests (ENDC/100/Rev.1), and the signing of an agreement prohibiting the placing of nuclear arms in outer space (ENDC/117).

As a symptom of this acceleration we may mention, for instance, the text of the communiqué published by the White House on the 17th of this month from which we learned that President Johnson was determined to achieve here in Geneva new and greater results on the road to disarmament. To achieve them - he declared - the United States will not be content to await proposals from other participants in order to judge of their acceptability according to the classical criteria of national

(Mr. de Castro, Brazil)

security. The President of the United States announced that, on the contrary, his delegates would come as bearers of new proposals of which we have already heard the general outlines in the statement made by his delegation, and about which we are impatiently waiting to hear further details at forthcoming meetings. Mr. Johnson has thus shown that he is convinced that the Geneva Conference should move with the spirit of the historical times in which we live, and that each country's proposals should be dynamic and capable of modification and adaptation, and should not constitute rigid, unalterable texts which in time would create new obstacles on that road which they are called upon to smooth out.

And so, if there has been a change in the world situation between August 1963 and January 1964, and if it is true that the relaxation of international tension has become more pronounced even during this Conference's recess, in spite of the tragic disappearance of that indefatigable champion of peace President Kennedy, and in spite of the black clouds which threatened to gather on the horizon of that international détente of which he was one of the chief protagonists, there is every reason to hope that more realistic and conciliatory proposals will be studied from now on. It is essential to take advantage of the climate of universal good will which now prevails, and which has also manifested itself in the attitude of Pope Paul VI, who continues to follow the line of peace and harmony initiated by his great predecessor John XXIII.

All this should encourage us to intensify our negotiations and to push them further forward without futile fears or unfounded suspicions, without illusions or undue timidity. The fight for disarmament is today the most stable basis for the fight for peace, and hence for the survival of the human race.

Such was also the spirit of the message which Prime Minister Khrushchev recently addressed to the Heads of States of various countries concerning a Pact prohibiting the use of force in the solution of territorial conflicts; such too was the spirit of the reply (ENDC/119) which the United States President sent to him, expanding still further the terms of the proposal he had received; such too is the spirit behind the efforts which many British leaders have made on a number of occasions.

It is therefore true that peaceful gestures are becoming more and more numerous and that the principal Powers have already convinced themselves of the uselessness of continuing the armaments race. They have already reached, or are on the point of reaching, the stage when the accumulation of new arms in their arsenals will, paradoxically, become a threat to the national security which they

(Mr. de Castro, Brazil)

are aiming to protect. This somewhat strange situation was faithfully described in President Johnson's message to the United States Congress when he said:

(read in English)

"... even in absence of agreement, we must not stockpile arms beyond our needs or seek an excess of military powers that could be provocative as well as wasteful".

(continued in French)

Without any doubt, Mr. Chairman, all ostentatious and excessive stockpiling of arms constitutes a dangerous provocative factor.

The Brazilian delegation agrees with Premier Khrushchev when he says that he has come to the conclusion that:

"... it would be useful, while continuing to seek solutions of the problems of general disarmament, to multiply at the same time all efforts for removing serious frictions in relations among States and for eliminating the sources of tension".

All these very pertinent declarations, as well as the five very significant resolutions on disarmament adopted at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly (ENDC/116, 117), and the decisions taken by the Great Powers to reduce their military budgets, eloquently point to a new political consciousness in the world, a consciousness very different from that which reigned before the atomic era and which persisted even after the first nuclear explosions. This was due to the fact that the astonished world had not immediately grasped the political significance of this weapon and all its consequences. The atom bomb was at first considered merely as a bigger and more powerful bomb than all the others, while in actual fact it was an absolutely revolutionary weapon which was completely to upset the world's military strategy and international political consciousness. This consciousness has now spread everywhere, through all social strata and to the furthest corners of the world, rendering war senseless and impossible and making an absolutely essential necessity of peace.

Our Conference is therefore resuming its work in an atmosphere of hope which we must no longer disappoint. That is why we are convinced that new agreements will be negotiated at this Conference, and not at meetings of a restricted or limited character from which the non-aligned countries are excluded. These countries possess a mandate entrusted to them by the United Nations General Assembly, that is to say by the world, and they refuse to admit that peace and world security can depend exclusively on the

(Mr. de Castro, Brazil)

decisions of a directorate of Great Powers. A common peril equally menacing nuclear and non-nuclear Powers implies a common responsibility in finding solutions capable of abolishing for ever the peril of a universal slaughter. It is this responsibility that Brazil, a non-nuclear Power, cannot, must not and does not wish to evade.

In order to demonstrate to my eminent colleagues on this Committee my country's constant and active interest in the urgent problem of general disarmament, I shall now have the honour of reading out the text of an official communiqué dated today in which my Government outlines the Brazilian position in the current stage of disarmament negotiations.

"The Brazilian Government views with satisfaction the resumption of the activities of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament; it intends to spare no efforts to ensure that these activities will lead to positive results. Brazil remains true to the policy it has followed since it had the honour to be appointed by the General Assembly to take part in this Conference. That policy was defined as follows at one of the first meetings held in Geneva:

'We wish to make a contribution to disarmament consistent with the priority we invariably give to peace in our foreign policy, and we are sure that the best way of doing so is to preserve our independence of judgment and the authority of our voice, in order to lend them to everything calculated to promote effective and immediate disarmament, and to refuse them to everything that merely aggravates polemics, emphasizes antagonisms, impresses public opinion or delays settlements.' (ENDC/PV.3, p.7)

"In conformity with these guiding lines, the delegation of Brazil will act with the greatest flexibility, and be ready to exploit all possibilities of agreement. Brazil continues to believe that, whenever possible, any progress that is achieved should be immediately embodied in special instruments designed to become effective at once. Far from taking us further from the goal we are aiming at -- that is, general and complete disarmament -- this procedure would, on the contrary, bring us closer to it. The Brazilian Government considers that we must advance without any further delay along the road towards the total elimination of all nuclear tests, in order to attain

(Mr. de Castro, Brazil)

the goal set out in the preamble to the Treaty of 5 August, as recalled by resolution 1908 (XVIII) of the General Assembly.

"The delegation of Brazil is ready to submit concrete proposals on the prohibition of underground tests. As far as collateral measures are concerned, there already exist several suggestions on which Brazil considers that immediate general agreement could be reached. It appears to us that this question calls for the most careful and urgent attention, including, among other possibilities, that of a multilateral pact of non-aggression, already suggested by the delegation of Brazil.

"As regards measures of disarmament proper, the Brazilian Government thinks that the slight progress already attained in the direction of harmonizing conflicting theses gives ground for some hope and justifies new and most earnest endeavours on the part of all the members of the Eighteen-Nation Conference. Brazil continues to believe that it would be extremely useful to establish a technical body which might, in many instances, facilitate political decisions.

"Disarmament, as Brazil has often stated before, does not concern only the great Powers, the nations that hold in their hands the tremendous power of nuclear destruction. It is mankind as a whole which faces the risks of destruction, and no State can remain indifferent to such risks.

"The Brazilian Government, interpreting the aspirations of its people, firmly believes in the necessity of action in Geneva, and will do everything in its power to bring about the results that the whole world so eagerly desires."

That is my Government's communiqué. I should be most obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, if it could be considered as an official document of the Conference and distributed as such.<sup>1/</sup>

---

<sup>1/</sup> Circulated as document ENDC/121.

Mr. de SANTIAGO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): Although my delegation had not intended to take part in today's opening debate, I cannot let this opportunity pass without associating myself with the tributes that have been paid to the memory of President Kennedy, who was such an outstanding upholder of the cause of peace, harmony and human welfare. The deed of hatred which cut short his life has raised him to the peaks of history and made him a symbol of peace and justice among all nations.

At the beginning of this session I express the hope that, without sparing any effort, we shall continue to work for a solution that will translate into reality the supreme hopes of our peoples and thereby finally ensure that those who fight for peace do not die in vain.

In conclusion I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the heads of delegations, for the welcome you have given me.

The CHAIRMAN (Canada): Before I read the communiqué, I should like to put to the Conference a recommendation which has been arrived at by the co-Chairmen, the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The co-Chairmen recommend that the Committee should hold two plenary meetings a week, such meetings to take place at 10.30 a.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays and to be devoted to the discussion of general and complete disarmament and collateral measures respectively; that is, the Tuesday meetings would be concerned with general and complete disarmament, and the Thursday meetings with collateral measures.

The co-Chairmen also recommend that the Committee should hold an additional meeting at 10.30 a.m. on Friday during the first two weeks -- that is, this week and next week -- for the purpose of general discussion such as we have had today.

They note that these recommendations do not preclude, of course, the holding of additional meetings at any time the Committee might wish.

I should like to hear if any representatives have comments to make on those proposals, or any suggestions in relation to them. If not, may I take it that the Committee is prepared to accept those recommendations of the co-Chairmen?

I take it they are accepted, and I would request the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to make arrangements accordingly.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 157th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Burns, representative of Canada.

"The Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations made a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

"After the conclusion of the open part of the meeting, statements were made by the representatives of the United States of America, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, Italy, Brazil and Mexico.

"The delegation of the United States of America tabled the text of a letter<sup>1/</sup> from the President of the United States of America to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR delivered on 18 January 1964, as well as a message<sup>2/</sup> of President Lyndon B. Johnson to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, dated 21 January 1964.

"The delegation of Brazil tabled the text of a communiqué<sup>3/</sup> from the Government of Brazil dated 21 January 1964 for the resumption of the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 23 January 1964, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

---

1/ ENDC/119  
2/ ENDC/120  
3/ ENDC/121

There is a small stream which flows  
into the river at the place where the  
road crosses it. The water is very  
clear and the banks are very  
green. The trees are very tall  
and the leaves are very green.

The water is very clear and the  
banks are very green. The trees  
are very tall and the leaves are  
very green. The water is very  
clear and the banks are very  
green. The trees are very tall  
and the leaves are very green.

The water is very clear.