



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.821
14 January 1957
ENGLISH

Eleventh Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 14 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]

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

Mr. Lodge

(United States)

Mr. Kuznetsov

(USSR)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record,
will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.821.
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 [Agenda item 22]

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The report of the Disarmament Commission, including the proceedings of its sub-committee, is before us. This is the time to review that work.

My statement today, however, will look more to the future than to the past. It deals with the steps and the means by which a sound and safeguarded agreement might be reached in the new year just beginning.

The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, will soon begin a new administration in the Government of our country. He has been elected for a second term by the people and will be inaugurated for that four-year period. The members of the United Nations may be confident of his continued devotion to the quest for a just and durable peace. He continues to lead our nation in a renewed effort to find the way to devote more of the resources of mankind to abundant peace and less to armaments and armed forces; to reduce tensions and increase confidence among nations by establishing a reliably inspected and lower level of armaments; and to lessen the perils of the outbreak of war by easing the dangers of great surprise attack.

Only recently, in his letter to Marshal Bulganin of 31 December 1956, President Eisenhower reaffirmed his belief that "deliberations in the framework of the United Nations seem most likely to produce a step forward in the highly complicated matter of disarmament".

President Eisenhower also declared the intention of the United States to submit new proposals in the United Nations.

These new proposals will centre upon five principal points. Before outlining these points, I wish to emphasize that the United States is ready and willing to take sound steps towards arms reductions, whether they are very small or whether they are large and extensive, provided, however, that any such steps must be subject to effective inspection. This insistence on adequate inspection is not a whim. It arises from the deep conviction after a thorough study that only an inspected agreement would serve the objective of a reliable peace.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

An agreement without effective inspection would immediately become the source of doubts and suspicions, of distrust and invective, and of charges and countercharges. Such an unsound agreement would add to tensions and increase the danger of war. Deeply as we are convinced of the desirability of a reliable agreement and of the dangers in the absence of agreement, we have, nevertheless, concluded that a bad agreement is worse for the cause of peace than no agreement. An uninspected agreement, or an inadequately controlled agreement, or a one-sided agreement, would be a bad agreement. It would not serve the objective of peace.

We believe that renewed negotiations should strive toward these objectives:

1. To reverse the trend toward larger stockpiles of nuclear weapons and to reduce the future nuclear threat.
2. To provide against great surprise attack and thus reduce the danger of major war.
3. To lessen the burden of armaments and to make possible improved standards of living.
4. To ensure that research and development activities concerning the propulsion of objects through outer space be devoted exclusively to scientific and peaceful purposes.
5. To ease tensions and to facilitate settlement of difficult political issues.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

To meet these objectives, the United States makes the following proposals, in broad outline. Specific details will, of course, be developed in the negotiations in the Sub-Committee.

First: The United States proposes that an agreement be reached under which, at an early date, under effective international inspection, all future production of fissionable materials shall be used or stockpiled exclusively for non-weapons purposes under international supervision. The Members of the Assembly and scientists throughout the world know that it is impossible to account with essential certainty, or to discover through any known scientific means of inspection, all of the fissionable materials produced in the past, or all of the existing accumulation of nuclear weapons. It is not possible to turn backward the clock of nuclear discovery and development, nor to repeal the nuclear age. One thing which can be done and which, for the sake of humanity, the United States proposes should be done, is to establish effective international control of future production of fissionable materials and to exchange firm commitments to use all future production exclusively for non-weapons purposes.

When such commitments are executed, it would then be possible to move reliably toward the reduction of existing stockpiles. When future production is controlled it should be easier than with information now available to establish within a reasonable range of accuracy the approximate amount of fissionable materials previously produced, so that equitable and proportionate amounts in successive increments could be transferred from past production to internationally supervised national or international use for non-weapons purposes.

The Members of this Assembly will recognize that this proposal is the logical projection and follow-through of the concept emphasized by President Eisenhower in his message to this body on 8 December 1953 when he proposed the "Atoms-for-Peace" programme. It is inspired by the same motives which led to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency through the co-operation of the nations of the world.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Under this programme the United States, for its part, would make generous, progressive transfers of fissionable material to peaceful uses, just as it has previously announced its intention to contribute to the International Atomic Energy Agency. It will continue to encourage nations to make their full contributions to the constructive uses of atomic energy.

Under such a programme, the whole future may be changed. The course of atomic development will move in a benign direction rather than toward some evil end.

Second: If such an arrangement to control the future production of fissionable material can be negotiated and put into effect it would then be possible, in a secure manner, to limit, and ultimately to eliminate, all nuclear test explosions. The United States proposes that this be done. Pending the negotiation of such an agreement, the United States is also willing to work out promptly methods for advance notice and registration of all nuclear tests, as has been suggested by the delegation of Norway, and to provide for limited international observation of such tests. This could be an effective forerunner of far-reaching agreement affecting both the nuclear threat itself and testing, in particular.

Third: The United States proposes that we move ahead toward the realization of a first stage reduction, under adequate inspection, of conventional armaments and armed forces, using as a basis of measurement the figures of 2.5 million for the USSR and the United States, and 750,000 for France and the United Kingdom, upon which the countries represented on the Sub-Committee seem to agree. The United States proposes that we achieve this forward step through the progressive establishment of an effective inspection system concurrent with such reductions. An effective inspection system would require an appropriate aerial inspection component as well as ground units. The United States accepts the principle of establishing observers at key ground locations, as generally proposed by Marshal Bulganin, in addition to air inspection. The proposed first stage of reductions can be fulfilled provided there is good faith on all sides in establishing a system of inspection that can in fact verify the commitments.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

It would seem appropriate, also, for other nations to begin to consider the relation between their own armed forces and the projected first stage force levels, in the event the fulfilment of such first stage reductions can be assured in the coming negotiations of the Sub-Committee.

The United States does not believe that deeper reductions than those agreed for the first stage can be made unless some progress is made in settlement of the major political issues now dividing the world. But the fulfilment of a first stage reduction would certainly improve the climate for the negotiation of such political settlements.

Fourth: Scientists in many nations are now proceeding with efforts to propel objects through outer space and to travel in the distant areas beyond the earth's atmospheric envelope. The scope of these experiments is variously indicated in the terms: "earth satellites", "intercontinental missiles", "long-range unmanned weapons", and "space platforms". No one can now predict with certainty what will develop from man's excursion in this new field. But it is clear that if this advance into the unknown is to be a blessing rather than a curse the efforts of all nations in this field need to be brought within the purview of a reliable armaments control system. The United States proposes that the first step toward the objective of assuring that future developments in outer space would be devoted exclusively to peaceful and scientific purposes would be to bring the testing of such objects under international inspection and participation. The United States earth satellite presently planned for the International Geophysical Year is an example of an open project devoted exclusively to scientific purposes and developed with the knowledge and approbation of the scientists of the nations represented in the International Geophysical Year. In this matter, as in other matters, we are ready to participate in fair, balanced, reliable systems of control.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Fifth: The United States continues to emphasize the importance of providing against the possibility of great surprise attack. This is not a minor or an ancillary proposal. The nature of modern weapons is such that if all nations are safeguarded against great surprise attack there is much less likelihood that a calculated major war would be initiated in the nuclear age. Likewise, such mutual assurances against great surprise attack would do much to prevent miscalculation by any nation regarding the intention of another. The greater the speed of potential attack and the more devastating the blows that could be struck the greater is the danger that anxious apprehension, feeding on ignorance of the dispositions and intentions of others, would adversely and dangerously affect the decisions of nations.

It is in the interest of each nation, not only that it has sure knowledge that other nations are not preparing a great surprise attack upon it, but, also, that these other nations should have sure knowledge that it is not planning a great surprise attack upon them. Today many nations have knowledge of the location of key centres, of the areas of strategic importance, and of the concentration of military power of other nations. This information would be adequate for the waging of a devastating war. But unless a reliable inspection system is established with open skies, open ports, open centres, each nation will possess something less than the regular, dependable information necessary to form a stable basis for a durable peace. The United States proposes therefore the progressive installation of inspection systems which will provide against the possibility of great surprise attack. The United States is willing to execute, either as an opening step or a later step, the complete proposal made in the summit conference at Geneva by President Eisenhower.

It is clear that whatever the first steps may be, a method of control, an organization of supervision, and a mechanism for regulation will be needed. The United States proposes that such an international agency for the regulation of armaments should be installed concurrently with the beginning of the programme. It can constitute a nucleus of hope at the centre of the grim implications which radiate from the destructive power of modern armament.

In making these new proposals may I re-emphasize that the United States continues to stand back of the proposals and suggestions made by it at the summit conference at Geneva and in the meetings of the Sub-Committee since that time.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

You will find in the Sub-Committee report suggestions submitted by the United States at London in May 1956 for initial steps for demonstration of inspection methods, for joint technical study, and for first levels of reduced armaments. I will not burden you with a review in detail because the record is before you. We stand on this record and we present our new proposals in a spirit of endeavour to meet the views of other nations. We are trying to move toward agreement, provided only that such agreement is sound and secure.

We are fully aware of the extent of devastation which would befall mankind if a third world war should occur. We believe it to be in the interest of all nations to take far-reaching steps to minimize this danger. We are convinced that an armaments control agreement which is fair to both sides and thoroughly inspected so that there can be no reasonable doubt of its fulfilment, is both physically and theoretically possible. Such an accord should be politically attainable if the prompt, forthright and thoughtful attention of the governments of the world is given to this problem.

That is the spirit in which I speak on behalf of the United States today.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have to examine one of the most acute and important international problems of our time, namely the problem of disarmament the solution of which is of vital interest to all peoples.

The decisive importance of this problem, among other international problems, is evident. An agreement on the problem of disarmament and the termination of the arms race with its immense unproductive expenditures to the detriment of the welfare of peoples and the continuous threat to turn any local conflict into a global war, would be a most significant contribution of the United Nations to the lessening of international tension, to the maintenance and consolidation of peace.

From the point of view of the interests of the peoples it is inadmissible that a policy aimed at the preparation of war, a policy of the arms race, be carried out. It is necessary that all the achievements of science and modern technique, all achievements of human genius, all the material resources of States and their productive forces, be directed toward peaceful aims, be used only for constructive purposes, but not for the sowing of death and destruction.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The termination of the arms race and the establishment of the era of peaceful co-existence, of an active economic co-operation of States, would open before humanity inexhaustible opportunities for an uninterrupted and rapid rise in the well-being of peoples, for the liquidation of economic backwardness of under-developed countries, for cultural progress of all peoples.

In the course of the general debate the Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity to draw the attention of the Members of the United Nations to the proposals of the Soviet Government of 17 November last. These proposals deal with all sides of the problem of disarmament. They have received broad support among public opinion which rightly considers that they provide new opportunities for agreement. We are entitled to expect that this detailed and comprehensive plan for the solution of the disarmament problem not only will be duly studied, but that it will secure the necessary support in the United Nations.

The Government of the Soviet Union, faithful to its policy of peace and peaceful settlement of international disputes, invariably stood and stands for the reduction of armaments, for a ban on nuclear weapons and all other types of mass destruction weapons, for complete disarmament.

In its statement of 17 November last, the Government of the Soviet Union frankly described all the seriousness of the present stage of international relations. It is quite obvious that a realistic evaluation of the present situation makes it possible to establish the real sources of international tension and to determine the means for their elimination.

The statement by the Soviet Government pointed out that the unprovoked armed attack of Britain, France and Israel on Egypt had created a dangerous situation, dangerous not only for the Near and Middle East but also for universal peace, since the war was threatening to extend to other countries.

The aggression against Egypt was a desperate attempt to crush Egypt by means of armed force, to demoralize thereby the other Arab States, to pave the way for abolishing their national independence and for reimposing the domination of the colonial Powers throughout the Near and Middle East.

The heroic resistance of the Egyptian people, the universal condemnation of the aggression, and the decisive warning to the aggressors on the part of the peace-loving countries made the organizers of the attack cease hostilities against Egypt. It would be premature, however, to assume that there is no longer any danger of deterioration of the situation in this area, that there is no danger of new military conflicts. On the contrary, the events of recent days show that the countries of the Middle East are threatened with a great danger, namely, subjection to a new colonial oppression -- this time, on the part of the United States.

One cannot fail to see that the so-called programme for the Near and Middle East advanced by the United States runs counter to the principles and purposes of the United Nations and constitutes a clearly formulated programme of imperialist expansion, and is fraught with grave danger to peace and security in that area.

At present, when real possibilities have been created in the Middle East for consolidating peace and settling outstanding issues in that area, the Government of the United States has come forth with a programme which envisages flagrant interference on the part of the United States in the affairs of the Arab countries, down to and including military intervention. The aggressive trend of this programme and its colonialist nature with regard to the Arab countries is so obvious that it cannot be disguised by any nebulous phrases.

The ruling circles of the United States are seeking to impose "trusteeship" of the colonialists on the peoples of the Near and Middle East and to seize the natural resources and national wealth of these countries. To put it plainly, the United States is attempting to implant the former colonial order in these countries under a new signboard and to capture dominating positions there...

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Many of us are convinced of the desirability of achieving a friendly agreement on disarmament, and this can only be achieved in our debates by limiting ourselves to the precise subject of the debate and avoiding other points of discussion which can only give rise to acrimony and take us away from the concrete and specific matter of the subject before us. Therefore, in the most cordial manner, I should like to request the

representative of the Soviet Union to limit his remarks to the item of disarmament. I ask this while, at the same time, I pay tribute to him as a person and to his country.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers that what refers to the question of disarmament must be stated here. We are talking about the problem of disarmament and we should, first of all, give an estimate of the conditions which are leading to the armaments race. Therefore, it seems to us that, without such an analysis, it is impossible to understand the substance of the question. Therefore, I would request the Chairman not to interrupt me. I shall soon conclude this part of my statement.

United States ruling circles consider that the weakening of the positions of the Anglo-French colonialists in the Near and Middle East and the success of the Arab countries in consolidating their independence have produced a "vacuum" which they would like to fill by their military and economic intervention in the internal affairs of those countries...

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United States has the floor on a point of order.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I make a point of order on the ground that the statements made by the representative of the Soviet Union are, in the first place, entirely inaccurate. They are a smear on the United States, they have nothing to do with disarmament, and they are irrelevant and impertinent.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The words of the Chair have been borne out. In a friendly manner I told the representative of the Soviet Union that to go into matters not immediately connected with disarmament would create an atmosphere of acrimony in our discussions. Therefore, once again, with all my authority as Chairman, but still in a respectful and friendly way, I would request the representative of the Soviet Union, in the interests of the cause of disarmament which we are discussing, to limit his observations to the subject matter. The representative of the Soviet Union may continue.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I consider that what the Soviet delegation is now stating is directly connected with the question of disarmament.

In order to cover up its policy, the United States is resorting to the invention of an alleged threat to the Arab countries by the Soviet Union. These slanderous assertions are completely false and will deceive no one.

It was not the Soviet Union, but France and the United Kingdom, the United States' chief partners in the North Atlantic bloc, which committed aggression against Egypt, inflicting great losses and suffering on the Egyptian people. Through their days of ordeal for the Arab peoples, it was the Soviet Union which came out as their sincere friend and, together with all peace-loving forces, took steps to end the aggression against Egypt.

It is well known, on the other hand, that when Egypt was threatened with the loss of its national independence, the United States refused to pool its efforts with the Soviet Union in the United Nations with a view to taking resolute measures to cut short the aggression. The primary concern of the United States was not and is not the defence of peace and of the national independence of the Arab countries, but the desire to take advantage of the weakening of France and the United Kingdom in the Near and Middle East to capture their positions.

The Soviet Union, as distinct from the United States, has not and does not want to have any bases or concessions with the object of increasing profits; it does not strive to gain any privileges in that area, since all this is incompatible with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The Soviet Union always opposes any manifestation of colonialism, any "doctrines" which protect and cover up colonialism. It consistently supports the principle of self-determination of peoples, of achieving and consolidating the national independence of peoples. In its relations with all countries the Soviet Union adheres unflinchingly to the policy of equal rights and non-interference in the internal affairs of others and actively supports the right of every people...

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I feel that I must again point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that I see no need to bring before this Committee points that have already been debated in the General Assembly and will no doubt be debated again. Naturally, on occasion the policy

(The Chairman)

of a certain country may have to be referred to in connexion with disarmament, but this has been done at great length. I should like to ask the representative of the Soviet Union whether he is prepared to contribute in a constructive manner to our discussion of disarmament. If so, I ask him to do so, avoiding any marginal matters which would put us into a difficult situation. For the third time, and with all my authority as Chairman, I would ask the representative of the Soviet Union -- and I think that I am expressing the views and feelings of the Committee -- to avoid creating a situation which would hinder our debate and would lead to all kinds of retorts in the discussion of a problem which concerns the whole of mankind. Therefore, very cordially, and in a friendly manner, I would ask him to eliminate from his speech any references which are unnecessary in this debate, which is, as I say, of interest to all mankind.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Spanish): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but I must protest against the fact that you have interrupted me for the third time, inasmuch as the subject and the views set forth in the Soviet Union statement have a direct relation to the strengthening and the maintenance of peace. However, I shall try to be brief, taking account of your urgent appeal.

The Soviet Union is interested in the maintenance of peace in the area of the Near and Middle East, which is situated in direct proximity to its frontiers. It is sincerely interested in the consolidation of the national independence of those countries and their economic prosperity and regards this as a reliable guarantee of peace and security in that area. One cannot fail to point out that steps with regard to the Near and Middle East, outlined by the United States Government, which envisage the possibility of employing United States armed forces, might lead to dangerous consequences, the responsibility for which would rest fully with the United States Government.

Mention should be made of the fact that the aggression undertaken by France, Israel and the United Kingdom, as well as the failure of the counter-revolutionary conspiracy in Hungary, have produced a new explosion of war hysteria in the countries of the North Atlantic bloc. The United States, in particular, intends

MW/gd

A/C.1/PV.821

15

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

to increase its war preparations in 1957. The decisions of the NATO session show that the circles responsible for the policy of this aggressive bloc actually reject the principle of peaceful coexistence and intend to arm West Germany with atomic weapons.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

They reject this principle of peaceful co-existence of States based on respect for national sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs. They aim openly at intensifying in every way possible subversive activities against socialist countries.

Numerous facts show that the achievements of peace-loving countries in the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of international co-operation alarmed the imperialist forces. They fear that these conditions may force them to halt the arms race which is a source of enrichment for war monopolies.

Those circles in Western countries which oppose peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition between the two social and economic systems -- capitalist and socialist -- are exerting every effort to return to the "cold war" and are seeking any pretext for such a turn of events. Thus they are pushing forward along the slippery path to the verge of disaster from which the world may plunge into the abyss of a new war. This policy is fraught with the gravest consequences.

World war under the present circumstances, when there exist such weapons as atomic and hydrogen bombs and such means of delivering them to any point on the earth as long-range bombers or, say, intercontinental rockets, would result in immeasurably heavier casualties and material losses as compared with the two previous world wars. But in those two bloody conflicts the peoples paid a heavy toll -- more than 30 million killed and about 55 million wounded and maimed, which is equal to the population of the two largest countries of Europe, Britain and France, or half the population of the United States of America.

Immense resources were wasted in the two world wars. The American columnist Davis, in his book "Peace, War and You", makes some estimates which convey an idea of what humanity could have had if there had been no wars and if all resources wasted in wars had been used to improve the wellbeing of the working people. He says that the resources wasted in the Second World War would have been sufficient to build a five-roomed cottage for every family in the world, and to build and maintain during ten years a hospital in every town with a population of over 5,000.

One can imagine what the peoples would pay for a new world war with nuclear and other weapons, the destructive capacity of which exceeds by many times that of the weapons used in previous wars. No country, on whatever continent it is situated, could avoid the consequences of a new war with its modern devastating means of annihilation.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

Here I would remind the Committee of the statement made by so well-informed an expert as Lieutenant-General James M. Gaven, Director of the Research and Development Agency of the United States Army. On 22 May 1956, at the hearings in the Senate Sub-Committee on the United States Air Force, he said that the effect of nuclear weapons could not be limited by definite territorial boundaries. Radiation fallout would be dispersed over vast areas and would affect the civil populations of many countries, both belligerents and non-belligerents. General Gaven said that "current planning estimates run on the order of several hundred million deaths -- that would be either way, depending on which way the wind blew".

Such is the fate which is now being prepared for the world by the forces interested in war. The imperialists are prepared to sacrifice the lives of hundreds of millions of men, women and children for the sake of their fabulous profits, which go up at the speed of jet planes, to use the neat remark Mr. George Mahon, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Appropriations of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. George Mahon well knew what he was talking about. The profits of American monopolies connected with military production have reached an unprecedented level for peace-time. For instance, the well-informed Magazine of Wall Street called 1955 a "golden year" for business. The year 1956 brought even higher profits from the armaments race.

It is necessary to recognize for the sake of objectivity that this "golden rain" which results from the production of tools of death is far from blinding everybody. Sober voices which warn against the terrible disaster that may result from the frenzied and, for humanity, fatal armaments race are heard more and more often, even from statesmen and businessmen of Western countries.

There are two possible ways open for States to choose from now. Either the way of putting an end to the "cold war", giving up the policy of "positions of strength" -- the way of stopping the armaments race, the way of disarmament and of creating conditions for peaceful co-existence of States with different economic and social systems: or, the way of continuing the armaments race, of continuing the "cold war", of hostile isolation of States one from the other -- the way leading to a war of unprecedented devastation, which would call forth untold hardships and sorrow to the world.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

If we take account of the interests of peoples, only the way leading to the preservation and strengthening of peace must and can be chosen -- the way of putting an end to the "cold war", the way of disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons. In these circumstances, the question of disarmament acquires particular significance.

While the armaments race continues, while the plants producing atomic and hydrogen bombs are working at full capacity, and while the most devastating means of mass annihilation are being stockpiled, one cannot give oneself up to illusions as to the possibility that all this can be done with impunity. Life has taught us repeatedly that when armaments are accumulated in great quantities they inevitably begin to fire. This is confirmed in particular by the recent armed aggression of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt. Therefore we must resolutely reject the theory, widespread in some Western countries, according to which peace may be ensured, allegedly, by the "balance of horror" -- the so-called "balance of forces" of armed Powers. The groundlessness of the theory of armed peace is obvious, and this is understood by all reasonable people.

Mr. Titterton, an Australian professor of atomic science, is quite right when he says that such a balance would be unstable because any error or any incident could lead to serious consequences. Can we make international peace and the security of peoples dependent upon some one's error or upon casual chance? There can be no doubt that the peoples will never accept any excuse for irresponsible playing with their fate.

There are not and there cannot be any reasons at present which could justify in the eyes of the peoples further delays in working out an agreement of disarmament. We should, calmly and in a business-like manner, analyse specific proposals and plans on disarmament at our disposal, and agree, first of all, upon the immediate implementation of those provisions which are indisputable, and with regard to which the positions of the parties have become identical or have been brought close together.

If all parties prove their sincere willingness to come to an agreement on the programme of disarmament there is no doubt that such an agreement will be reached, and that it will be possible to start its implementation immediately.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The implementation of measures in the field of disarmament would, as a matter of fact, contribute to the improvement of the international atmosphere as a whole and to the strengthening of confidence among nations. This, in turn, would create still more favourable conditions for the implementation of an all-embracing programme of disarmament and would open the way to a general relaxation and a peaceful settlement of pressing international issues now awaiting solution.

The peoples are yearning for this, and the governments cannot ignore the fact. Such a trend of developments would serve the cause of maintaining and strengthening universal peace. It is the duty of the United Nations to justify these hopes of the peoples, to come out against the policy of continuing and stepping up the armaments race, and to call upon all countries to proceed immediately to the practical solution of the disarmament problem.

The Soviet Union is persistently and steadily pursuing a policy of peace, a policy of peaceful international co-operation. The policy of peace is not a matter of expediency for the Soviet State, but the very foundation of its relations with other countries. We need peace not because, as has been alleged, our country is weak. Our socialist State proved with honour in the years of great hardship and trial during the Second World War that it could defend to the best not only itself, but also the cause of universal peace. Since that time, the Soviet State has become even stronger and now has true friends in the person of the socialist countries of Europe and Asia and common people all over the world, who will not and cannot forget the outstanding part played by the Soviet Union in the victory over fascism.

But the Soviet people is a peace-loving people. The Soviet people and, by its nature, the Soviet Socialist State resolutely reject the policy of positions of strength as a means of settling international disputes. They have always stood and continue to stand for peace and the peaceful coexistence of nations, against war and the interference of one State in the internal affairs of another.

The Soviet Union has been doing and is doing everything to eliminate the threat of a new war, to reach agreement on disarmament and to put an end to the armaments race.

The interests of peace demand real, practical steps in the field of disarmament. In this connexion, all the participants in the present session of the General Assembly bear a special responsibility, unless the United Nations wishes to repeat the sad experience of the League of Nations, which failed to do anything in the field of disarmament.

When one examines the proposals submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, one cannot fail to note that there is a certain group of questions on which agreement could be reached if all parties were willing to do so. Unfortunately, however -- as is known -- this has not been possible so far, owing, first of all, to the fact that the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France have persistently evaded any agreement on disarmament. The Soviet Union, inspired by a desire to start the practical implementation of a disarmament programme, repeatedly during the past negotiations met the Western Powers half way, accepting their proposals. However, everytime it appeared that it was possible to reach agreement, the Western Powers advanced obstacles and raised objections, thus avoiding agreement.

That was the case, for example, as regards the question of determining the levels of armed forces and conventional armaments. For a number of years, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and some other Powers persistently adhered to the position that atomic weapons could be banned only after the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. They stated that atomic weapons would compensate for the alleged situation in which the Western Powers lagged behind the Soviet Union in the field of conventional armaments. To eliminate this so-called "lagging behind", they proposed to reduce the armed forces of the USSR, the United States and the Chinese People's Republic to the level of 1 million to 1.5 million men and those of the United Kingdom and France to the level of 650,000 men, respectively. After this reduction, the Western Powers stated, the Soviet Union would lose its advantage in conventional armaments and would be prepared to prohibit atomic weapons. When the Soviet Union, however, agreed to those levels, the Western Powers went back on their own proposals.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

Then the Western Powers moved proposals for higher levels of armed forces: for the United States, the USSR and China, 2.5 million men, and for the United Kingdom and France, 750,000 men, respectively. Desiring to facilitate agreement, the Soviet Union accepted these higher levels, too, as a first step with a view to a subsequent reduction of the armed forces of the USSR, the United States and China to 1 million to 1.5 million men and of the United Kingdom and France to 650,000 men, respectively. However, the representatives of the United States and other Western countries once again avoided agreement on this question, seeking new pretexts in order to drag out the practical implementation of measures on disarmament.

As regards the question of atomic weapons, the Soviet Union -- although it possesses all the modern weapons, including nuclear weapons -- was and is persistently seeking the complete prohibition of atomic weapons, the discontinuance of their production, their withdrawal from the armaments of States and the destruction of all existing stocks of such weapons. Under the pressure of world public opinion, the Western Powers had earlier submitted a proposal to the effect that the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons should come into force after 75 per cent of the agreed reductions of conventional armaments had been completed. Desirous of breaking the deadlock in the disarmament problem, the Soviet Union Government agreed to that proposal. And what happened? The same thing: the Western Powers, in this case again, began to go back on their own proposals. The Western Powers rejected the Soviet Union proposals to the effect that all States Members of the United Nations should undertake, in the interests of the peace and security of nations, a solemn obligation to refrain in their international relations from the use of force or the threat of force, and should also assume an obligation not to resort to the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

In present circumstances, however, the necessity of assuming such an obligation is becoming ever more urgent. This is evidenced by the fact that now, as members know, the United States is openly declaring that it intends to use its armed forces against the peoples of the Near and Middle East.

The Western Powers also refused to accept the proposals providing for some partial measures in the field of disarmament, despite the fact that, in our opinion, all the necessary conditions were present for the implementation of such proposals. Among these proposals we might mention those for the immediate

cessation of tests of thermonuclear weapons, the prohibition of atomic weapons in the armaments of troops stationed on the territory of Germany, and a 15 per cent reduction in the military budgets of States, as compared with the budgets of the previous year.

I turn now to the question of control. As is known, the Soviet Union was the first country in the United Nations to move a proposal concerning the establishment of international control over disarmament. It proposed a detailed plan of control, which for the first time provided reliable guarantees against a surprise attack of one State against another, by establishing control posts at important junctions in the territories of States parties to the agreement.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

In summarizing briefly the discussions of the problem of disarmament in the organs of the United Nations, it should be noted that the Western Powers evaded the acceptance of the proposals of the Soviet Union of 10 May 1955, 27 March 1956, 12 July 1956 and others. In these proposals, the Soviet Union expressed its willingness to come to an agreement on all questions concerning the problem of disarmament. At the same time, the Soviet Union was ready to conclude an agreement at least on one part or another of this problem, the reduction of conventional armaments, the prohibition of atomic weapons, the reduction of military expenditures and so on, if the Western Powers considered such a method more acceptable to them. At the same time, the Soviet Union did not make agreement on any specific question or proposal conditional upon agreement on the problem of disarmament as a whole.

Confronted with a persistent unwillingness by the Western Powers to conclude a general or partial agreement on disarmament, the Soviet Government made new efforts designed to make a start on disarmament. I am referring to the proposal of the Soviet Government of 14 May 1956 that States, and, first of all, the great Powers possessing large armed forces, should take unilateral action to reduce their armed forces and to stop the arms race without waiting for an international agreement on disarmament.

The Soviet Union took the lead in this important question. During the last year, the Soviet Union unilaterally undertook a large reduction of its armed forces -- by 1,840,000 men -- including a reduction of Soviet troops stationed in the German Democratic Republic, reduced its military expenditures by almost 10 per cent and liquidated its military bases in Port Arthur and Porkkala Udd. At the same time, the Soviet Government stated that if the United States of America, Britain and France, for their part, would carry out a corresponding reduction of their armed forces and armaments, it would be prepared to consider the question of a further reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, the Western Powers did not follow the example of the Soviet Union, but continued to seek new pretexts to delay the solution of the disarmament problem.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

Recently, in the course of negotiations on disarmament, the Western Powers have insistently put forward a new preliminary condition. The cessation of the armaments race has been made conditional on the settlement of a number of political problems. We are now told that it is not even possible to think of reducing armaments without a settlement of the German question, the problems of the Near and Middle East, the problems of the Far East, and others. Allegedly, this will be possible only after outstanding international problems have been solved. At the same time, it is stated that only this will create the confidence required for disarmament.

It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has done much towards the solution of pressing international political problems. One can recall such measures as the settlement of the Austrian problem, the normalization of relations with Yugoslavia, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Federal Republic of Germany and with Japan, and the efforts of the Soviet Union to develop contacts between statesmen of various countries. One can also mention the well-known Soviet proposals concerning the European system of collective security which, were they to be adopted by the Western Powers, would contribute greatly to the normalization of the situation not only in Europe, but throughout the whole world. The proposal made by the Soviet Union to the United States regarding the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and co-operation should also be cited in this connexion.

Naturally, in the future as well the Soviet Union will be prepared to contribute actively to the solution of outstanding political problems, and it is not the fault of the Soviet Union that a number of international questions still remain unsolved.

At the same time, it is quite obvious that to make agreement on questions of disarmament conditional upon the settlement of international political problems means giving up any attempt to reach agreement on disarmament. Such an approach would mean lumping together deliberately all questions, which would only make more difficult the solution of the already complicated problem of disarmament and which would only lead us into a deadlock.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The dispute around the question of where to begin, whether with disarmament or with the solution of international problems, reminds us of the well-known fruitless dispute, which was the first, the chicken or the egg. The champions of the armaments race would like to draw the countries into an endless dispute so that they could continue to arm and to prepare for war under the cover of this noisy dispute. It is for this purpose that some people are interested in the creation of a vicious circle, when both the problem of disarmament and the settlement of outstanding international questions would be at a stand-still.

Such an attitude in influential quarters of the Western countries is designed not only to disrupt the negotiations on disarmament, but also to justify the remilitarization of Western Germany carried out by them and the maintenance of United States armed forces in Europe and Asia. This attitude is also needed, as is indicated by the programme of the United States of America for the Near and Middle East, for the introduction of United States armed forces into this area, in accordance with the interests of those monopolistic circles which are interested in the arms race.

Such a policy in international affairs is dangerous and harmful. It dooms the United Nations to inactivity at a time when the worsening of the international situation demands that we make even greater efforts to reach agreement on the problem of disarmament.

Attaching paramount importance to the problem of disarmament for the strengthening of peace, considering that there exist real possibilities for a satisfactory solution of this problem and that all the necessary conditions exist for taking the first step, both for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the Government of the Soviet Union, in order that progress might be made in the field of disarmament, has submitted its proposals.

The General Assembly has before it the statement of the Soviet Government on disarmament and the lessening of international tension, dated 17 November 1956 and circulated as an official document. Our delegation would like to stress the importance of these Soviet proposals which, it is convinced, can constitute a good basis for negotiating and reaching agreement on disarmament.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

In the first place, the Soviet Government proposes a substantial reduction in the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, China, Britain and France, this reduction to take place in two stages. We propose that during the first year the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America and China should be reduced to 2,500,000 men and those of the United Kingdom and France to 750,000 men each, and that during the second year the armed forces of these five Powers should be reduced to 1,500,000 men and 650,000 men respectively, providing that all other States shall possess armies not exceeding 150,000 to 250,000 men. At the same time, of course, it is understood that armaments will be reduced correspondingly. It is opportune to recall that all these levels were proposed in the past by the Western Powers.

In the second place, the Soviet Government proposes that within two years there should be the prohibition of nuclear weapons, with the discontinuation of their production, the banning of their use, and the complete destruction of the stockpiles of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

As a first step, we propose the immediate discontinuation of tests of nuclear weapons, in accordance with the demands voiced by mankind, which sees a serious danger in the continuation of these tests. Such a proposal, as is known, was put forward by the Government of India, and it has been supported by the Parliaments of Indonesia, Japan and other countries.

One must dwell a little longer on this question. The peoples of the world are deeply concerned about the continuation of the tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, since the atomic radiation resulting from these tests constitutes a threat to the life and health of the populations of all countries. This threat can be eliminated only by putting an end to the tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The Soviet Union proposes that, in response to the universal desire of the peoples and in conformity with the humanitarian objectives of the United Nations, the States carrying out tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons should immediately stop such tests.

To this end, the delegation of the Soviet Union submits the following draft resolution to the General Assembly:

(Mr. Kuzretsov, USSR)

"The General Assembly,

Taking into account the deep concern of the peoples of the world about continuing tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons,

Noting that the continuation of the tests of these types of weapons constitutes a threat to life and health of the population of all countries of the world,

Considering that the cessation of the tests of thermonuclear weapons would eliminate the said threat to the population, would correspond to the universal desire of the peoples of the world and correspond to the humanitarian objectives of the United Nations,

Calls upon the states carrying out tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons to stop immediately the tests of these types of weapons."

The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that no difficulties should arise with regard to supervision over the implementation of an agreement on the prohibition of tests, since any explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb under present conditions of science cannot be effected without its being registered in other countries. The best guarantee against violations of this agreement would be the very fact that secret tests of nuclear weapons are impossible and that accordingly a government assuming the obligation to discontinue such tests could not violate it without exposing itself before the whole world as a transgressor of an international agreement. Thus, there are no insurmountable obstacles to reaching an agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests.

In the third place, the Soviet Government proposes to reduce during 1957 by one-third the armed forces of the United States, the USSR, the United Kingdom and France stationed on the territory of Germany. It stands to reason that these reductions should be carried out under appropriate control.

In the fourth place, the Soviet Government proposes to effect during 1957 a considerable reduction of the armed forces of the United States, the United Kingdom and France stationed on the territory of the NATO countries and of the Soviet forces stationed in the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty. The carrying out of such a measure would undoubtedly contribute to the creation of healthier international conditions.

In the fifth place, the Soviet Government proposes to liquidate within two years all military bases in the territory of other States.

In the sixth place, the Soviet Government proposes to cut the military expenditures of States in the course of two years, in conformity with the reduction of armaments, the banning of nuclear weapons and the liquidation of military bases on the territory of other countries.

In the seventh place, proposals are submitted providing for the establishment of strict and effective international control over the fulfilment of the disarmament obligations.

The Soviet Government has repeatedly expressed its attitude to the proposal on the so-called aerial photography plan and has declared that the "open skies" plan put forward by the United States Government by itself solves neither the

problem of control nor that of preventing aggression. Since, however, the proposal on aerial surveys is put forward by the United States as an indispensable condition for reaching agreement on disarmament, the Soviet Union, attempting to find a way out of the deadlock, stated that it was prepared to consider the question of employing aerial photography within a vast area of Europe to a depth of 800 kilometres to the west and the east of the demarcation line between the principal armed forces of NATO and those of the Warsaw Treaty countries, provided that the States concerned agree.

The Soviet Union is certain that the implementation of the disarmament programme which it now proposes would open the way to the complete liquidation of armed forces and armaments of all types, States retaining only such contingents of militia -- police -- as are necessary to maintain internal security and protect their frontiers.

Finally, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to recall another proposal of the Soviet Government which is of great importance. Desiring to give the peoples confidence that arms shall never be used for settling disputes between States, the Soviet Government once more proposes the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty.

Recognizing the expediency of using all possibilities and all ways for the examination of the disarmament problem and taking into account the existing difficulties in this field, the Soviet Government supported the proposals made by the President of the Swiss Confederation for the convening of a conference of the Heads of Government of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and India. Such a conference would facilitate agreement on questions related to the disarmament problem.

However, we must note with regret that the Government of the United States, followed by the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, refused to support the proposal made by the President of the Swiss Confederation with regard to a new consideration of the disarmament problem at a special conference of the Heads of Government.

We considered and still consider that all channels and all means, including summit conferences of statesmen, should be used for the solution of such a problem as that of disarmament which is of vital importance for the whole world.

This is the broad programme of action proposed by the Soviet Union. The proposals of the Soviet Union, as everybody may see, take into account the position of the Western Powers. These proposals considerably improve the prerequisites for reaching agreement on the most important questions connected with disarmament, namely, on the prohibition of atomic weapons and on the reduction of the armaments and armed forces of States.

Now the matter is up to the Western Powers. The Soviet delegation expects that the Soviet Union's important step will be duly appreciated by our partners as a constructive contribution to the cause of disarmament.

What, in our opinion, is now needed to ensure the success in the immediate future of the efforts of States aimed at solving the disarmament problem? Only one thing is needed for this, namely, the good will of all those concerned.

The Soviet delegation cannot help expressing its regret that the prolonged work in the United Nations in the field of disarmament has not led to any concrete, positive results. The ineffectiveness of the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee is to a certain degree conditioned by their restricted membership and by the private nature of the discussion of this most important problem for the peoples of all countries. Even when the Sub-Committee was set up, the Soviet delegation expressed its misgivings that the restricted membership of the Sub-Committee might be a serious impediment for the successful fulfilment of the tasks assigned to it. Unfortunately, one must admit that these misgivings have been justified.

The Soviet Union considers that such important United Nations bodies as the General Assembly, the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee should take more effective measures to break the deadlock in the disarmament problem. In this connexion the Soviet delegation would like to make some proposals which, in its opinion, would contribute towards making the work of the United Nations more active in this field.

In order to secure a more representative character of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, it would be expedient to enlarge the membership of these bodies, taking into account the existing opinions in this respect.

The Soviet delegation suggests that the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee be instructed to examine all proposals on the reduction of armed forces and armaments and on the prohibition of nuclear weapons which have been submitted to the United Nations by the Governments of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States, France and other States. At the same time we take into account the wishes of a number of delegations as well as the wishes contained in the messages of Messrs. Eisenhower, Eden and Mollet to Marshal Bulganin to the effect that all proposals on disarmament should be discussed at the forthcoming session of the Sub-Committee.

In our opinion, the time has come for the General Assembly to give special consideration to the problem of disarmament, paying to it the particular attention which that problem deserves.

In view of these considerations, it would be opportune to consider now the question of convening a special session of the General Assembly devoted exclusively to the disarmament problem. The calling of such a session would undoubtedly draw general attention to the disarmament problem and would make a serious contribution to its speedy solution.

Accordingly, the delegation of the Soviet Union considers it appropriate under the present circumstances to submit to the General Assembly the following draft resolution:

The General Assembly,

Taking into account the ardent desire of the peoples to strengthen peace and to eliminate the threat of a destructive atomic war,

Desiring to save the peoples from the heavy burden of taxation caused by the continuing armaments race,

Recognizing that the achievement of these purposes requires the cessation of the armaments race, the prohibition of nuclear weapons and a substantial reduction by States of their armed forces and of conventional armaments, with the establishment of appropriate international control,

Noting with satisfaction that the positions of negotiating parties on a number of questions of the disarmament problem have recently been brought closer together, which is evidenced by the proposals contained in the statement by the Soviet Government of 17 November 1956 on disarmament and the lessening of international tension,

Considering that the solution of the disarmament problem brooks no further delay,

1. Takes note of the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission,

2. Instructs the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee to examine the proposals on the reduction of armed forces and armaments and on the prohibition of nuclear weapons submitted to the United Nations by the Governments of the USSR, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, France and other States,

Decides to convene a special session of the General Assembly on the question of disarmament, instructing the United Nations Disarmament Commission to work out proposals concerning the date of the convening of this session.

The Soviet delegation would like to express its confidence that the proposals of the Soviet Government will meet with the necessary support on the part of the Members of the United Nations.

It stands to reason that we shall be ready to study and to support any proposals of other countries if they really lead to tangible and practical results in the field of disarmament.

The statement made today by the representative of the United States on the disarmament problem deserves attention and will be carefully studied by us.

The Charter of the United Nations proclaims that Members of this Organization are "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind" and that to this end they assume the obligation "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

These noble words, inscribed on the banner of the United Nations, should not remain merely pious wishes. The United Nations should take effective measures which would initiate genuine disarmament, put an end to the arms race and strengthen the cause of universal peace and the security of peoples.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): In total disregard of the rulings of the Chair, the Soviet representative has seen fit to accuse the United States of colonialism and of violating the United Nations Charter. This, from the Government which has perpetrated the blood-bath in Hungary, which has to all intents and purposes admitted its guilt by rejecting any impartial investigation, and which has been condemned in a climactic action in the General Assembly by an overwhelming vote of the Members of that body.

The truth is that no one has been oppressed by the United States, no one has been enslaved by the United States -- and no one will be. Nothing that President Eisenhower has proposed involves any actions of the type which the

Soviet representative has described. The United States has never, in any country, engaged in any activity -- be it economic or be it military -- except with the approval of the country concerned. And the representative of the Soviet Union knows that. What we propose is the opposite of colonialism, what we propose is squarely in harmony with the Charter. None of the lengthy statements made by the representative of the Soviet Union can be supported by fact.

If representatives will read the statement which I made this morning on behalf of the United States Government, they will see that it is a very sincere and a very good-faith disarmament proposal. It contains not one word of invective or of acrimony concerning the Soviet Union or concerning anyone else. Is it not really bitterly discouraging to have the Soviet representative deliberately make the speech which we have just heard? It is also contemptuous of the work of the United Nations. This is really a sad thing for us all, but we shall keep hoping and we shall keep trying.

Mr. CASSIMATIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): I should like to raise a point of order. At the end of one of our recent meetings, the Chairman addressed an appeal for the co-operation of the Committee with a view to the successful carrying out of our work. He insisted on the necessity for avoiding any waste of time, so that all the items on our agenda might be properly and fully discussed. All the items are important and affect peace and security in the world, and all delegations should be sure of having enough time at their disposal to put forward their points of view. In expressing his concern that the Committee should carry out its tasks successfully, the Chairman, I am sure, spoke for the whole Committee. Our great difficulty this year is the limited period of time at our disposal, especially in view of the fact that we began late and that 15 February has been mentioned as the closing date of the session. We should therefore try to organize our debates in such a way as to provide the maximum yield in the limited period of time at our disposal.

(Mr. Cassimatis, Greece)

It is with this aim in mind that we think it would be desirable for us to follow a work programme along the following lines: firstly, to decide on a proper distribution and number of meetings which we could have until the closing date; secondly, to decide to bridge any gaps in order to have more time available, to hold evening meetings or Saturday meetings, with the possibility of discussing the following items when speakers are lacking on a certain item.

These observations of mine arise from the fact that there has been a lag in dealing with the various items on our agenda. The intention of these suggestions is simply that we might try to see in a clearer light the problem that you have brought to our attention, Mr. Chairman, and we think that you would earn the gratitude of the Committee if you were, with your wisdom and experience, to draw up a working programme which would help this Committee in carrying out its tasks.

If, in spite of all our efforts, it becomes obvious that the time at our disposal is not sufficient for the Committee to carry out its task, then we should simply have to ask for a prolongation of the duration of the present session. As I said on the first day that the Committee met, there are very important matters before us, on which the peace of many countries depends, but there are also questions on which the prestige of our United Nations Organization depends, and it is rather for this second reason that I make this suggestion to you.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the Committee and I myself should be very grateful to the representative of Greece for the suggestions we have just heard from him. As he knows, my constant concern is that the Committee should devote all necessary time to the study of the various great problems which we have before us. For the same reason, I can assure the representative of Greece that the Chair will devote all its attention to the valuable suggestion he has made and, with the collaboration of the Secretariat, which will be extremely useful, we shall make use of the points that he made.

I should like to take this opportunity to point out to representatives the necessity for their placing their names on the list of speakers. At the moment, I have only two speakers: the representatives of France and Israel.

(The Chairman)

If there were no further speakers for this afternoon, we should perhaps have to close the meeting as soon as we had opened it, which would be a pity. For that reason, I would ask all the members of the Committee who wish to speak to place their names on the list and that, when they speak, they do so in an objective way and without any unpleasantness.

Mr. MOCH (France) (interpretation from French): I do not wish to refer to the particularly thorough statements we have heard this morning. I should like to make a very brief clarification leaving aside everything that was said by the representative of the Soviet Union dealing with questions other than disarmament, which is the only item now on our agenda. Therefore, I shall not take up anything that was said concerning my Government's attitude, except for a single point which refers to matters of disarmament.

I see on page 14 of the English text of the speech we have just heard in Russian that, "unfortunately, as is known," it was not possible to reach agreement and that "this is due, first of all, to the fact that the representatives of the United States, Britain and France have persistently evaded any agreement on disarmament."

This is a judgement which falls quite precisely within our present agenda. I should like to recall, especially to our colleagues who were not present at earlier sessions of the General Assembly -- and there are many of them, at which fact I am gratified -- that France has constantly followed a policy of conciliation in the matter of disarmament and that for the six years during which I have been in charge of the French delegation on this subject we have proliferated our proposals -- in 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955 and 1956 -- and that, accordingly, ~~it is a somewhat one-sided view of past events to say that we have constantly evaded any effort towards conciliation.~~

I may add that, in spite of this assessment, which I take up in terms which can shock no one, the French delegation will pursue indefatigably its attempt to bring the points of view closer together.

Mr. COMAY (Israel): I ask for leave to intervene on a brief point of order. In the earlier part of his statement the representative of the Soviet Union referred to the situation in the Middle East, and in the course of his remarks he also made certain reflections on my Government.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation accepts your view sincerely that this is not the time or the place to reopen the discussions which have taken place in the General Assembly concerning recent events in the Middle East.

Therefore, my delegation will confine itself to putting on record that, in so far as the Soviet representative's remarks referred to my Government, they do not accurately or fairly reflect the facts.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Are there any further speakers for this morning or this afternoon? In this rather unfortunate situation, there being no further speakers, I shall be compelled to cancel this afternoon's meeting. In the meantime I shall have time to think about the suggestions made by the representative of Greece.

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.