VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
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Chairman: Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador)

1. Question of disarmament (/64/) (continued)
2. The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests (/70/) (continued)
3. The reduction of the military budgets of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France by 10 - 15 per cent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries (/72/) (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/PV.946. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

58-23515
AGENDA ITEMS 64, 70 and 72

1. QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT (continued)

2. THE DISCONTINUANCE OF ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN WEAPONS TESTS (continued)


The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before continuing the debate on the three items before the Committee, I should like to advise the Committee that in addition to the two draft resolutions (A/C.1/L.202 and A/C.1/L.203) that had been distributed at the previous meeting, two further draft resolutions which have a bearing on the items on the agenda, have been submitted for the Committee's consideration. These two new draft resolutions are A/C.1/L.204, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and A/C.1/L.205, submitted by Argentina and sixteen other delegations.

Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The urgent problem of disarmament remains a first priority which the peoples and Governments have attempted to solve in the post-war period. The peoples of the world resolutely demand a cessation of the armaments race, the effective reduction of armed forces and armaments, the cessation of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the prohibition of such weapons. For years the armaments race has been seriously disrupting the economies of a number of countries, lowering the standards of living of their population, hampering the peaceful coexistence of States and becoming an increasing danger to the cause of peace and security throughout the world. Freeing the peoples from this burden would spell not only the liberation of the vast creative forces and material resources of man for the benefit of society, the development of the economy of people, the raising of the living standards and the economy of the under-developed countries to a higher level, but at the same time it would constitute a substantial contribution towards ensuring peaceful coexistence.
It is regrettable that after thirteen years of negotiations in the United Nations, and two unanimous General Assembly resolutions, one in 1949 and the other in 1954, which put forward a common disarmament programme for the reduction of armaments and armed forces, the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and effective international control, not even partial disarmament measures have so far been carried out.
Responsibility for the continuing arms race rests on those quarters in the Western Powers, especially the United States, whose foreign policy is based on giving rise to international tension, continuing the cold war, carrying out a policy from positions of strength, tottering on the verge of war and hampering the people's efforts to build their lives according to their own will. This policy is particularly dangerous as a result of the expansion in the production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction.

The ruling circles of the United States of America, which have been forging aggressive pacts such as NATO, SEATO and the bankrupt Baghdad Pact, have drawn many countries into their military plans. These circles are engaged in feverish rearmament and, as recent events in the Near and Middle East and the Far East have shown, their aggressive policy endangers the peace and security of various parts of the world and creates hotbeds of war. The territories of numerous countries of Western Europe, North Africa, the Near and Middle East and the Far East have been riddled with a network of atomic and rocket bases. These measures are nothing but a preparation for nuclear war.

The history of the disarmament negotiations in the United Nations up to the present convincingly demonstrates who it is that is fighting for genuine disarmament. The Soviet Union, guided by its consistent policy of peace, submitted a proposal as early as 1946 for a comprehensive solution of the disarmament problem, including the general reduction of armaments and armed forces, the prohibition of the nuclear weapon and its elimination from the armaments of States, as well as the creation of a system of effective international control. In subsequent years, the Soviet Union put forward a number of other proposals designed to meet the views of the Western Powers. Nevertheless, the latter did not display a sincere willingness to reach an understanding. No sooner had the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to accept their proposals when the Western Powers suddenly lost interest in their proposals. Thus, to this day, they have frustrated any progress on the question of disarmament.

When it became manifest that the Western Powers did not intend to join in a comprehensive disarmament agreement and programme, the Soviet Union put forward a number of concrete partial measures which would be beneficial and the carrying out of which, if acceptable to both sides, could help move the disarmament problem
off dead centre. What happened? The Western Powers opposed the carrying out of any partial measures designed to bring about genuine disarmament. On the contrary, they made these measures mutually conditional, tied in one measure with another. Finally, in their notorious proposals of 29 August 1957, they again lumped all the partial proposals into one mass and declared that, on the basis of the conditions of these proposals, they were resolved to solve all questions only as a whole and would not agree to any solution of individual or separate questions. Today, they are sticking to this position, as the result of which the negotiations on partial measures as well as on disarmament as a whole are floundering in a vicious circle.

The leading representatives of the United States are not seriously interested in genuine disarmament. They speak only of control over armaments. They do not consider that their main objective is to help to put a stop to the armaments race in developing peaceful co-operation between peoples.
Quite the contrary is true. They are entirely the prisoners of their own policy of positions of strength. In their speeches, they again speak of the great "deterrent" based on the use of nuclear and rocket weapons. The American press daily publishes boastful threats addressed to the socialist countries. This policy obviously leads not to disarmament but to a continued and intensified armaments race, to intensified pressure and to threats of the use of force. This policy must be stopped. It must be replaced by practical steps leading towards disarmament, as demanded by a majority of delegations in the plenary meetings of the current session of the General Assembly.

The immediate and unconditional cessation for all time of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons is one measure for the fulfillment of which conditions have long since become ripe. The cessation forever of these test explosions by all countries possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons would bring far-reaching favourable results. First of all, an agreement on this question would apply the brake to the further development and perfecting of increasingly destructive types of nuclear weapons. It would make more difficult the intensification of the atomic armaments race and the distribution of these weapons to other countries which heretofore have not produced them. Thus it would contribute to the reduction of the danger of atomic war in general. The cessation of test explosions of nuclear weapons would at the same time make it possible to utilize for peaceful purposes the resources now allocated to the production of weapons, and in particular to utilize them for peaceful applications of atomic energy. The cessation of nuclear test explosions would stop the further increase of levels of radiation brought about by these test explosions -- levels which, as has again been demonstrated and confirmed by the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, are becoming an increasing threat to the health and well-being of present and future generations.

Attainment of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear test explosions would not in itself solve all atomic armaments problems. But it could constitute a first step towards the solution of other questions, in particular the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, their elimination from the armaments of States, the cessation of the production of such weapons and the liquidation of all stock piles thereof. This would substantially contribute to a relaxation of tension in international relations and the strengthening of confidence between States, and it would render the general international atmosphere safer.
This year, a number of events of such significance have occurred in connexion with the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests that its solution has been moved into the foreground of the agenda with unprecedented urgency. I have in mind, first of all, the unilateral cessation by the Soviet Union, in the spring of this year, of the testing of nuclear weapons, and also the Geneva Conference of Experts on the feasibility of detecting possible violations of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear explosions, and likewise the Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation.

The whole world welcomed with joy and hope the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, on 31 March 1958, for the immediate and unilateral cessation of the testing of all types of nuclear and hydrogen weapons by the Soviet Union, and its appeal to the United States and the United Kingdom to follow suit and to put an end for all time to all atomic explosions. This initiative of the Soviet Union provided convincing evidence of its peace-loving policy. At the same time, it demonstrated that the implementation of a measure of this kind is entirely within the realm of feasibility. The Soviet Union called a halt unilaterally to nuclear test explosions in order to contribute through this resolute step, which should constitute an example to others, to the attainment of agreement on a complete and multilateral cessation. That is the way in which world public opinion understood the decision of the Soviet Union. The Governments of more than thirty States expressed their agreement with this decision. One might have expected that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom would follow up this move of the USSR by similar measures, all the more so since the United States and the United Kingdom together had carried out many more test explosions than had the Soviet Union up until 31 March of this year.

With regret and indignation, however, the world witnessed the fact that, far from following the example of the Soviet Union, these two Powers carried out large and intensive series of test explosions during the current year. In the past half year, the United States has carried out almost forty nuclear explosions in the Pacific Ocean and in the State of Nevada. In fact, one of them took place yesterday. Moreover, British atomic weapons are now being detonated on Christmas Island. Thus, the great peace-loving initiative of the Government of
the USSR has been utilized by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom in their own interests and in order to attain military advantages in the development of nuclear weapons.

You gentlemen who today disseminate the slander that the Soviet Union did not intend sincerely to stop test explosions but was interested only in propaganda -- why do you not tell us now what the Soviet Union was supposed to do in such a situation? Why did not the United States and the United Kingdom follow the example of the Soviet Union? Why is it that they would not stop their nuclear explosions? Why is it that they would not conclude an agreement on the cessation of explosions, in order to see whether the intentions of the Soviet Union in this respect were sincere or not? After all, if they were really full of good-will, as they claim to be, this should not present any difficulties for them. Did not the United States often boast that it had produced many more nuclear test explosions than had the Soviet Union?

The United States, however, did not want to take any such peace-loving steps, because the United States does not want to agree to a cessation of tests. In this predicament the Government of the Soviet Union could do nothing else than carry out the meaning of the decision of the Supreme Soviet of 51 March and declare that the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom had released the Soviet Union from the obligations which it had assumed unilaterally, counting as it did on the good-will of the Governments of the Western Powers on the question of the necessity of an immediate and universal cessation of nuclear test explosions. The Soviet Union was therefore compelled to resume such tests. The actions of the Government of the Soviet Union in this situation are fully in harmony with the interests of the security of the Soviet Union and with the vital interests and the security of all other peace-loving countries.
The Czechoslovak people and its Government are fully in agreement with those moves. World public opinion fully understood the step taken by the Soviet Government because it is entirely alive to the fact that responsibility for the failure to stop nuclear test explosions forever lies exclusively with the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. No amount of appeals to public opinion and no amount of distortion of facts will help those Governments to relieve themselves of that responsibility or shift it on to other parties.

The Geneva conference of experts from eight countries, including experts from Czechoslovakia, studied for two months with scientific thoroughness all aspects of the detection and location of all types of nuclear test explosions, and recommended unanimously to the Governments practical methods for an effective system of control to ensure the observance of an agreement for the universal cessation of test explosions of nuclear weapons. In the final report of that conference it is recommended that a network of control posts should be set up, including about 160 to 170 land control posts and some ten posts on ships for control in the open sea. The experts' report makes it clear that the effectiveness of this network of control posts, if all suitable control methods were used, would be high. The report states clearly that "whatever the precautionary measures adopted by a violator, he could not be guaranteed against exposure". (A/3897, page 25)

The Czechoslovak Government has examined the experts' report and agrees with its conclusions.

The results of this Geneva conference of experts have confirmed the position of the Soviet Union and of all those other countries which, from the very outset, contended that control over the cessation of nuclear explosions was entirely feasible. Scientists of all countries have taken an increasingly resolute stand in favour of the cessation of explosions, as is indicated by the 9,235 signatures of scientists of all nations which the outstanding American scientist, Dr. Linus Pauling, transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 13 January of this year.
The desire of all peoples to put an end to nuclear test explosions was convincingly expressed also at the World Congress for Disarmament and International Co-operation which took place in Stockholm in July this year. The Nobel Prize winner, Dr. Schweitzer, in his statement of 20 April of this year, emphasized the significance of the unilateral cessation of tests by the Soviet Union in the following words:

"Were the United Kingdom and the United States able to adopt a similar reasonable decision, which is in harmony with the rights of man, then mankind would be relieved of the dread that increasing radioactive contamination of the atmosphere and of the soil as the result of test explosions will subject the very existence of mankind to danger."

The fact that, as the result of continuing nuclear explosions, mankind is subjected to increasing hazards was clearly confirmed by the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, submitted to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. The conclusions of that report make it quite clear that:

"Radioactive contamination of the environment resulting from explosions of nuclear weapons constitutes a growing increment to world-wide radiation levels."

The report then goes on to confirm that this fact

"involves new and largely unknown hazards to present and future populations;". (A/3838, page 41, para. 54)

Thus the report of this Committee bears further witness to the urgency of stopping nuclear tests, universally and for all time.

On 31 October conversations are scheduled to begin in Geneva between representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom on the cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons. This fact has stirred hopes among the peoples of the world that this question will, after all, be solved in the interests of mankind and in the interests of world peace.
What is the position of the United States in relation to these forthcoming negotiations? An answer to that question was given by the representative of the United States, Mr. Lodge, in his speech in this Committee on 10 October. The United States, as his speech made clear, once again ties in the question of the complete and permanent cessation of nuclear test explosions with the whole complex of other disarmament problems. Mr. Lodge stated that the complete and permanent cessation of tests of nuclear weapons can occur only if there is progress on the way to a reduction of the nuclear threat, a reduction of the high level of nuclear weapons and a minimizing of the danger of surprise attack. This may be seen from the verbatim record of the meeting in question (A.C.1/FV.945).

This means, incidentally, that the solution of the most urgent question in the whole gamut of contemporary disarmament problems -- that is, the cessation of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, a problem whose solution has become timely, requiring only the goodwill of the United States and the United Kingdom -- is made contingent by the United States on other problems, and the United States places it not in the foreground but in the background. The attainment of an agreement on this question is again being hampered by the United States. At least, the United States is trying to hamper it by making it contingent upon other measures in the field of disarmament, and it is universally known that it is the Western Powers which have frustrated any steps in the field of disarmament.

The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom are now declaring, with a great deal of publicity, that as from 31 October they are prepared to put an end to their tests for one year on certain conditions. What is hidden behind these declarations? A man does not have to be an expert or a specialist in such weapons to realize that the United States and the United Kingdom are now in the process of completing a large series of test explosions, that one year is the approximate time required to evaluate the results of such a series such as that which is still going on, and that one year is required to prepare for a new series. The actions of the United States and the United Kingdom make it obvious that those countries do not intend to stop tests at all.
That conclusion may be drawn from official statements, and it is openly emphasized in the American Press. It is indicated, for example, by Mr. Kissinger's article published in the October 1958 issue of Foreign Affairs. The whole article, from beginning to end, is directed against the cessation of nuclear tests. Its author brushes aside the results of the Geneva conference of experts and deliberately casts doubts on the possibility of detecting certain kinds of nuclear tests, especially underground tests and those conducted at great altitudes. At the same time he openly expresses misgiving on the ground that the cessation of tests would hamper the development of new types of weapons, would interfere with their distribution to other States and would increase the resistance of peoples to the use of nuclear weapons generally.

The conclusion of the article is clear. Nuclear tests should not be stopped. Instead, proposals should be submitted for the carrying out of some kind of regulation of future nuclear tests, under the aegis of the United Nations. To this it should be added that, according to a New York Times dispatch of 10 October 1958, the United States Defense Department has expressed its agreement with Mr. Kissinger's point of view.
The Soviet Union's approach to the forthcoming Geneva conference is wholly in harmony with the insistent demand of the peoples that nuclear tests should be stopped without delay. As in the past, the Soviet Union Government proposes that tests should be stopped immediately, for all time and without reservations, as a partial measure towards disarmament. That is why the Government of the Soviet Union likewise asks that the object of the Geneva negotiations should be the attainment of agreement on the permanent cessation of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, along with the institution of control over the observance of such an agreement.

Given the present situation prior to the Geneva negotiations, it is particularly necessary -- it is in fact imperative -- for the thirteenth session of the General Assembly to state its views, which are weighty views, on the question of the cessation of nuclear tests. The General Assembly will scarcely help these negotiations if, as recommended in the draft resolution presented by the United States and sixteen other countries (A/C.1/L.205) of 10 October, it appeals only to countries which are carrying out weapons tests to make every effort to achieve rapid agreement on the suspension of such tests.

In this respect the correct solution is the one called for by the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.1/L.203) of 9 October, according to which the General Assembly should call upon the countries carrying out test explosions to stop such tests immediately.

The Czechoslovak delegation considers that the General Assembly must not stand aside from the negotiations on the cessation of nuclear test explosions. It is not enough to express good wishes to the Geneva negotiators of the atomic Powers and then sit back and await results. The urgent question of atomic tests is not a matter of concern to these three States alone, but touches also upon all States because it concerns the interests of the peoples of the entire world. One cannot be reconciled with the tendency displayed by certain States, as indicated in the discussion on the order of consideration of individual aspects of the disarmament problem, to frustrate, or at least sidestep, any examination of this question -- or rather, a thorough examination of the question.
(Mr. David, Czechoslovakia)

The General Assembly must carry out its duty, must examine this problem in a responsible manner and adopt recommendations in support of a simultaneous universal and unconditional cessation of testing of nuclear weapons.

The Czechoslovak people and its Government have repeatedly come out in favour of the complete prohibition of the use and production of atomic and hydrogen weapons and their elimination from the armaments of States, as well as the complete destruction of existing stockpiles, with suitable international control. That is why the Czechoslovak delegation has always supported proposals for the unconditional and unreserved cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons and has sought to have this carried out. It is in this spirit that the Czechoslovak delegation will act at the present session of the Assembly and will support wholeheartedly the Soviet Union draft resolution on the cessation of the tests of nuclear explosions. The unconditional and complete cessation of nuclear tests would create favourable conditions for further steps towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, for the cessation of their production, for the elimination of such weapons from the arsenals of States, and for the destruction of stockpiles.

Proceeding from these principles, the Soviet Union has already submitted a number of proposals in the realm of disarmament. The Western Powers, particularly the United States -- even though they voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 41 (I) of 1946 and 808 (IX) of 1954 -- in practice, from the very outset, have taken a stand against the implementation of any prohibition of nuclear weapons, in every way seeking to sidestep a solution of this problem. In recent proposals, both at last year's session of the General Assembly and those presented for inclusion in the agenda of a summit meeting, the United States does not even mention the prohibition of nuclear weapons. On the contrary; in recent years we have witnessed a number of attempts directly or indirectly to legalize these weapons. The reason for the United States resistance to the prohibition of nuclear weapons can be found in the fact that this weapon of mass extermination has become the alpha and omega of contemporary United States policy and military strategy.

The United States is producing more and more new types of nuclear weapons and, as its representatives boast, is increasing the effect of such weapons,
equipping its armed forces therewith, distributing them among its network of bases on the territories of foreign States, and foisting these weapons on its allies in military blocs.

In today's tense atmosphere, the fact that atomic warfare can be unleashed in a purely accidental manner is a new factor which gives rise to profound alarm. It is well known that United States aircraft are carrying out continuous flights over Western Europe with payloads of nuclear bombs, that the United States strategic Air Force is carrying similar cargoes for provocative purposes, and is conducting flights over the Arctic region in the direction of the frontiers of the Soviet Union. At the present time, when nuclear weapons are kept in constant battle-readiness, they can be placed in action by a few people, or even by one person. It is enough for one person's nerves to collapse or for some sort of psychological disturbance to occur, to cause a whole series of atomic blows and counter-blowes whose consequences are incalculable.

The fact that the ruling circles of the United States will not shrink from the most risky measures in preparing atomic war is witnessed by a report published in The New York Times of 7 October of this year, which states the following:

"... it may well be a division commander -- ... not necessarily even an American -- who will make the decision on firing the first nuclear weapon of World War III ..." (The New York Times, 7 October 1958)

At the present time there is a clear danger of an increasing threat of nuclear warfare in view of the apparent trend to distribute nuclear weapons to new States. This dissemination of nuclear weapons is fostered by the policy of the United States, which seeks to arm the armies of aggressive military groups with nuclear weapons.
It is likewise fostered by the fact that as a result of the continuous perfecting and development of the production of nuclear weapons, conditions have been created where the production of these weapons of mass extermination is being simplified. It is becoming cheaper, as a result of which it is becoming accessible to an increasing number of States. This new aspect of the atomic armaments problem has alarmed the peoples and it has created the danger of the use or the possession of nuclear weapons by other countries. In recent times this relates in particular to France which, notwithstanding its sad experience with German militarism and revanchism, is carrying out jointly with the Federal Republic of Germany intensive preparations as regards production of rocket and nuclear weapons, as reported in one of the October issues of Le Monde.

As regards co-operation with German militarists, it is proper to recall the saying that it is not right to boil a soup with the devil. In view of his character, the devil is likely to cook the Gallic rooster in that soup. So his goose will be cooked. It is essential for the threat of atomic and hydrogen weapons to be eliminated from this world, that the door should be opened wide to the solution of international problems through negotiations for the development of peaceful co-operation of States, on the basis of which international security could be made safe and secure.

Inasmuch as the Western Powers are not at the present time prepared to accept a complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, the USSR proposes that the States possessing nuclear weapons of all types should assume the solemn obligation to forswear the use of atomic weapons, including air bombs, rockets of all ranges of actions, with atomic and hydrogen warheads, atomic artillery, and so on. This measure would be a concrete step forward toward the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and would be welcomed by all people who are unwilling to live under the Damocles sword of atomic war. At the present time, when the tendency to arm the armies of additional capitalist States with nuclear weapons is increasing, it is becoming more and more urgent that States which possess nuclear weapons should assume the obligation not to permit the stationing of atomic military units outside of their frontiers, and that they should assume the obligation not to make these weapons available to other States and military groupings.
The Czechoslovak people and Government are seriously alarmed by the fact that with the direct assistance of the Western Powers, especially the United States, West Germany is arming feverishly, within the framework of NATO, with the most modern types of weapons, including atomic and rocket weapons. This course of events poses a dangerous threat to peace in Europe and touches upon the security of all European countries, especially Germany's neighbours. It is a consequence of the long-term policy of those ruling circles of the United States which were and are interested in strengthening German imperialism and militarism, which they helped rear their heads again after the Second World War when they assigned to Western Germany a leading role in the aggressive plans against the Socialist countries.

As a consequence of the American policy of atomic armament of West Germany, the German militarists and revanchists, in particular in recent times, are rearing their heads again, and their statements and declarations are becoming increasingly impudent, insolent and provocative.

The participation of the Federal Republic of Germany in NATO, and its increasing influence on the activities of this aggressive grouping, constitutes the basis of the carrying out of plans for the nuclear armaments of the armed forces of the Federal Republic of Germany. After the West German Bundestag had voted in favour of equipping the armies of that country with atomic weapons, the War Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Strauss, in July of this year, proclaimed a large-scale plan for the general reorganization of the West German Wehrmacht for purposes of waging atomic warfare. This reorganization is scheduled to be completed in 1963.

According to the plans of American strategists, the West German army is to become the mightiest military formation in the framework of NATO. For the attainment of this purpose it is proposed to increase substantially the Federal German Republic's military budget, to develop further on West German territory military production, especially the production of nuclear and rocket weapons. So long as West German industry is not capable of producing sufficient numbers of nuclear and rocket weapons itself, the West German Government will be in a position to acquire such weapons from the United States and other Western Powers.
According to a dispatch in The Times of London of 19 March of this year, West Germany's Defence Minister Strauss had declared that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany intends to purchase, for military training and production purposes, twenty or more ballistic rockets and twelve rocket-launching pads. Czechoslovakia, which twenty years ago was handed over by the West to German imperialism, to be devoured, is watching the dangerous course of events in West Germany with attention and vigilance.

The policy of the establishment of atomic bases in West Germany, the policy of the re-armament of the West German army and its equipping with nuclear weapons is incompatible with the interests of peace in Europe. This policy is opposed, with increasing urgency and alarm, by West German public opinion itself, which is becoming increasingly alive to the great dangers implicit in this policy. As far as the German people itself is concerned, first of all this policy is actively and consistently fought by the German Democratic Republic. The German Democratic Republic's great efforts are a great contribution to the cause of peace in Europe and deserve recognition by peace-loving world public opinion.

The Czechoslovak delegation consequently considers that it is essential to take effective measures to call a halt to the further intensification of tension in this region of the world. A significant role in this respect would be played by the creation of a zone in Central Europe which would be free of nuclear and rocket weapons, as proposed by the Government of the Polish People's Republic. This proposal stipulates that nuclear and rocket weapons are not to be produced, supplied or stationed in the territories of Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, and likewise, that the use of nuclear weapons against this region should be prohibited. The proposal of the Polish People's Republic is entirely realistic and fully in harmony with the efforts of the United Nations to attain disarmament through the carrying out of partial measures.
As shown by broad international discussion on this proposal, it has been welcomed in Europe and outside of Europe. The creation in Central Europe of a zone free from nuclear and rocket weapons would constitute a serious step towards ensuring Europe's security and eliminating the danger of nuclear war in Europe, as a result of which the solution of further aspects of the disarmament question and of other questions would be facilitated. Seeking to discourage the further dissemination of nuclear weapons, the Czechoslovak delegation thinks that it is urgent in the present state of affairs -- when there are regions such as the Near and the Middle East, the Far East and so on, where international tension seems to be focussed and which poses the danger of turning into the seedbeds of a new world war -- and it also deems it essential in these conditions that the possibilities of creating similar zones in these regions should likewise be studied. Such measures would contribute substantially to the relaxation of tension throughout the world. It would be a substantial factor in the initial phase of disarmament and would constitute an important step in the efforts directed against the further dissemination of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

In the framework of partial disarmament measures, the Czechoslovak delegation attaches great significance to the proposal of the Soviet delegation that the thirteenth session of the General Assembly should consider as an independent item the question of the reduction of the military budgets of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France by 10 to 15 per cent and the use of part of the savings so effected for assistance to the under-developed countries. The adoption of this proposal would be an important practical measure for the cessation of the armaments race. It would make it possible to raise the level of well-being of the peoples, and it would indubitably contribute to the placing of the development of the economies of States on a sounder basis. The adoption of this proposal would be of exceptional significance for the under-developed countries since a part of the savings so effected would be allocated to the economic development of these very countries. A number of under-developed countries have worked out two to six-year plans of gradual liquidation of the backwardness of their economies. The greatest difficulties are occasioned by the shortage of resources for the carrying out of these plans. The aggregate sum of investments planned for the development of Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, India, Indonesia, Cambodia,
Nepal, Pakistan and the Sudan is $22 billion. These countries propose to expand $4 billion annually for the needs of their economic development.

According to data for the 1956-1957 fiscal year, which would apply even more to the 1957-1958 fiscal year, especially as regards the United States, the reduction of the military budgets of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and France by less than 6 per cent per annum would release the resources required to finance the annual expenditure for economic development in the ten countries of Asia and Africa which I just mentioned -- all of them.

The Czechoslovak Government warmly welcomes the proposal of the Soviet Union for the reduction of military budgets because its adoption and implementation would contribute to disarmament and to the raising of the standard of living and well-being of all peoples.

An agreement for the prohibition of the utilization of cosmic inter-planetary military space for military purposes would be of great significance for the solution of the disarmament question, as well as liquidation of foreign military bases on the territories of foreign States and international co-operation in the field of the study of cosmic space. The solution of this question is only possible if the interests and security of all States are taken into account. The General Assembly should carefully examine this problem which was presented by the Government of the Soviet Union as an independent item on the agenda of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly, and the Assembly should adopt suitable recommendations for an expeditious solution of this problem.

The further proposals contained in the memorandum of the Soviet Government on disarmament measures, presented to the thirteenth session of the General Assembly on 22 September of this year, offer genuine possibilities for the solution of a number of other items relevant to the disarmament question. The reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments would be encouraged by the implementation of the recommendations contained in that proposal to the effect that the Soviet Union and the United States should reduce the effective of their armed forces at the first stage to 2.5 million men each and at the second stage to 2.1 million men each and at the third stage to 1.7 million men each. As regards the United Kingdom and France, the first stage for them should bring about the reduction of their armed forces to 750,000 men each and in the second stage to a level of 700,000 men each and in the third stage to 650,000 men each.
As regards the question of conventional armaments, the Soviet Government has proposed that as a first step these armaments should be reduced by 15 per cent. At the same time the Government of the USSR has expressed its readiness to follow another alternative path towards the reduction of conventional armaments, that is, through the exchange of lists of armaments to be reduced, as proposed by the Western Powers themselves. While the level of the armed forces of the United States has remained for a number of years at an unvaried high level, while the level of armaments of Western Germany is being increased with every year that passes, the countries of the socialist camp have for a number of years now carried out a policy of the systematic reduction of the levels of their armed forces. Since 1955 the States Members of the Warsaw Treaty have reduced their armed forces about 2,477,000 men. The States Members of the Warsaw Treaty, at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee on 24 May 1958, decided to carry out a further unilateral reduction of the levels of armed forces of the countries adhering to the Warsaw Treaty by 419,000 men. Over the past three years Czechoslovakia, for its part, reduced its armed forces by 64,000 men. However, no one should nurse the thought that the socialist countries will indefinitely reduce their armed forces unilaterally if no response comes from the West.
While making every effort to bring about a general reduction of armaments, those countries, with the interests of their security in mind, will not for one second relax their vigilance in respect to the plans of the enemies of peace. A great role in the question of the reduction of armaments could be played by the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of other States or, at least, by a reduction in their numbers as a first step. An agreement should be reached between the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France to reduce the number of troops stationed on German territory by one-third or by some other ratio to be agreed upon. An agreement on the reduction of the armed forces of the great Powers situated on the territories of the States members of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty would be a great step forward towards the relaxation of international tension.

In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the implementation of agreed measures for disarmament should be supported by measures of international control which would be in keeping with the scale of the disarmament measures to be adopted. In discussing the question of controls, measures for the prevention of surprise attack by one State against another are of great significance. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that a good way to tackle this question would be the gradual solution of the question of the prevention of surprise attack dependent upon the character of the steps to be taken in the field of disarmament in the initial stage. It is in particular necessary to reach agreement on the location of control posts at railway junctions, large ports and important highways and aerial inspection in the zone of the concentration of the basic armed forces of the two military groupings in Europe to a depth of 800 kilometres to the east and the west of the line which divides these forces and similarly in a zone which would include the far eastern portion of the territory of the Soviet Union and the far western portion of the territory of the United States.

The Czechoslovak Government has expressed its agreement with the proposal made by the Soviet Union that on 10 November there should be held in Geneva a conference of experts to consider a convention on the prevention of surprise attacks, and it is prepared to take part in these conversations. However, technical conversations can only have a meaning if their purpose is to pave the
way to concrete measures for disarmament and if there is some evidence of goodwill to carry out such measures. Technical negotiations and the various studies urged by the representative of the United States, Mr. Lodge, in his speech in this Committee on 10 October, which he described as a new approach to disarmament, could prove to be merely a new strategem or tactic designed to create the impression that negotiations on disarmament were being carried out, whereas behind the screen of such negotiations the solution of the question of disarmament would still continue at top dead-centre. The fact that despite the successful results of the Geneva Conference of Experts, the United States and the United Kingdom have yet to stop their tests of atomic and nuclear weapons constitutes, in our opinion, a warning in this regard.

An utterly new approach by the United States towards disarmament can be taken seriously only if the United States begins practically to carry out at least some first step towards disarmament. But the feverish armaments race is being further intensified by the war propaganda which is being spread in various countries and which is being intensified to an unheard-of degree. The adoption of the spirit of General Assembly resolution 110 (II) adopted in 1947 would discourage those quarters which are thirsting for war or disseminating hatred between peoples; it would contribute to the creation of a greater modicum of confidence between States and would lead to a reduction in international tension.

The most urgent partial measures in the field of disarmament set forth in the memorandum from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, document A/3929, could be adopted at the present juncture without any particular difficulty. Their fulfilment would lay the foundation for the solution of other more complex problems of disarmament and would contribute to improving the present international situation. The proposals of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are clear, forthright and comprehensible. They answer the demand of the peoples for disarmament and, therefore, they have commanded the support and sympathy of world public opinion. The Czechoslovak Government, proceeding from the premise of its consistent peace policy, fully supports the Soviet proposals.
The result of the disarmament negotiations last year, because of the actions of the Western Powers which sought to impose their own points of view on the socialist and neutral countries, was that the talks in the United Nations ended in a deadlock. If some progress was achieved in the negotiations, this was done outside the halls of the United Nations. The Czechoslovak delegation expresses the hope that the States Members of the United Nations which want the United Nations to contribute to the solution of disarmament questions will support the institution of a representative United Nations body on disarmament, a body created on the basis of equitable representation. It is inadmissible to accept the unilateral membership of the Disarmament Commission which the Western Powers imposed upon the United Nations at the twelfth session of the General Assembly, because this method, as the year that has just elapsed clearly shows, can only lead to an impasse.

The thirteenth session of the General Assembly should examine the most important aspects of the disarmament problem with a full awareness of the responsibilities which it assumes. In the first instance, this applies to the important and urgent measure of disarmament of the cessation of the testing of nuclear and hydrogen weapons. At its current session, the General Assembly should call upon the Governments of countries carrying out such tests to stop them and to conclude as swiftly as possible a suitable agreement. Were it to do so, the General Assembly would fulfil the hopes of all world public opinion. In this manner, this session would contribute towards a successful outcome of the negotiations which are to begin in Geneva on 31 October. The Czechoslovak Government attaches great significance to the forthcoming conference on the preparation of an agreement on the prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons and the establishment of a suitable system of controls. Consequently, the Czechoslovak delegation supports the proposal of the Soviet Government that this very important conference should be held at the Foreign Ministers' level.
The Czechoslovak delegation champions that type of solution of the disarmament problem which would be based on a fair and equitable consideration of the legitimate interests of all countries, a solution under which no one State would be placed in an unfavourable position regarding its security.

If the General Assembly wishes to fulfil the demands of the peoples of the world, it must contribute to a solution of the problem of disarmament and to the implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The Czechoslovak Government is prepared to co-operate in carrying out all effective measures that are directed to this end.

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I have listened carefully to the statements which have been made thus far in the Committee, and I have examined carefully the statements which were made during the procedural debate on the agenda. I believe that all the statements point to one thing: a desire on the part of us all to arrive at concrete solutions at this session that will lead to progress in the field of disarmament.

"Disarmament by deeds" is the phrase which in three words sums up the general desire of the world. It should also express our firm desire here. In the course of the general debate I made three suggestions on the disarmament question. Two of these have been summed up in draft resolutions which appear in the records of the General Assembly. In due course my delegation will also submit these draft resolutions to the Committee. At the moment, however, I shall merely deal with one of these suggestions.

We must agree that basically disarmament is the most important problem facing the world today. Owing to the advances made in the field of science, rocketry, missiles and so forth, the problem has acquired a new and dramatic dimension. I do not believe that there is an important international issue today, political or economic, whose solution is not conditioned to some extent by the question of disarmament. I think we might say that the disarmament question is the acid test through which the United Nations is now passing. The United Nations will justify its existence by solving this problem.
There are encouraging signs at present, but there are also discouraging signs. The negative element is that general discussion on disarmament has completely ended. The Commission which was established at the last session of the General Assembly has not met. The initial positions regarding the composition of that Commission have become even more rigid, and we have arrived at a stalemate. On the other hand, the positive aspect is the very important agreement which was arrived at in Geneva by the experts of the principal nuclear Powers on the possibilities of detecting test explosions. Those consultations by experts were highly successful. We know that it is impossible to hide explosions and we know how to detect explosions. This might perhaps be the first true advance made in this subject, since it goes to the very basis of the problem. I think we can congratulate ourselves on this fact, which redounds not only to the benefit of the countries concerned but also to all the countries of the world.

My delegation believes that the technical agreement arrived at in Geneva provides a sufficient basis for a political agreement on the prohibition of test explosions. As time passes humanity will be less liable to resign itself to the dangers inherent in test explosions now that the basic technical obstacle has been removed.

We agree that any disarmament plan, even a partial one, should cover all the elements of the problem: conventional weapons, nuclear weapons, equipment, a system of control and methods to prevent a surprise attack. In principle we cannot separate the different elements of the problem because one element must have a bearing on the others. We cannot accept some elements and reject others. To do so might leave some States in an advantageous position regarding others. We do feel, however, that the question of test explosions is in a specific position regarding the other elements of the problem because it requires not only economic sacrifices and increases the danger of war but also presents grave dangers to humanity itself.

It is true that some experts contend that the radioactivity to which we are subjected from nuclear tests can be overlooked and is in fact less harmful than radiation normally produced, but there are other experts who state that the most serious problem facing the world today is not the direct exposure to radioactivity generated by explosions but the indirect absorption through a series of biological changes, the effects of many of which cannot as yet be calculated. This seems to be the true danger.
Furthermore, each new test explosion increases international tension and fear among peoples. This in turn makes it more difficult for us to be calm and objective with regard to this problem, which no doubt will tend to make the solution more difficult.

The strategic advantages which one country might enjoy by continuing tests are, after all, short-lived, because military supremacy is based upon the constant invention of new weapons. It is a historic fact that these situations generate a constant increase of armaments and of fear.

The technical agreement which was arrived at in Geneva might also be used to serve another purpose. The General Assembly might channel the impulse which moved the experts to agree to other fields so as to solve other problems. The entire machinery must be put into motion on the question of disarmament. I stated in the general debate that we believe that the encouraging results which have been obtained by the experts in Geneva indicate that the same type of study should gradually be applied to other aspects of the disarmament problem. We know that very soon the same approach will be used with regard to measures to be taken to avoid surprise attack.

We believe, nevertheless, that it is necessary for some organ of the United Nations to deal regularly with the question of disarmament during the period when the Assembly is not in session.
For this there are reasons of principle and reasons of a practical nature. As regards the former, we must bear in mind the fact that the solution of the disarmament problem depends primarily on the great Powers; because of their capacity they have the greatest and most direct responsibility in the matter. However, it is something that very deeply and equally concerns all Members of the United Nations, since, after all is said and done, what is at stake is the survival of the peoples. Therefore it would be rather difficult to understand why an Organization, to which we have entrusted the main task of maintaining international peace and security with the purpose, among others, of avoiding the use of human and economic wealth in the arms race, should be able to deal with such a vital question only once a year during the somewhat short period when the General Assembly meets and deals with this specific question either in plenary meetings or in the Political Committee.

From a purely pragmatic point of view, we must realize the necessity of making all effort to prevent the situation existing since the twelfth session from becoming chronic. For instance, let us take the case of the negotiations, constituting the second stage of the meeting of experts, which are to begin on 31 October in Geneva. These conversations will turn into a political reality the obvious desire of humanity: that is, the final halting of nuclear weapons tests. There are two possibilities. One is that, as we all hope, the negotiations may be crowned with success. On the other hand, these talks may lead to a stalemate. In either case, it is obvious that it would be most appropriate and desirable to have available an official body of the United Nations, having the co-operation and participation of all the great Powers. In the case of an agreement in Geneva it might be able, there and then, under the aegis of our Organization, to undertake the very complex tasks that will emanate from such an agreement. If there is, unfortunately, a disagreement or a stalemate in Geneva, this official body of the United Nations could also intervene immediately to keep alive the explorations of the possibilities of agreement by using all the procedures that may be deemed appropriate in the light of the circumstances at the time.
In either case the presence of the United Nations would seem to be absolutely indispensable. As I said a week ago, I feel that the First Committee would be acting correctly and in accordance with its terms of reference if it recommended to the representatives of the United States, France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union that they jointly examine ways of renewing negotiations on disarmament and especially that they examine the chances of agreement on the setting up of a body that with the participation of these Powers might act within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations on all matters pertaining to disarmament.

The initial question which I believe this First Committee has to solve, therefore, is the finding of ways and means efficiently to renew negotiations. The question of time and place and the relations of disarmament to other matters and so on are all of importance to the Members of the Assembly, but some Powers have greater and more direct responsibility. Besides this, agreement between those Powers is absolutely imperative if the process of negotiation is to be renewed. So I repeat that the best way to act at this juncture, in my opinion, would be to recommend to the representatives of the nuclear Powers, which are most directly concerned, that they meet now in New York. Naturally in the meantime we should continue the general debate on disarmament in this Committee, but they would meet to negotiate and try to agree on a formula that would solve the first problem, that is, a renewal of the disarmament negotiations that were suspended a year ago. Such a meeting of the representatives of the nuclear Powers might take place with the participation of the Chairman of the First Committee, who would assist those representatives in their consultations, and of course with the participation and help of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I also believe that, were my suggestion accepted, talks between the representatives of those four delegations should be undertaken as soon as possible and, if possible, before our general debate in the First Committee is concluded, and such talks could take place when this Committee is not meeting.
It is imperative that the international community represented in the
First Committee make known its views and affirm its competence in the matter.

 Might I recall the private conversations that took place in Paris from
1 to 10 December 1951 during the sixth regular session of the General Assembly?
Those representatives who were present in Paris in 1951 will no doubt recall that,
following a suggestion made by the delegations of Syria, Pakistan and Iraq, a
unanimous request was addressed to the four great Powers that they meet privately
to discuss the draft resolutions that had been submitted by both sides on
dismantlement at that session. As I have said, these talks were held for ten days
in Paris. At that time Ambassador Jessup represented the United States,
Mr. Vishinsky represented the Soviet Union, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd represented the
United Kingdom, and Mr. Jules Moch represented France. At the end of those talks,
over which I had the honour to preside, having been entrusted with this task by
the Political Committee, I submitted a memorandum to the Political Committee that
was adopted unanimously as the report of Sub-Committee 18 of the Political
Committee. In that memorandum I gave a detailed account of what had taken place
in the Sub-Committee. This report was agreed to by the members of the Sub-Committee
and it was subsequently divided into a number of parts. We pointed out what
points the Sub-committee had agreed on, what points it might agree upon and,
finally, the points on which it had been unable to agree.
I shall not detain this Committee by going into detail on the different points contained in that document of Committee 10 of the First Committee. It is dated 10 December 1951 and can be found if anybody wants to see it. But at this moment what I should like to say is that despite the fact that the functions and the terms of reference, that at that time had been given to the Sub-Committee, were on matters of substance that touched on disarmament and therefore were more difficult to agree upon, and despite the fact that these terms of reference did not lead us to hope that at some time we might come to agreement on all the different details, the opinions of the four representatives I mentioned, when we discussed the work of the Sub-Committee itself, was extremely encouraging and praised the work of the Sub-Committee.

I have before me the report of the statements made by the Great Powers in the Political Committee later when they referred to the work of the Sub-Committee. I shall not dilate on this matter and I shall not read out all these remarks, but I should like to stress a few remarks that were made at the time.

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, representing the United Kingdom, pointed out that "in the debate of the Sub-Committee an atmosphere of sincerity and cordiality reigned, that there were no acrimonious discussions on procedural questions and that these discussions permitted us to establish decisions upon what points we agreed, upon what points we might agree and also upon what points there was still disagreement". "These debates" continued Mr. Selwyn Lloyd "will no doubt be taken as having been fruitful and we must thank the representatives of Iraq, Pakistan and Syria for their felicitous initiative". How to go on to examine the points of agreement. The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that the four Powers have agreed on the setting up of a new commission. They have agreed on the name for it, namely, the Commission on Atomic Energy and Conventional Weapons; and this Commission will present proposals that will be incorporated in a draft convention or treaty which shall be submitted for consideration in a world conference.

After going into a detailed analysis of everything that was dealt with in the Sub-Committee, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd continued, "concisely this is the result of the work of the five-man Sub-Committee. The positive balance is that the Sub-Committee has agreed that debate on the question should continue. The work of the Sub-Committee has incontestably contributed to a reduction of international
tension. Although it is no less true that insofar as certain essential points are concerned there is disagreement on the part of the three Western Powers on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other hand, we have nevertheless achieved progress in many other fields. First and foremost" -- and this is what I personally wanted to stress here -- "an agreement has been reached regarding the machinery that we intend to continue permanently using in the United Nations to examine these questions constantly."

At that self same meeting Mr. Vishinsky, representing the Soviet Union, in his examination of all that had occurred and had taken place in Sub-Committee II, said "some decisions of an important nature were arrived at in the Sub-Committee despite the fact that they referred to matters which appear to be of a secondary nature; they are important insofar as they contribute towards reducing disagreement because they can facilitate the elimination of other difficulties."

Mr. Jules Nych and Ambassador Jessup both referred in their speeches to the work of the Committee. They, too, considered as extremely important the recommendation for the setting up of a new commission. It is therefore extremely important that the tasks which had been adopted in a number of resolutions of the General Assembly, first of all, resolution 502(VI) that was adopted in Paris on 11 January 1952; another one is the resolution that was adopted last year, and all the resolutions that were adopted in between.

I say that the basic instrument set up for constant study and effort for the solution of the problems that beset the negotiations of such a complex question has been set up according to these resolutions, it has been restated in every resolution of the General Assembly, and its existence has been considered as necessary. It would be inappropriate and dangerous for us now to cast aside that instrument set up with all these perspectives and with all these ideas in mind and so constantly reiterated.

We must, as I said earlier, make one more serious effort to try to find the general formula by which we can renew our negotiations. The question of disarmament cannot be left subject to the sporadic yearly meetings of the
General Assembly, nor can it be left open to the occasional discussions on specific items, such as that at Geneva. No matter how much we may hope for from these sporadic meetings, the existence of an impasse will ultimately make it more difficult even to call meetings such as that of Geneva. Furthermore, we know full well that a permanent standing committee, which can call meetings at any moment, wherein the different subjects can be discussed, such a standing committee allows for a constant vigilance and a constant discussion of this type of problem. So that all this proves that the renewal of talks is the most important aspect of the question.

That is why I make this suggestion: if seven years ago a unanimous agreement was achieved in the General Assembly, that with the agreement of the four Powers informal and private talks be held, and these talks led to certain agreements, then it is no less true that today we might also achieve that. What we want is that this Committee should request the great Powers to exchange views and see how they can renew negotiations, not sporadic or periodic negotiations, but standing negotiations which, once and for all, would wipe out and break through this impasse that was built last year, and still stands, as far as the work of the Disarmament Commission is concerned.
World public opinion does not believe that nuclear weapons and the arms race can in any way guarantee the independence of small nations, the security of great nations or the maintenance of international peace. World public opinion knows that the only thing to which such races lead is the race to destruction.

The world has followed very closely the progress of science in the conquering of outer space. The world hopes that this effort to escape into another planet will be inspired by the benefits that it might bring to mankind. But until these dreams come true we should devote our efforts in the field of science to making life on earth better for all its inhabitants. As yet, we are bound to this planet; we cannot escape it. We are all born equally naked, ignorant and vulnerable. If we have not as yet grown up in wisdom and nobility to permit us to love one another, at least let us share our common home without destroying one another.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): In accordance with the usual custom of this Committee, I have asked to speak today in order to explain the provisions of the draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Ecuador, Iran, Italy, Laos, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Thailand, The United Kingdom and the United States, which has been circulated in document A/C.1/L.205. This draft resolution outlines policies and procedures which would make a concrete contribution to disarmament. It deals with tests suspension, surprise attack, further initiatives and the relationship of the United Nations to them. Let me comment briefly on these matters in the order in which they appear in the operative paragraphs.

First, there is the suspension of tests. There is a widespread desire among all Members of the United Nations, a desire which is fully shared by the United States, for an early agreement on the suspension of nuclear weapons tests under effective international control. Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution stresses the importance which the General Assembly attaches to the success of the 11 October conference between the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom. It urges the parties to "make every effort to reach early agreement." I submit that that is strong language.
action by the General Assembly should encourage the participants to do everything in their power to make the conference a success. Operative paragraph 2 urges the parties involved not to undertake further testing of nuclear weapons while the negotiations are going on. The United States and the United Kingdom have already volunteered to stop nuclear weapons tests for one year beginning 31 October provided the Soviet Union does not conduct tests during that period. We hope the Soviet Union will stop its tests. The co-sponsors considered that a halt on tests during the negotiations would facilitate a lasting agreement and, as I said on Friday, we are ready to extend our suspension indefinitely as long as we know each year that an agreed inspection system is working and that we are making reasonable progress on other aspects of disarmament.

Secondly, there is surprise attack. Another important issue which has concerned us all has been the increasing danger of surprise attack in an era when the warning time has been reduced to minutes. President Eisenhower's "open-skies" proposal of 1955 and the recent United States effort in the Security Council to achieve agreement on an Arctic inspection zone, which I think you all remember, are examples of this concern. It has also been reflected in the disarmament proposals of the Soviet Union. We hope that there will be a serious effort to reach understanding in the 10 November Geneva meeting on the technical aspects of measures against the possibility of surprise attack. If these talks are successfully concluded and an agreement is subsequently reached, its practical benefits would be of great value. Among other things it would increase confidence among States, which is indispensable for rapid progress on disarmament. In the light of these considerations, paragraph 5 calls attention to the urgency of reaching the widest possible measure of agreement in the prospective technical talks on measures against surprise attack.

Thirdly, there are the objectives. Operative paragraph 4 expresses the determination of the sponsors that the technical approach, as well as other approaches, should be pursued vigorously with a view to achieving the ultimate goal of a comprehensive disarmament agreement. It has become apparent that technical studies can be an effective means to this end. The General Assembly should build on the recent success of the Geneva technical talks on nuclear testing. The draft resolution therefore encourages an extension of this approach to other aspects of the disarmament problem with a view towards finally achieving
the long standing goal of the United Nations -- that is, a balanced and effectively controlled world-wide system of disarmament.

Fourthly, there is the role of the United Nations. The United Nations has a vital responsibility in the field of disarmament. The last section of the draft resolution states explicitly how the conferences and the United Nations can assist each other. Operative paragraph 5 invites the forthcoming conferences to avail themselves of the assistance and services of the Secretary-General. We are pleased that both sides in these conferences have in fact already been working with the Secretary-General to this end. This paragraph also calls for the United Nations to be kept informed about the forthcoming conferences. This is obviously important. Operative paragraph 6 reflects the significant role that the Secretary-General can play. He is invited, in consultation with the Governments concerned, to give such advice not only as may seem appropriate to facilitate the current developments, but also with respect to any further initiatives on disarmament. Finally, operative paragraph 7 assures that the deliberations of the General Assembly and the proposals made here should be taken into account by the States and experts involved in the forthcoming conferences.

The United States hopes that the General Assembly will unanimously endorse the principles outlined in this draft resolution. They are positive forward-looking measures which are consistent with the obligations of this body and, we think, with the overwhelming aspirations of mankind.
Mr. UNDEN (Sweden): It is my intention to deal at the present moment
only with the question concerning suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests.
During the last few years the question of the discontinuance of nuclear
weapons tests has to an ever increasing degree attracted the attention and the
interest of public opinion. This fact may seem surprising. As has frequently
been pointed out, a discontinuance of tests does not in itself constitute
dismament. But there are obvious explanations for the interest shown by the
general public in an agreement on this particular question. First of all, the
tests involve considerable risks in connexion with the dissemination of radioactive
fallout. Although in the present state of science we do not have sufficiently
certain knowledge of the magnitude of these risks, we know enough about them to
be able to say that the present generation is acting in an irresponsible manner
by subjecting mankind, to a constantly greater extent, to nuclear weapons tests,
with harmful effects also in future generations. But another reason also
plays an important role in the demand that the tests be stopped. This is the
wish for a limitation of the production of nuclear weapons as a first step in the
efforts to achieve a total ban on these weapons of mass destruction. Such a
limitation might be carried out by a cessation, by the three members of the
"Atom Club", of all new production of nuclear weapons under adequate control.
This was in fact a position taken by the Western Powers last year but it was not
accepted by the Soviet Government, which was of the opinion that the suspension of
tests could be adopted as a separate measure, without conditions as to suspension
of manufacture of nuclear weapons. It is true, moreover, that a prohibition of
the manufacture of such weapons, and still more the elimination of existing
stockpiles of weapons, gives rise to difficult problems of control, problems
which may not yet be ready to be solved. A discontinuance of nuclear weapons
tests is in certain respects a more limited measure. But if a prohibition of
tests becomes universal, it has the important effect that States which have not
yet manufactured nuclear weapons would desist from carrying through possible plans
for future production. Therefore the General Assembly should not limit itself
to an appeal to those States which possess nuclear weapons to discontinue further
tests but should give the stop signal for all nuclear weapons testing.
In Sweden our technicians believe that, within a certain number of years, they will be able to manufacture smaller so-called tactical atomic weapons. Up to the present, however, they have not been permitted to go in for production of that kind. It has been reported in the press that the Swedish Military Command has recently recommended that preparations be made during the coming fiscal year for possible future manufacture of atomic weapons of this type. But the issue has not yet been dealt with by the political bodies, that is, the Government and the Parliament. The Swedish Government supports the proposal for a universal discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. As I have already pointed out, an international agreement on this question would form an important first stage in the efforts to limit and finally to eliminate nuclear weapons, and the Swedish Government wishes to co-operate to this end.

I should have liked to address a particular word of acknowledgement to the Government of the Soviet Union because of its decision of 31 March of this year concerning the unilateral suspension by the Soviet Union of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. But unfortunately the Soviet Government has already retracted its decision and has recently undertaken new nuclear weapons tests. The reason given for this change of attitude is that the Western Powers did not immediately interrupt their testing also. Obviously, discontinuance of the tests ought to be based on reciprocity. But the Government of the Soviet Union could hardly have expected the date it had chosen for the suspension of its own tests to be acceptable as a suitable starting date also to the Western Powers.

However, I note with great satisfaction that the three Members possessing atom weapons, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, seem to be in agreement in principle that a discontinuance of the tests is highly desirable. Furthermore, I take it that all three now accept 31 October of this year as the date on which the first year of prohibition is to begin. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed a very narrow time limit, one year at a time, for the maintenance of the prohibition. I deeply regret this restriction and, with due respect, I venture to appeal to the Governments concerned to extend the period for a possible agreement. For each prolongation of an agreement, the United States makes it a condition that "an inspection system is installed and working effectively", and further wants to stipulate that "satisfactory progress
is being made in reaching agreement on and implementing major and substantial arms control measures such as the United States has long sought. The United Kingdom has formulated similar conditions. I understand these conditions to mean that the Western Powers claim that substantial disarmament measures, in accordance with the programme of the Western Powers, ought to have been accepted and carried out when the time comes for negotiations concerning the first prolongation of the agreement, that is, within one year. Against the background of such an interpretation the one-year period does seem unreasonably short.

In conclusion, I wish to say that a general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests would, in addition to the important and favourable consequences of which I have already spoken, have a great psychological effect on the general public in our countries. At last, a positive result would emerge from the perennial debates on the disarmament question. Even if an agreement were to have only temporary validity, a strong opinion would demand its prolongation after the expiration of the given period. When a control system for an agreement on the suspension of testing has been successfully tried, the way is laid open for the addition also to more complicated disarmament agreements of the necessary control machinery.

Consequently, a heavy responsibility rests primarily on the three big Powers which are to take part in the conference later this fall on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. These negotiations will be followed with keen interest and attention.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): There are no other speakers on the list for this morning's meeting. There is only one speaker -- the representative of the Soviet Union -- on the list for this afternoon. I should like to address an appeal to representatives to put their names on the speakers' list as soon as possible. I would especially appreciate it if some other representatives, in addition to the representative of the Soviet Union, would speak this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.