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GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT (A/4218; A/4219; A/C.1/818) (continued)

Mr. SFYLLA (Albania) (interpretation from French): First of all, may I be permitted, both personally and on behalf of the delegation of Albania, to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, most warmly on your election to the Chairmanship of the First Committee. Under your guidance this Committee must consider problems which are both important and urgent, first among them being that of general and complete disarmament.

I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Velanovski and Mr. Fekini on their election as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur respectively.

When the First Committee decided unanimously to give priority to the examination of the question of general and complete disarmament -- proposed by the Soviet Union -- it proved that it realized the prime importance of the problem. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania trusts that the same spirit of understanding and responsibility will guide States Members towards unanimous support of the programme for general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union.

When the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, on 18 September 1959 proposed to the General Assembly his historic programme for general and complete disarmament, an expression of hope and joy was heard everywhere. This programme was considered as a milestone in the history of man. The "cold war" and the mad armaments race, especially in the field of atomic and nuclear weapons and rockets, has led the world to the very brink of an abyss. The Soviet Union programme for general and complete disarmament has the incomparable merit of pointing the road to salvation, the road that will avoid the catastrophe of a third world war, the threat of which hangs over all peoples. The adoption of this programme would also be a milestone in the destiny of humanity and a new hope for our world. It would inaugurate a new era in international relations and offer a radiant prospect for peoples everywhere.
It is the opinion of the Albanian delegation that the United Nations, whose main task is to preserve succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to guarantee international peace and security, can fulfil this task only by wholeheartedly supporting the programme for general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union delegation. The time has come to emerge from the dangerous stalemate on which the negotiations on disarmament ended and to resume negotiations in a completely different frame of mind.

Consistent with its policy of friendship and peace between nations, the Soviet Union, as can be proved by its many proposals in this regard, has continued doggedly its negotiations and its unilateral measures for disarmament, thus trying to bring about an agreement on the problem with the Western Powers. The efforts of the Soviet Union in the field of disarmament have always been warmly supported by the other socialist countries, as well as by other peace-loving nations, and have certainly been supported and welcomed by world public opinion.

Unfortunately, the United States and its partners in the problem of disarmament have shown a complete lack of goodwill in reaching a final agreement. While negotiations on disarmament were taking place, the arms race was continuing and was being speeded up. A dense network of bases and military blocs was set up surrounding the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and other countries of popular democracies. These bases have become the cause of friction in the countries where they have been set up and have been a threat to international peace and security. The "cold war" policy and the "positions of force" have, in many parts of the world, resulted in cockpits of tension and fear. The arms race has become dangerous and terrifying. It consumes tremendous material and financial resources. More than $100 billion -- more than half of which is utilized by the United States alone -- is spent each year to prepare for war.
To this task more than 100 million young men and workers and highly skilled technicians have devoted their time, as well as scientists. The economy of the countries of Nato also have to carry the weight of militarization. Recently the American chemist William Davidson defined the defence programme of the United States as a step toward death — and I quote him. The socialist countries too are obliged to devote a great part of their income to defence. The arms race can lead nowhere but to war. It has already achieved a very dangerous degree of saturation; a simple straw may push the world into the greatest conflagration and the greatest catastrophe it has ever known. Peoples all over the world are watching this situation with anguish, and they raise their voices and beg the avoidance of war. They have not forgotten the horrors of two world wars.

In the course of the First World War ten million men were killed, more than twenty million others were wounded. Thousands of towns and villages in Europe were razed, and in the course of the First World War human losses in Europe were equal to those suffered during all the wars which had taken place in the previous 1,000 years.

In the course of the Second World War the losses were five-fold. Statisticians in Western Germany calculate that fifty-five million human beings were lost, taking into account civilians and military personnel. Furthermore, the direct military expenditures of the belligerent countries, according to American economists in the World Almanac of New York for 1957, page 523, rose to the amount of $925 billion; that is to say, five times the military expenditures of the First World War. To this figure we must also add the military expenditures of the Soviet Union, which was $357 billion, and also the expenditure of China.

How much more tragic, therefore, would it be for human nature and for mankind to have to bear the consequences of a third world war with the utilization of nuclear weapons, rockets and other means of mass destruction. Already the bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 and which claimed more than 300,000 victims have shown the destructive power of these weapons. But the hydrogen weapons are even more terribly destructive. The explosion of one solitary hydrogen bomb has a destructive power greater than all the explosions
which took place during the last four years of the Second World War. It would destroy a surface of thousands of square miles. It would destroy great urban centres, industrial centres, and would certainly kill thousands or millions of human beings. With the discovery of inter-continental ballistic missiles, no point in the world is safe from the effects of a new world war.

The alternative to this threatening prospective of a nuclear war is but one: general and complete disarmament, as proposed by the Soviet Union. Peace cannot be safeguarded by the armed forces nor by hydrogen weapons. Peace can only be safeguarded by the adoption of measures which will make the unleashing of a new world war impossible; that is to say, by the elimination of all ways and means of waging warfare.

At present the concepts of a limitation of armaments or balanced disarmament have already been outmoded. With the progress achieved in the last few years in military technology, particularly in the field of the production of nuclear weapons and rockets, local or limited wars are no longer conceivable. The danger that threatens the world is that of a new war with the use of all weapons in the possession of all nations, and this danger could be avoided by total and complete general disarmament.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania considers that precisely the Soviet programme for general and complete disarmament is important, not only because of the generous policy inspiring it and the noble aim of avoiding the danger of a new war, but also because at the right moment it can bring the right solution to the most crucial and most dangerous problem which at present threatens humanity, which is the problem of peace or war. The programme submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union is the result of a careful and balanced understanding of the international situation. It is a weighing of the forces in the world. It is a consideration of the perspectives open to all peoples. More than once the Soviet Union, and Nikita Sergeyovitch Khrushchev personally, have with complete understanding stated that war is not inevitable; it can and must be outlawed from human society as one of the ways of settling differences between nations.
At present the world stands at the crossroads. Nuclear war or peaceful coexistence: that is the choice open to us. The Soviet Government has proclaimed that it is the primordial duty of any responsible government to stint no effort to avoid the danger of a new war and ensure the existence of peace. The superb discoveries and progress achieved by the Soviet Union in the field of science and technology, and the great success achieved by the Soviet Union and other countries in all fields in these last years, has led human beings to understand that all States must carry out an agonizing reappraisal of their policies, and therefore to recognize the existence of the possibility of policies of understanding. The simultaneous existence of the socialist and capitalist systems is indisputable, and independent of the will of any. Their peaceful coexistence, their commercial and cultural exchanges, their efforts to settle problems at present in abeyance by peaceful means and negotiation through an honest and confident co-operation in all fields, their peaceful competition, must characterize their relations, not the reactionary concept of a cold war or its deadly arms race.

An examination of the problem of general and complete disarmament is taking place under most favourable conditions. The visit of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Nikita Sergeyevitch Khrushchev, to the United States, his conversations with President Eisenhower, and his programme for complete and general disarmament presented to our General Assembly, have greatly improved the international atmosphere. The efforts made to do away with the "cold war" and to consolidate this relaxation of tension are still continuing. At present it is clear to the world itself that the "cold war" and the arms race cannot lead to anything but a general conflagration, the consequences of which would be catastrophic. They would solve no problems; on the contrary they have complicated the international situation in a dreadful fashion. Even in the West, the most lucid thinkers of States admit it is absolutely imperative that this arms race be stopped before it gets to the point of explosion.
The favourable reception given to the Soviet programme, this programme for general and complete disarmament, in the General Assembly as well as in all countries of the world shows exactly how timely this programme is and how well it responds to the vital interests and the urgent requirements of all humanity.

When all is said and done, what does the Soviet Union propose? The Soviet Union proposes a programme for general and complete disarmament, that is to say, the disbanding of all armed forces, excepting, of course, whatever domestic forces are necessary; the elimination of all bases in foreign lands; the elimination of atomic and hydrogen weapons and rockets and the cessation of production of these devices; the abolition of war ministries, general staffs, military educational institutions and military establishments and organizations of all kinds. In a word, it proposes the elimination of all means of waging war; it proposes a world without weapons, without arms, without the means of extermination; it proposes a world without these murderous weapons, where atomic energy would be used only for peaceful purposes. The Soviet Union proposes a warless world, a world of peace, of mutual confidence and co-operation, of peaceful competition, for the welfare and progress of all.

The Soviet Government believes that this programme should be put into effect after four years, going through four stages under strict and effective international control. For each stage there are provided practical measures for disarmament which would be perfectly realizable, perfectly feasible. Each step prepares for the next step, and each step provides for corresponding international controls; and when complete and general disarmament is achieved, international control will also be general and complete. For this purpose it is proposed that an international control body be set up with the participation of all States. This perhaps radical proposal of the Soviet Union may be surprising to all, but it must also attract all honest statesmen who are concerned with the interests of their peoples and with the maintenance of peace. Who could not support this programme that would liberate mankind from the fear of tomorrow, the fear of nuclear war? Who would reject the possibilities of this great new world? This programme is ideal because it answers the aspirations and requirements of all countries and provides a radical solution to the problems that confront us. But it is not utopian. On the contrary, it is solidly established on reality itself. It is perfectly feasible within the four years provided.
In the declaration of 29 September 1959 on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of Albania we supported completely the proposal of the Soviet Government and stated that we hoped that all other countries, responding to the needs of their peoples, would also contribute their support to the proposal. The Government of the People's Republic of Albania believes that a speedy and equitable solution of the problem of disarmament is an urgent obligation for all States. We also feel that the United Nations has its duty to perform, and that is to consider this new way of carrying out general and complete disarmament as proposed by the Soviet Union, and thus free humanity from the fear of a new war and assure to mankind the enjoyment of all the good, all the benefits it can derive from the world.

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania considers that if there is goodwill in all quarters, and first of all, goodwill on the part of the great Powers, then conditions are propitious for the achievement of this programme in four years. The People's Republic of Albania as a socialist country extremely eager to build its country in peace, and therefore to safeguard international peace and co-operation, has always supported the efforts of the Soviet Union as well as the efforts of other peace-loving nations which might lead us to a peaceful solution of the problem of disarmament. As far as our capabilities have allowed, we have always acted along these lines. Twice we have considerably reduced our armed forces. We have constantly diminished our budgetary provisions for defense. At the Conference for the Prevention of Surprise Attack which met at the end of last year in Geneva, Albanian experts together with the experts of other socialist countries made honest and sincere efforts to come to positive conclusions acceptable to our Western colleagues. May I mention also the repeated efforts of the Albanian Government to prevent the establishment of bases for rockets and atomic weapons on the territory of neighbouring countries such as Italy and Greece. I also wish to reaffirm the fact that we are always ready to enter into agreements with other countries concerned and to take practical measures to transform the Balkan and Adriatic region into a zone of peace, a zone free of atomic bases and rocket launching-pads. In my country war propaganda is punishable by law.
Consistent with the declaration I have just mentioned, the Albanian Government, attaching to this programme for general and complete disarmament exceptional importance for the safeguarding of peace and international co-operation, wishes to address a fervent appeal to all nations to support this programme without reservation. No country has anything to lose, every country has everything to gain by this complete and general disarmament and the liquidation once and for all of the "cold war". The enormous sums at present devoted to the arms race would be utilized for peaceful construction and progress. Taxes would be considerably reduced and might even be eliminated altogether. The conditions of cultural and material existence of all countries would improve enormously. If, as the Soviet Government has proposed, some of the funds used for warlike preparations were granted to the under-developed areas, these countries could develop their agriculture, create their own industries, successfully fight the remnants of colonialism and raise the standard of living both spiritually and materially, of their peoples. Disarmament would open a completely new era in international relations. The danger of war would be abolished forever. Suspicion would give way to confidence. Peaceful solution of any disputes would be the normal, everyday practice. Economic competition between two systems could not but serve to lead to an ultimate improvement of the standard of living of all peoples and would contribute to the progress of science and technology and place them at the disposal of mankind.

No one can doubt that a stable condition of peace in the world would redound to the benefit of the United Nations also, in peaceful coexistence among nations. Social and political systems would provide better application, better implementation, of the high and noble principles and aims of the Charter of the United Nations. General and complete disarmament is the basic and fundamental problem besetting the General Assembly at the present session. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania believes that the adoption by the General Assembly of the principles of the Soviet proposal for general and complete disarmament would constitute a gigantic step forward on the part of the United Nations and would be a milestone in the history of humanity in its human and international relations. The adoption of such a decision would open the road to
the preparation of an agreement acceptable to all on the practical measures required to put into force this programme of general and complete disarmament, including a detailed plan of control and international inspection. We feel that the process of liquidation of the "cold war" and of relaxation of international tension which has already begun would be greatly stimulated and furthered if all countries agreed in principle on the programme for general and complete disarmament proposed by the Soviet Union.
It is the opinion of the Albanian delegation that at the moment it is the duty of all Governments to do nothing that might in any way hamper this process but to do everything possible to assist it and to seek all means to reconcile points of view and establish agreement. Unfortunately, the agreement recently arrived at between the Governments of the United States and Turkey cannot be regarded as evidence of a desire to strengthen peace in the world, for this agreement provides for the setting up in Turkey of a nuclear rocket base which, according to the United States Press, would be able to cover the whole of the European section of the Soviet Union, the democratic republics of Europe and the greater part of Central Asia. Such a decision, taken at such a moment, can be considered as nothing but a deliberate act of the "cold war", in complete contradiction of the spirit that ought to guide the examination of the question of general and complete disarmament which we are at present undertaking in the First Committee. Public opinion could not reconcile the declarations by the Government of the United States of its desire for peace with the agreement to set up new military bases and rocket launching pads directed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

We believe that words must be confirmed by facts. The time has come to take definite steps towards the safeguarding of peace. If we all agree that peace depends on general and complete disarmament, then as Members of the United Nations we must leave no stone unturned to come to an immediate agreement on the matter. The programme proposed by the Soviet Union offers us the desired solution. Let us not hesitate to give it unanimous and complete support.

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania will be happy to add its small contribution to the efforts of all other Governments to carry out general and complete disarmament, to eliminate forever the hideous spectre of war, and to establish on solid bases lasting peace and friendship between all nations.
Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, first of all, allow me to congratulate you, on behalf of my delegation, on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. Your widely-known ability as a diplomat and international statesman and your personal and human qualities, which are so well known to all of us, carry a guarantee for the success of our meetings. May I also extend my congratulations to the Vice-Chairman of our Committee, Mr. Velazquez, the representative of the sister republic of Uruguay, and to the Rapporteur, Mr. Fekini, the representative of Libya.

We are now considering a proposal by the Soviet Union on general and complete disarmament. This proposal was originally voiced by Mr. Khrushchev in the statement he made to the General Assembly and was in due course formally submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union. I am mentioning this background to the question because I wish to keep as closely as possible to the subject before us. The question of disarmament is, as you know, a vast one, and we would run the risk of bogging down in generalities if we did not limit ourselves strictly to the point under discussion. Naturally, my delegation reserves its right to take up other aspects of the disarmament problem when we deal with the other items on the agenda that are connected with the matter of disarmament.

The Soviet proposal has an importance which cannot be disguised. We must give it the attention that this importance warrants and also the attention that it deserves because of the leading role played in matters of disarmament and of armaments by the Power supporting this proposal. Basically, I want to say that we should consider this proposal seriously. We consider that it would not be in keeping with the gravity of the times to discard this proposal ab initio with the argument that it is a mere propaganda gesture. In order to maintain discussions in this Committee it is indispensable that those countries taking part, at least as a basis on which to work, should accept the fact that what the others say is what the others think. It is not for us to judge intentions. We can only appreciate and weigh facts. The only fact that we have before us today is a draft resolution which places before us a programme for the elimination within four years of the arms and armed forces of all countries of the world.
The Soviet proposal raises two questions, which I believe should be discussed separately. One is whether general disarmament as projected is convenient, and the other is whether it is viable. With regard to the first question -- whether it would be convenient and appropriate -- obviously at first sight the answer should be categorically in the affirmative. Certainly general disarmament, the elimination of all instruments of mass destruction, is one of the ancient ideals of humanity that have constantly obsessed the great thinkers and the great Utopia builders. Therefore, when the Soviet representative the other day transported us in his imagination to a world where the present military expenditures would be devoted to the moral and material progress of mankind, I must confess that I was most impressed. However, our principal duty is to see things as diplomats; in other words, we must see things as they are rather than as we would have them be. Therefore, in the light of realistic considerations -- and I do not mean by "realistic" that I am hostile or sceptical -- we have to analyse the appropriateness and timeliness of the proposal that is now before us.

General and complete disarmament is a means to lead us to the end, which is a certain objective, and we believe that this objective can be divided into two parts. First, because of the immeasurable destructive power of present-day weapons, humanity should no longer have to consider the possibility of total annihilation. Secondly, we should avoid the danger of armed aggression whereby the weakest will fall under the will of the strongest. There can be no doubt that the Khrushchev proposal, if I may call it that, would facilitate the integral achievement of the first of the two objectives I have outlined.

If in the course of four years all atomic weapons and rockets and all weapons of high offensive power were to be eliminated, there can be no doubt that we would have done away with the threat that today hangs over the majority of the inhabitants of the world. But what we have to know is whether general and complete disarmament, apart from excluding the possibility of mass destruction, will allow us also to achieve the second of the objectives I have outlined: in other words, if by means of this programme we will be able to end aggressions whereby the weaker nations fall under the domination of the stronger. Here I think the answer cannot be such a categorical affirmative as in the case of the first question.
After all, what determines armed aggression? What determines political domination on the international level? First of all, there is a subjective element: the will to power, united with aggressive intent. Then there is an objective element: the disparity of forces between the aggressor and the victim.

Will the elimination of all armed weapons, as proposed by the Soviet Union, do away with these two elements? We think not. The extremely destructive power of weapons is something new in the history of the world. Until the First World War, armed conflicts were, if we may use the term, relatively humane. But wars of aggression and conquest are as ancient as man himself. In other words, the elimination of modern weapons would not in itself eliminate aggressive intentions or inequality in relationships of power.

To understand this fact better, let us turn our eyes for a moment to the Khrushchev proposal. The Soviet proposal suggests that all States should eliminate all armed forces except for strictly limited contingents of police, the size of which would be agreed upon for each country, to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens. This qualification, as related to the forces required for the maintenance of domestic order within the structure of the Khrushchev proposal, is perfectly reasonable. Otherwise, there would be the inherent risk that a gang of delinquents could, by surprise, take over the Government of a country. But the truth of the matter is that, since this exception is reasonable, it once again injects into international life the elements of force and disparity of power which, while there is an animus dominandi, continues to make possible enterprises of domination.

May I give a concrete example: Let us suppose that there are two neighbouring States, A and B, and that State A is 10 million square kilometres in size and has 250 million inhabitants, while State B is 50,000 square kilometres in size and has 2 million inhabitants. It is logical that State A should have in its militia and police, in order to safeguard domestic peace, one hundred times more arms and men than State B. In other words, the relationship of imbalance between the two will be the same as obtained before disarmament, because what matters is not whether one has or does not have means of destruction but rather whether there is an inequality of force. In the hypothetical example I have given, if State A
should harbour any aggressive intentions, it would be able to attack and subjugate State B during a period of general and complete disarmament and it would be able to do so with as much ease as in the atomic era.

This obviously must lead to the conclusion that general and complete disarmament, although it may liberate us from the nightmare of atomic destruction -- and that in itself is a considerable gain -- would not eliminate or even attenuate the danger of aggressive wars and of enterprises of domination and conquest. The only thing which will permit the removal of that danger is the extirpation of the hunger for power and the implanting of respect for the rights of others. When a messianic doctrine is set up in any part of the world -- a doctrine which calls for the "liberation" of other countries -- the result is unavoidably the domination of those who are presumably to be liberated, because in politics the redeemers hardly ever work for nothing. The existence of these absolute concepts -- which may be very noble and generous in their intentions and their origin -- are what gives birth to aggressive wars, whether one uses a hydrogen weapon or a lance and sword.

Moreover, the unbridled will to dominate, the messianic desire to save and redeem the world and to implant a certain ideological system, can be promoted by procedures which do not even include war by organized armies. For example, it can be carried out by provoking domestic rebellion from outside, by spreading subversive propaganda, by systematically taking advantage of all the factors of social dissolution which can throw one country under the influence of another. We have recently seen many cases of countries subjected to the power of other countries in this indirect and subtle way, and especially has this been true in the last few years. In order to bring this about, one does not need arms, one does not need armies, one does not need weapons, and certainly one does not need atomic weapons. While this type of danger exists, we cannot agree with Mr. Kuznetsov in his statement that peace and friendship between nations would thus be consolidated. Arms are the visible and exterior expression of a state of mind. If we eliminate weapons but leave the state of mind, aggression and the imposition of slavery will be expressed by other means but will not be wiped off the face of the earth.
Thus far, I have spoken of the Soviet proposal from the point of view of its timeliness and appropriateness. Now may I more briefly consider it from the point of view of its viability. What at first impresses us and, I must say, touches us very deeply is the considerable transformation required not only internationally but nationally, in each country. Has there been noted with sufficient clarity the unprecedented revolution inherent in the abolition, within the short space of four years, of all the armed institutions of the world? Armed bodies, armed institutions, are historic forms which are part and parcel of the life of all peoples. In the history of these peoples and in their traditions, such institutions take a very important position. From time immemorial, they have led millions of human beings, and especially the young ones, into new fields. In many countries, they play a very important role in the life of the nation. Can all this be wiped out in four years?

We believe that not everything in the history of arms and armies has been evil. Armies and, in recent years, air forces and navies have not only been instruments of death and destruction; they have also served as schools of honour, of courage, of heroism, and they have called forth noble human virtues. They have been the element that has preserved order. They have been the means by which culture has been carried to human masses living in backward and tragic conditions.
In the majority of Western countries -- and may I just cite one example, my own country -- we became one with civilization because of the action and presence of the Roman legions. Although they may not have read about it, many people have in their souls that passage from Don Quijote where Don Quijote reminds Sancho that "without arms, laws cannot be enforced because arms are used to defend republics, to preserve kingdoms and to safeguard cities."

I understand that for the Marxist mentality these values are of little importance. But for those of us who cherish other beliefs, they are part and parcel of our life. They are the essence of our living. It is true that the invention of weapons of annihilation has eliminated from war, and from those who make war, much of that chivalrous aspect that moved Cervantes and which he expressed in the past. It is true that in international life we must realize the entire function of arms and weapons, but all this that I have called a revolution, and which in point of fact would be the greatest and most important revolution of all times, has been proposed to us in passing, with an air of innocence as an anonymous item 70 in the agenda of the fourteenth session, and when we are asked in forty-eight months to fulfill this objective, then I think it would tend to water down the importance of the matter and would ultimately lead to failure.

The most fundamental reforms in the social field have always been made in stages all over the world. We believe that a disarmament programme of the importance of the one we are considering cannot be carried out if we were not to have all those "details" clarified, the details which refer to control which the Soviet Union wants to postponed until after agreement on the substantive question has been arrived at. Among these "details" we include the careful and detailed consideration of the powers of the International Commission, the certainty that can be given us by experts regarding the detection of underground explosions, the acceptance of inspection by countries not represented in the United Nations, the inability to reconvert war industries into peace industries. There are many other details, as they call them. If a precise agreement on these aspects of control were to accompany an agreement on disarmament, then we might be able to consider it viable within the limitations to which I have already referred.
We could not analyse a programme of general disarmament without linking it very closely to the organization of the international community of nations itself. The role that this international Organization would have to play in such an organization is obviously decisive. Therefore, we believe that, first of all, a previous understanding would have to be arrived at among the great Powers regarding matters that are today to a large extent hampering the functioning of our Organization, and only then would we be able to speak clearly of "general and complete disarmament". The agreement would have to include, over and above all, the way of giving back to the Security Council its vitality and the techniques to set up, with vigour and with impartial action, an international force that would guarantee respect for any agreements arrived at.

Nor do we believe it possible to undertake general disarmament if we isolate it from the great political problems of the present day. Such a movement requires a minimum of mutual confidence and tranquillity. And if during the last few months certain signs have appeared that seem to augur a substantial reduction in international tension, the consolidation of such an atmosphere would be achieved when at least an agreement on principle is arrived at on the main points of friction between the East and the West. It would be at that time that the policy of disarmament would open its own road toward fulfilment.

The position that we have outlined may at times be considered by some as incompatible with the support that we always give the idea of disarmament. May I reject such an interpretation. The arms race is one of the greatest evils afflicting our era, and we do not have the right to undermine any initiatives which would try to stop this arms race.

But in order for such measures to deserve support, they at least must lead us to the desired result. In our statement last year on this very point, we said that the policy of all or nothing is not one which will give lasting success in international affairs. In its original form the Soviet proposal seems to give us that option of all or nothing. We have expressed, however, with all the objectivity and impartiality that we can muster the reasons why we do not consider this proposal appropriate or viable.
This discrepancy, however, does not mean that we cannot stress the importance underlying the fact that a great Power like the Soviet Union, one of the two most powerfully armed countries in the world, is submitting such a proposal for complete and total disarmament. In this we should like to see a proof of its peace-loving ideas and its peaceful disposition. We note with satisfaction the Soviet Union's willingness to accept more modest but more viable formulas if the main proposal of the Soviet Union does not appear to the rest of this Committee to be immediately applicable.

In this case, we believe that the suggestions made by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd in the general debate do have these characteristics of practical efficiency and short-range applicability which are a sine qua non for success in initiatives of this type. When comparing those ideas with the Soviet proposal, we can entirely place into focus the ideological orientation of the countries proposing them. We will simply compare the texts, and we find that the ideas of the United Kingdom representative permit us to reach the same objective as that sought by the Soviet proposal, but by progressive means which are more in keeping with present-day possibilities.

My country is not a member of the Committee of Ten that was recently set up by agreement of the great Powers. That is why we are making use of this First Committee to express our views. But we do not believe that it is here but in Geneva that the Khrushchev proposal, together with other similar measures, should be examined first. When the conclusions arrived at by the Committee of Ten are officially communicated to the Disarmament Commission, it will be in the Disarmament Commission that the Members of the World Organization will be called upon to give the final word. In the meantime, I do not think that at this fourteenth session of the General Assembly we can do anything other than to exchange views and hear the statements of the parties primarily concerned. That is why my delegation believes that it would be better not to vote on any resolution of substance on the proposal that we are now examining.

We believe that we have analysed, as we intended at the beginning of our speech, the Soviet proposal with all the seriousness and care that its exceptional importance warrants. To conclude, I should like to express the hope that when we meet again next year we will have covered sufficient ground so as to be able to consider a disarmament programme that will dissipate at the same time as it discourages utopian views of some.
Mr. SON SANN (Cambodia)(interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, may I, first of all, be permitted to address my warm congratulations to you on the occasion of your election to the important post of Chairman of the First Committee. I hope that under your skillful guidance, owing to your vast experience, the deliberations of our Committee will succeed in achieving constructive results.
May I also address my sincere compliments to Mr. Carlos Maria Velazquez, our Vice-Chairman, who represents a peace-loving country attached to century-old democratic traditions, and likewise to the representative of Libya, Mr. Fekini, whose election to the post of Rapporteur is proof of his competence.

The delegation of Cambodia has been particularly happy to note that unanimous agreement was arrived at for inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the question of general and complete disarmament. The Kingdom of Cambodia which practises a policy of neutrality and peaceful coexistence with all States, without distinction, can only express its gratification that an agreement on the question of disarmament should have been arrived at, because a small country like ours can only wish ardently for peace -- it has nothing to gain from war. The contrary is true. We are obliged to maintain a small army which costs us a great deal. With the sums now devoted to the small army, we could, in the event of general disarmament, devote ourselves more effectively to raising the economic level and the social well-being of our people.

We have always pointed out the dangers involved in the armaments race and the cold war. We have always placed our confidence fully in the work of peace wrought by the United Nations. We hope that this time our Organization, to which the task of achieving disarmament has been entrusted, will manage to find a common ground for understanding in this question, in conformity with the wish expressed by the President of this session who said that this session should go down in history as the Assembly of Peace. We think that the United Nations should avail itself of the present climate of relaxation of tension to formulate at last general but precise directives on the basis of which technicians could be put to work in order to arrive at a swift solution of the disarmament problem. The key of the problem being the organization of effective international control of disarmament measures, an agreement on this point having now been given by the principal Powers concerned, all efforts should now be focussed on swiftly eliminating the obstacles and difficulties which still hamper the establishment of a control organ endowed with proper means for rendering its actions as effective as can be wished.
It is true that at the base of any disarmament agreement there must be confidence between the various partners. It is necessary that each of the parties to the agreement should receive full assurance that the others are in fact animated by the same wish to disarm, and to the same degree. I consider that the contribution of the United Nations can assist mightily in bringing to fruition the necessary climate of confidence. And the fact that the principal Powers concerned are now agreed to settle the question within the framework of our Organization, already constitutes a great deal of encouragement. This confidence which has been progressively affirmed since the work that was done in Paris, in London and in Geneva on the disarmament problem, is indeed the keystone of the edifice of peace which we all wish to construct.

As the representative of the United Kingdom stated with regard to the Geneva Conference on the discontinuance of nuclear tests:

"...there has been steady progress in working out a treaty relating to the cessation of nuclear tests. Many articles have been agreed, and without doubt this conference has been the most realistic and sustained attempt to reach an agreement upon one aspect of armament development ever undertaken." (A/PV.798, p. 17)

For its part, the Disarmament Commission in its resolution of 10 December last has expressed the hope that the results obtained in the course of the deliberations undertaken in Geneva by the Powers will constitute a useful basis for the study and consideration of disarmament by the United Nations. (A/4209)

In his statement to this Committee on 9 October, the representative of the Soviet Union said, in connexion with the recent joint USSR and United States communique:

"The agreement between the two greatest Powers of the world that they will make every effort to solve the disarmament problem opens up new and favourable prospects for reaching agreement on the disarmament question." (A/C.1/PV.1026, p. 26)
For his part, the representative of the United States has listed here substantial results obtained in the field of disarmament since the Geneva conversations, as well as a number of points on which the United States and the Soviet Union have reached agreement; and he concluded his statement by saying:

"We hope the Assembly will encourage us in our approach to these goals. And we assure the Soviet Union that, in the process of translating words into action for disarmament and peace, the Soviet Union will find the United States unflagging in its determination to get results." (A/C.1/PV.1027, p. 13-15)

This is perhaps the first time since mankind has undertaken the search for the way that will lead to a lasting peace that a ray of hope seems to be shining, following the encouraging results of the Geneva negotiations. The gaze of all is now turned to the United Nations, after the proposals made recently by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States in favour of general and controlled disarmament.

There is no question that the forces of peace are gaining ground. My country's Government and people, who have watched with particular interest all the conversations and moves in favour of disarmament, have had occasion to note with profound satisfaction that the hitherto opposing thesis in positions of the great Powers on this question have come to harmonize with each other on a number of important points.

It appears that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States would reject the carrying out of certain partial disarmament measures pending the reaching of an agreement on the process of general and complete disarmament. Among the measures proposed and accepted, we might list with satisfaction the agreement on the prevention of surprise attack and the one on the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons tests, with the assurance that the treaty will remain in force so long as the obligations and conditions inscribed therein will continue to be fully observed. A conformity of views among the Great Powers has also been harmonized as regards the need not to subordinate the settlement of the general and controlled disarmament question to the previous solution of other international questions that are outstanding. This is a decisive step towards the relaxation of tension and the establishment of mutual confidence. But the
Cambodian delegation is more particularly gratified at the fact that the
Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States are at one in recognizing
the principle and the necessity of effective international control appropriate
for each of the steps of disarmament.
According to the speeches of the representatives of these Powers, both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee, it appears that the principle is set in this field and all that remains is to entrust the examination of the technical aspects of the problem to the Committee of Ten-Powers. Now that noticeable progress is being made in Geneva and in our Organization on the settlement of the central problem of our epoch, the problem of disarmament and the establishment of a lasting peace in a warless world, as the representative of India put it, it is a particular pleasure for the Cambodian delegation to join with all the other delegations here in proclaiming together our common faith in the possibility of general and complete disarmament.

We welcome with joy the prospects of the economic and social development of the under-developed countries which would result from a judicious utilization of the vast resources released by disarmament and demilitarization of the world. It is comforting to note that each and every one of us at least understands to what point men are in fact united by the bonds of common destiny.

The United Nations is now going through a decisive stage in its existence. For the first time, a real opportunity obtains for our Organization to fulfil its ultimate objectives, which is to make peace and prosperity prevail in the world. The Cambodian delegation wishes to make an urgent appeal to all the States to respond favourably to the concrete proposals of the great Powers for disarmament with a view to safeguarding the future of mankind and of civilization.

Mr. SCHMIDT (Brazil) (interpretation from French): The Brazilian delegation has been loath to intervene in this debate. The natural reluctance to pronounce a purely academic speech, in view of the fact that my country is not among those which find it possible to exercise a decisive influence on the solution of the problem before us, has motivated the Brazilian delegation in its adoption of a watchful attitude and in limiting itself to following the deliberations and to appraising the importance of current developments in the realm of disarmament. I am sure that the most valid and well thought out arguments that might be presented by countries whose arsenals do not include nuclear weapons will never succeed in modifying the position of the two parties which now seem inclined to reach a direct understanding.
I therefore weigh my words carefully and I am fully cognizant of their weight. It is in this frame of mind that I should like to affirm what many have thought, that is, that the risk of atomic war which might destroy all life on this planet is being reduced, even as more progress is being made in the field of the military application of nuclear energy. There are many signs which point to the changes that are occurring in the relations between the Powers, and these signs would appear to justify this hope. This may be the very cause of the unanimity with which the Soviet proposal for the inclusion in our agenda of the question of general and complete disarmament was accepted.

We have listened to a number of speakers, some of whom have a great deal of experience, who have voiced scepticism about the genuine intentions underlying the Soviet initiative, but the truth of the matter is that one cannot merely speak of disarmament and do so with impunity. Words have a power, a dynamism which is inherent in them, and they frequently wind up by creating obligations. The promises made by Mr. Khrushchev before the General Assembly and the hopes to which he has given rise are good, and the paradise-like picture which he has painted is truly a very attractive one to us, and the prospect opened up by the head of the Soviet Government would be worthy of a Jean-Jacques Rousseau, if it were not for the circumstances of present day technology, which peoples with monsters the most bucolic of landscapes.

A country like the Soviet Union, which has given surprising proof of its capacity to assimilate and create the most modern technological achievements and which has achieved so speedy and so important scientific triumphs, and which is playing so vast a role in directing world affairs, cannot possibly want to drag the entire globe, and, therefore, its own people, into the most tragic of catastrophes.

Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Soviet Union is committed to a war of another kind, in which it is endeavouring to produce evidence that the regimes of liberal democracy and free enterprise -- that is, what have been called, "capitalist societies" -- are no longer capable of struggling victoriously against under-development and misery. Now, if this demonstration should one day succeed, if the non-communist countries simply adhere to a posture of criticism and do not act in a constructive manner, if they do not in the end take an
initiative for the creation of wealth which would make it possible to build the necessary defences, which is the only wealth which is valid, the socialist countries would have no need whatever to resort to a destructive attack or to run the risk of falling victims themselves to lightning reprisals. It would be sufficient for the river to follow its course and for the revolt to continue, as is already the case, to spread in the neglected areas. It would be sufficient to allow resentment to germinate and, without any need to resort to the atomic bomb, what is called the "cause of the West" would be fatally jeopardized.
In the ideological war which is now in progress, victory will be won by the side which can prove not only that its conception of existence is superior but also that it has the necessary technical capacity and competence, as well as the ability to communicate its dynamism to others and to find solutions compatible with its ideals.

I should like to emphasize that we have a bit more time than we had thought in order to reflect and find effective solutions which would transform our fair intentions into acts. We have at least some time in order to nurture hopes. Mr. Khrushchev's visit to this country and the forthcoming visit by President Eisenhower to the Soviet Union bring us hope that it is possible to take a step forward, a fundamental step indeed, which will lead to the disarming of minds. It is to the cause of the disarming of minds that surely all countries -- large, medium-sized and small alike -- can render effective service. On this point, we can be sure that we are not speaking in vain. We know that everything depends on the sincerity with which we desire peace, and consequently disarmament.

No one is unaware of the fact that devoting vast resources to instruments and implements of war whose use would give rise to destruction of unforeseeable scope is surely incommensurable with the degree of development which we have arrived at.

There are numerous arguments which the campaign for disarmament has not sufficiently invoked. Material dangers are only part of the reasons which militate against the arms race. There are also motives of a moral character, such as the respect due to the dignity of the human species. These must likewise be invoked if a climate is to be created in which resort to weapons of mass destruction will be impossible for all peoples. I acknowledge the notion that Mr. Khrushchev's speech may have constituted an extraordinary opportunity for disseminating the doctrines and the conceptions defended by the Soviet Union. On the other hand, it must be recognized that the Soviet Prime Minister's visit to the United States and the words he spoke in the General Assembly constitute promising harbingers for the establishment of the climate of reduction of tension which we all yearn for.
I am not at the moment thinking of the uses in the economic development of under-developed countries of savings that may arise from the reduction of military expenditures. The countries which need economic assistance must not rejoice in advance at these promises. The promise of economic assistance, albeit vague and dubious, no matter how substantial, must not prevail over the judgement which we may have to make on man, on his creative intelligence, on his moral superiority, a judgement which must be based upon his capacity to find a rational solution to a conflict which, by its very definition, is an ideological one. If the degree of technical development, the harnessing of nuclear energy and the conquest of inter-stellar space are used for purposes of destruction, human intelligence, on which we pride ourselves so much, will have won a final and paradoxical victory of having rooted out in the hearts of men the last animal drive and instinct, the instinct of self-preservation. But we do not think that things will come to that pass. We have reasons to hope that public opinion will exert upon governments the salutary and necessary pressure which will lead to the only victory worthy of its name, the victory of common sense.

The position of the Brazilian delegation on the disarmament question, especially at the current session of the General Assembly, is necessarily closely related to a recent event which needs scarcely be mentioned here. On 10 September last, as you know, the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations gathered in New York in order to take note of an important communication addressed jointly by the Governments of the United States of America, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to the Secretary-General. In that document the four Powers announced the resumption of consultations with a view to having new negotiations carried out on the disarmament problem, previous negotiations having reached a deadlock in July 1957. According to that communication, a disarmament committee composed of ten countries was established outside the United Nations. On that occasion, the members of the Disarmament Commission had made it clear that that committee set up on the so-called parity criterion had been established outside the United Nations and that its establishment must therefore not be construed as constituting a precedent for the establishment of commissions or subsidiary organs of the United Nations.
As far as we are concerned, we feel that the so-called parity criterion jeopardizes the fundamental principle of the sovereign equality of all Member States of the Organization which is set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter. That meeting of the Disarmament Commission was the first one and so far the only one held by that Commission, which had been set up by the General Assembly in a resolution adopted at its thirteenth session when it decided to expand the membership of the Commission to include representatives of all Member States. The Disarmament Commission decided unanimously to voice satisfaction at the resumption of direct consultations between the four Powers and at the intention expressed by the four Powers to keep the United Nations Commission informed of the progress of the negotiations to be undertaken at Geneva at the outset of 1960. Moreover -- and this point must be especially emphasized -- the Disarmament Commission wished to express the unanimous hope that the results obtained in the course of these deliberations would constitute a useful basis for the consideration of disarmament in the United Nations.
Consequently, this decision constitutes explicit recognition by the competent body of the United Nations of the usefulness of the new negotiations on disarmament in a restricted Committee prior to definitive consideration of the question by our Organization.

It is surely no exaggeration to state that in all the countries of the world the results of the conversations in Geneva are being awaited with anxiety. The new atmosphere which prevails in direct relations between the great Powers will surely facilitate these conversations. It is in this frame of mind and having in mind the new prospects which have appeared on the horizon that the Brazilian delegation at that meeting of the Disarmament Commission voted in favour of the resolution the broad outlines of which I have just brought to mind.

From the beginning of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, two proposals of vast scope were presented on disarmament, one coming from a Western source and the other from a Soviet source. I am referring, of course, to the proposals contained in the speech of the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, of 17 September, and the speech of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union on 18 September. Both speeches covered the same topic and aimed at the same lofty target, that is, the general disarmament of States.

The delegation of Brazil did not fail to see an important contribution to the solution of the disarmament problem as a whole in these speeches. It was with satisfaction that we heard in this hall the statement of the representative of the United States who said that his Government was prepared, during the forthcoming meetings of the Geneva Committee, to study with great care the Soviet disarmament proposals. He added that the United States was awaiting with great interest, at that meeting, the discussion of the proposals of the United Kingdom Government as well.

We have, therefore, no reason to question either the initial goodwill of the great Powers or their acceptance of the principle of the idea of general disarmament, an idea which is the content of the item on the agenda with which we are now dealing. My delegation is gratified at these good inclinations.
However, for the reasons which I have already set out, my delegation considers that it would be premature to examine the substance of the technical details of the two proposals during the current session of the General Assembly. Surely one of these proposals seems to deal rather with grandiose political objectives which are in keeping with the universal aspirations for disarmament, rather than the ways and means and practical conditions necessary for achieving these objectives. Unquestionably, in a matter of such complexity, and which so vitally affects the security of States, the ways and means and the practical conditions are virtually equivalent in importance to the ultimate objectives themselves.

A number of points in the Soviet proposal would require very careful examination and more complete clarification, especially as regards the establishment of an effective system of inspection and control. On the other hand, while the proposal of the British Government strikes us as being less radical or optimistic as regards the ultimate targets, it seems to us to be rather more interesting from the practical point of view, since it calls for a thorough-going analysis and a gradual institution of the systems of control necessary for implementation and enforcement.

Even though the United Nations has been in existence for fourteen years, it has not yet been in a position to adopt any disarmament plan. The fact that I am speaking here at this stage is evidence of the great measure of patience which we have displayed. It would be a veritable miracle to arrive at substantive decisions during the month and a half interval between now and the closing of the present session. This is all the more true as our Committee must deal, in addition, with a number of other questions of obvious importance.

Without wishing to present any formal proposal, but merely as a suggestion, the Brazilian delegation considers that the General Assembly might perhaps give expression to the great hopes inspired by the presentation of the two new disarmament proposals and also voice the wish that the United Kingdom plan and the Soviet plan should be subjected to thorough-going and comprehensive study and examination in the ten-Power Committee in Geneva at the beginning of next year.
However, we would be remiss if we did not emphasize the point that this time, notwithstanding the misgivings and doubts that may be felt when confronted with the picture of a felicitous and happy humanity, a well-fed and peaceful humanity, as presented by the Head of the Soviet Government, it must be acknowledged that something has changed. We must make it a point of honour that no one should run ahead of us on the path of hope.

The President: It appears that no one else wishes to speak. Before adjourning the meeting, I should once again ask all the members of the Committee to participate in the debate as early as possible so that we may make some progress in our work, because this week we had very few speakers. As plenary meetings of the General Assembly have been scheduled for this afternoon and Monday morning, our next meeting will take place on Monday afternoon at three o'clock.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.