

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.826
22 January 1957
ENGLISH

Eleventh Session
FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 22 January 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments: conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction: report of the Disarmament Commission [22] (continued)

Statements were made in the general debate on the item by:

Mr. Nase	(Albania)
Mr. Mahgoub	(Sudan)
Mr. Tarabanov	(Bulgaria)
Mr. Tarazi	(Syria)
Mr. Jamali	(Iraq)
Mr. Hamdani	(Pakistan)
Mr. Mahmoud	(Egypt)
Mr. Aznar	(Spain)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.826. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

REGULATION, LIMITATION AND BALANCED REDUCTION OF ALL ARMED FORCES AND ALL ARMAMENTS: CONCLUSION OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION (TREATY) ON THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS AND THE PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC, HYDROGEN AND OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION: REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION (DC.83; A/C.1/783, 784; A/C.1/L.160, L.161, L.162)/[Agenda item 22] (continued)

Mr. NASE (Albania)(interpretation from French): There is no more important problem for the cause of peace than the problem of disarmament. This is universally recognized and peace-loving peoples throughout the world rightly expect agreement to be reached in this field, because their future depends on it.

It is quite natural for my Government, which bases its policy on the defence of peace and the peaceful development of the Republic of Albania, to attach all the necessary importance to this problem. We assess at its proper value the immense scope of this question for the peace of mankind. We do not ignore the delicate and complex nature of this problem, but we are convinced that possibilities of reaching agreement do exist and if the indispensable goodwill of all parties had existed during the long period of time that the discussions had been held on this problem, there would have been enough time to reach solution or at least to apply the first practical measures on the way to disarmament. No international problem has been the subject of such prolonged discussion as the problem of disarmament. In spite of this, up to the present time there have been no results, no measures have been taken.

The reason for this is that the official circles of the Western Powers are directly interested in the arms race and are doing everything possible to prevent a settlement of the problem of disarmament as well as the other pending international problems. All their efforts over the last ten years were, in the last analysis, designed to create obstacles, to prevent any agreement on this question and to aggravate the international situation still further.

The peoples of the world cannot fail to take account of facts such as the increase in the military budget of the United States, the increase of military preparations by the members of NATO -- and particularly Western Germany -- the efforts to incite as much as possible the participation of countries in aggressive pacts led by the United States.

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

But the peoples who condemn war and the arms race cannot approve such plans. They wish to lead a peaceful life, both for themselves and for future generations. It is for this reason that they earnestly ask us to reach agreement on disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons. The peoples demand that we go on from words about disarmament to practical measures.

If one considers carefully the attitude adopted by each of the great Powers in the disarmament question, one cannot help noting the continuous efforts of the Soviet Union in order to reach agreement on all aspects of the problem and thus to eliminate the threat of a new war. Account should be taken of the fact that on several occasions the Soviet Union went more than half way to meet the Western Powers' proposals but, and this is characteristic, every time the Soviet Government accepted proposals emanating from the Western Powers, those Powers gave them up. An example of this is the question of the level of forces and the prohibition of nuclear weapons, which is made conditional by the Western Powers on the reduction of conventional armaments to 75 per cent of the agreed reduction.

Likewise, we cannot fail to take note of the concrete proposals made by the Soviet Union in order to get out of the deadlock created by the Western Powers, such proposals as that which would ask the Member States of the United Nations to refrain in their international relations from the recourse to force and the use of nuclear weapons; the proposal for the immediate cessation of experimental nuclear explosions; the proposal concerning the adoption of measures for each State to reduce its armed forces and to stop the arms race without waiting for an international agreement on disarmament -- a proposal in which the Soviet Union set an example in implementation, as well as in other proposals.

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

It is to be regretted that the Western Powers not only have given no evidence of the goodwill necessary for giving serious consideration to the Soviet proposals to reach agreement but they have, on the contrary, placed condition after condition on agreement, and on various pretexts have evaded a solution of the problem of disarmament. For instance, they make the prohibition of nuclear weapons conditional on a previous reduction of conventional armaments or they make the end of the arms race dependent on a the settlement of a certain number of political problems or the requirement of previous control before disarmament, and so forth. All of this is for the obvious purpose of dragging out discussions without reaching any results, because there can be no doubt that such a procedure makes only more difficult the solution of the problem which is already very complicated.

One of the most important problems with regard to disarmament is the problem of the prohibition of nuclear weapons. The people of the entire world are calling for the prohibition of these most destructive and lethal weapons. The solution of this problem would have a positive influence on the whole problem of disarmament, would contribute to the relaxation of international tension and thus would create favourable conditions not only for disarmament but also for the solution of outstanding international issues.

We cannot fail to appreciate highly the efforts exerted in this direction by the Soviet Union, which has constantly asked for the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, the cessation of manufacture of these weapons, their elimination from the armaments of all States and the destruction of existing stockpiles.

We should recall, in this connexion, the position taken by the Western Powers. Before the acceptance by the Soviet Union of the force levels proposed by the Western Powers, those Powers submitted a proposal according to which the total prohibition of nuclear weapons could be accepted only when the reductions of conventional weapons had reached 75 per cent of the agreed reductions, but as soon as the Soviet Union accepted that proposal and it became possible to reach agreement on this subject the Western Powers went back on their own proposals and relegated to the background the question of conventional armaments by saying that it was necessary to begin with nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

In the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Government last July to the Disarmament Commission it was proposed, inter alia, that the use of atomic and thermonuclear weapons be prohibited. This proposal was also rejected by the Western Powers. Neither did those Powers accept the important proposal submitted by India, the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States, concerning the prohibition of nuclear test explosions, which might constitute a first step towards their total prohibition.

The same situation prevails in the present stage of negotiations between the great Powers. The Soviet Union proposes a prohibition within two years of nuclear weapons, that is, prohibition of their use and the destruction of existing stockpiles. Moreover, in its draft resolution the Soviet Union proposes the immediate cessation of tests of nuclear weapons. It is to be regretted that in the memorandum submitted to the Committee by the United States the same negative attitude continues to be adopted with respect to the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

With regard to the suggestion of prior notice for nuclear tests and the registration of nuclear tests, proposed in the draft resolution submitted by Canada, Japan and Norway, it seems to us that this merely serves the purpose of evading the urgent demand of the peoples of the world for the prohibition of nuclear tests. It is not necessary to set up special control machinery, because it is already possible to register explosions of atomic bombs at whatever point on the globe they may occur.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania firmly supports the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union on this question and considers that the adoption of this draft resolution by our Organization would meet the universal desires of the peoples of the world and would eliminate the dangers created by nuclear weapons tests to the lives and health of people and constitute a first, happy step towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania highly appreciates all the efforts of the Soviet Union to seek common grounds of understanding with the Western Powers and to reach desired solutions of the question of disarmament. We appreciate and we firmly support the recent effort represented by the declaration of the Soviet Government of 17 November 1956, a declaration which is a good basis for negotiations for the purpose of reaching agreement on disarmament.

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

We consider that with the new Soviet proposals possibilities have been created of reaching agreement on the reduction of armed forces and armaments. The Soviet Government, meeting the last proposals of the Western Powers, accepts the level of 2,500,000 for the Soviet Union, the United States and China and 750,000 for France and the United Kingdom. Of course, this would constitute the first step, in the first year of implementation of the programme, whereas during the following year the force levels would be brought down to 1,500,000 and 650,000 respectively.

The question of control appears to be in the foreground of the United States proposals. Of course, no one would deny the importance of control nor its complex nature, but it is not for that reason that the negotiations have taken so much time. The reason for that is that Western diplomacy has attempted to drag out these negotiations, with the expectation that it would be possible to sidestep a debate on concrete measures designed to prohibit and to eliminate nuclear weapons.

We all know that the Soviet Union has proposed a comprehensive system of effective control which should be perfectly acceptable, particularly in its attempt to prevent surprise attack through the establishment of control posts in principal ports, railway junctions, airfields and motor highways. It thus provides for the establishment of an inspection staff which would have free access to all objects of control and the right to look into military expenditures and legislative and executive decisions. This programme would make it possible to discover any preparation for sudden aggression and to prevent it.

The United States, unable to find any serious objection to the Soviet proposal, has proposed the "open skies" plan, which provides for aerial surveys as an essential condition to agreement on disarmament. This plan does not by itself settle the question of control over disarmament and will not prevent aggression.

Nevertheless, we see once again that the Soviet Union has given another proof of its good will and its desire to get around the present deadlock by its willingness to consider the question of using aerial surveys in the zone of Europe covering 800 kilometres east and west of the demarcation line between the forces of NATO and those of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Despite the importance of this new step on the part of the Soviet Union to reach agreement, the United States and certain other western Powers have not demonstrated the expected good will and are again demanding the acceptance without discussion of the United States "open skies" plan.

It should also be emphasized that the proposal of the Soviet Union for the withdrawal of forces from frontiers and the elimination of bases on these territories is of great importance. The Soviet Union proposes that in 1957 the forces of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France which are stationed on the territory of Germany should be reduced by one third under appropriate control arrangements, and that all naval and air bases on the territory of other States should be eliminated within two years. Despite the great importance of this proposal, the United States has refused to consider it. The United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, stated openly last December that the United States forces in Europe will be maintained as they have been in the past.

My delegation does not intend to dwell at greater length on these observations on the various positions adopted by the western Powers, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other. However, we do consider it necessary to draw the attention of the First Committee to the fact that these various positions cannot be considered independently of the policy carried out by these Powers in their international relations. We cannot help noting that the continued efforts and the constructive attitude of the Soviet Union on the question of disarmament reflect accurately its peaceful foreign policy, which is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence among States of differing social and political systems.

It is perfectly clear that the attitude of the United States up to now on the problem of disarmament cannot be separated from the policy followed by influential United States circles. Nothing can justify or cover up a policy which pursues purposes which have nothing in common with the strengthening of peace.

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania, which is guided in its foreign policy by the principle of peaceful coexistence and international co-operation on the basis of the mutual benefit and equality of States, has always endeavoured, as far as possible, to contribute to the solution of problems relating to the maintenance and strengthening of peace, including the important problem of disarmament. My Government has always supported all constructive efforts in that direction. In addition, the Albanian Government has made an effective contribution by reducing its armed forces by 9,000 men and its military expenditures for 1956 by 25 per cent as compared to 1955.

My delegation supports the Soviet Union proposal which calls for convoking a special session of the General Assembly to deal exclusively with the consideration of the question of disarmament. We support also the proposal to increase the membership of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee.

The problem of disarmament has concerned all of mankind for many years. The armaments race clearly interferes with the relaxation of international tension and constitutes a permanent threat with the danger of transforming any local conflict into a world war. It diverts enormous resources which might otherwise be used for civil production and raising the standard of living of the people. The creation

BHS/gd

A/C.1/PV.826
13-15

(Mr. Nase, Albania)

of modern weapons, such as nuclear weapons, has made it even more imperative that we should solve the problem of disarmament. We believe that it would be possible to settle this question if all parties demonstrated the good will which is expected of them by the people of the world. The people insist that we should stop paying lip-service to disarmament and adopt practical measures. A practical solution of this problem by the United Nations would constitute the greatest possible contribution to the cause of the maintenance and strengthening of peace.

Mr. MAHGOUB (Sudan): It may appear presumptuous on the part of my delegation, which comes from a small country that is completely disarmed, to participate in a debate on disarmament or reduction of armaments. But we, the small nations, are far more interested in disarmament than the big Powers. Our countries can develop and thrive only in times of peace and security. In a mad world that competes in an armaments race, our countries can do nothing but spend a great part of their budgets on enlarging the size of their armies and on military equipment -- not in the hope of maintaining the balance of power, but in the vain hope of defending their territories against aggression.

The funds we have, limited as they may be, are needed for expanding and maintaining our social services, particularly in the fields of education and health. We still need better roads and communications and we need to raise the standard of living of our fellow-countrymen and improve their conditions. It is therefore our duty to help in arresting the armaments race, in banning the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons, and in reducing conventional weapons to the minimum necessary for internal security.

In this spirit and with an aim in view to which I shall allude later, my delegation makes this humble contribution to this debate.

The two big Powers have often expressed their avowed intention and willingness to reduce their armaments, if not to disarm completely. Let us examine in detail the two points of view: that of the Western bloc, on the one hand, and that of the Soviet bloc, on the other. If we are able to point out the differences and list them, it may then be possible for us to refer those differences to a special commission, with a view to finding a basis for agreement.

The last two years have witnessed moves and activities for disarmament. These were a result of anxiety for the future of the human race as a whole and the preservation of civilization, as well as the fear of the consequences of an armed conflict for individual nations and States, whether large or small. Indeed, science has harnessed the power of the atom, which can bring either doom or prosperity. The scientists have gone far ahead of the statesmen and politicians and, unless this gap is bridged, unless we find a balance between the two, unless man can adapt his instincts to these formidable discoveries, the world might as well hasten its own end. Unless human standards and values rise high above the laws of

the jungle, it is no exaggeration to say that modern armaments will put an end not only to the present civilization but equally to what has remained of its predecessors.

There is not the least doubt that no human being would wish, consciously or unconsciously, to bring about such a catastrophe. Whether at present or on previous occasions, the major Powers have always agreed on an honest desire for peace and disarmament. The differences between them are too trivial to be weighed against their consequences.

These differences are mainly on the procedure for carrying out an effective disarmament. They have, however, been reduced, and there are still ample chances to iron them out. On the final day of the meetings of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, the Western Powers declared their policy on disarmament to be: carrying out the programme by stages, initiating significant reductions in armed forces under effective control, discontinuing the production of nuclear weapons at an appropriate stage, and establishing a control programme. The declaration expressed the conviction of the possibility of an agreement with the USSR and determination to continue the efforts to reach such an agreement.

The USSR expressed its dissatisfaction because it felt that the Western Powers were retreating on the matter of the force levels, refusing to proceed toward agreement on conventional armaments and insisting on the settlement of major political issues as a prerequisite of disarmament.

This situation was in itself a step forward, and the differences were reduced. It was a start for the Disarmament Commission when it met last July. There was agreement, however, on the figures of 2,500,000 men for the United States, the Soviet Union and China, 750,000 for the United Kingdom and France, and consideration of the figure of 200,000 as a maximum for each of the remaining Powers.

The differences over these intricate and complicated issues cannot be solved overnight and, because of the legacy of mutual suspicion and of ideological and other differences, as well as almost complete disagreement on all the problems of the last twelve years or so, it may take some time before a final concord is reached. In seeking the final solution, we cannot start at only one point and let the others follow in a chain reaction. It is all a muddle, and the approach has to be on a wide front, however slow it may be.

The position has hardly changed since the spring meeting of the Disarmament Commission. The statements delivered by the representatives of the major Powers have mainly reiterated their previous positions. It is a pity that there were attacks and counterattacks by the delegations. Such actions can neither affect situations of the past nor help in creating the right atmosphere for attaining the end which we all wish to achieve.

The representative of the United States of America has stated the objectives of his Government as: first, the establishment of effective international control of future production of fissionable materials and commitments to use future production exclusively for non-weapon purposes; secondly, moving for a reduction of the existing stockpiles; thirdly, when that is executed, the possibility of limiting and ultimately eliminating all nuclear test explosions; fourthly, a reduction of conventional armaments to the basic measurement figures agreed upon by the Commission, with the proviso that the reduction cannot be made without the settlement of the issues dividing the world; fifthly, the creation of provisions against a surprise attack by either side. That is a very brief résumé of the main objectives of the United States of America.

The representative of the USSR has also given us the objectives of his Government, which are, briefly, a peaceful settlement of international disputes, a reduction of armaments and a ban on nuclear weapons. He has also informed the Committee of his Government's wish to analyse specific proposals and agree first on the indisputable ones. He has proposed procedural data, the main elements of which are a substantial reduction of armies, in two stages, and a provision that within two years there should be a prohibition of nuclear weapons, with discontinuance of their production, banning of their use, complete destruction of stockpiling, and discontinuance of tests. The representative of the USSR has also put forward proposals for reduction of armies in 1957 and limitations on NATO and the Warsaw Treaty and the establishment of international control over the fulfilment of disarmament obligations.

I do not intend to analyse the details of the differences between the major Powers regarding disarmament. I do not like to underrate them in any way. But, as can be seen, they are only procedural and it is only a matter of time. However, they seem to rotate around whether to begin with disarmament or with a solution of

international problems. This leads directly into a vicious circle which has to be broken somewhere. The remaining differences, such as inspection and control, aerial photography, the meetings of the heads of the five States -- the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India -- and the membership of the Disarmament Commission, are not too difficult to solve. Once the right atmosphere is created, no disagreement is beyond solution. Whether to begin with disarmament or with the solution of international problems is a difficult question to decide. Each approach has very important and strong supporting points.

(Mr. Mahgoub, Sudan)

In such circumstances, it is the opinion of my delegation that a broad attack on both can be made concurrently. What is at stake is not what the other side might take as an advantage, but the future of the whole human race, civilization and perhaps the world itself.

As I mentioned earlier, we, the small nations, are far more interested in disarmament than the major Powers. After all, each side professes to protect us from the other. Apart from this, a small part of the resources which go into this mad armaments race, if directed towards the development of the less-developed countries, towards lessening the misery and poverty of the human race, or rather the majority of it, and towards raising the standard of living of peoples who may have to toil and sweat for years before being able to effect a tangible raising of standards, and if a part of the funds spent wastefully on armaments were directed against any of these major world problems, we would have been able to achieve noble ends and make the lot of man better in a way which would be more effective and desirous, rather than a paralyzed victory for any particular side. This is an indirect interest. But the small Powers have an equally direct interest. The disease of armaments has been carried to almost all the small nations, not in any quixotic venture to try to conquer or settle a dispute by force, but in the vain hope of being in a better position to defend themselves in case of an attack. The money which the small nations spend on strengthening their armies, however meagre they may be, are badly needed for schools, hospitals and livelihood schemes.

The gains to be derived from disarmament are too obvious to be stressed or reviewed. The consequences of an armed conflict are fatal to us all without exception. This in itself should impel us to be above the differences which seem petty and insignificant, when compared to the horrible outcome of a war.

We should save no effort in trying to achieve a final agreement over this vital issue. We here all have the same ideas and the same love for peace and security, and we all wish to save our children and grandchildren from the panics and disaster of wars, and to establish good human relations. It is our desire to promote all the noble and lofty principles and leave the world better than we have found it. Why then, gentlemen, should we not do so and have a clear conscience.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from Russian): The Bulgarian people, along with the other peoples of the world, is following with great attention the efforts of the United Nations which are designed to settle one of the most important and acute problems of modern times, the problem of disarmament and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. We are all well aware of the fact that mankind will not be delivered from the nightmare of a third world war -- which fact was so well described in a number of statements made here by speakers who are familiar with the horrors of thermonuclear weapons and radiation -- until atomic and hydrogen weapons are prohibited and their manufacture comes to an end, and until States eliminate these arms from their armaments and destroy stocks of such weapons.

The peoples who knew the horrors of the Second World War -- when these weapons did not exist -- cannot carry out peaceful and constructive labour until the armed forces and armaments of all States have been gradually eliminated and until only those types of armed forces remain which are required for the maintenance of internal order and security and for frontier protection. We know that such a task cannot be solved easily even by the United Nations, but the first and most important task put before our Organization by its founders is "to save succeeding generation from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

One of the basic obstacles to reaching success in the field of disarmament, as is known, is the existence in some countries of people and groups which are raking in fabulous profits from the manufacture of weapons, including the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen weapons. It is obvious that these people and groups are opposing energetically, and will oppose, every step taken toward disarmament, because the beginning of real disarmament would mean for them not a reduction of their profits, but it would compel them to make a basic readjustment

As far as our country is concerned, there are no people or financial groups in it which are interested in making money out of the production of arms. All the Bulgarian people without exception, and their Government, are interested in raising the public economy of the country and, through peaceful creative labour, raising the standard of living of the population. Complete disarmament would create even more possibilities for our Government and people to exert all of their

efforts in order to realize their economic plans. Therefore, our Government and our country, will encounter no internal or domestic difficulties in disarming. On the contrary, they would lend all their support and assistance in this matter.

We know that the Governments of countries in which there are powerful financial groups interested in the production and trade of arms and armaments and whose sources of profit would decline in case of disarmament, will run into very serious opposition even at the slightest attempt to embark on this path. Therefore, their merit would be even greater if they could overcome the resistance of these groups and move the question of disarmament forward.

In their statements some representatives have depicted the difficulties of disarmament in such a way as to play into the hands of those groups which are interested in proving that any disarmament is impossible. Thus, for example, on 15 January the representative of Belgium declared the following in this Committee:

"Basic difficulties persist which it would be vain to deny. But it is nonetheless true that unless we can overcome them now an arms race is the only alternative. To prevent this, we must be convinced first of all that disarmament is inevitably linked to a satisfactory settlement of the political question without which the indispensable minimum of confidence could not exist." (A/C.1/PV.822, page 23-25)

There can be no doubt that the settlement of pending political issues would create a favourable atmosphere for moving forward with disarmament. In view of such a prospect and such a possibility, which by the way one may say began to come about as a result of initiatives on the part of the Soviet Union and under the pressure of the peoples of the world, some ruling and financial circles in the Western States provoked aggression against Egypt, organized and continue to organize subversive activities against the people's democracies and the Soviet Union and are preparing new plans to impose a position of dependence and subjugation on the peoples of the Middle East.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

Such attempts are not designed to create trust and mutual confidence among peoples. If we follow the logic of the representative of Belgium, then, in such circumstances, we would have to abandon for a long time any attempts to make progress in the problem of disarmament until we had settled pending political problems.

Accordingly, one cannot help noting that the favourable signs in the international atmosphere, which were received so hopefully by all, have not been to the liking of certain circles in Western countries which have too much interest in other people's territories and riches and which assert that they cannot live without holding the oil of the Middle East in their hands. The efforts of these circles to interrupt the increasingly healthy process in international relations have been observed. If this problem can make no progress -- as the representative of Belgium and other representatives have stated -- until pending political questions have been settled favourably, does this mean that these questions must be settled in circumstances of full armament and, therefore, under the threat or use of force and that, only after that, it would be possible to proceed towards disarmament?

If these are the intentions of those who guide the political life of these countries, then their own people should be told about it in order that they may have a clear idea of the intentions of their Governments.

The Western Powers have a common point of view on this matter, which became clear from the statement made by the representative of the United States during our present discussion. It was pointed out in that statement that, in the opinion of the United States, a reduction greater than that provided for in the first stage would be impossible until more progress had been made in political settlements. But who can guarantee that there will not be some who would enjoy adventures, such as that launched against Egypt, when we reach the second stage of disarmament? Obviously, the desire to achieve political settlements can be viewed as a desire to promote disarmament, and only complete disarmament can, in turn, ensure a peaceful solution of all problems which are outstanding among the various countries.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

In spite of the difficulties encountered on the path of disarmament, together with the divergent views, the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee have made a certain amount of progress towards settling these questions. The Soviet proposals formulated in the Soviet Union Government's declaration of 17 November 1956 expressed the longing of all peoples to reach general disarmament within a short time. One would have expected these proposals to have met with the approval of those who accuse the Soviet Union of having submitted on 27 March 1956 proposals relating only to the field of conventional armaments. But, once again, they accuse the Soviet Union of adhering to an over-simplified concept of the prohibition of atomic weapons and conventional armaments, a conception from which it has not departed during the last decade. Perhaps these delegations would prefer the registration of atomic tests, as proposed in the draft resolution submitted by Canada and some other countries. That proposal appears to some to be more appropriate, since it would make it possible to deceive people while, at the same time, having little in common with real disarmament. However, the peoples of the world are happy that the Soviet Union is pressing its proposal to discontinue atomic and hydrogen tests, to prohibit atomic and hydrogen weapons, to bring about the destruction of all atomic weapons, and to reduce conventional armaments. The peoples would be dissatisfied if the Soviet Union were to abandon its position and embark on the path of petty compromise, which would only create the illusion that something was being done in the field of disarmament. There can be no doubt that the Disarmament Commission, especially its Sub-Committee, should consider all proposals relating to disarmament which have been advanced during the present session, and all reasonable possibilities should be utilized to reach agreement on these questions which are decisive for mankind.

In this connexion the United States proposals are worthy of attention inasmuch as the United States is one of the countries possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons. The United States proposals on disarmament, with the exception of the so-called earth satellite question and inter-continental ballistic missiles, are not new. They appear in one form or another in various previous statements. However, they are now presented in a more developed and concrete form. A number

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

of representatives have spoken favourably of these proposals, describing them as realistic, practicable, etc. In spite of these favourable responses, these proposals cannot satisfy the demand of the peoples for elimination of these most destructive atomic and hydrogen weapons.

What is proposed in these statements? We are asked to stop the accumulation of fissionable materials, not the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Experimental explosions, designed for military purposes, would not be discontinued. Probably the fissionable materials already existing are sufficient to guarantee not only the production of already tested weapons for some time to come, but even of new ones. This is a very unhappy prospect which the United States is offering. One may understand from these proposals that the United States is prepared to agree to the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons but that it is prevented from doing so by the impossibility of establishing real control and, accordingly, control already existing weapons. In spite of this, the United States does not wish to stop further tests of new types of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Thus it appears that, where it is not yet possible to ensure effective control, the United States would agree to stop production if control existed. But, in an area where control is quite possible, the United States does not agree, not reckoning with the obvious threat to the life and health of the peoples from the accumulation of new weapons.

We do not doubt that specialists will be found who will assure us that tests of atomic weapons do not constitute any danger. However, such assurances cannot resurrect the dead or heal the sick. It is perfectly clear to the peoples that tests of atomic weapons are not only harmful to the health of populations but also dangerous because a constant accumulation of ever new and ever more destructive types of weapons can lead to a situation in which, one fine day, they will speak for themselves.

The Bulgarian delegation considers that instead of making ever new proposals which, with their added conditions, complicate matters even further, it would be useful to take the results already achieved as a basis and move on. It appears now that all participants in the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee agree that it would be possible to begin a reduction of the forces of the great Powers to 2,500,000 and 750,000 respectively. That proposal has already been adopted by the United States delegation -- unfortunately with certain conditions which make its implementation very problematical -- and this could serve as a basis for the development of the further work of the Commission and its Sub-Committee.

It is timely to recall here that it would be entirely unrealistic to think seriously of disarmament, and, in particular, to assure others that this question is being seriously discussed if one of the greatest States in the world is ignored -- the People's Republic of China with a population which represents almost one-quarter of the total population of the globe.

Both Soviet and American statesmen have said that they would not use atomic weapons for purposes of aggression. In the letters of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Bulganin we read, "As far as my country is concerned it will continue not to use this force" -- that is, atomic weapons -- "for aggressive purposes". Now why could not these statements be brought together in a common document? That would be a good beginning since it would create favourable conditions for further progress and further successes in the field of disarmament -- saying that thermonuclear weapons could serve as a deterrent against aggression, and so on. It may be said that this is untimely, but it could be done at the time when the reduction of conventional armaments and of armed forces to 2,500,000 and 750,000 was being co-ordinated.

Is it not clear that with such an army it would be difficult to wage, and even more difficult to win, a modern war? And let us emphasize especially that thermonuclear weapons would not be used for purposes of aggression but only for self-defence against atomic attack.

I should like to comment that the proposal made here to increase the membership of the Disarmament Commission by four new members, and that of its Sub-Committee by two new members, is reasonable and timely. Its adoption would make it possible to exert greater efforts to settle the problems of disarmament. It is necessary for the Commission and its Sub-Committee to make every effort to study all the possibilities and to make proposals with regard to such initiatives as could make possible progress in the disarmament problem. We not only should not exclude, but should in fact have in view initiatives such as the calling of a special session of the United Nations General Assembly on the question of disarmament, as well as the organization of meetings of leaders of the great Powers and responsible statesmen of the different nations. We think that this year we should not overlook the slightest possibility which might serve the cause of disarmament.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): My delegation has always taken part in the debates on disarmament. Its position has been amply defined during previous sessions of the General Assembly. I do not wish to repeat here what has been said in the past by the representatives of Syria. My only purpose is to make a number of comments which, in the opinion of my Government, derive from the reading of the vast quantity of documents that bear on this problem.

The representative of Iran, with his usual wisdom, outlined yesterday the role which the small Powers can play in the question of disarmament. That point of view has also been stated today by the representative of the Sudan, and I share it fully.

The Asian and African countries which have recently attained their national independence naturally have no effective means of halting the arms race. These countries, in common with all others, are interested primarily in the maintenance of peace and security. Indeed, peace is essential to them if they are to achieve their aspirations and to accomplish the tasks which their peoples and their leaders have set themselves.

Those are the reasons for which a country as small as Syria is seriously concerned with the progress that could and should be made in the field of disarmament.

To turn now to facts, my delegation would express its regret that no agreement has so far been arrived at on the question of the reduction of conventional weapons and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, the improvement in the international atmosphere that resulted from the Conference of the four great Powers at Geneva in July 1955 seems to have faded. Once again dark clouds seem to be lowering on the horizon of humanity. It is necessary to dissipate them and to re-establish the atmosphere of confidence which is so necessary if the peoples are to move ahead.

The right to happiness is one of the rights which was envisaged by the founders of the American Constitution when that document was drawn up. But I fear that as things are going the only thing that will be achieved will be to create unhappiness and misery.

We have listened with care to the suggestions made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union. We are convinced that an agreement must be arrived at and that it can be achieved only on the basis of all the useful suggestions made by the great Powers.

It is obvious that so far as concerns international control the points of view, although different, now seem to be moving closer to one another.

The problem of disarmament is important to small countries such as mine in many respects. We have frequently stressed the fact that the budgetary expenditures entailed in the armaments race could be used to develop the world's resources. Thus, the under-developed countries would be able to view the future with greater optimism. The gulf which separates them from the countries which are usually called "developed" or "industrialized" could not fail to disappear as techniques were improved. But these techniques are subject to the needs of war. In the present state of the world science is placed at the service of the powers of destruction whereas it should serve solely to raise man's level so that, from generation to generation, the eternal flame of life would be transmitted intact and burning ever brighter.

(Mr. Tarazi, Syria)

What is taking place today? A mere examination of the main activities of the great Powers leads one to the realization that these Powers are devoting three fourths of their resources to the development of their war potential. I must say that this is a sad state of affairs, and it becomes even sadder when we examine the other aspects of the disarmament question.

A few days ago, the representative of Yugoslavia referred, quite rightly, to the use of force as a means of obtaining political objectives. Unfortunately, events bear out that statement. Many representatives who have already spoken here have alluded to the recent occurrences in the Near East. If the disarmament problem had been solved sooner, the security of the brave country of Egypt and of all the other Arab countries would not have been threatened. The well-known attack was carried out with all the destructive equipment which two Powers -- Powers which have made proposals and counter-proposals on disarmament -- were able to put into the field; it was an attack launched because the policies pursued by certain Arab countries did not please those two Powers, or prejudiced the so-called legitimate interests of two Powers.

How can one talk about disarmament when one reads, in the New York Herald Tribune of 17 January 1957, a statement by Mr. Anthony Nutting, a former Minister of State in the Foreign Office of the United Kingdom, that Syria must be eliminated as a political entity because its presence constitutes a danger? I would only recall to Mr. Anthony Nutting something which Alfred de Musset said: "Il y a loin de la coupe aux lèvres" -- that is, "there's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip".

I do not want to dwell on the question of the armed intervention in Egypt and in my country -- an intervention during which the imperialists and their partner, Israel, did us the honour of flying over our territory in order to make sure that there were Soviet "MIGs" in Syria. Representatives seated round this table will say, "That seems unbelievable". But, during a press conference held in Toulon last December, Admiral Barjot -- one of the heads of the armed expedition against Egypt -- frankly admitted that he had sent reconnaissance aircraft over Syria in order to determine whether or not Soviet aircraft was to be found on Syrian soil. Is such action in conformity with the disarmament plans which the French representative here continues to present? It is up to Mr. Jules Moch, whom I

(Mr. Tarazi, Syria)

greatly respect and who knows his job very well, to clear up the contradictions between these theoretical plans and the hard and sad facts.

How can one talk of disarmament when two naval, aerial and land forces --

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish only to remind the representative of Syria that it is our duty to achieve a rapid solution of the problem with which we are now concerned. I would therefore address a friendly appeal to him not to poison the atmosphere of this debate. If the representative of Syria raises matters which are not relevant to the discussion, other representatives will want to reply, and we shall be led away from our subject. I think that all of us realize that we do not have much time left, and I think that we all wish to arrive at a constructive solution -- that is, to transmit all the proposals of the great Powers, including those of the Soviet Union and the United States, to the competent body.

It is in that spirit that I appeal to the representative of Syria -- and I am not speaking now as Chairman; I am not calling the representative of Syria to order, but am speaking to him as a friend -- not to raise these matters which will only lead to replies from other representatives.

Mr. TARAZI (Syria)(interpretation from French): I have always respected the Chairman's decisions, and I should like to do so in this case; but the people of Syria would never allow me to pass over the real facts in silence. I shall, however, be very brief and shall not indulge in polemics.

How can one talk of disarmament when two naval, aerial and land forces were mobilized and held ready to wreak death and destruction, to bring ruin and disaster to such a beautiful city as Port Said? This operation was planned in secret for weeks. In this respect, it is sufficient to read three articles written by a French journalist, Jean Planchais, and published in "Le Monde" on 7, 8 and 9 December 1956.

The facts to which I have just referred are, in my delegation's opinion, linked to an essential point -- that is, the existence of military bases on foreign soil. The operation "Musketeer", which finally failed, could not have been launched if there had not been a Cyprus and if French and British forces had not

(Mr. Tarazi, Syria)

been stationed there. The aim of disarmament is to ensure peace. But peace is threatened the moment that there are forces which can carry out a surprise attack. I think that, in saying this, I am not departing from the subject before us, because the great Powers have referred to surprise attacks.

The people and Government of Syria are quite aware of the danger posed by forces stationed in Cyprus, which is some twenty miles from the Syrian coast. Is such a situation in conformity with the spirit of disarmament? During the ninth session of the General Assembly, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd stated that the presence of British forces in Cyprus was necessary because the United Kingdom had undertaken certain defence obligations as regards some Arab nations. We now know only too well the uses to which these forces have been put.

The remarks which I have just made lead to the following basic observation which my Government wishes to present. Disarmament cannot be achieved without an atmosphere of confidence. In this respect, I think that it would be wise to apply the five basic principles of international law which the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, formulated and which were adopted by the Bandung Conference. One of those principles is that of non-aggression. Another, and no less important, is that of non-interference in the affairs of other States. One cannot deal with disarmament at the same time as one is intervening in the policies of other States. Today, we hear much about the existence of a political vacuum in the countries of the Middle East, caused by the fact that these countries have become independent. Such an attitude is contrary to the logic of events. It can lead to armed attacks and to the worst kinds of catastrophes for the future of humanity. There is no vacuum today. Only the peoples are responsible for their destiny. The Arab countries wish to achieve their national unity and to remain outside any military bloc. They are struggling against imperialism and Zionism. They are working to strengthen peace. The mere fact that they do not wish to participate in military alliances should make their contribution to the solution of the disarmament problem more important.

(Mr. Tarazi, Syria)

As an example of that contribution, I should like to cite the Syrian-Indian Declaration of 21 January 1957 -- that is, yesterday, This Declaration stresses the intervention of the great Powers, which use military pacts and alliances for that purpose. The Declaration states that these pacts and alliances prejudice the peace and stability of the Middle East.

Another aspect of the disarmament problem concerns the prohibition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. My delegation is happy to note that almost all the members of this Committee support the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. In this connexion, I would recall that, in 1950, those who signed the Stockholm Appeal were called Communists. The same label is being given today to governments which wish to maintain their national independence. But they will maintain their independence despite the efforts of the imperialists.

We were very much impressed by the statement of the representative of Japan, who carefully described the consequences of nuclear tests. My delegation shares his point of view. Furthermore, guided by the letter and spirit of the resolutions adopted by the Bandung Conference, my Government believes that the use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction should be completely prohibited. This prohibition should also apply to nuclear tests, which have such disastrous consequences.

Those were the observations which my delegation wished to make on the subject of disarmament. Our sole aim is to strengthen international peace and security -- the basic objective of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. JAMALI (Iraq): We have been discussing disarmament for more than ten years, and we shall have to continue doing so for more years to come. The reason is that, while we wish to disarm in order to relieve our budgets from the heavy burden of armaments and to channel much of the amount spent for armaments into peaceful, constructive purposes, the need for arms is still with us. We need arms because some feel that with arms they can remove injustice oppression and domination. Some feel afraid of being attacked by a strong neighbour, and some may still wish to dominate and impose their own social and political system upon others or to exploit other peoples and other territories.

So long as fear, injustice, greed, desire for domination and the exploitation of others remain in the world, the need for arms will remain. So long as ideological cold war prevails, so long as the great political problems of the day, such as the unification of Germany and Korea and the problem of Palestine, remain unsolved, so long as colonialism in its old overseas form or in its new overland form remains, the need for armaments will remain. The relationship between the political and moral atmosphere and disarmament is direct. The sooner the political and moral barometer of humanity rises, the sooner we shall know that the atmosphere is suitable for disarmament. The more honesty, justice, freedom and unselfishness we possess the more easily we can disarm. In other words, in order to work out an effective plan for disarmament, mutual confidence, a sense of justice, and mutual respect among nations, great and small, must prevail.

So far, we have been mainly discussing the question of disarmament from the point of view of the great Powers and the gigantic machinery of war and lethal weapons which they possess. There is no doubt that this is well justified. Any conflagration that involves the great Powers will involve us all. I wish to treat the subject from the point of view of the small Powers, for any conflagration between the small Powers might involve the great Powers.

I wish to turn to our part of the world, the Middle East, and raise two issues that are directly related to armaments. The first issue is that which has been called the theory of equilibrium in arms between Israel and its Arab neighbours. On 25 May 1950, three Western Powers, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, issued a Tripartite Agreement, which contained the following:

(Mr. Jamali, Iraq)

"The Governments of the United Kingdom, France and the United States, having had occasion during the recent Foreign Ministers' meeting in London to review certain questions affecting the peace and stability of the Arab States and of Israel, and particularly that of the supply of arms and war material to these States, have resolved to make the following statements:

"(1) The three Governments recognize that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defence and to permit them to play their part in the defence of the area as a whole. All applications for arms or war material for these countries will be considered in the light of these principles. In this connexion, the three Governments wish to recall and reaffirm the terms of the statements made by their representatives on the Security Council on 4 August 1949, in which they declared their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab States and Israel.

"(2) The three Governments declare that assurances have been received from all the States in question, to which they permit arms to be supplied from their countries, that the purchasing State does not intend to undertake any act of aggression against any other State. Similar assurances will be requested from any other States in the area to which they permit arms to be supplied in the future."

In practice, this agreement was interpreted as meaning that Israel should have an arms power equal to that of all the neighbouring Arab States combined. The result was that Israel was strong, so strong that it invaded with its arms the neighbouring States, one after another. Jordan, Syria, and Egypt were attacked one after the other with full military force. Hundreds of lives were lost.

Egypt, knowing that the Western sources would not allow it to get arms for self-defence, had to seek arms from Czechoslovakia, from which Israel had secured arms in the past. This started the chain of political events in the Middle East which has led to the present deadlock. The so-called argument that there should be a balance between the Arab States and Israel is morally and politically untenable. To begin with, a nation's armaments should be according to its thinking and to its own needs and responsibilities. If there is to be

(Mr. Jamali, Iraq)

a control on armaments, it should be universal and just. Israel's drunkenness with the power of arms made it invade Egypt and persist in its occupation of Egyptian territory.

If we are to have peace in the Middle East, with arms control, Israel's arms should not be more than it is entitled to have by its size and population. Pending a final and just settlement of the Palestine question, Israel might be offered protection by the United Nations Force, but not arms which it uses to invade its neighbours. That is why we appeal to the States that provide Israel with money or arms to stop doing so, in order that a further conflagration might be avoided in the Middle East.

The second point which directly affects peace in the Middle East, and which is also connected with the arms question, is that of Communist infiltration and subversion. My country, Iraq, is one of the countries that has felt the danger of communism to its social, economic and political system for many years. In order to preserve our integrity and to dispel the fear of Communist subversion or invasion, we took part in initiating the Baghdad Pact with our friendly neighbours, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. The Baghdad Pact is not directed against anybody.

(Mr. Jamali, Iraq)

We harbour no ill intentions as regards the people of the Soviet Union or as regards any other people in the world. But we are entitled under Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter to prepare for self-defence, to preserve peace by preparedness.

We in Iraq see the Communist danger to our existence in its true perspective. We have witnessed what happened in Korea, in Viet-Nam and in Eastern Europe. We cannot say that the USSR is not interested in the Middle East. We need arms not to attack anybody, but to defend ourselves if others attack us. It is for this reason that we welcome President Eisenhower's plan for helping those people of the Middle East who desire help in money and in arms for self-protection, especially because President Eisenhower's plan is based on respect for the independence of the nations concerned and because it proposes that peace shall be based on justice in the area. We sincerely hope that the Arabs of Palestine will attain justice. We believe that President Eisenhower's plan can be a great contribution to peace, depending on the manner and place in which the help is rendered. A stabilized Middle East will be a great contribution to disarmament.

Coming back to the larger subject of disarmament, we certainly welcome any progress made towards reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic warfare, but we wish to repeat this year, as we did in the past, that no disarmament should be effected unless and until we have full guarantees of a full system of control and inspection. So long as confidence is not perfect and so long as we have our fears, disarming may prove to be suicidal to freedom-loving peoples.

We support everything that is contained in the United States memorandum. We go along with the Soviet delegation's draft resolution except that we do not see any need for calling a special session of the General Assembly at this stage. We support the draft resolution presented by Canada, Japan and others.

Before I end my statement, I wish to reiterate that unless mutual confidence prevails, unless freedom is respected everywhere and unless the independence of nations is respected, it is futile to speak of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Israel has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. COMAY (Israel): At this stage I would just like to reserve my delegation's right of reply to certain comments on the situation in the Middle East and concerning my country, which have been made in the speech we have just heard.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Israel will be called upon to exercise his right of reply after the general debate is over.

Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan): My delegation has studied with care the reports before us and has listened with great attention to the statements that have so far been made in the Committee, especially those of the Powers represented on the Disarmament Commission and the Sub-Committee.

We must note the basic fact that a possible worldwide conflagration sparked in the Middle East was effectively snuffed out when the two big Powers were in agreement in this august body. Appreciation of this basic and latest evidence available to us would lead one to understand that disarmament in all its aspects could be achieved realistically and gradually only when the big Powers agree among themselves on the subject. Indeed, the previous history and chronology of the subject is a pattern of see-saw between these Powers when they seem to agree to disagree.

Although the unilateral reduction of armed forces has been announced by some Powers, which is natural with the undoubted easing of international tensions, this unilateral reduction of armed forces cannot be termed disarmament as envisaged in the United Nations.

The United Nations aims at multilateral agreement for a balanced reduction of all armaments, for the prohibition of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and for safeguarded control.

In the field of nuclear weapons Governments have shifted to and fro in advocating control or elimination of these weapons. Emphasis seemed to have moved from atomic disarmament to a search for a method of guarding against surprise attack. It also seemed to have moved to methods by which countries not yet producing nuclear weapons could be prevented from developing them. The International Atomic Energy Agency will in effect have control of the development for peaceful

purposes of nuclear technology and of processed fissionable material. By means of inspection guarding against diversion of processed nuclear material from peaceful purposes to bombs, this Agency may develop to a limited extent a form of disarmament by precluding recipient countries from producing nuclear weapons. This, however, has not affected the stockpiles of the United States, the United Kingdom and the USSR.

My delegation therefore welcomes the United States voluntary transfer from their stockpiles of fissionable material to the Atomic Agency for peaceful purposes. My delegation earnestly hopes that other big Powers in possession of stockpiles will follow this example, which is an effective way of reducing the stockpiles.

The slow pace of negotiation among the big Powers on this vital subject of disarmament has been outstripped by the phenomenal progress in the perfection of nuclear weapons such as guided missiles, etc. These new weapons would not only change the nature of warfare, but also would give rise to new problems. My delegation therefore fully commends to the attention of the Sub-Committee the constructive objectives mentioned by the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom. In our opinion, renewed negotiations on these lines would lead to material progress in this thorny field of disarmament. We feel that once effective international control of future production is established, steps could be taken towards the reduction of existing stockpiles by voluntary transfers of fissionable materials to the International Atomic Energy Agency for peaceful purposes.

Once the future production of fissionable materials is controlled, nuclear test explosions could then ultimately be eliminated. There is, however, great force in the arguments made by the representative of Norway to work out immediately methods of limiting such nuclear tests by means of advance notice and registration with the United Nations.

The representative of Sweden has asked for a moratorium on nuclear tests. My delegation would gladly support either proposal which meets with the unanimous approval of the Committee.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that the big Powers are apparently in agreement on the first stage of reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces with some adequate inspection. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that,

given good faith and good will, such a system of inspection could be established so as to lead to the first stage of reduction of conventional arms and armed forces.

I am in full agreement with my colleague from Iraq when he emphasized that disarmament can begin only with moral armament. Disarmament begins first in the hearts of peoples, to be reflected in the policies of their Governments. Informed public opinion and not propaganda can play a vital role in persuading the Governments concerned to negotiate among themselves, thus leading to the elimination of the scourge of total destruction and annihilation.

Finally, I wish to repeat what my Foreign Minister said in the general debate. He said that

"... the most sceptical among us would have to admit that the gap between positions (of the great Powers) has considerably narrowed. My delegation fervently hopes that this gap will be bridged. It has to be bridged because the alternative is too frightful to contemplate. Human beings may lack many virtues, but the instinct of self-preservation is strong as a motive force in our actions". (A/PV.601, page 26)

Mr. MAHMOUD (Egypt): The representatives of Syria and Iraq in their statements this morning referred to the aggression to which Egypt was subjected last October. They not only expressed the views of their own delegations but they expressed also the views of the Egyptian delegation in this respect. My delegation has already dealt at length with this subject in the General Assembly and we shall continue to do so when the question comes up again for discussion in the plenary meeting. At this juncture I am going to confine myself to the technical aspects of the question under discussion.

It is not the intention of the Egyptian delegation to comment in detail on the various suggestions, proposals and working papers which have been submitted in the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee. This, however, should not be interpreted as a lack of interest on the part of my Government or an indication that it minimizes the issue under discussion. On the contrary, I would like at the outset to register my Government's gratification over the increasing interest of the Members of the United Nations, and specially the small countries, in this vital issue. This new trend is in our opinion an encouraging symptom in the right direction and at the same time an indication that, with patience and endeavour, a solution may at last appear on the horizon. The increasing interest of the small Powers will no doubt bear fruit and gain momentum so long as we, in the United Nations, adhere to the true principles of the Charter, thus creating a strong world public opinion which no country, no matter how big, can defy or ignore. This world public opinion deserves our continuous and unfettered support and should be stimulated by all of us here, big and small.

In this respect we share the view expressed yesterday by the representative of Iran. With this in mind, and fully convinced that the disarmament question is not -- at least morally and humanly speaking -- the monopoly of the big Powers, the Egyptian delegation does not intend to put the blame on one side or the other. We shall approach this vital question on the basis of right and justice.

We are fully aware of the interest and positions of the countries principally involved, yet we believe that the small countries, which are the majority of the people of the world, have every right to express their views on this vital issue. We also believe that their views should be taken into consideration and not looked upon as mere words delivered in a vacuum. The problem should not ultimately be referred back, as it was, to either the Disarmament Commission or to its

Sub-Committee, to be discussed behind closed doors. This procedure, which is nothing more than a vicious circle, will not lead to any concrete solution. It is not practical for the United Nations to continue, wittingly or unwittingly, to be involved in such a procedure.

The time has come for the voices of the small countries to be heard and their right to take part actively in this vital issue to be recognized. It is true, so far, that no small and law-abiding country ever started a world war; yet it is equally true that once a major conflict broke out, its devastating effects embraced almost every part of the globe.

When it comes to the settlement of international problems we are reminded, on various occasions, of the principles of international law and justice. This voice of wisdom usually comes from the big Powers when they deal with matters outside the sphere of their direct interest. But in discussing such important problems as disarmament, we very seldom find an echo of this belief and philosophy. The principle of justice is no less important and applicable in the case of disarmament than in any other situation. It is not just or wise to monopolize the potentialities of the world in one direction, -- the direction of evil -- and not in the other direction of peace and progress.

The unprecedented speed of the arms race, whether atomic or conventional, is threatening and alarming to an extent which makes one doubt the wisdom which induces those who are responsible for the present dangerous situation to pursue their present policy, a policy which will no doubt lead the world to a critical point at which I am afraid no one can foresee how it will be feasible to turn the course of events in the right direction. The frightening machinery of the cold war makes us believe that it is high time to put the brake on this course of events.

This is the picture as we see it. It is a true picture which reflects what is happening in our world today and I believe it cannot be refuted by the expression of sheer optimism. It may appear that it is a very sad picture, but from whatever angle you look at it, you find it is not encouraging. It is better in our opinion to face facts than to deceive ourselves.

It is not enough to visualize our present world situation in such a gloomy perspective. We have to go deeply to the root of the problem and try to find a solution, however imperfect it may be, which at least could pave the way for a further and durable settlement under which the peoples of the world can live peacefully and in security.

While it is true that the core of the disarmament question is the control and inspection system, it is equally true that any control system to be effective should be preceded by an atmosphere which can breed a certain minimum of confidence between the big Powers. This minimum of confidence is a prerequisite to any attempt to find a solution for the disarmament question. In our opinion, we cannot foresee that any control system, however effective it may be, can be implemented in an atmosphere of mistrust and lack of confidence. It is not enough to draw plans for inspection and safeguards; it is equally important to create the necessary climate for the useful application of such a control system.

It stems from this, that as a matter of priority the United Nations should make every effort to bring the cold war to a stop, at least for a period of time. The freezing of the cold war is no less important than a cease-fire in the case of actual hostilities, because the cold war is not only an obstacle to the attainment of any solution but it paralyzes the development of the various potential resources of the world. This paralysis is the more dangerous because, contrary to actual hostilities, which usually last for a certain period, the cold war makes people believe that they are living in a peaceful world while they are in fact being guided towards an undesired end.

The small Powers not only can but should appeal to the big Powers and urge them to come to an agreement in this direction if they really mean to achieve at least a certain amount of progress in the solution of the major political and other related problems.

The position of the Egyptian Government regarding the control and inspection system was made amply clear on various occasions, both in this Committee and during the period of Egypt's membership in the Security Council and its Commissions.

We believe and still are of the opinion that any disarmament agreement should be based upon an effective system of control and inspection. Yet we are aware of the fact that the attainment of the desired and ideal system of inspection in one stroke is not practical, if not almost impossible. This is why the Egyptian delegation is in favour of an effective control system which at least can be applied for a certain time within a specific area as an experiment for further application on a wider and more durable basis.

It is the opinion of my delegation, therefore, that we should not sit idle and wait until the ideal system of control comes by itself. If the big Powers could agree to consider such an idea, at least on an experimental basis, they could, in the light of experience, improve the defects of such a system before it is universally applied. We should start, and start in this direction, as soon as it is feasible and possible. We should not postpone every solution until we come to an agreement regarding an effective and ideal control system, because of the simple fact that any control system which may be considered today as effective can possibly, because of the progress in science and military knowledge, be ineffective for our purposes in the future.

The aerial inspection, coupled with ground posts and other related proposals, can be worked out to reach a satisfactory system of inspection.

So far as nuclear and thermonuclear weapons are concerned, the position of the Egyptian Government was made abundantly clear on several occasions. In this respect we have supported the communique of the Bandung Conference which deals with this particular point. It is not my intention to reiterate the text of this communique, which is well known to all of us. However, for the record, I wish to state that it is the opinion of my Government that any further experiments with nuclear or thermonuclear weapons should be stopped. It is not for me to draw the attention of this Committee to the disastrous effects of these experiments and the degree of the unforeseen damage with which we are all threatened from radioactive fall-out resulting from the explosion of such weapons. The representative of Japan, for good reasons, made an appeal for the cessation of such experiments. We trust that his appeal will be heard.

We firmly believe that the big Powers, as a gesture of good-will and human interest, will cease these experiments or at least agree to establish as a preliminary step a system of advance registration with the United Nations of tests of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. This step, although it does not abolish experiments of these terrible weapons, still is considered a step forward which we hope will be followed with more concrete and final results in this direction.

My delegation is aware of the various proposals presented in connexion with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and is looking forward to the day when those who have the secrets of the atom will declare their intention not to use atomic weapons in any major conflict.

Now, with your permission, I should like to state briefly my delegation's position regarding the composition and work of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee. It is a fact that, according to the historical background of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments during the period 1946-1951 and since the establishment of the Disarmament Commission in 1952 and its Sub-Committee in 1953, these various organs were the site of various proposals and counter-proposals presented mainly by the big Powers. These proposals eventually were submitted to us in their original form to be commented upon in the General Assembly, which, in its turn, usually returned them to the Disarmament Commission to deploy further efforts towards an acceptable solution of this vital question. My delegation has sensed through the present discussion that there is a trend to enlarge the Disarmament Commission and not limit its membership to the members of the Security Council. In the opinion of my delegation, this effort should be encouraged. The membership of the Disarmament Commission should be increased, and more Member States should be invited to actively participate in its activities. This move will, no doubt, strengthen its work and help in increasing the interest of the small countries in this vital question. This is why my delegation will look favourably on any proposal in this direction.

My delegation fervently hopes that the positions of delegations, as embodied in the draft resolutions which are before us or which may be proposed at a later stage, can be brought closer and closer together, so that we can as far as possible reach a unanimous agreement and start afresh on a major effort to look for an honourable agreement satisfactory to all of us here; so that the Disarmament Commission in its new composition can start a constructive approach to this whole issue.

We should keep in mind -- especially the big Powers -- the tremendous responsibilities which they bear in adopting a rigid position. We firmly believe that we should not forget our past errors and should thus mobilize all our efforts to lead the world towards a peaceful and happy life.

Mr. AZNAR (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): For the first time the delegation of Spain is taking part in a debate on disarmament in the First Committee of the General Assembly. However, for many years, even in the days of the League of Nations, the Spanish Government has shown its strong interest in this problem through active participation in the discussions which at that time opened up horizons of hope to the world but which were frustrated in the bloodiest fashion.

More than thirty years have gone by since those days. The atmosphere in Geneva was filled with eloquent statements and solemn declarations, but after a few years the Second World War shattered civilized humanity. In the midst of the dreadful failure of pacifism, which revealed its fundamental insincerity, the most powerful cannons that the world had ever known roared forth and the most violent explosives were detonated. The Geneva debates were left behind as the sinister grimace of a suicidal society. Millions of men died; cities were razed to the ground.

Now once again we are going back to the period of speeches. Promising voices offer us peace and coexistence. We ask ourselves, will this also sink under a dreadful atomic catastrophe?

(Mr. Aznar, Spain)

At Geneva Spain favoured a secure system for peaceful co-operation between all peoples. Today when the problem is more serious owing to the presence of nuclear weapons, the Spanish Government wishes to repeat here the offer of its wholehearted endeavours in the work for peace. The great Powers upon whose shoulders the future of humanity rests must continue to strive to reach a policy of effective disarmament.

Unfortunately the political ramifications of the last world war have counselled defensive rearmament by the West. It was only in this manner that guarantees could be obtained for the survival of the free world. Can we not understand, however, that a situation of tension and fear lasting many years will sap our strength and weaken us? The peoples of the world are living under a system of fear, fear of the future. This nightmare must end.

We add our voice to the voices of those who are asking that disarmament measures should be taken. The basic truth, however, is that in one way or another the arms race continues. And why do people arm? It is simply because of certain political problems and conflicts which divide men into irreconcilable groups and factions of hatred and enmity. While such conflicts exist, the desire to disarm must necessarily run the risk of becoming mere words that are cast into the whirlwind or of being considered some type of manoeuvre. We must therefore try to re-establish the mutual confidence which is missing today. It is only in this way that effective disarmament can be achieved, and we believe that this is the only way.

In this connexion, we agree with the views expressed by a number of delegations, in particular the delegation of Italy. We agree also with the opinions expressed by the delegation of the United States when it maintained that no effective disarmament was possible without the establishment of international controls. The establishment of an international control system appears to us to be a most fruitful idea. We trust that if the Soviet Union honestly wishes to contribute to peace in the world, it will overcome all its fears. At the moment its entire attitude appears to be surrounded by ill-founded fears. It would be a major achievement if the suggestions set out in the United States memorandum could become crystallized. In that way we could gradually

(Mr. Aznar, Spain)

achieve the agreement of the great majority of the people. Upon achieving that agreement, we would be at the stage of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes, which would open a triumphant period in the evolution of civilization.

In this connexion I am happy to pay a tribute to the many statements that have been made by the delegation of France.

My delegation wishes to congratulate the delegation of the United States for the memorandum which it has submitted to our Committee.

We believe that the statement made by the representative of Norway was extremely timely and appropriate. He stated very objectively the difficulties involved in the control over the centres of atomic tests and the need for setting up a registration system of atomic tests. My delegation will vote in favour of the joint draft resolution submitted by Canada, Japan and Norway.

The United States memorandum contains some extremely important and constructive elements, which should lead to the renewal of negotiations. The five points contained in the memorandum have our warm support and, if applied, they can be very useful and constructive. I cannot understand why the Soviet Union is unable to find in this document sufficient points on which to base negotiation.

The Spanish delegation pleads with the Committee not to twist the promises of peace and security which were made by the United Nations when it was first established. We must not allow what might be the salvation of the world to become a ghastly crime. We should not waste time here with too much rhetoric. We must not allow a repetition of what took place years ago -- we must not allow a new war of annihilation to incubate behind the screen of speeches in this Committee. We must allow the desires of the world for happiness, justice and peace to be fulfilled. These desires were expressed yesterday by the President of the United States in words that have once again given rise to hope in the minds of all free men and all men of goodwill.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

