

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.880
24 October 1957
ENGLISH

Twelfth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 24 October 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDON

(Iran)

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 [24] (continued)

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

Mr. Boland	(Ireland)
Mr. Kiselev	(Byelorussian SSR)
Mr. Sastroamidjojo	(Indonesia)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.880. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 24

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 (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION
- (b) EXPANSION OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION AND OF ITS SUB-COMMITTEE
- (c) COLLECTIVE ACTION TO INFORM AND ENLIGHTEN THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD AS TO THE DANGERS OF THE ARMAMENTS RACE, AND PARTICULARLY AS TO THE DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS OF MODERN WEAPONS
- (d) DISCONTINUANCE UNDER INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF TESTS OF ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN WEAPONS

Mr. BOLAND (Ireland): The Disarmament Sub-Committee's reports on the meetings in London do nothing, I am afraid, to allay the apprehensions of those of us who for some time now have felt increasing anxiety about the trend of world events and about the race in armaments which seems constantly to gather rather than to slacken momentum. We recognize, as several speakers in this discussion have pointed out, that the meetings in London were not entirely barren of results. We recognize that the Sub-Committee did agree to lower its sights and to aim, as a first step, at a limited rather than a comprehensive disarmament agreement.

In addition, of course, there was, if not a meeting of minds, at least a narrowing of differences on some of the points which such a partial disarmament agreement might contain. Taken by themselves, these are perhaps not wholly negligible advances. In so vital a sector of international relations as disarmament, every sign of agreement, however slight, is a gain and every point of concord is a blessing to be welcomed.

But if the results of the London discussions are viewed not in isolation but in the perspective of eleven years of negotiations on disarmament and against the background of a world situation marked by mounting tensions and ever-sharper and

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

more intractable conflicts of interests, who of us in this Committee can rid his mind of the feeling that unless some new and more fruitful approach to the disarmament problem can soon be found, the last chance of achieving agreement will have passed, the race in armaments will proceed unchecked and mankind will again lose control of its history?

In the view of my delegation, it is the primary purpose of the present debate to seek, and to seek anxiously, for some means of rescuing this greatest of all world problems from its present state of deadlock, and, by so doing, of stopping an arms race which threatens civilization with ruin.

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

We in the Irish delegation are inclined to doubt whether any really effective contribution can be made to the solution of the disarmament problem at this stage by simply passing resolutions which do no more than restate the respective positions which the London discussions failed to reconcile. It is not a question whether we agree or disagree with those positions or whether we regard them as fair and reasonable or not. If our aim is to secure agreement and if we are determined to pursue that aim as a supreme objective -- always bearing in mind that in the field of disarmament any agreement, however slight and however limited in scope, is bound to be of immense significance -- we can do little to hasten the achievement of our goal, and we may even do something to delay it, by widening the area of commitment to proposals on which agreement has already proved impossible to reach. It may be argued, no doubt, that the endorsement of any proposals by a substantial majority of the Assembly of the United Nations, representing the opinions of the Governments of the world, is bound to invest them with such a degree of moral authority as to improve the chances of their ultimate acceptance. In many contexts a resolution of this Assembly might have such an effect. But it is doubtful whether the theory would apply in a case such as this, in which the stumbling block is a fundamental disagreement on basic technical issues between the Western Powers on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other, in a matter vitally affecting their national security. The Soviet Union indeed has shown what attitude it is capable of adopting in such a case by ignoring, and continuing to ignore, resolutions passed by large majorities of the Assembly on the question of Hungary. In our view, it would be sanguine to suppose that the twenty-three Power draft resolution now before this Committee, no matter large the majority in its favour, would meet with a better fate.

It is natural and understandable, when vitally important international discussions such as those on disarmament arrive at a standstill, that men of sincerity and good-will should seek to bring some fresh element to bear which might serve as a catalyst and accelerate the process of negotiation and agreement.

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

Several of the suggestions and proposals already made in the course of our debates at this Assembly would seem to owe at least part of their inspiration to this reasonable and constructive idea. Among them may be included, perhaps, the proposal made by the Foreign Minister of Belgium in the General Assembly on 24 September, which is the subject of sub-paragraph (c) of the agenda item now before the Committee. As the representative of Belgium explained to us at our meeting on 11 October, the proposal stems from the idea of associating the peoples with the efforts of Governments to reach an agreement on the regulation of armaments, and from the conviction that it is essential and imperative for the peoples of the world to exercise all the pressure within their power in order to bring about the international agreements on which their very survival depends.

In principle, of course, many persuasive arguments can be adduced in favour of this proposal. An alert and well-informed public opinion is always the greatest safeguard of the public good. Indeed, it is an essential condition for the proper working of the kind of political institutions under which many of us live. On that, I am sure, most of us would be in agreement. What I confess we in the Irish delegation are not quite so sure about is whether the solution of the kind of problems which at the present moment are holding up progress in the field of disarmament is likely to be furthered by recourse to what I may call, perhaps, the method of public propaganda -- using the term not in any pejorative, but in its proper sense.

Undoubtedly, there are certain less technical aspects of the armaments race which should be much more widely appreciated and understood by the man in the street than they are at present. There is, for example, the so-called "fourth country" danger -- the fearful prospect that unless nuclear weapons are soon brought under effective international control more and more countries may come to produce or possess them, with the result that the problem of disarmament will become even more intractable than ever and the risk of a global nuclear war will be greatly increased. Another aspect of the armaments race which deserves much more attention than it has received is that, while immense resources of capital and human skill continue to be devoted to the development and manufacture of weapons of destruction which are as often as not already obsolete

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

by the time they reach the production line, men and women in the less-developed areas of the world, deprived, owing to the lack of capital, of the education, the welfare and the living standards to which they are justly entitled, are tending to lose faith in the free institutions they have managed to establish and to desert the paths of democratic liberty in disillusionment. It would be a tragic paradox if, in that way, free institutions and personal liberty were to become the victims of the efforts and sacrifices made to preserve human freedom and to save mankind from war; but it is a real and a present danger.

These are aspects of the armaments race which we cannot afford to ignore and of which it is right and proper that public opinion in our respective countries should be constantly aware. They relate, however, to the general background of disarmament rather than to the immediate obstacles standing in its way. When it comes to the technical problems of disarmament -- more particularly to the practical issues on the solution of which the conclusion of a disarmament agreement depends but which have so far proved incapable of settlement -- the role which public opinion can usefully play appears to us more open to question.

Negotiations between Governments cannot be carried on in the market place and the settlement of disputed issues is rarely made easier by the encouragement of firm public attitudes on them in advance. When the General Assembly asked the Disarmament Commission in November 1953 to establish a sub-committee of the Powers principally involved, it suggested that the sub-committee should pursue its task in private. It was a wise and far-sighted suggestion which, in practice, has been given, if anything, too little weight. It is difficult to escape the impression that the discussions of the Disarmament Sub-Committee up to date have been conducted to the accompaniment not of too little publicity, but of too much. The successive proposals of the two sides have been presented not only to one another but simultaneously to the Press and the public opinion of the world, with the result that the proceedings of the Sub-Committee have at times assumed the appearance less of a diplomatic negotiation designed to achieve agreement than of a court hearing at which the opposing cases are argued before a world jury. But this is a case which must be settled out of court. With world society organized as it is, there is no way of ending differences and disputes other than that of agreement between those directly concerned.

What I may perhaps continue to call for convenience the propagandist approach to the disarmament problem seems to us to present a further danger. Any appeal to world opinion as a whole implies certain assumptions. It assumes that the various peoples of the world are equally free, not only to know the truth but to discuss, to criticize and, if necessary, to oppose publicly the policies of their Governments. It implies too that the Governments concerned are equally sensitive and responsive to the opinions and wishes of their people. That is not the situation in the world today; nor was it the situation in the world twenty-two or twenty-three years ago -- with the result that while Hitler was expanding his armaments industry and building up his armed forces, strong sections of public opinion in other countries, under the influence of propaganda in favour of disarmament and peace, were voting to cut back their countries' defence expenditures and to lower the level of their national armaments.

And this brings us to a consideration which, in our view, is basic to any attempt to resolve the present deadlock and to relieve the world of the burdens of the arms race which threaten the welfare and survival of mankind. The question

of disarmament cannot be dealt with apart from the problems of the world political situation as it exists. The inter-connexion is fundamental and inescapable. It is an illusion to expect national armaments to be limited or reduced in a world atmosphere characterized by by unresolved clashes of vital interests and the presence of opposing military forces in areas of tension in a proximity so close as to make every strengthening of defence appear to be a preparation for attack. No doubt the two things interact: the arms race worsens the political atmosphere and the intensification of the political struggle reduces the prospects of disarmament. The vicious circle is complete. The point has come at which the problem of disarmament can no longer be profitably dealt with in isolation. The prospect of reaching a really effective disarmament agreement now seems remote unless progress can be made, by at least limited political agreements, to reduce those constant sources of friction and tension which exist in certain areas of the world.

The race in armaments is, after all, merely a reflection of the political situation existing in the world today. The salient feature of that situation is the division of the world, not only as between different orders of ideas, different philosophies, different conceptions of the nature of man and his relation to the universe, but between two immense concentrations of military power ceaselessly manoeuvring for positions of strategic and diplomatic strength vis-à-vis one another. The dangers of the situation are immeasurable. We see them at the moment in the Middle East. There, as elsewhere, behind the smaller countries of the region, there now stand the two greatest of the great Powers, each considering it vital not to seem to flinch before the might or the threats of the other and each increasingly committed, by its public declarations and the logic of its policy, to go ahead if the case arises as though mutual nuclear deterrents did not exist.

The consequences of situations of that kind go beyond their impact on the prospects of disarmament. They endanger the prospects of peace and, as long as the peace is challenged, no man will lay down his arms.

It is our view, and we venture to submit it to this Committee, that the time is rapidly approaching, and indeed is already at hand, when we must put ourselves the question, earnestly and searchingly, whether what has been achieved by the effort to solve the disarmament problem on the technical plane is really commensurate with the immense pains and patience which have been devoted to the

task, and whether it is realistic and justifiable to continue to rely on that approach alone to secure the results we all desire.

No one can criticize the Disarmament Sub-Committee for lack of zeal in the discharge of its mandate. The immense efforts it has made to arrive at concrete results are obvious from its reports. In spite of that, no one can claim that it is within reach of fulfilment of the high hopes reposed in it. In our view, if that is so, it is no fault of the Sub-Committee itself. It is mainly because that degree of mutual confidence between the great Powers which is a condition precedent to any disarmament agreement is lacking, and because that lack of mutual confidence results from political circumstances and situations with which the Disarmament Sub-Committee is not empowered to deal. The more one reads the Sub-Committee's reports, the more sharply one is brought up against the realization that the vital obstacles standing in the way of any effective disarmament agreement in present circumstances is what our colleague, Mr. Belaunde, called the other day, in one of those vivid phrases in which he is so fertile, "that psychic ill, mistrust". If it is true, as he said, that the cause of the arms race is to be found in the tension existing between the Powers principally concerned, their mutual suspicions, their mistrust of one another -- and for our part we agree with him -- then surely means must be found of grappling with this baneful factor and abating its effects before it is too late.

If this is to be done, however, a radical approach is required -- an approach going far beyond the various proposals we have before us in this Committee. If, as we think, the true cause of the lack of progress in the field of disarmament is the degree of political tension existing throughout the world, we can do nothing to escape from our difficulties, we are afraid, by simply increasing the membership of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee. Neither the Commission nor its Sub-Committee is empowered to deal with the causes of the tension which is the principal impediment in its work. Nor can we feel that any really worth-while progress can be made by taking particular aspects of the disarmament problem and attempting to deal with them apart from the disarmament problem as a whole. To propose the suspension of tests or the renunciation of the use of atomic or nuclear weapons without the cessation of production or manufacture is merely to reopen discussion of issues on which the London meetings failed to agree. To propose any measure of disarmament unaccompanied by arrangements for effective international supervision and control is simply to try to sweep under the carpet the factor of mutual distrust which, in our view, lies at the heart of the disarmament problem. The solution of the disarmament problem and the ending of the arms race can, in our view, no longer be sought with any hope of success in procedural expedients or temporary arrangements of limited scope on the technical level. What we need to give us hope, and to enable the discussions of the Disarmament Sub-Committee to be resumed with a genuine prospect of success, is a further effort, undertaken under the most favourable possible circumstances, to abate the political tension existing in the world, at least at its points of greatest danger.

These points are Central Europe, the Middle East and the Far East, particularly Korea. Mr. Jules Moch pointed to them the day before yesterday in his address to this Committee which made so profound an impression on us all. My Minister for Foreign Affairs referred to them in his speeches to the Assembly and submitted proposals on how the problems of the two most critical of these areas might be tackled. But if the existing tension in these areas is to be reduced, it can be done only by discussions between the great Powers, and primarily between the United States and the Soviet Union; moreover, in order to offer the

(Mr. Boland, Ireland)

best prospect of success, such discussions would need to be undertaken on the highest possible level and with the broadest possible terms of reference -- not in the limelight of publicity but with all the safeguards of their privacy which wisdom and experience suggest. As Mr. Moch told us, disarmament discussions and discussions on current sources of political tension do not exclude one another. They can proceed simultaneously. It is our view, however, that the former are unlikely to yield the concrete results we all desire unless a substantial relaxation of tension in the areas I have named can be achieved by means of the latter. A reciprocal withdrawal of foreign forces inside Europe or a reciprocal diplomatic withdrawal in the Middle East could not, of course, solve all the problems of those areas. Much less could it prevent all the local rivalries and clashes of interest which are bound to arise when two great concentrations of power confront one another throughout the world as they do today. But it would reduce the risk of explosion at the points of greatest friction, and the easement of tension which that would bring about would enable discussions on disarmament to be resumed in a fresh atmosphere and, by so doing, open a new vista of encouragement and hope to mankind.

Mr. Chairman, if these reflections and suggestions have carried me somewhat outside the scope of this debate, I apologize to you and thank you for the indulgence you have shown me -- which, indeed, is not the first I have received at your hands. May I, at the same time, reserve the right of my delegation to intervene again, if the occasion arises, when we come to discuss the draft resolutions before us?

Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): From all corners of the globe telegrams and letters pour into the United Nations from public organizations and common men throughout the world demanding prohibition of the atomic, hydrogen and all other types of weapons of mass destruction and the elimination of the danger of a new world war. They demand that the Member States of the United Nations, and primarily the great Powers, call a halt to the armaments race, carry out a major reduction of armaments and armed forces, prohibit weapons of mass destruction, stop the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons and utilize atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

We are being reminded of our duty to adopt the necessary measures for the implementation of the United Nations Charter, in which it is stated clearly that the peoples of the United Nations are "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". The representatives in the First Committee are in duty bound to heed the voice of public opinion and to make further efforts for a relaxation of international tension, barring the way, in so doing, to the forces of aggression and war.

Many of the speakers who preceded me acknowledged the necessity of concluding an international agreement on the question of the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction. Very aptly they pointed out that the increasingly destructive force of atomic weapons, and the appearance of the hydrogen weapon which is many times more powerful, render the conclusion of such an agreement even more necessary and even more urgent. The Byelorussian delegation shares the anxiety, nay the alarm, voiced here by the representatives of Member States in connexion with the lack of progress on the disarmament question, the continuing arms race, the increase of military expenditures and the growing danger of a new war. The Byelorussian people, which suffered so severely during the Second World War, cannot be indifferent to this spectacle where the disarmament problem still remains unsolved. We do not want towns and villages which have recovered from the ruin of the last war to become the objects of atomic and hydrogen bombings. That is why the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is prepared to contribute to an effective solution of the disarmament problem and to play its part generously in the achievement of this task.

The debates in our Committee have already made clear the positions of many delegations on a number of aspects of the disarmament question. Those representatives who, like Mr. Menon the representative of India, assert that, along with the great Powers, the medium-sized and small countries -- eager as they are to bring about a genuine solution of the disarmament problem -- can contribute for their part to the progress in bringing about a prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and a reduction of armaments and armed forces are indubitably right.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The representatives of the United States, Peru, the United Kingdom, Australia and a number of other countries have sought to represent matters here as though the lack of progress in the solution of the disarmament problem were a mere consequence of a negative position espoused by the Soviet Union in this question. The speeches of these representatives, by their content as well as by their terminology, pull us in the direction of the cold war and are designed to sidetrack the Committee from the solution of the most important problem on the contemporary scene, that is, the problem of disarmament.

In his speech on 10 October, Mr. Lodge, the representative of the United States, sought by all means in his power to justify the position of the United States and at the same time to distort the clear position of the Soviet Union on the disarmament problem. Mr. Lodge put forward so many conditions and reservations that he practically reduced to naught the possibility of carrying out any sort of disarmament. For reasons which we fully understand, Mr. Lodge called upon us first to institute control over intercontinental ballistic rockets and artificial earth satellites. But it is perfectly well known that ballistic rockets and satellites pose no danger by themselves. What is important is that they are capable of carrying atomic and hydrogen warheads. That alone would make them dangerous. Consequently, the problem of control over ballistic rockets must be solved in close connexion with the problem of the prohibition of the atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Mr. Lodge took a position designed to bring about not greater common ground, not a rapprochement of views on the question under consideration, but an emphasis on what he himself called our divergencies. At the very beginning of his address, he declared that the general debate at the present session demonstrated that the differences between the Soviet Union and the so-called free world are almost as large as they have been heretofore. The representative of the United States sang the praises of the proposals of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada of 29 August of this year. He would have us believe that these were new proposals. But let us look at these allegedly new proposals of the Western Powers. It appears that the gist of these proposals is to be found in the fact that the Western Powers now suggest not a ten-month initial period for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests, but a

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

twelve-month period, even while maintaining all of their old reservations.

In submitting these proposals to the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, the representative of the United States made it clear that the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada maintained their demand for the solution of unsolved post-war political problems, for the carrying out of a large-scale scheme of aerial photography, for the adoption of a decision on the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, and for the institution of controls over this cutoff.

The so-called aerial photography proposals again put forward in London by Mr. Dulles are designed only to sidetrack the problem of the partial reduction of armaments. Let me remind the Committee that the newspaper correspondents of Western countries quite candidly called this aerial photography scheme legalized military intelligence.

Mr. Lodge demanded that the Soviet Union should agree that, during the second period, the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes should be stopped -- without, however, having the United States agree to a prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination from the armaments of States.

This is the gist of these "new" proposals. In the opinion of my delegation, there is nothing new in these proposals at all. We see that the United States wants to have a good deal of talk about the alleged eagerness of the Western Powers to bring about disarmament and wants to use this in order to prolong and complicate the path toward disarmament and at the same to delude world public opinion. It is manifest that the United States and the United Kingdom are doing everything in their power to prevent the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons. They wish to reserve the right to use these ghastly weapons in the event of war.

A theory which has wide currency in the United States holds that a lasting peace can be the result of a balance of power between great countries armed to the teeth. This theory is the wellspring of the strategy and tactics of the cold war. It breeds contempt for the interests of genuine international co-operation. It determines the scale and the pace of the armaments race and also the approach of a number of countries to international relations and to the proceedings of the United Nations as well.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The United States is likewise engaged in a policy of war "brinkmanship". The present state of affairs in the Near and Middle East, where a threat to the security of Syria has arisen owing to military provocations engaged in by Turkey and the United States, is a concrete manifestation of this policy.

Quite naturally, the common man wonders why it is that the ten-year discussion of the disarmament question in the United Nations has turned out to be a fruitless exercise and one which has led to no affirmative results. Who is it, the common man wonders, that flouts the will of the peoples, which determinedly demand the immediate adoption of measures for calling a halt to the armaments race and extinguishing the danger of atomic war?

We must say in so many words that the responsibility for this state of affairs lies wholly on the shoulders of the ruling circles of the United States and also of the United Kingdom, France and Canada, which obediently follow in the wake of the former. In order to delude public opinion, they use talk about disarmament to camouflage their feverish war preparations.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

In this connexion, I should like to adduce some facts and figures.

A report of the United States Defense Department published in May of this year states that there are 3 million men in the United States armed forces, 40 per cent being stationed outside the borders of the United States in the territories of seventy-three foreign States.

According to data of the United States Congress, in 1948 it cost \$12.6 billion to support the United States armed forces; in 1956-1957 it cost \$45 billion, and the sum was actually \$50 billion if one takes into account unallocated sums from the previous fiscal year.

A break-down of military appropriations according to the various arms of the United States armed forces results in the following figures: the Army, more than \$7.5 billion; the Air Force, more than \$20 billion; and the balance going to miscellaneous other military purposes.

The preparations of the United States and its partners for a new world war have increased significantly over the past few years. In June of this year, the State and Defense Departments of the United States jointly issued a booklet entitled "The Mutual Security Programme for the 1958 Fiscal Year". In that booklet we read that between 1950 and 1956 United States land forces were increased from 600,000 to 1 million men, while the land forces of the allies of the United States were increased from 3.6 million to 5 million men; the number of United States naval vessels increased from 598 to 669, while those of the allies of the United States increased from about 1,000 to 2,500; the number of United States aircraft increased from 12,600 to 26,600, while those of the allies of the United States increased from about 13,000 military airplanes, of which less than 500 were jets, to 27,000 military airplanes, of which 12,600 were jets.

These are the concrete facts, which convincingly demonstrate the basis used by the sponsors of policies of "positions of strength" and "brinkmanship". These figures demonstrate at the same time that, even while negotiations on disarmament are in progress, the Western Powers are increasing their armed forces and intensifying the armaments race.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

Representatives of many States who have already spoken here have paid considerable attention to the problem of the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The importance of solving that problem is manifest. It must, however, be noted that the discussion of the matter has been going on for more than a decade, and positive results are conspicuous by their absence. The countries members of NATO base their military plans on the possibility of using nuclear weapons in a future war. A decision to that effect was adopted, as is well known, as early as December 1954 by the Council of the North Atlantic bloc. In the United States, appropriations this year for the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons were the largest since the last war. For the Atomic Energy Commission alone, appropriations for the current fiscal year amounted to \$2,425,000,000. Plans for the development of United States atomic production for 1958-1959 will make it possible to expand the production of atomic weapons tenfold as compared to the level of 1952.

I cannot refrain from pointing out that the military leadership of the United States has approved the report of the so-called Civilian Advisory Committee, which calls for the development of chemical, bacterial and radiological weapons for actual use. I should like to quote one excerpt from that report:

"These types of weapons must be regarded as unique in their war-waging potential, since they do not lead to the destruction of material resources and do not breed problems of reconstruction".

These facts cannot fail to attract our attention, particularly in connexion with the refusal of the Western Powers to accept a prohibition of the use of weapons of mass destruction. We must not forget that aggressive forces are on the loose in the United States, forces committed to frustrating any prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, committed to a mad armaments race, committed to preventing any relaxation of international tension. These circles press for an intensification of the cold war and for a continued armaments race. They impel the United States along a path leading to destructive atomic warfare, which would bring untold sorrow and misfortune to mankind.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

According to official NATO data alone, the aggregate military expenditures of all the member countries of this aggressive bloc amounted to \$430 billion during the years 1949 to 1957 inclusive. The United States' share of this figure was \$324 billion. It has been estimated that from 1949 to 1957 the large American monopolies earned \$227 billion, mainly out of armaments. This means that the positions of strength policy of the NATO countries costs an average of \$3,500 for each family in each of the countries of that bloc. Small wonder, therefore, that the greater part of the resources allocated for the United States federal budget is assigned to armaments.

Speaking on 14 May of this year on the budgetary policies of his Government, President Eisenhower declared that the American taxpayer will pay the truly enormous sum of more than \$45 billion for the so-called "security" of the country and that the United States now maintains the mightiest military machine of its entire peace time history. This means that 59 cents out of every dollar is assigned directly to the armaments race. In his message to Congress on the so-called "mutual security programme", President Eisenhower announced that the United States has helped to establish and supply 200 divisions of what he called "friendly armed forces". From 1950 to 1956 inclusive, the United States supplied to its allies more than 40,000 tanks and other military machines, 1,300 naval vessels of all types, 57,000 artillery weapons, more than 10,000 aircraft, 2,200,000 machine-guns and other smaller weapons.

At the present time the greatest attention is being paid to the plans for the atomic rearmament of the fifteen NATO countries, including the Federal Republic of Germany. The Governments of a number of NATO countries have decided to station American atomic weapons in their own territories. Such a decision was taken, for example, in June 1957 by the Government of Norway, to our great regret. At the present time a plan is being worked out under which the United States would ensure the swift supply of atomic and hydrogen weapons and long distance guided missiles to all members of the North Atlantic bloc.

These facts make it perfectly clear that during the past few years the preparations of the United States and its allies for a new world war have increased rapidly. For the sake of profits on a dream-like scale, the

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

imperialists are prepared to sacrifice the lives of hundreds of millions of human beings. That is why the American monopolists are doing everything in their power to maintain the present state of international tension and to prevent the solution of the disarmament problem. The great fear of the American monopolists is that progress might be made in the disarmament question, and this is mentioned in the United States periodical Business Week in an article entitled "Who wants to engage in military production?". In this article, which appeared in May of this year, the periodical indicated that so far as the large companies are concerned, their very existence would be unthinkable if military production did not comprise the bulk of their orders. Military production is the mainspring of the United States present economy. The military production of the large concern General Dynamics Corporation constitutes 75 to 85 per cent of its total production. In the light of these facts, it is not coincidental that articles appear in the American press such as that which appeared in Barron's Review on 13 May of this year under the heading "Disarmament a dangerous, illusory hope".

These facts convincingly refute Mr. Lodge's hypocritical assertions that the ruling circles of the United States are interested in peace and interested in the prohibition of nuclear weapons. By his repeated use of the word "peace", Mr. Lodge tried to throw dust in the eyes of the people. He tried to convince people that the ruling circles of the United States are busying themselves only with the peaceful uses of atomic weapons and the like and he did so to try to cover up the feverish arms race in the United States. He tried to hide the unwillingness of the United States to put an end to the testing of nuclear weapons, and for that purpose he used the screen of an alleged Soviet threat which, he said, endangered the so-called "free world".

As is well known, the General Assembly instructed the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee to work out an international agreement on the most urgent problem of the contemporary scene, the solution of which will brook no delay, the problem of disarmament. We watched with great care the proceedings of the Sub-Committee which continued for more than five months, we studied the documents presented by representatives of the Western Powers as well as those

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

presented by the representatives of the Soviet Union, and we reached the conclusion that the whole course of the negotiations shows convincingly that the Western Powers, especially the United States, simply do not want to reach an agreement on disarmament. They do not want such an agreement, and that is that. They have refused a complete solution of the disarmament problem and it is their responsibility that the Sub-Committee made no headway, that it ignored the will of the peoples which resolutely demand urgent measures for calling a halt to the armaments race and for removing the threat of an atomic war.

One is bound to agree with Mr. Crossman, a member of the United Kingdom Parliament with whom the United Kingdom delegation is surely well acquainted, who wrote in the London Daily Mirror on 28 May of this year:

"It is silly to deny that it is precisely the Americans and not the Russians who have recently prevented progress in disarmament. Over the past two years the Kremlin has repeatedly displayed a readiness to accept disarmament plans as soon as they were put forward by the West, but no sooner do the Russians accept them than the Americans, with active British support, start to find fault with them. This position has turned the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission's Sub-Committee into sheer farce."

The United States press similarly does not fail to note that whenever there are prospects for the conclusion of some agreement on disarmament, in general or on various aspects of it, certain quarters in the United States ring the alarm bell. For example, the New York Herald Tribune stated on 9 June of this year:

"The Russians now speak of disarmament so seriously that some Americans are getting the creeps at the thought that this might actually become a reality."

This was stated in a United States newspaper that surely cannot be suspected of sympathy with the Soviet Union.

Bearing in mind the paramount importance and urgency of the disarmament problem, and eager to achieve an agreement, if only on individual aspects of that problem, the Soviet Government put forward a proposal to single out the question of the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons, so as to solve that as an initial measure. The Soviet Government proposed the cessation of tests for at least two to three years, with the institution of an international system of supervision over observance by the States of their obligation to put an end to the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

This proposal of the Soviet Union meets the aspirations of all the peoples who so strongly demand the immediate cessation of atomic and hydrogen bomb test explosions. The peace-loving peoples call for a swift solution to this problem, believing, quite properly, that a cessation of tests would be conducive to a major improvement in the international situation, that it would call a halt to the continuing armaments race and would remove the indubitable danger which now threatens the health of mankind. For example, in the United States, 63 per cent of Americans questioned in a poll were in favour of the cessation of the testing of further nuclear weapons; and this was published in the United States Press.

While not formally rejecting the proposal for putting an end to the testing of these weapons, the representatives of the Western Powers at the same time reduce to nought any real possibility of reaching an agreement on this question by unflinchingly tying in the implementation of this measure with other disarmament problems the solution of which they themselves are busily frustrating. This is rather like a vicious circle. They are pouring water through a sieve. As we say in Russia, they are pouring water from a vacuum into a hollow.

The Soviet Union has pressed, and continues to press, for an agreement on the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons, without tying in an understanding of this question with understandings on any other disarmament problems. In the memorandum of the Soviet Government concerning partial disarmament measures it is quite properly indicated that other States, including the United States and the United Kingdom, which possess nuclear weapons, should be interested in the cessation of the testing of these weapons to an extent not less than the interest of the Soviet Union.

The time has come to put and end to a situation in which a country or group of countries which hamper agreement on the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons, regard the greater part of the globe, inhabited by the overwhelming bulk of the population, as nothing but a chessboard on which a game can be played, with the destinies of all peoples of the world in the role of mere pawns.

The years which have elapsed since the second world war are characterized by a vigorous development of military technology, especially in the field of atomic and hydrogen weapons the might of whose explosions can now be counted in millions of tons of TNT. Rocket technology is developing a pace. Such new types of weapons as intercontinental ballistic missiles have become a reality. The appearance of this type of military technology has made any and every point of the globe vulnerable. There can be no doubt that, in the event of a new war, with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the consequences of such a war would be particularly grievous for all participating countries, especially those with high population densities and large concentrations of industrial facilities.

Bearing this in mind, the Soviet Union has presented to this Committee a draft resolution which has been distributed to all delegations. This draft resolution appeals to the States which possess nuclear weapons to assume a temporary commitment not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons, on the understanding that if, after five years, no comprehensive international agreement on the disarmament problem has been worked out, the question of the obligations of States to renounce the use of nuclear weapons will again be considered by the United Nations. Millions of human beings in the world have welcomed this draft resolution. It offers a way out of the impasse in which we are now floundering. The First Committee is in duty bound to support this draft resolution -- if, that is, this Committee is truly eager to listen to the appeals of the Parliaments of many countries, political parties, trade union and co-operative associations, scientists, scholars, religious organizations and other mass and public organizations. Prominent scientists throughout the world have drawn our attention to the great danger which looms over mankind owing to the development of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the continued test detonations of such weapons. Collective and individual appeals for the immediate cessation of test explosions of atomic weapons have been made this year by scientists of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as by

2,200 American, 400 Japanese, 256 British, 230 French, 80 prominent West German and many other scholars and scientists from all countries.

May I now quote an excerpt from the appeal made by United States scientists to the Governments and peoples of the whole world, published in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists of September 1957:

"We, the American scientists whose names figure under this appeal, demand the immediate conclusion of an international agreement for the cessation of testing of nuclear bombs. Every nuclear bomb test scatters an additional quantity of radioactive fall-out throughout the world. Every addition to radiation spells harm to the health of men in all parts of the world and likewise to the embryonic protoplasm of human beings, thus leading to an increase in succeeding generations in the number of births of children with serious defects.

"An international agreement for the immediate cessation of the testing of nuclear bombs can serve as a first step towards a more complete disarmament, with the ultimate effective elimination of nuclear weapons, thus eliminating the possibility of the outbreak of nuclear war which would be catastrophic for all mankind.

"As scientists, we are particularly alive to the existing danger, and that is why persons who are cognizant of this danger bear a special measure of responsibility. We consider it particularly necessary that immediate steps should be taken to conclude an international agreement for the cessation of the testing of all types of nuclear weapons."

(Mr. Kisel'ev, Byelorussian SSR)

I quoted this passage in order to draw the Committee's attention to the alarm felt by the most prominent American scientists owing to the growing danger to the very life of mankind as a result of the continued armaments race and the carrying out of a policy of force in our atomic century.

The question of the cessation of the armaments race and of the immediate halting of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons has now become the most urgent problem of international life on which the attention of hundreds of millions of human beings throughout the world is focussed. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR warmly supports the draft resolution moved by the delegation of the Soviet Union in which States that have carried out tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons are urged to conclude an agreement immediately on the cessation of the testing of such weapons effective 1 January 1958 for a period of two to three years. My delegation expresses the hope that this draft resolution will command the support of the Political Committee.

Permit me to comment on the speech of the representative of Japan, Mr. Matsudaira, of 10 October of this year in our Committee. In this connexion, I shall speak about the draft resolution of Japan. We note that the Japanese delegation recognized the need to call a halt to test explosions of atomic and hydrogen weapons. But in our opinion the question of calling a halt to the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons should not be made contingent on the simultaneous adoption of decisions on other aspects of the disarmament problem as the draft resolution of Japan would have us do. Any other method would make it more difficult to reach a swift agreement on the cessation on the testing of nuclear weapons. It would likewise be of affirmative significance if the period for which these tests are to be discontinued were lengthened, and if a specific date were given for the effective entry into force of the cessation of the tests.

The representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Noble, in his address in our Committee on 14 October, endeavoured, like his American colleague, to distort the position of the Soviet Union on the disarmament problem. Using the fictitious screen of the Soviet threat, Mr. Noble regarded atomic and hydrogen weapons as the foundation of Britain's military might and, consequently, endeavoured to prevent

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

any cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons and reserved the right of the United Kingdom to use these weapons as well. The representative of the United Kingdom likewise put forward the question of the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons out of newly-produced fissionable materials. He sought to represent this proposal as just about the most decisive contribution to the question of the elimination of the danger of atomic warfare. But this appeal for the cessation of the production of fissionable materials in the future for weapons purposes is made in order to create a semblance of Western measures in the field of atomic disarmament; this is done in order to delude world public opinion and to lull the people with mendacious fictions about disarmament, even while continuing the armaments race apace.

The proposal of the Western Powers does not eliminate the danger of a war in which atomic and hydrogen weapons would be used because previously accumulated vast stockpiles of fissionable materials would, as before, serve as the raw material source for the production of more and more weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, the adoption of the proposal of the Western Powers on the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes in the future would, in reality, be tantamount to a legitimation of the use of these weapons. Thus we see that it is not the interests of disarmament at all that guide the representative of the United Kingdom when he presses for the cut-off in the production of nuclear weapons out of newly-produced fissionable materials. The United States and the United Kingdom are resolved to continue the production of atomic and hydrogen bombs out of previously extracted fissionable materials which are in their stockpiles.

The proposals of the Western Powers do not contain any unambiguous statement to the effect that they are prepared to accept any definitive prohibition of the nuclear weapon.

The representatives of the Western Powers have questioned the seriousness and effectiveness of any obligation that may be assumed by the great Powers not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons. But it should be recalled that the international agreement for the banning of bacteriological and chemical weapons adopted in 1925 was not violated by a single State, not even by Hitlerite Germany,

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

the very country which dragged the world into the holocaust of war. Even Hitlerite Germany did not dare to violate this convention on the prohibition of germ and chemical warfare. There is no doubt that under present conditions, when the activity and the consciousness of the popular masses has increased tremendously, when the United Nations which joins together scores of States is in existence, it would hardly be possible for any State to dare to violate an agreement which renounces the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Noble pressed the point that the United Kingdom must reserve the freedom to continue the testing of nuclear weapons. He declared that the United Kingdom plans to carry out further test explosions of these weapons. The other day, we read in the press that France also proposes to build its own atomic bomb, a point which Mr. Moch passed over in silence in his address.

As you see, the Western Powers persevere in their commitment to the atomic and hydrogen weapon. It is very dangerous to expect to keep the peace by enhancing one's atomic might and by continuing the armaments race. It is not by atomic and hydrogen bomb rattling but by way of friendship and co-operation between the peoples that peace can be maintained and mankind freed from the spectre of atomic warfare.

In conclusion, I should like to dwell briefly on the draft resolution presented by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and a number of other countries. I must be forthright in stating that this draft resolution contains nothing new as compared to the Western proposals presented on 29 August of this year in the Disarmament Sub-Committee. It calls for consideration of the question of instituting controls over inter-continental missiles without awaiting the completion of negotiations on the other principal subjects of the disarmament question. We consider that only if the problem of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is solved, if only for a five-year period, will it be possible to find the correct solution of the problem of control over inter-continental missiles and artificial earth satellites. Owing to these considerations, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR regards this draft resolution as unacceptable. We consider that the general direction for the solution of all urgent problems in the field of disarmament and likewise the solution of partial or initial measures on disarmament is indicated by the

MA/ds

A/C.1/PV.880

44-45

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

memorandum on disarmament presented by the Soviet Government to the General Assembly.

The proposals of the Soviet Union are permeated by a desire for international co-operation. They are designed to bring about the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of peace and security throughout the world. The adoption of the Soviet proposals would put an end to the armaments race, which has created so great a danger and tension in international relations.

(Mr. Kiselev,
Byelorussian SSR)

The adoption of the Soviet Union proposals would bring about a vast easing of the heavy burden borne by the peoples in connexion with the armaments race. It would contribute towards the abatement of international tension. It would open up wide prospects for the peaceful uses of atomic energy for the greater benefit of mankind. My delegation warmly supports the Soviet Union proposals and will vote in favour of them. The Byelorussian delegation expresses confidence and hope that the United Nations will contribute to the swift solution of the problem of the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons -- a consummation so devoutly wished by all mankind.

Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): It gives me particular pleasure to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, the congratulations of my delegation on your unanimous election. If we are somewhat saddened at losing you as our immediate neighbour around this table, that loss is more than compensated by the gain of having you guide the proceedings of this Committee.

I take this opportunity also to extend our congratulations to the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Barros, and to the Rapporteur, Dr. Matsch, on their election to offices in the service of this Committee.

Since the truth can never be too often proclaimed, it cannot be thought superfluous, even at this juncture of our debate, to assert that the time has come to heed the expectations and needs of the peoples of the world with concrete achievements in the field of disarmament. Every member who has spoken in the debate has recognized the urgency of creating a new climate of confidence and trust in a peaceful disarmed -- or, at least, disarming -- world.

We hope, indeed, that this recognition connotes a positive reaction against the current trend in international affairs, which is anything but conducive to a disarmed peace in a climate of mutual trust. The intrusion of the cold-war struggle in parts of Asia and Africa, in the form of a hectic arms race with the consequent aggravation of tension, is obviously in diametric opposition to the endeavours to relieve mankind of the heavy burden of armaments.

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo,
Indonesia)

It should not be too surprising, therefore, that the initial progress made by the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission in narrowing differences was interrupted, instead of culminating in concrete agreements. One can hardly expect fruitful results when disarmament discussions in one part of the globe are conducted simultaneously with a policy of armaments, military bases and military pacts in another part of the globe. Progress towards disarmament and a give-away programme or competition in armaments are clearly incompatible. Consequently, in order to fulfil their primary responsibility of achieving agreement in the field of disarmament, the big Powers, first of all, must cease or refrain from actions inimical to the emergence of such an agreement.

If these words sound harsh, they reflect the harsh facts of reality, as well as the deep concern of a nation which feels acutely the negative influences of the armaments race. As an under-industrialized nation emerging from the wasteland of our colonial past, the continuance of the armaments race would mean not merely giving up the possibility of a higher standard of living but even giving up the possibility of achieving a decent standard of living for our people. Many delegations have indeed already pointed to the economic repercussions generated by the armaments race; and none more eloquently and precisely than the representative of Peru. Mr. Belaunde cited, among other things, figures given to him by the United Nations Secretariat regarding the national income of the eighty-two Member States. These figures have a special meaning for my country, which is one of the nineteen countries with a national income of less than \$100 per capita.

Indonesia is a nation blessed with rich but yet untapped resources. Their development, a responsibility we have assumed since independence, demands all of our mental and material energies. We are determined to improve living conditions and to remove all obstacles in the way of achieving economic well-being, which after all is the prerequisite for attaining political and social stability on the principle of freedom. The greatest obstacle in the way of achieving this is the arms race in the context of the disruptive cold-war struggle. Even if it does not lead to a world-wide conflagration, it threatens our endeavours of reconstruction and rehabilitation. Moreover, as so succinctly put by Mr. Belaunde, it diverts

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo,
Indonesia)

"the great nations from their true mission, a mission which is a duty that it is in their interest to carry out, and that is to help in the development of the under-industrialized and under-developed nations." (A/C.1/PV.868, page 8-10)

Against this background, it can truly be said that disarmament is a matter which vitally involves and affects every country of the world. It is -- as Mr. Lodge, the representative of the United States, rightly noted -- "of deep and legitimate interest to every State represented in this room." (A/C.1/PV.866, page 8) This implies that the small and the weak nations, which do not possess vast arsenals of nuclear or conventional weapons, have a duty to state frankly their position in regard to this problem, as well as the obligation -- though different from that of the big Powers -- to contribute towards its solution.

On the basis of these considerations, I would like now to express the views of my delegation on certain aspects of the disarmament problem or issues related to it that are of special concern to the Government and people of Indonesia.

First of all, there is the problem of nuclear test explosions. A country which is situated in a region where experiments in the military uses of atomic energy are being undertaken -- to the north, the east and now even the south of its national frontiers -- cannot be indifferent to the clouds of atomic dust scuttling across its blue sky. They are the messengers and harbingers of fear, of destruction, of tragedy for the human race in the present and in the future. While our people do not give way to panic, they are apprehensive and even alarmed. They expect some reassurance from their Government. If we cannot give them that reassurance, we have the duty to at least join our voice to the rising chorus of voices demanding an end of these death-bearing tests.

I was indeed happy to hear an eminent representative of a big Power, though it is true very reluctantly and conditionally, concede that we must take all necessary measures to eliminate any risk of endangering the well-being of humanity. The representative of France, Mr. Moch, said that we must do so "without losing our heads." May I humbly add that we must do so also before we lose our lives and before we cause irreparable harm to future generations.

No responsible person has ever asserted that the increase in radiation is beneficial to the health of mankind. On the contrary, there is general agreement that an increase in radiation jeopardizes the health of mankind. The only question at stake is in regard to the size of this increase and whether we have already reached the stage, or are fast approaching it, when the increase in radiation and its cumulative effects endanger the very survival of mankind. Here differences and doubts may exist. But the consequences of our limited knowledge may be so terrifying, and certainly irreversible, that doubt itself is a compelling reason to end nuclear test explosions.

Indeed, how dare we turn our backs to this rational approach and, in the reckless pursuit to perfect the art of self-destruction, dismiss even the considered opinion of scientists, who unquestionably are masters of under-statement rather than dramatization. I need not repeat all the scientific opinions, warnings and excerpts so convincingly presented before this Committee by my colleague of India, Mr. Menon. But to show the tragedy and, in our opinion, even irresponsibility of the present situation, let me only refer briefly to the conclusions reached by the Advisory Committee on Biology and Medicine of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, which reviewed the test problem in the light of dangers to the world's population caused by radioactive fall-out, which is to be found in The New York Times of 20 October 1957.

While its overriding criteria was the national security of the United States in terms of military strength and preparedness, this Advisory Committee had to admit, nevertheless, that on a world-wide basis the genetic damage due to fall-out added up to large figures. Mind you, not one or two human beings -- alone condemnable -- but thousands of human beings. The Committee, however, went on to advise that tests of nuclear weapons are justified in terms of national security because the harm from fall-out of tests is "tolerable". In other words, an increase -- and by no means a slight one -- in the rate of genetic defects and mortality of the human race is "tolerable".

Can anyone in good conscience subscribe to such a thesis? Is science not being stripped of all morality and made to bow naked before the goddess of national security? Can national security even be attained on this basis? We do not believe so. Both in practice and in essence, national security on this basis can only be self-defeating.

The Advisory Committee, moreover, made this thesis of tolerability conditional upon the assumption that the nuclear weapon tests will continue at the rate of the last five years. But what is this rate? It is not a static one, but a rate that steadily increases year by year and that we have good reasons to believe will continue to increase in the future, if tests are not brought to a stop. Indeed, the Advisory Committee could not ignore this fact and, consequently, warned that "the situation may well become serious" if more and more countries embark on test programmes. We can already count on three instead of two testing countries, and there is no ground for excluding the probability of a fourth, a fifth, and so on ad infinitum. Therefore, we are already moving from a so-called tolerable to a "serious" situation, which is certainly a serious understatement of the catastrophe facing the peoples of the world.

It is to avoid this catastrophe, to reinject morality into science, that the Government and people of Indonesia appeal to the big Powers to end immediately nuclear test explosions. We make this appeal not only in our own interest or that of the other small or militarily weak countries, but also in the interest of the well-being and security of the peoples of the big Powers themselves.

We are told, however, that merely the suspension or end of nuclear test explosions would not halt the nuclear arms race. And we agree. To suspend or end the nuclear test explosions does not constitute a disarmament agreement. It is an agreement ensuring the survival of mankind. But is this not reason enough to end the tests? The argument that an immediate cessation of nuclear test explosions would not halt the nuclear arms race in fact begs the question. The continuation of these tests also will not halt the nuclear arms race. Nor can it enhance the national security of the big Powers, particularly as they already possess the capacity to deter a nuclear attack from any potential aggressor.

The continuation of nuclear test explosions can, therefore, have only one effect; that is, to compound the present danger, to aggravate present fears and tensions, to harm mankind fatally in time of peace on the assumption or in panic that war may break out.

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo, Indonesia)

On the other hand, an end of these tests by mutual agreement of the big Powers, under an adequate system of control, would not only create a new atmosphere bereft of present fears and the spectre of mankind's extinction, but also would stand as another example of co-operation between the big Powers. The positive influence this could exert on the disarmament problem and especially on problems on which the parties directly concerned have already moved closer together, should not be under-estimated.

Thus, the end of nuclear test explosions should be viewed as a preparatory step towards disarmament, encouraging and facilitating the hammering out of a disarmament agreement. A reversal of the present nuclear arms race, as I have already explained, is for us a matter of vital concern and urgency. We believe that this should be accomplished without delay by exerting further efforts towards reaching agreement on a first-phase disarmament programme, including the following matters which are set out in a number of General Assembly resolutions, namely, resolutions 808 (IX), 914 (X) and 1011 (XI): first, the total prohibition of the use and manufacture of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction of every type; secondly, the conversion of existing stocks of nuclear weapons for peaceful purposes; thirdly, the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only; and fourthly, the establishment of effective international control to guarantee the effective observance of these agreements, as well as the agreement relating to conventional armaments.

In our view, all four steps are equally important and indispensable. However, I would like at this time to confine myself to some remarks as regards the first matter mentioned; namely, the total prohibition of the use and manufacture of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction of every type.

We are deeply concerned over the changed position taken by some of the big Powers who now contend that, since it is no longer possible to control a total or unlimited prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, this prohibition should be made conditional to the right of self-defence as provided for by the Charter. I can assure this Committee that my country, as much as any other, respects the right of self-defence in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. In fact, this is one of the ten principles -- the fifth, to be precise -- proclaimed by the Bandung Conference. Nevertheless, we cannot go along with the argument that the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons should be made conditional to the right of self-defence.

To begin with, such a conditional prohibition would not only be contrary to the Assembly resolutions calling for total prohibition, but it would also destroy the principle -- upheld by this Assembly and by the most eminent statesmen of the big Powers -- that atomic energy should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Worse yet, what is the actual meaning in practice of the thesis that nuclear weapons should not be used except in case of self-defence as provided by the Charter? In view of recent world events, this is a question which we must seriously ponder and reflect upon. Let us recall in this respect the relevant words spoken by the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Mr. Padilla Nervo, in the general debate on 3 October. He said:

"The idea that we might keep partial wars within the limits of a local region, and to do so with the use of small nuclear weapons, is a concept of great danger and an idea that is wrong. The arms race is like a gallop during the night on the edge of a mountain, with an abyss on one side and a precipice on the other. The balance that is found there is the balance of fear; it is not stable, it is precarious."

(A/PV.699, p. 67)

Indeed, the idea of a limited prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons can only be interpreted in the sense that these weapons would be used in cases of so-called local conflicts which are the product not of contending local forces but of a power struggle between the two big-Power blocs. A collision of this kind inevitably takes place on the territory of small or weak nations which do not possess nuclear weapons. Consequently, it would be these nations and their peoples who would be the first victims of a so-called defensive nuclear war. And while nuclear bombs or rocket heads rain down upon them, spreading devastation and destruction, both sides to the conflict would undoubtedly describe their actions as an exercise of the right of self-defence. This, however, could hardly matter one way or the other to the victim.

Yes, under the concept of a limited prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the nuclear Powers may be deterred from attacking each other, although even here there is no guarantee that a localized nuclear war would not spill over

into a world-wide conflagration. And what guarantee, I humbly ask, have the peoples of States not possessing nuclear weapons that they will not be killed or horribly maimed in a so-called defensive nuclear war caused by external rather than local forces?

The answer to this question could lead us to despair. But we refuse to give in to despair. We cannot believe that man does not also possess the wisdom and ingenuity to control the holocaustic forces that he has unleashed. We cannot resign ourselves to living forever in a world based on a precarious "balance of fear." And this would be the situation if we gave up the idea of a total prohibition on the use and manufacture of nuclear weapons for a limited or conditional prohibition.

I cannot stress strongly enough that a limited prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would actually allow the nuclear arms race to continue unabated as before. Why? Because the big Powers would be left to determine the size of the stockpile of nuclear weapons needed for self-defence and they would obviously do so in terms of existing tensions and mistrust in the international climate. At the same time, the very existence of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the threat that they would be used, even if in so-called self-defence, would in turn create fears and tensions. Thus, we would again witness the interplay of tensions and of national security or self-defence needs, resulting in an interminable nuclear arms race.

What it boils down to then is a necessity to stop equating national security solely in terms of military strength. More than that, it highlights the dire need, especially on the part of the big Powers, to re-evaluate and appreciate the achievements of modern science and technology in terms of their positive contribution to the fund of knowledge that is the basis for civilization, rather than in terms of their power for destruction. We must restore morality in science. And I make bold to say that the small or weak nations, not harbouring vast arsenals of armaments on their territory, can make a positive contribution towards this end. Whether by necessity or inclination, they view the achievements of modern science and technology as tools for improving their living conditions and not as means for gaining military advantages over one another. And it is not

because they are more peaceful, but because they concentrate on the peaceful rather than military potentialities of scientific and technological developments, on their potentialities for good rather than evil, that their representation in disarmament negotiations could well foster a new climate conducive to progress. My delegation, therefore, favours the principle of enlarging the composition of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission.

In this connexion, I would like to make some very brief comments in regard to some of the arguments raised by the representative of France against the expansion of the Sub-Committee's composition. Mr. Moch argued that an enlargement of the Sub-Committee would not be advantageous since it already contains the four Governments whose initial agreement conditions all progress. Now we certainly cannot find any fault with the contention that progress on disarmament depends initially upon agreement between the big Powers. That is our view also. But the representative of France goes on to conclude from this that the participation of other countries in the Sub-Committee would be of no value, perhaps even disadvantageous. Well, what about Canada? I am sure that Mr. Moch did not mean to imply that Canada's participation in the work of the Sub-Committee had been of no assistance in narrowing differences.

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo, Indonesia)

Indeed, I am sure that Canada did make its contribution and that the inclusion of representatives from other impartial States would likewise contribute towards making possible progress through compromises and eventually unanimity. The task of these impartial States would, moreover, not be to impose a line of conduct, but to suggest and perhaps even urge a line of conduct more responsive to world public opinion and the needs of all humanity for security in a peaceful world. Whether in the Sub-Committee or in this General Assembly, we believe that our approach should not be one of imposition but of seeking unanimity through conciliation and mutual compromises, thereby furthering the efforts to achieve a workable and comprehensive disarmament plan.

In the spirit of the philosophy of that great atomic physicist and humanitarian, Niels Bohr of Denmark -- today the recipient of the first Atom for Peace Award -- we would like, therefore, to urge all the members here to rededicate themselves to the fight to bring harmony out of diversity, sustained in this positive and constructive struggle by the knowledge that harmony, indeed, is always the product of two initially conflicting forces or ideas.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.