



Wednesday, 13 December 1950, at 3 p.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
International control of atomic energy ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	639

*President:* Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

### International control of atomic energy (*concluded*)

[Agenda item 26]

1. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution [A/1668 and Corr.1] which is now before the Assembly. We are anxious, as all, or at least almost all Member States must be, that any progress that can be made towards agreement on the control of atomic energy and on the regulation and reduction of armaments should be made. The threat of an atomic war which hangs over the world is regarded with horror by the people of all countries. It is equally repugnant to us that we should be forced to devote such large proportions of our national budgets to the strengthening of our armed forces and the amassing of what are called conventional armaments. Our experiences in the last war, which are still only too recent and vivid, have shown us what destruction and suffering can be wrought by these conventional weapons, and there is every reason to fear that any future world war, even if atomic weapons were not used, would be the more terrible and would indeed threaten the very basis of human civilization.

2. There can therefore be no question of our desire, and the desire of every sane man, to bring about agreements which would establish effective international control of atomic energy, ensuring the prohibition of atomic weapons, and also measures to regulate and reduce conventional armaments, which are equally essential for real world peace and security.

3. I confess that the immediate prospect of any agreement, either on atomic energy or on disarmament, seems to me very small, and I think we should be deluding the peoples of the world if we, in the United Nations, were to adopt any resolution which glossed over the realities of the present situation, unpleasant though they may be, and which promised a quick solution, when we know that there is not at the moment that minimum degree of international confidence and co-operation which would make such agreement possible.

4. It may sound, I know, like a confession of failure to say that for the time being we see little hope of any real progress. But what is the alternative? To elaborate a form of words which might give the impression that something was being achieved, but which would in fact do nothing to preserve mankind from the menace of a new war and might indeed increase the danger of future aggression? It is very easy to coin slogans such as "Ban the atomic bomb!" And we all know how the Soviet propaganda machine tries to exploit in this way the genuine desire of people all over the world for security against this terrible weapon. But what value can we attach to the assurances of the USSR about its peaceful intentions and its desire to reach agreement on atomic energy so long as it rejects the only plan which has yet been worked out for effective control of atomic energy and effective prohibition of atomic weapons?

5. I do not now propose to go over all the old ground. This subject was exhaustively debated at the last session of the Assembly, and in my view the statement presented by the five Powers on 25 October 1949<sup>1</sup> still represents the best analysis of the two opposing points of view. I am afraid that since that time very few new elements have emerged. We stand by the plan approved by the Assembly in 1948 [*resolution 191 (III)*], while the Soviet Union brings up again and again the proposals which it put forward in 1946<sup>2</sup> and 1947<sup>3</sup>. These proposals were found to be inadequate at that time, and although they have been examined and re-examined since then, they are still found wanting. Nothing which Mr. Vyshinsky has said this year [*321st meeting*] or last year suggests that the USSR would accept a system of international control which would be effective and enforceable not only in the democratic countries but, above all, in the Soviet Union itself.

6. It is really no good Mr. Vyshinsky repeating what he has said time after time — that it is all the fault of

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Supplement No. 15.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, Third Year, Special Supplement, Annex 3 (A).*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Annex 3 (B) and (C).

the American monopolists. It is of course true that the bomb is being manufactured in the United States through the instrumentality of private companies, but this fact is quite irrelevant to the actual issue, which is that, in the absence of an agreed system of international control, such manufacture is essential not for purposes of profit, but for the defence of the free world against aggression.

7. It seems in any case that the only cure Mr. Vyshinsky can suggest for our ills is that the American system of free enterprise should be replaced by a system in which the United States economy, I suppose, is centrally controlled by a small body of men who are replaced at intervals by purges resulting in a series of judicial assassinations. It is open, of course, to Mr. Vyshinsky, since he has played such a prominent part in this system of government, to assert that it is a good one. But it is extremely doubtful whether the American people, at any rate, will think it is preferable to their present system. In any case, if Mr. Vyshinsky's communist system were introduced in the United States, it is not in the least clear that the new United States government would not create some super-monopoly which might really be a menace to the peace of the world. The argument, in fact, is bogus and only put forward to distract popular attention from the real issue.

8. What, in any case, are we to make of the argument of the USSR representative that the atomic bomb must instantly be banned because of its appalling effect, and of his simultaneous assertion that it has little or no military value? Or of his argument that the Soviet Union — unlike the capitalist world, of course — is using atomic energy only for peaceful purposes, while the USSR Government asserts that in the event of war it would be able to use the atomic bomb with tremendous effect?

9. I pause at this point to inquire how many more mountains have been moved by the Government of the Soviet Union since Mr. Vyshinsky made the same speech last year. Has the creation of a new range in central Asia increased the standard of living of the Soviet people? These are questions to which we should certainly like to know the answers. But Mr. Vyshinsky told us nothing about these things, and this seems to indicate, I suggest, that such small amounts of uranium as the USSR Government has been able to extort from Germany and Czechoslovakia have been put to quite a different purpose.

10. Finally, what indeed are we to make of Mr. Vyshinsky's central argument, around which his speech was built as it was built up last year and the year before, the argument that international control is essential but that sovereignty must in all circumstances remain inviolate?

11. Indeed, in view of all these contradictions, for Mr. Vyshinsky to talk any more of capitalist contradictions is really rather ironical. His communist contradictions are in fact so staggering that we can only hope that they will be detected by the faithful even in Outer Mongolia.

12. One point, but only one point, was new in what Mr. Vyshinsky said — at any rate unless I understood

it wrong. He sought to insinuate that the atomic bomb was being constructed in the United States only for use against Asian peoples, by which presumably he meant peoples of Asia other than those in the Soviet Union. It is quite evident why this malicious suggestion was made; it was in order to embroil the western with the Asian peoples, and particularly to cause alarm and despondency in Peking.

13. Our position, therefore, is the reverse of the position taken up by Mr. Vyshinsky. We stand by the majority plan for the control of atomic energy, while the Soviet Union, of course, rejects this plan and stands by its proposals of 1946 and 1947.

14. There seems to be some feeling that in these circumstances it is we who must compromise, perhaps because in the past the western Powers have so often shown themselves willing to make compromises in the hope of reaching agreement with the USSR, while the latter has almost invariably stood rigidly by its own point of view and refused to make any concessions whatever to the will of the majority. It is also sometimes said that the majority plan is too rigid and elaborate, and that many of its provisions could be dropped or watered down without any real risk. I wish this were so. We certainly do not claim that the majority plan is the best which could be devised, but we do say that it is the best which has so far been devised and we cannot abandon it unless and until we are persuaded that something better is available.

15. It is perhaps natural that when faced by an apparently unbreakable deadlock on such a vital matter as atomic energy, there should be suggestions for some half-way house, some temporary agreement or armistice which might halt the race in the production of atomic weapons. We should be entirely in favour of any such proposal if we could be sure, or even reasonably confident, that it would in fact halt the production of atomic weapons on both sides and not merely on one side. But suppose we were to agree to a plan which depended for its execution entirely on the good faith of the nations concerned and not on any watertight system of international control. Knowing what we do of the USSR record since 1945, of the secrecy on which the whole Soviet system of government is based, of the rigid exclusion of all external contacts and communications by the countries behind the iron curtain, what reliance could we place on any assurances on the part of the Soviet Union that it would at once destroy any atomic bombs which it might have been able to produce and would forthwith cease to produce any more?

16. In August 1939, when the treaty between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union was finally concluded, Hitler is reported to have said: "Now I have the world in my grasp." He may well have said so, for he was very nearly proved to be right. I can well imagine that if we agreed to any plan for the immediate prohibition of atomic weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles without the certain knowledge that the USSR would do likewise, Stalin would say, and with reason: "Now I have the world in my grasp."

17. We must therefore continue to work for and insist on a plan of international control in which we can all have confidence. The immediate outlook may

be very unpromising, but given time and patience none of the world's problems need prove insoluble. We, for our part, stand ready at all times to undertake further consultations or negotiations if there is even the smallest chance that they will bring us nearer to any real settlement.

18. The present draft resolution does, in our opinion, afford such a chance — a small chance, but a chance. Hitherto, the work on atomic energy and on disarmament has been pursued in separate United Nations commissions. In our view, there was much to be said for this arrangement, since the control of atomic energy poses very special problems which are different in kind as well as in degree from the problems presented by conventional weapons. We still feel that the two subjects need different treatment, and there can, in our view, be no question of scrapping the work which has been done on them in the hope that some new and all-embracing plan might be elaborated and applied without discrimination to both. But even though the treatment of atomic energy and conventional armaments may need to be different, the two problems are obviously closely related.

19. If an agreement were reached which could effectively prohibit the manufacture and use of atomic weapons, the threat of war would not be removed so long as mass armies were still being mobilized and trained, and war, if it came, would be only one degree less terrible than if atomic weapons were also used.

20. It is therefore clear that if the peace of the world is to be securely established, control systems must be worked out and applied both to atomic energy and to conventional armaments, and the method and timing of such controls must be closely co-ordinated.

21. This aspect of the question has not been given very detailed study in the past, and the work of the proposed committee may therefore be of considerable value. The task of the committee is a relatively modest one, but in present circumstances this seems to us to be both prudent and honest.

22. We should be doing a disservice to the world if we were to promise more than we can achieve at the moment. The free world is now resisting aggression in Korea, and the immediate task and duty must be to strengthen still further the defences of the free world against the possibility or threat of future cases of aggression. At the same time, we must abandon the hope of eventual agreement or relax our efforts to attain it.

23. It is in accordance with these principles that my delegation will support the joint draft resolution, and we hope that it will be approved by the overwhelming majority of the Assembly.

24. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): It is clear that the circumstances in which we are now debating the question of the control of atomic energy and atomic weapons are somewhat different from those envisaged by many at the time when it was decided [285th meeting] to bypass the discussion of this question in committee and to bring it directly before the General Assembly. At that time we were all aware that we were not dealing with an academic or technical question, but that we were dealing with the problem of control

of a weapon whose horrendous potentialities were already so needlessly demonstrated at Nagasaki and Hiroshima. We were already aware that we were dealing with an instrument for the mass extermination of people, the use of which had already deeply troubled the conscience of the world. It was already clear that no elaborate system of simultaneous translation was needed to make intelligible to us the deep and powerful cry pealing forth from all humanity, demanding that we of the United Nations should act at once and decisively to render forever impotent the threat of atomic weapons.

25. But the full importance and timelessness of this problem was often overlooked. Since that time, events have taken place and new threats have been made which pose this question before mankind in its awful reality, and therefore gives to this discussion its character of timelessness and great significance. For it is evident that with President Truman's statement that the use of the atomic bomb remains under "active consideration", we have passed to a new phase of the threat of atomic warfare which has been with us for the past few years. For the past few years we have been treated with the barbarous spectacle of war-mongers, both semi-official and private, calling for the immediate use of the atomic bomb against the USSR. For the past few months we have been hearing demands by war-mongers for the use of the atomic weapon to further the purposes of United States aggression in Korea. And for the past few weeks we have been hearing a mounting demand from the same war-mongers that this weapon of mass extermination should be immediately employed against the Soviet Union, against the People's Republic of China and the People's Republic of Korea.

26. On Thursday, 30 November, however, it was made patent that the cries of those war-mongers were not the futile howling of a pack of wolves. For on that day, brushing aside the fiction that the forces under General MacArthur are United Nations forces with the statement that the United States feels free to use the atomic bomb without consultation, and brushing aside the clear meaning of General Assembly resolution 1 (I) of 24 January 1946, by which in effect the United Nations outlawed the use of the atomic weapon, the President of the United States openly declared that his finger was on the trigger and that he would not hesitate to pull it if he so decided.

27. All of us are aware of the tidal wave of horrified response that greeted that statement. It was a wave of horror, indignation and anger, the impact of which was felt throughout this Organization. There should be no illusion that the reaction of the overwhelming majority of mankind to that projected use of the atomic bomb is anything else than that such action is immoral, inhuman and impermissible. The truth of this is demonstrated, for instance, by the statement of almost two hundred Labour Party members of Parliament to the effect that British troops should be pulled out of Korea if the atomic bomb were used, and by the haste with which the French Government authorized the issuance of a statement to the effect that the Korean objectives were not important enough to justify the use of the atomic bomb.

28. The more than four years of discussion of this question, made sterile by the deliberate intransigence of the United States, with the acquiescence of the majority, have therefore achieved only this result; it has brought us to the point where the overwhelming majority of mankind places an "either/or" alternative before this Organization. The alternative is that either the United Nations takes definite steps to outlaw the scourge of atomic warfare, or this Organization defeats whatever moral standing it still retains among the peoples of the world. Either it breaks loose from the immoral and untenable position into which the United States has forced it, or it takes upon itself the inevitable consequences of the just wrath of the peoples against those who first would use this instrument of aggression and mass extermination of peoples, or who by their silence and inaction acquiesce in its use.

29. It cannot be said that the majority of the Members of this Organization were not forewarned of the precise dilemma in which they now find themselves. When, in March 1950, the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress first advanced what has come to be known by the historic name of the Stockholm Appeal, the war-mongers everywhere tried to push that appeal into oblivion by deriding it as a communist manoeuvre or another trick of Soviet propaganda; but only a few brief months were necessary to give the lie to such demagoguery, because it became increasingly clear that the Stockholm Appeal was an expression of the broadest and most formidable mass movement for peace in the history of humanity.

30. No cry of trick or fraud can obscure the fact that 500 million people — and that means almost half the adult population of the world — have affixed their signatures to an appeal demanding the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon of aggression and mass extermination of human beings, and the institution of strict international control to enforce this. No cry of trick or fraud can obscure the fact that 500 million people have declared that they will regard as guilty of war crimes the government which is the first to use the atomic weapon against any country. No cry of trick or fraud can obscure the fact that 500 million people of all races and nationalities, of all political and religious views, have affixed their signatures to an appeal which puts forward the only just and moral course of action this Organization can take.

31. It was the mass movement for peace, expressed in the signing of the Stockholm Appeal, that received organized expression in the World Peace Congress recently held in Warsaw. At that congress, to which my country was proud to play the host, representatives of almost 800 million people, in an appeal directly addressed to this Organization [A/1660], again expressed the demand that the United Nations should take action to prohibit unconditionally all types of atomic weapons and declare its intention of branding as a war criminal the first government which employs atomic or other means of mass destruction. A world council of peace was created to observe the implementation of this desire. The World Peace Congress, the World Peace Council and the signatures to the Stockholm Appeal are the response of the peoples of the

world to the fact that the guidance for which they looked to the United Nations is not forthcoming; they express the decision of the peoples of the world to take the initiative in their own hands, to build a strong front of peace, to bar any possibility of a war of annihilation and destruction, to prevent any use of instruments of mass extermination of human beings.

32. Hence it cannot be said, I repeat, that the majority of the Members of this Organization were not forewarned that any such statement as that made by the President of the United States would call forth, not only from those who have signed the Stockholm Appeal, but from all mankind, the demand that the United Nations should act at once to interdict the projected use of atomic weapons.

33. The Members of this Organization must ask themselves the question that is today being asked the world over. Why is it that the United Nations, after more than four years of discussion, has taken no action to achieve real control of atomic energy, prohibit atomic warfare, destroy existing stockpiles of atomic weapons and thus create conditions for realizing the enormous potentialities for good presented by the discovery of atomic fission?

34. The answer to this question is one of which the majority of the Members of this Organization are well aware, an answer which they find it increasingly difficult to conceal from their own peoples. It lies in the foreign policy of the United States and in the military and strategic calculations designed to implement that policy. It is here that we find the reasons why the United States has ruthlessly and recklessly placed every possible obstacle in the way of achieving any solution or compromise on the question before it. That foreign policy, it has been made clear, is one designed to further the mad ambitions of the ruling circles of the United States for world domination.

35. Even before the end of the war against fascism, those ambitions had become self-evident. With the end of the war, they began to be expressed openly in policies designed to establish United States hegemony over the world, to subordinate the economics and governments of other countries to United States aims, to enslave other countries and peoples and to unleash a new war.

36. The United States emerged from the war practically untouched, with a tremendous apparatus to be kept going at a profit, on the one hand, and with a shrinking internal and world capitalist market on the other, with vast economic and military power at its disposal and its imperialist rivals either crushed or vastly weakened. The ruling circles of the United States therefore considered the moment propitious for embarking upon an attempt to fulfil their long-cherished aim, world empire, to achieve that mad goal and to bolster the badly shaken system of world capitalism by war against the countries of socialism and by crushing the resurgent national liberation movements of the colonial peoples.

37. It is this and this alone that explains every aspect of the post-war foreign policy of the United States: the Marshall Plan, with its motive of destroying the

sovereignty of the countries of western Europe and forcing them into the war schemes of Washington; the Truman doctrine, which stands revealed in all its nakedness in the ravaging of Greece; the North Atlantic Treaty which was openly proclaimed a pact for war against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies

38. It is these openly expansionist and aggressive aims of the United States that explain the scrapping of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements; the renazification and remilitarization of western Germany; the freeing of war criminals and restoration to power of the Mitsuis and Mitsubishi in Japan; the vast aid given to the rotten and corrupt Chiang Kai-shek clique; the arming of reactionary governments and the support of every fascist clique the world over. It is these aggressive aims that explain the monstrous growth of the military budget, the war preparations of the United States Government and the plague-like spread of its air and naval bases in every corner of the world into which it has been able to bribe or bully its way.

39. It was clear from the start that it was not upon dollars or productive capacity or ordinary military weapons alone that the ruling circles of the United States placed their chief reliance in satisfying their insane ambitions for world domination. Uppermost in their calculations was the belief that their monopoly of the atomic bomb gave them the sole possession of a supreme weapon, an irresistible force before which all and everything must yield. To create the proper impression, the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were arranged, with enormous cost in lives, with this instrument of mass destruction of which they thought they had exclusive possession. They felt that they could intimidate and blackmail other nations and peoples into complete submission. If that failed, the atomic bomb could come into its own as a perfect military weapon for achieving United States world domination.

40. This latter conception was advanced at the time only by the most rabidly imperialist elements, who fallaciously assumed that a knock-out blow could be delivered in a *blitzkrieg* fashion by a fleet of bombers carrying atomic bombs and by rockets with atomic warheads. It is well known, of course, that this policy of intimidation achieved only dismal failure as regards its effect upon those against whom it was chiefly directed — the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. It cannot be said, however, that the policy of the atomic bomb blackmail did not achieve certain results and did not gain some Pyrrhic victories. The support given by the majority of the Members of this Organization to the completely unworkable and unacceptable Baruch plan is evidence of that fact. It will pay us to look briefly at the sad history of the discussions of this plan which only this afternoon was described as the only possible solution.

41. It will be recalled that on 24 January 1946, at the first session of the General Assembly, a resolution was passed directing the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission. In order to understand the causes of the failure of the Atomic Energy Commission one must go back to 14 June 1946,<sup>4</sup> when the Baruch

report was laid before the Commission. In a tone of almost biblical self-righteousness, Bernard Baruch presented the United States plan. It was clear from the start that that proposal for an international atomic development authority was intended to guarantee for the United States a virtual monopoly in the entire field of atomic energy, a monopoly to be ensured by the fact that within the international authority, in the foreseeable future at least, there would be a majority amenable to United States dictation. Not satisfied with this, however, Mr. Baruch demanded that the principle of the unanimity of the great Powers should be eliminated, that the sovereignty of nations should be eliminated. However, the basic questions of the elimination of atomic weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles were left to the discretion of the majority of the members of the authority, which could, of course, prolong indefinitely the existence of the growing United States stockpile of bombs.

42. Throughout the interminable months of debate in the Atomic Energy Commission, it became clear that the United States had adopted a "take it or leave it" position — as Mr. Baruch expressed it — on the plan, and was not prepared to accept any genuine compromise.

43. The repeated efforts of the Soviet Union delegation and of my delegation, which at that time was a member of the Security Council, to bring the points at issue to a compromise, were coldly rebuffed time and again. Thus when the USSR, in its desire for a solution, agreed to provisions for freedom of inspection whereby the inspectors would have "unimpeded rights of ingress, egress and access . . . into, from and within the territory of every participating nation, unhindered by national or local authorities",<sup>5</sup> and whereby the organs of inspection would operate "on the basis of their own rules, which should provide for the adoption of decisions, in appropriate cases, by a majority vote",<sup>6</sup> even then the United States declined to explore the merging area of agreement on this crucial point.

44. The proposals of the Soviet Union of 11 June 1947<sup>7</sup> expounding those it had advanced in 1946, contained a comprehensive scheme of control based on international inspection as well as an outline of an organization for scientific research in the field of atomic energy. Before submitting the plan, the USSR, in its efforts towards a compromise, had agreed that all decisions within the competence of the control agency should be adopted by an ordinary majority and that, in case of violation, Article 51 of the Charter should be applied. The Soviet Union also agreed that countries should be allotted quotas for production and consumption at every stage of the work, from mining to the release of atomic energy.

45. It was clear to all at the time that the USSR proposals constituted a well-rounded plan aiming at a sound compromise which would guarantee the legitimate positions of all the parties concerned and which therefore afforded a basis for a workable agreement. Events showed, however, that the United States was bent upon preventing any agreement, believing that

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, First Year, Special Supplement, page 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Third Year, Special Supplement, page 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, page 22.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, First Year, No. 1* (1st meeting).

it had a monopoly of atomic energy secrets. The United States considered that monopoly to be a major weapon in its power politics and was not prepared to give up its use, either in war or in peace, as a weapon of pressure, blackmail and extortion.

46. At the third session of the General Assembly, in Paris, the United States delegation came to the United Nations with the determination — and with the assurance, or so it thought, at least, that the majority of delegations would be prepared to follow it and assist it — to anaesthetize the Atomic Energy Commission and withdraw the disposal of one of the most crucial problems of our time from the limelight of world public opinion, placing the blame for the failure on the USSR. That, the United States thought, would permit it to pursue an unimpeded course of building up an ever greater stockpile of atomic weapons and gradually capturing control of uranium resources the world over.

47. The pressure of public opinion and the intense desire for peace of peoples everywhere put a snag in the implementation of those aims of the United States. So strong was the impact of the stand taken at the third session of the General Assembly by the representatives of the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR, so strong was the response of the peoples of the world to the Soviet Union proposal for an immediate pact to bring about the reduction by one-third of the armaments of the great Powers,<sup>8</sup> that the United States and its associates had to back down on the issue of discarding the Atomic Energy Commission. The resolution for the suspension of the Commission<sup>9</sup> and the accusation against the USSR were withdrawn. The resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly [*resolution 191 (III)*], although its final version was unsatisfactory from the point of view of establishing a genuine possibility of agreement, nevertheless directed the Atomic Energy Commission to resume its activities and the possibility was preserved, at least theoretically, for continued negotiations among the Powers.

48. There is no doubt that a certain climax was reached in the discussion in Paris when, in his desire to reach an agreement, the chairman of the Soviet Union delegation, Mr. Vyshinsky, demonstrated to the world the genuineness of his country's intention to arrive at a solution of the impasse on the atomic energy question.

49. It will be recalled that throughout the whole debate on that question, and in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 1 (I) and 41 (I) of 24 January and 14 December 1946, the USSR and Poland demanded in the Security Council that in settling the question of control of atomic energy, priority should be given to the adoption of a convention outlawing the atomic bomb and ordering the destruction of existing stockpiles.

I submit that the validity of that approach continues to be unquestionable today, yet in order to

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Plenary Meetings*, page 135, and *ibid.*, *Annexes*, document A/723.

<sup>9</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year*, Nos. 83 and 88.

remove any lingering suspicion and to facilitate the needed agreement, the USSR expressed its willingness to accept a simultaneous enactment of both conventions, one dealing with international control and the other with the prohibition of atomic weapons.

50. Amidst an immense wave of hope, amidst optimistic reactions the world over, responsible statesmen who were genuinely concerned about a peaceful settlement of outstanding international issues looked to the United States for the next move, but their statements betrayed a lack of knowledge of the real aims pursued by American business, military and political leadership. The answer was a resounding "No", while the American people, subjected as they are to the fury of the spying witch-hunt hysteria, were not given even a chance to examine the Soviet Union attitude. The summary and curt fashion in which the United States Government rebuffed that proposal, the cursory way in which the American Press reported it, left little room for doubt as to the real intent of the ruling circles of the United States to preserve what they hoped would be their monopoly in the field of atomic energy.

51. The Baruch plan and the policy of atomic bomb blackmail and intimidation received the most staggering setback when, during the period between the third and fourth sessions of the General Assembly, a new situation arose — when the world learned that the United States could no longer even claim monopoly of the atomic bomb. What is more, the world learned that at the very time when the United States had been bent on the utilization of atomic energy for destructive purposes and had obstructed every attempt made in the United Nations to resolve the problem of atomic energy and atomic warfare, the USSR had been putting atomic energy to work in the performance of great tasks of peaceful reconstruction.

52. No cheap irony, no cheap jokes will belittle that fact. The world learned that in the socialist Soviet Union atomic energy was being used to carry out vast economic plans, that it was being utilized for the blowing up of mountains, changing the course of rivers, irrigating deserts and laying out new lines of life where human foot had never trod. The world learned that in the USSR atomic energy was being used to advance the welfare of the Soviet people and to further the real progress of human culture.

53. The announcement by President Truman that the Soviet Union was also in possession of the atomic "know-how" and the atomic bomb had, it will be recalled, the effect of a bombshell in the United States. The American people, who had been bullied by demagoguery into believing that their security rested solely upon the myth of the American atomic bomb monopoly, felt betrayed, let down. Their weapon, the American atomic bomb, had ceased to be in the possession of the United States alone. Their false feeling of security had been shattered to pieces. How did the government react? The government ordered the preparation of better bombs, meaning bombs which would destroy more, cause more destruction and kill more people. The famous hydrogen bomb was born of that fear.

54. One would have been justified in believing, at that time, that the fact that the alleged monopoly of atomic weapons by the United States had proved to

be non-existent would exert some influence on the foreign policy of the United States and would help to advance the control of atomic energy and the universal and unconditional prohibition of its use in war. The debates which took place during the fourth session of the General Assembly<sup>10</sup> proved that that was not the case; they proved that while the USSR was continuously maintaining its position for the prohibition of atomic weapons, the destruction of existing stockpiles and the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes the world over, the United States was insisting even more intransigently that it would permit the adoption of its own proposals only.

55. The draft resolution submitted jointly by Canada and France and approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee<sup>11</sup> was, as my delegation pointed out at that time, only another version of the position of the United States. It prolonged and sanctioned the existing impasse, while the draft resolution of the USSR<sup>12</sup> again demonstrated the sincere and constructive efforts of that Power in the field of control of atomic energy. The Soviet Union demanded effective action. Its proposal was rejected.

56. Among the ruling circles of the United States, the faint line of demarcation separating those who had viewed the atomic bomb solely as an instrument of intimidation or as an irresistible weapon in the event that intimidation did not succeed, and those who had been calling for the immediate use of the atomic bomb in a so-called preventive war, grew increasingly faint. Adventurously sweeping aside the new reality created by the loss of what they had thought was their monopoly, the ruling circles of the United States projected a foreign policy and strategic plans based on the determination to have more, bigger and more destructive bombs, to use them, and to use them first. It is this that explains the increased feverishness with which the United States Government began to increase its stockpile of atomic weapons, to speed up its development of bacteriological and chemical means of mass destruction. It is now its intention to strive to create what the world has correctly named the "hell bomb", and it has appropriated millions of dollars for that purpose.

57. It is incontestable, therefore, that the entire foreign policy and military strategy of the United States, the entire system of what is hypocritically named "United States security", is based upon the intention to keep the atomic weapon. The representatives of the United States made this more than clear when they cynically declared that even if all mankind signed the Stockholm Appeal, it would not influence their way of thinking.

58. In the light of what I have just stated, it is easy to understand the entire history of our discussions on the question of atomic energy. No elaborate statement, such as we heard from my predecessor, will change these basic facts, nor will references to the new

prophet of certain States, Adolf Hitler, change the fact that the Soviet Union has always adopted a position which, if accepted, would lead towards control and prohibition and would guarantee the economic development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes on a basis of equality. On the other hand the United States, in producing the Baruch plan as the only solution, has sought to maintain a monopoly for the purpose of blackmailing the world and furthering its imperialist aims. We need not go further to explain the stubbornness with which the United States, and the mechanical majority which it commands in this Organization, cling to that plan in spite of the fact that they know that it is unacceptable to the USSR, the country which also possesses atomic energy and which proposes to destroy atomic bombs after others have subscribed to the prohibition of that weapon. They stick to this plan in spite of the great criticism which has been expressed in many circles and from many sources, including United States and British scientists.

59. It is quite clear to everyone that the Baruch plan was not intended to be accepted by the Soviet Union. It was devised with the full knowledge that its terms were unacceptable to any State which wished to have the right of sovereign development. It was destined to be rejected. It was first advanced in a period when it was thought that the United States possessed a monopoly and that the USSR would not have atomic energy for many years to come. The Baruch plan was intended to harness all the atomic energy research of the allies of the United States to the direct aims and requirements of the United States' drive for world domination. At the same time, it was intended that the rejection of the Baruch plan by the Soviet Union should be used as a potential weapon of propaganda in an anti-Soviet campaign, as it was used this afternoon by the representative of the United Kingdom. The idea, as practised by him, was to heap accusations upon the USSR for having rejected the plan and thus place that country in the position of allegedly constituting the main obstacle to the control of atomic energy and atomic weapons.

60. This, I am sure, is clear even to those who support the position of the United States on this question. It is therefore unnecessary for my delegation once again to analyse the details of the Baruch plan or to expose it point by point. The discussion we have had for more than four years has made it quite plain that the United States has no intention and never had any intention of yielding to any international control; that it will continue to refuse to accept any compromise; and that the sole alternative which it proposes is acceptance of United States domination and control of all atomic energy resources and its exclusive right to possess atomic weapons and atomic energy.

61. The balance sheet is clear. One has to admit—and I do so with great regret—that the United Nations has not fulfilled its duty of finding a solution to this problem. It has yielded to the strategic interests of the United States and to the designs of that country for world domination. It has continued to yield to the United States despite the increasingly evident contradictions in the proposals advanced by that country.

<sup>10</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 252nd to 254th meetings inclusive, and *ibid.*, *Ad Hoc Political Committee*, 30th to 37th meetings inclusive.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, *Fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, Annex*, document A/1119.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, document A/1120.

62. The clumsiness with which the delegation of the United States has tried to conceal the falseness and untenability of its positions is most clearly revealed in its latest manoeuvre. It will be recalled that when the movement for signatures to the Stockholm Appeal first began, the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, tried to ridicule it, to disregard it, to pretend that it did not exist and to bury his head in the sand. Soon, however, when the signatures to the appeal kept exceeding all expectations, Mr. Acheson had to take a new tack. On 12 July 1950, Mr. Acheson stated that the type of weapon used was quite incidental. Thus he bluntly declared and admitted that he did not consider the prohibition of atomic weapons at all necessary and that the goals presented in the appeal were unacceptable to the United States Government.

63. Following Mr. Acheson's line of reasoning, the President of the United States, speaking before the United Nations on 24 October [295th meeting], tried to put all weapons on the same level, thereby trying to link up the prohibition of atomic weapons with general disarmament. It is quite characteristic of the entire policy of the United States that on the question of atomic energy control, when it believed that it had a monopoly of the atomic bomb, it hesitated even to discuss jointly the question of prohibition of the atomic weapon and general disarmament. Now, all of a sudden, it sees no difference between the atomic bomb and other types of weapons, and all it is concerned with is aggression. The United Nations was founded to prevent aggression.

64. The imperative necessity to outlaw the atomic bomb, resolved in the first days of the existence of the United Nations, was based on the very nature of this type of weapon, on the fact that it is solely and wholly a weapon of aggression destined to be used for attack, for the destruction of cities and for the mass annihilation of peaceful populations.

65. Less destructive and less cruel weapons have been outlawed and condemned separately. It is enough to mention the conventions on the prohibition of poison gas and the dum-dum bullets. Is it not therefore correct that this weapon, which can be used only as a weapon of aggression and against peaceful cities, a weapon whose military importance is limited, should be treated separately and should be outlawed as one of the first steps in the drive for general disarmament and the creation of a better atmosphere in which further steps would be possible?

66. All the double talk about the identity of weapons and the necessity of joint disarmament, whether the weapons are rifles or atomic bombs, is meant only to confuse the issue, to hide the fact that it is a crime against humanity to use weapons of mass destruction. This attitude has been formulated before this Assembly in a draft resolution which, if we reject and remove all the verbiage of its introductory part, is reduced to this, that the United Nations will be given an opportunity during the coming year to study whether the linking up of the consideration of the problem should or should not be adopted. Then next year we shall be faced with a report which we may discuss and perhaps make amendments and recommendations for further studies.

67. It is clear that in view of the position of the greater part of humanity, expressed in the Stockholm Appeal, in view of the desires and tendencies of all humanity, no disarmament could be rejected. Therefore the problem is reduced to a discussion which would dissolve into technicalities and legal quibbles, and from which no genuine solution, or even any solution at all, could be brought forth.

68. It is therefore clear that by yielding to the pressure of the United States, the majority of the Members of this Organization have condemned themselves to the necessity of following every twist and turn of the manoeuvres of the United States on the question we are now discussing. By supporting the position of the United States on this question, the majority have brought themselves before the court of all mankind, by whom they will be declared no less guilty than those who are preparing atomic warfare.

69. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing in all earnestness, the hope of my delegation that the Members of this Organization will not close this discussion without taking some definitive steps in the direction of real control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons. When we say this, it should be clear that we do so out of a genuine desire for peace and not out of fear. We have made it clear in the past, and we make it clear again, that we consider the brandishing by the United States of the atomic bomb and of the hydrogen bomb as an attempt to blackmail the world, and neither we nor any other people intent on maintaining control over their own destinies will yield before such pressure. No, our only hope is that this Organization may yet take some positive action at this session to resolve this question, and this hope is based on the belief that not all of you will or can close your ears, as the United States would have you do, to the insistent and resounding cry of humanity that the United Nations should act to outlaw the atomic weapon and brand as a war criminal the government that first uses this instrument of mass annihilation.

70. Those of you who seek for a positive course of action do not have to look far. In the proposals which the Soviet Union has placed before us, proposals which my delegation unreservedly supports, we have a plan for which we can vote with the full knowledge that we are meeting all the requirements of the sovereignty of our countries, of logic, workability and morality. These proposals put the issue squarely before the Assembly. They are for the prohibition and the destruction of the stockpiles and the implementation of that through control, which has been made plainly clear. The control must be efficient. We shall have to work through a commission which will act on its own rules of procedure and which will, at the same time, create new hope and new possibilities for co-operation in this world where various social systems are maintained. The simultaneous introduction of both conventions is more timely than ever before, in view of the repeated threats with which we are faced from many circles in the United States.

71. Therefore, before anyone here rushes once again to reject these proposals, I ask you to consider most seriously what it is that you are rejecting. Also, that what we have before us is not purely a USSR proposal. The



proposals which are contained in the Soviet Union draft resolution [A/1676], to which we request you to give most serious consideration, embody the demands which, through the Stockholm Appeal and the World Peace Congress, more than 800 million people have individually and collectively placed before us. The peace movement which brought forth the Stockholm Appeal is a great historic event. It directly embraces the greater part of the population of the world. It represents the interests of the human race, the interest of the preservation of culture and civilization from madmen who, in their drive for world domination, would not hesitate to leave the most terrible destruction and an abyss of suffering in their wake. It expresses in the most conscious and emphatic manner the appeal for relief from the threat of atomic bombs that welled forth spontaneously when the President of the United States openly brandished the atomic bomb last week.

72. The peoples of the world, to whom we refer in the first words of our Charter, have thus voiced their desire and demand that what they have hoped for, the United Nations will at last make a reality. They have voiced a demand that atomic weapons, and all other instruments of mass extermination of human beings, should be prohibited and destroyed, thus clearing the way for the universal utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. They have voiced the demand that this gigantic step forward in man's mastery of nature should be used not for the mastery of the many by the few but to promote the welfare and raise the standard of living of the peoples everywhere, to heal the sick, and to make the grass grow green in the desert.

73. And those who do not heed the people, who treat them as pawns to be moved about in the wild game of world conquest, will not long escape the just retribution that will be visited upon them for having failed to act while there was still time.

74. In the name of the Polish delegation, I call upon the Members of this Organization to break the deadlock in which the United States has kept us on this question. Vote for the proposals of the USSR and thus convince the peoples of the world that they can still continue to regard the United Nations as a force for peace.

75. Colonel GHALEB Bey (Egypt): More than five years have elapsed since it was stipulated, in Article 26 of the Charter, that "in order to promote the establishment . . . of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources", plans should be submitted to Members of the United Nations "for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments".

76. The Charter speaks of armaments as a whole. That means all types of weapons used by armed forces. This approach to the problem was maintained in several resolutions of the General Assembly for which my delegation and a great majority of other delegations voted.

77. The consistent and impartial stand taken by the Egyptian delegation, whether in the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the Commission for Conventional Armaments, derives from the correct conception of the General Assembly's resolutions on the question.

78. In its resolution 41 (I) of 14 December 1946, the General Assembly pronounced as an urgent objective the prohibition and elimination from national armaments of atomic and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction, the early establishment of international control of atomic energy and other modern scientific discoveries, and technical developments to ensure their use only for peaceful purposes. In the same resolution it made clear its intention to ensure that the general prohibition, regulation and reduction of armaments were directed towards the major weapons of modern warfare and not merely towards the minor weapons.

79. In its resolution 192 (III) of 19 November 1948, the General Assembly stated "that the aim of the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces can only be attained in an atmosphere of real and lasting improvement in international relations, which implies in particular the application of control of atomic energy involving the prohibition of the atomic weapon".

80. The Egyptian delegation has consistently held the view that the two questions of the prohibition and control of atomic energy, and the regulation and reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, are interrelated and closely connected. That view, based not only on Article 26 of the Charter, but on the subsequent relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, has not been spared criticism.

81. It is not, therefore, without a sense of satisfaction that the Egyptian delegation finds itself readily supporting the joint draft resolution now before us [A/1668 and Corr.1] It can only hope that the draft will receive the unanimous support of the Members of the United Nations. We cannot afford to waste any more time to bring about agreement on this vital issue.

89. Our goal, as frequently expressed by the General Assembly and the two United Nations organs most directly concerned with the problem, can be reached only in an atmosphere of real and lasting improvement in international relations. It is with this object in view that Egypt co-sponsored the two draft resolutions<sup>18</sup> presented to the First Committee regarding the cease-fire in Korea and the question of peace in the Far East.

83. The economic and social advancement of the human race in all parts of the globe necessitates the curtailment of arms expenditures. This can be achieved only if the present tension is relaxed to the extent necessary to lay the foundation of friendly international relations among nations. By voting for the joint draft resolution, which provides that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments should be merged in one disarmament commission, we feel we are lending our support to a practical and, we hope, a fruitful measure that has long been sought.

84. In line with these views, the Egyptian delegation will therefore abstain from voting on the USSR draft resolution [A/1676].

85. We must always bear in mind the fact that the most essential prerequisite for the formation of practical proposals for disarmament is an atmosphere of international confidence and security. In the name of the

<sup>18</sup> See documents A/C.1/641 and A/C.1/642.

living, and in memory of those who have fallen or are now dying, shall we, great and small, strive to achieve that goal?

86. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): There is no need to stress the exceptional importance of the prohibition of the atomic weapon for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. Nevertheless, although the General Assembly has now been considering the question for five sessions, the United Nations has been unable to arrive at a satisfactory solution, namely, the prohibition of atomic energy for military purposes and the establishment of strict international control to ensure observance of such prohibition.

87. It is therefore natural to ask who is responsible for this situation, whose fault it is that the United Nations still cannot adopt the requisite recommendations for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, and who has brought about the deadlock in the Atomic Energy Commission. The responsibility lies with the Anglo-American bloc and, above all, with the ruling circles of the United States. Carried away by feverish plans for world domination, the United States, aided by the United Kingdom, has staked its greatest hopes on the use of the atomic bomb and relies on its superiority in atomic weapons. United States policy on the utilization of the atomic bomb is based on the popular misconception that supremacy in international relations belongs to the country possessing the largest stock of atomic bombs.

88. Thus, although at one time there was much talk in United States official circles about the vast potentialities latent in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, the question is in practice considered only from a military standpoint. The only reason why industry for the production of atomic energy is being developed in the United States is in order to manufacture the atomic weapon, not to satisfy peace-time needs.

89. In the official report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, published in 1949, it is bluntly stated that "the activity of the Atomic Energy Commission receiving major attention has continued to be the production and improvement of atomic weapons". Further on it is stated that "new designs of weapons have been tested and found to be successful, and further developments are now in progress".<sup>14</sup> It is perfectly natural, therefore, that the United States Government should sabotage the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the setting up of a system of effective international control to ensure observance of the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes.

90. The United States ruling circles, acting through certain delegations to the United Nations which are dependent upon them, are pushing through the adoption of such resolutions as suit their purposes. Those resolutions not only do not contribute towards a satisfactory solution of the atomic energy question but, on the contrary, actually hinder the establishment of atomic energy control. The debates on the question of atomic energy in various United Nations organs have shown that the United States ruling circles are not in

the least prepared to give up the use of atomic energy for the production of atomic bombs and do not intend to submit their atomic energy industry to international control. On the contrary, the United States, by stubbornly forcing its plan for atomic energy control on the United Nations, is seeking to place under its control the atomic energy industries of all other countries and to appropriate their reserves of fissionable materials, such as uranium and thorium ore.

91. The United States plan for international control reflects the military and strategic aims of the ruling circles of the United States. Its purpose, therefore, is to confirm the United States in its position of superiority in the production and stockpiling of atomic weapons, and to maintain the economic supremacy of the United States in the world by preventing a rational utilization of atomic energy. This plan not only does not offer guarantees for peace and international security, but it is actually directed against the economic development of other countries, particularly the smaller and insufficiently developed countries for which the use of atomic energy in economic development is of exceptional importance.

92. Under the United States plan, all world resources of atomic raw materials and all atomic energy plants and allied industries are to be handed over to the so-called international control agency which would, in fact, be an American super-trust directed by the chief monopoly groups of the United States. The United States plan would not only fail to restrict but, on the contrary, would encourage the production of atomic weapons by the United States, and would enable the American monopolists to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries under the pretext of control and to subordinate the economic and political development of those countries to their own interests.

93. The attitude of the United States Government to the problem of control of the use of atomic energy was unequivocally stated by President Truman at a Press conference held in February 1950. He said that the Baruch plan was as good then as when it had been worked out, that it had not been revised and that there was no reason to revise it now. Thus the head of the United States Government stated in direct terms that the United States was against the introduction of any control of atomic energy other than the so-called control provided in the Baruch plan.

94. This is also the position of the United Kingdom Government, which is entirely at one with the United States on this matter. That is what we were told today by the United Kingdom representative, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, who, as usual, appeared in the role of attorney for the United States ruling circles.

95. The USSR plan for the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes and, at the same time, the establishment of strict international control to ensure observance of that prohibition, is based on different and, indeed, directly contrary premises. It is designed to ensure, as rapidly as possible, the utilization of atomic energy as a new and inexhaustible source of energy for the acceleration of the development of the national economy of the Soviet Union. The policy of the USSR in the field of atomic energy is aimed at increas-

<sup>14</sup> See *Fifth Semiannual Report of the Atomic Energy Commission*, January 1949, page 40.

ing the welfare of the people of our country. The control plan of the Soviet Union reflects that policy.

96. That plan provides for the establishment, within the framework of the Security Council, of an international control commission which would carry out measures of control of atomic energy facilities and would be empowered to conduct periodical inspections of facilities for the mining of atomic raw materials and for the production of atomic materials and atomic energy.<sup>15</sup>

97. The Soviet Union considers it essential to vest the international control commission with wide powers in keeping with the purposes and requirements of control and inspection, which would ensure the setting up of real international control. Mr. Vyshinsky, the head of the USSR delegation, has listed those powers in full [321st meeting]. It is sufficient to study the provisions regarding those powers and the methods of the international control commission's work to realize that all the assertions of the representatives of the United States and certain other countries concerning the allegedly unsatisfactory nature of the Soviet Union plan of control do not bear scrutiny and are wholly unfounded. Such allegations are made by the champions of the United States control plan merely in order to discredit the USSR plan and to cover up the defects and the reactionary nature of the United States plan.

98. The Government of the Soviet Union considers that without the prohibition of the atomic weapon, any control of atomic energy is impossible; control without prohibition would be meaningless and would benefit no one except the United States. That is why the USSR delegation is proposing [A/1676] that the General Assembly should decide in favour of the immediate preparation of conventions on the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of international control to ensure observance of that prohibition, the intention being that they should be drafted and submitted to the Security Council not later than 1 June 1951. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR fully supports that proposal.

99. The United Kingdom representative, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, is insincere when he says that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom now wish to reach agreement with us regarding the utilization of atomic energy and the prohibition of the atomic weapon. Those governments have no such wish. They are doing everything to prevent even the discussion of this question, not to mention the adoption of conventions.

100. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR does not believe that the eight-Power draft resolution [A/1668 and Corr.1] brings us any closer to a satisfactory solution of the atomic energy question, as Sir Gladwyn Jebb asserted today. It is clear, on the contrary, that the purpose of that draft is merely to divert attention from the prohibition of the atomic weapon, which has been demanded by more than 500 million signatories to the Stockholm Appeal throughout the world. The draft represents an attempt to shelve the question of the prohibition of the atomic weapon for at least a year,

thus leaving the United States and its partners free to expand their production of atomic bombs, upon which the military adventurers and war-mongers have come to count more and more.

101. That is why the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR will vote against the eight-Power draft resolution and will support the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation.

102. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Assembly has embarked upon the discussion of one of the most important questions of our time, a question which is causing great anxiety to every human being and to every nation in the world—the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of international control of atomic energy. This question, as we all know, is not new. Every clear-thinking person is aware of the fact that practically nothing has been done so far to implement General Assembly resolutions 1 (I) and 41 (I), of 24 January and 14 December 1946 respectively, on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of control of atomic energy.

103. It may naturally be wondered why nothing has been done and who is to blame for that. It must be said outright that the fault lies definitely with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. I shall endeavour to substantiate this statement by facts and documents.

104. We accuse the ruling circles and the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom of having systematically and stubbornly prevented the United Nations during the past five years from reaching agreement on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the control required to ensure observance of such prohibition. They have tried to cover their refusal to agree to the prohibition of the atomic weapon by idle talk about the precedence of control over prohibition. They have harped incessantly on the Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan, a subject which they have no intention of dropping, but they have not expressed a single new idea which might inspire hope in the solution of this problem.

105. The ruling circles of the United States pretend to be in favour of prohibiting the atomic weapon, but in fact they are stubbornly opposing such prohibition. Yet the peoples of the world are clamouring for the immediate prohibition of the atomic weapon. Every day, in all countries of the world, the movement of the Partisans of Peace is acquiring hundreds of thousands of new members who demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, which is a weapon of intimidation and mass destruction. They call for the establishment of strict international control to ensure observance of the prohibition of the atomic weapon and they hold that the first government to use the atomic weapon against any country will have committed a crime against humanity and must be regarded as a war criminal.

106. Yet this does not deter the blood-thirsty champions of atomic warfare, who openly speak the language of cannibals and war-mongers. In that connexion, the statement made on 18 October 1949 by Mr. Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board,

<sup>15</sup> See *Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, Third Year, Special Supplement*, page 23.

before the House Committee on Armed Services of the United States Congress, is truly significant. He said that there were heavy civilian casualties in the Second World War, particularly when atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and added: "I think the President once told me he figured it [the atomic bomb] saved a quarter of a million American casualties . . . If civilians are going to be killed, I would rather have them their civilians than our civilians . . . I had never thought of the problem in the military establishment being one of morality of war before." Morality, he concluded, was a matter for the State Department, and not for the armed services. It could not be put more clearly.

107. Thus Mr. Symington comes out openly in favour of use of the atomic weapon and considers it to be perfectly normal. In fact, he is surprised that there should be any talk of ethics. He finds it utterly incomprehensible, and indeed peculiar, that millions of people the world over should angrily protest against such ghoulish statements and want to pillory the war-mongers who dream of using atomic and hydrogen bombs in order to reduce to ashes thousands of towns and villages and dozens of millions of human beings.

108. It would be a mistake to think that Mr. Symington was an exception. No, there are a good many Symingtons among the reactionaries in the United States and the United Kingdom. The *Washington Post* of 12 September 1950 reported a statement by Senator Stennis to the effect that the United States had 450 or more perfected atomic bombs, enough to drop fifty bombs on every major city in the USSR. That is Senator Stennis' dream.

109. Such statements must make it perfectly clear to everyone that those who want to further their plans for empire by means of the atomic bomb have not become resigned to the failure of their policy of blackmail and intimidation. Even now they are endeavouring to create a panic by their propaganda of hate.

110. It is common knowledge that the USSR mastered the secret of atomic energy production in an unbelievably short time, thereby putting an end to the United States monopoly in that field. The war-mongers are nevertheless continuing their propaganda for a new war and encouraging the armaments race, including the manufacture of the atomic weapon. They are resolutely opposed to peace. They say straight out that the United States cannot afford to accept a programme of disarmament in respect of the atomic weapon. They threaten to "shower" the peoples of other countries with atomic bombs.

111. This anthropophagous doctrine has even found a theoretician in the United States, in the person of Theodor Rosebury, a professor at Columbia University, who favours using atomic bombs in a future war. In his book *Peace or Pestilence*, which has been published in the United States, he says that it makes little difference whether a man dies an easy or a painful death, since the result is the same, and adds: "A man can be no deadlier than dead."<sup>16</sup> This brings him to the following conclusion: "In my opinion to single out biological warfare—

or any other weapon or kind of warfare—as particularly 'horrible' or ethically 'worse' can find neither useful purpose nor justification."<sup>17</sup>

112. It is quite obvious that such mental gymnastics on the part of the learned lackeys of atomic imperialism constitute further damning proof of the utter corruption and moral decadence of the capitalist system.

113. It is therefore not surprising that Senator Mundt, speaking at a dinner at the Elizabeth Carteret Hotel on 25 April 1950, should have urged the American people to launch a world-wide massacre by means of atomic bombs. When the war comes, he said, as it is bound to come, the United States must drop a sufficient number of atomic bombs to destroy the country which is their target.

114. I could cite hundreds of such ghoulish statements, but the examples I have given are sufficient to enable anyone to draw the proper conclusions.

115. President Truman, in line with the general aggressive trend of United States policy, has also repeatedly stated that he will not hesitate to use the atomic bomb if necessary.

116. The attitude of the Anglo-American bloc on this question is determined by the general aggressive policy of the ruling circles of the United States and the United Kingdom. For a number of years now a violent propaganda campaign has been waged to sway world public opinion in favour of a new war; instead of being allowed to die down, this propaganda and this atomic blackmail are being intensified under every possible pretext, the whole purpose being to justify the mad armaments race, including the manufacture of atomic weapons.

117. According to the calculations of economists, the United States has invested \$4,500 million in the production of atomic weapons, while the work on the hydrogen bomb brings the yearly expenditure to over \$1,000 million.

118. It may be of interest to note a statement by Gordon Dean, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. When asked by reporters whether he spent the greater part of his time and thought on producing the atomic bomb and dropping it on somebody, he answered that he could say, in all frankness, that the main efforts were currently directed to turning atomic energy into weapons and producing those atomic weapons at a faster rate. His answer was clear: the production of atomic bombs must be expanded and speeded up.

119. The United States monopolists are growing fat on the production of the means of mass destruction, which is already bringing them profits running into thousands of millions of dollars. The Press is spreading provocative rumours about the necessity of taking special measures for United States defence and frightening the public with descriptions of the havoc that may be wreaked by the atomic bomb.

120. The representatives of big capital, the Morgans, du Ponts, Mellons and others—the true masters of atomic energy in the United States—are carrying on a mad atomic armaments race, and at the same time they are doing their utmost to prevent the use of atomic

<sup>16</sup> See Rosebury, Theodor, *Peace or Pestilence*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, Toronto, London, 1949, page 175.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, page 181.

energy for peaceful purposes. Yet they wish to keep public opinion from discovering that research work on the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is deliberately being sabotaged, and are trying to justify the utterly unsatisfactory state of that research by attributing it to various extraneous circumstances.

121. To that end, they have recruited a number of scientists who are devoting considerable effort to proving that it is perfectly natural that the United States should have failed to achieve any results whatsoever in the field of the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, while such progress has been made in the production of all kinds of atomic weapons of mass destruction. Atomic energy will not be used for civilian purposes, according to Professor Hafstad, for another decade or two.

122. All this talk about the difficulties involved has been disproved by Mr. Philip Morrison, a famous United States scientist and one of the inventors of the atomic bomb, who has now come out in favour of prohibiting this weapon. He has urged large-scale research on the utilization of atomic energy for light and heat. It is not easy to solve this problem, he wrote, but much easier than to produce a hydrogen bomb, and much more useful.

123. Other scientists, however, are resorting to a variety of spurious calculations in the endeavour to prove that the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is irrational and unprofitable. The usual argument advanced in support of this thesis is that the United States has sufficient resources of water, coal, oil, etc. and needs no new form of energy. Consequently it would be more profitable and rational to spend thousands of millions of dollars from the taxpayers' pockets on the invention of weapons of mass destruction than to introduce atomic energy into peace-time industry.

124. The secret designs of the American monopolists have been revealed by Senators Vandenberg and McMahon, who, according to the American magazine *Collier's*,<sup>18</sup> asserted that the advent of atomic energy as a cheap source of power would lead to a fall in the shares of all railroad and coal companies; insurance companies would go bankrupt and general financial chaos would ensue. Thus one of the main reasons why the American monopolists oppose the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is that they regard atomic energy as an undesirable competitor for such existing industries as the coal, oil and electricity industries, from which they are deriving vast profits. The American monopolists are doing everything in their power to prevent the use of atomic energy for peaceful economic purposes.

125. Reflecting the will of its people, the USSR Government has always stood and still stands for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and for a strict and effective international control to ensure that atomic energy is not used for military purposes.

126. The discovery of atomic energy—one of the greatest scientific discoveries of our time—has created gigantic possibilities for expanding man's productive capacity and increasing the well-being of peoples; it must not be used for destruction and mass extermination. Atomic energy must be wholly and exclusively put

to peaceful and constructive work. Soviet scientists, who are working day and night on the problem of the peaceful use of atomic energy, have already achieved some results. We need atomic energy for peaceful purposes as man needs air, water and food.

127. In an article entitled "Peace and Energy" one of our scientists, Professor Golubtsov, wrote that Soviet scientists had discovered different technological methods and other technical possibilities for using atomic energy for peaceful purposes by converting it directly into heat and electricity, and that Soviet science was far ahead of foreign science in the field of atomic energy.

128. This bears out Mr. Vyshinsky's statement at the fourth session of the General Assembly<sup>19</sup> to the effect that the USSR was using atomic energy to accomplish great tasks of peaceful construction, to water the deserts and to chart new paths of life in regions untrodden by human foot. The American Press attempted to suppress or distort those words. Even today, in the General Assembly, the United Kingdom representative, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, attempted to be sarcastic on the subject of that statement. That was not wise, nor was it in accordance with the facts, because he was speaking against the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

129. Thus, the champions of the atomic bomb fear the truth, even in the field of science. The assertions of a number of foreign scientists, and also of some diplomats, that the use of atomic energy for peaceful production is not expedient, are utterly untrue. They are designed to convince plain people of the inevitability of preparing for war and to justify the intensified production of super-bombs. This explains their desire to detract from the impression created by the successes achieved in every branch of Soviet science.

130. In their frequent public statements, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and other States have contended that the responsibility for the breakdown of the highly important negotiations on the atomic energy question lies solely with the delegation of the Soviet Union, whose proposals for control, they say, would offer a solution only on paper. They slanderously assert that the Government of the USSR is primarily concerned about its own sovereignty and declines to accept any measure which might encroach upon its unrestricted sovereignty. They further assert that for the United States to place any confidence in such a paper guarantee would seriously endanger its security. Without a strict system of international control, a mere convention on prohibition of the atomic weapon would give the peoples a false sense of security.

131. In his detailed speech yesterday [321st meeting], Mr. Vyshinsky, the head of the USSR delegation, gave a comprehensive and profound analysis of the question before us. He gave an exhaustive reply to the charges levelled against the Soviet Union. There is therefore no need for me to go over the same ground or to deal with the question in detail again.

132. We have before us a draft resolution [A/1668 and Corr.1] submitted by the delegations of Australia, Canada, Ecuador, France, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States, which calls for

<sup>18</sup> See *Collier's*, 3 May 1947, article by Robert de Vore entitled "Passport to the Golden Age".

<sup>19</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Ad Hoc Political Committee, 33rd meeting.*

the establishment of a committee composed of the representatives of twelve States to prepare proposals on the atomic energy question for submission to the sixth session of the General Assembly.

133. The sponsors of that draft apparently believe that the atomic energy question will be solved by merging the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments. This draft resolution is a safety measure to stave off the adoption of the USSR delegation's proposal for the preparation of a convention for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to ensure observance of that prohibition. The sponsors of the draft resolution place no reliance on the peoples' support, and base all their calculations on the atomic bomb, on the use of atomic energy for the purposes of monstrous destruction and for the annihilation of millions of people.

134. No honest person in the world will deny that the problem we are discussing—the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to ensure complete and unconditional observance of this prohibition—is of great importance for the maintenance of peace and security, the strengthening and development of friendly relations among States and for co-operation among States in the solution of international disputes.

135. The USSR delegation's proposal [A/1676] regarding the immediate preparation of conventions for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the simultaneous establishment of strict international control has been warmly supported by hundreds of millions of partisans of peace in all countries. Peace-loving peoples cannot resign themselves to the threat to use the atomic weapon, which is a weapon of aggression and an inhuman instrument for mass destruction and the annihilation of civilians.

136. Therefore, bearing in mind the aims and purposes of the United Nations and the will of the peoples we represent here, we must at long last adopt a resolution instructing the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission to resume its work and to proceed immediately to prepare draft conventions for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and for the international control of atomic energy, both conventions to be concluded and brought into effect simultaneously. The draft conventions must be submitted to the Security Council not later than 1 June 1950.

137. By taking this decision, we shall snatch this dreadful weapon from the hands of the brutal advocates of atomic warfare. We shall free mankind from the fear of mass destruction and destroy the plans of the warmongers.

138. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR calls upon the delegations here present to adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union.

139. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The list of speakers is exhausted. If no one wishes to speak, we shall proceed to the vote.

140. The General Assembly has two draft resolutions before it, the first [A/1668 and Corr.1] has been submitted by Australia, Canada, Ecuador, France, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The second draft resolution [A/1676] has been submitted by the Soviet Union.

141. I put to the vote the first draft resolution [A/1668 and Corr.1]. The Chilean delegation has requested a roll-call vote.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

*Against:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Abstaining:* Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Pakistan.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 47 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

142. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/1676].

*The draft resolution was rejected by 32 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.*