

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SESSION
Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 697th
MEETING**

**Friday, 22 October 1954,
at 3 p.m.**

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 20:	
Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments: report of the Disarmament Commission (<i>continued</i>)	
Agenda item 68:	
Conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction (<i>continued</i>)	169

Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEMS 20 AND 68

Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments: report of the Disarmament Commission (A/2685, A/C.1/751, A/C.1/752/Rev.1 and 2) (*continued*)

Conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction (A/2742 and Corr.1, A/2742/Add.1, A/C.1/750) (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from Spanish*): I have received two requests about which I wish to consult the Committee. The representative of India has asked permission to make a brief statement. His name is last on the list of speakers, but he wishes to make a statement now and reserve the right to speak again when his name is reached.

2. Secondly, the representative of Canada has also asked permission to speak.

3. Since this is a matter for the Committee to decide, I think we should proceed as follows: First, I shall ask the other representatives whose names are on the list whether they have any objection and, if they have none, I shall ask the Committee whether it agrees. The representatives whose names are on the list and who have the right to speak are the representatives of the United States of America, Lebanon, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and India. Does any one of these four representatives object to the Indian representative, and then the Canadian representative, making a statement?

4. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): I have no objection to the representative of India and the representative of Canada speaking immediately. I would merely wish to reserve the position of my country as next on the list, since I believe I am the first to speak.

5. The CHAIRMAN: I wish to tell the representative of the United States that he is the first on the

list and, consequently, will speak immediately after the two statements have been made. I would now ask the Committee whether there is any objection to the representatives of India and Canada speaking now. There is no objection, and I accordingly call upon the representative of India.

6. Mr. BOROOAH (India): My delegation sought certain clarifications [*693rd meeting*] on a number of points contained in the Canadian, French, United Kingdom and United States draft resolution [A/C.1/752/Rev.1] before the Committee.

7. The representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Lloyd, was good enough to give full and frank replies, [*694th meeting*] which, the Committee will agree, have been of great help to us as well as to the Committee as a whole. The Chairman of my delegation at that time, after Mr. Lloyd had offered his clarifications, addressed a similar request [*694th meeting*] to the other sponsors of the draft resolution originally submitted by Canada.

8. My delegation hopes to intervene in the general debate early next week, and we would be grateful to the delegations of Canada, France, the United States and the Soviet Union if they could find it possible to assist us by giving us the benefit of their views on the points we have raised. We recognize that we have no right to make any demands, but we feel confident that this request of ours will be received in the same spirit in which it is made, and I hope that they will kindly respond to it. We do not ask for a reply at this moment, but we express the hope that they will find it possible and convenient to do so before we make our main intervention in this debate.

9. Mr. JOHNSON (Canada): I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the Committee for allowing me to speak at this time, though I did not put down my name to intervene further in the general debate. The reason why I have asked to speak is to inform the Committee of a development which will, I think, have some bearing on the course of our further deliberations.

10. On 13 October 1954 [*688th meeting*], the Honourable Paul Martin, Minister of National Health and Welfare of Canada and acting chairman of the Canadian delegation, tabled a draft resolution [A/C.1/752] setting out the line of procedure and providing the framework which seemed to us best calculated to allow detailed negotiations on disarmament to continue, after the debate in the General Assembly and in this Committee had done what it could to clarify the general principles and to bring out the main areas of agreement and disagreement. Though very conscious of the all important principles in which the viewpoint of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and ourselves on the one hand, and the views of the Government of the Soviet Union on the other, still remain divergent, we hoped that we could all at least agree on this matter of the next step for continuing negotiations. Mr. Martin

therefore appealed to the delegations of the other four members of the Disarmament Commission's Sub-Committee to join with us by becoming co-sponsors of our resolution. He had, naturally, given advance copies of his draft resolution to the leaders of each of these four delegations with notice of his hope that they would become co-sponsors.

11. We were greatly heartened that the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States accepted our appeal and agreed to become co-sponsors. Though Mr. Vyshinsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, was not immediately able to agree, we were encouraged that he at once promised, on behalf of his delegation, a sympathetic study of Mr. Martin's suggestions.

12. As I think every representative knows, Mr. Vyshinsky later that day handed us a list of four suggested changes in the terms of our draft resolution, and told us that if we could accept these changes he would become co-sponsor with us.

13. Since by then the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States were co-sponsors with us of the draft resolution [A/C.1/752/Rev.1], my delegation naturally consulted with them on the Soviet Union's suggestions. We and our three associates gave them jointly the same careful and sympathetic study which, I am sure, the Soviet delegation had given our original proposals. We found ourselves able to accept, as they stood, two of the four Soviet suggestions, which related respectively to the title and to paragraph 1 (c) of our resolution. The two others, relating to paragraph 1 (a) and to paragraph 2, we were able to accept in part, but not in their entirety.

14. On 18 October, Mr. Martin met Mr. Vyshinsky. He discussed the situation with him, and put forward certain compromise suggestions, designed to reconcile, as far as possible, our respective views. The representative of the Soviet Union naturally wished to have time to study these compromise suggestions and to consult his Government.

15. At this point I should say that in the series of meetings and discussions which the Canadian delegation has had with the chairman of the delegation of the Soviet Union on this matter, we have acted at the request of the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States as their spokesman and on their behalf as well as on that of Canada.

16. On the night of 19 October, the chairman of the Soviet Union delegation called on Mr. Martin to give him his Government's reply. He told us that he appreciated the changes we had made to meet his point of view and, on one of the points where we could not accept his original suggestions, he was prepared to accept the compromise suggestions which we had made. One point of difference however remained, relating to the terms of reference which would be given to the Disarmament Commission. Here the Soviet Union delegation put forward still a further suggestion. The gap on these procedural points was narrowing, but was not closed.

17. On the morning of 20 October, after further consultation with the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, Mr. Martin called on Mr. Vyshinsky to outline our conclusions. At the previous meetings we had explored a number of possible alternatives in the effort to reach agreement. At this meeting a final effort was made to bring us together on

a procedure, so that provision could be made within the framework of the Disarmament Commission to get on with the substantive problem of negotiation.

18. I am happy to inform this Committee that Mr. Vyshinsky informed me this morning that his delegation is now prepared to join with those of the other four members of the Disarmament Commission's Sub-Committee in co-sponsoring the draft resolution with the revisions which had been jointly worked out.

19. I have therefore asked the Secretary of this Committee to have a revised version of our draft resolution [A/C.1/752/Rev.2] circulated in the names of the delegations of Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

20. In Mr. Martin's statement of 13 October, he explained to the Committee the general principles in the procedure which it envisaged. None of these general principles has been changed in the revised text and therefore there is no need for me to take up the Committee's time in describing them again. I should however like to comment briefly on the four revisions.

21. The first change, which relates only to the title, is self-explanatory. It refers to agenda items 20 and 68, instead of only to agenda item 20, and spells out the title of this item as well as that of the earlier one.

22. The second revision concerns paragraph 1 (a), which originally read: "The regulation, limitation and major balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments;" and in this there are two changes.

23. First, the word "balanced" has been omitted, and secondly, the word "conventional" has been inserted before the word "armaments".

24. As to the omission of the word "balanced," this does not, of course, represent any change at all in the basic concept which we had in mind. It seems clear, however, that in this particular context the draft is improved by omitting the adjective, since it could be open to ambiguities and indeed to very divergent interpretations, which were not only not intended but, as our debate has shown, have given rise to understandable but wholly needless difficulties on the part of certain delegations.

25. The consideration which we had originally in mind when we included the words "balanced reduction" was not that the reductions should be proportionate—that was an old Soviet proposal which we had always rejected—but that the over-all effect of the reductions should be equitable and should not create an imbalance which could threaten any nation's security.

26. The programme as a whole must, of course, cover not only forces in all the main areas of the world, but must deal with all services and all types of weapons. This whole programme, to be effective, must clearly be "such that no State would have cause to feel that its security was endangered". This principle had already been written into the concluding section of paragraph 1 of the original draft resolution, which naturally refers to each aspect of the paragraph, including those set out in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). It seems to us therefore that there was not only no necessity to retain the adjective "balanced" in sub-paragraph 1 (a), but that there was a definite advantage in deleting it. We therefore decided to make this deletion.

27. It is surely obvious that a satisfactory disarmament programme must be a balanced programme—balanced geographically and balanced as between various types of force and weapons—so that the over-all effect of the programme will be such that it will not upset the security of any part of the world, but will, rather, increase the real security of all nations and result in a very substantial reduction in the over-all burden of armaments.

28. Naturally such a reduction will free substantial human resources for more productive purposes, so that they may be used to increase the economic development and productivity of peoples everywhere. But I need hardly expatiate in this form on this self-evident fact.

29. The other change in sub-paragraph 1 (a) of the joint draft resolution is the insertion of the adjective “conventional” before the word “armaments,” so that it reads “The regulation, limitation and major reduction of all armed forces and all conventional armaments;” instead to merely “all armaments”. Here, again, there is no change in substance from what we had intended, but I admit that the wording is improved as our earlier draft seems to have been ambiguous. It has, of course, always been our intention that, as part of a comprehensive disarmament programme, all nuclear weapons should be prohibited. This point has, in any case, always been clear from the terms of sub-paragraph 1 (b) of the original draft resolution [A/C.1/752]. When, in our earlier draft, we left out the qualification “conventional” in sub-paragraph 1 (a) it was anticipated that the words “the regulation . . . of all armaments” would cover the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, and incidentally, also the total prohibition of other weapons of mass destruction in the bacterial and chemical fields. The word “reduction” would apply to conventional weapons, but the word “regulation” is, of course, applicable to all weapons.

30. But I admit that, despite the clear statement of sub-paragraph 1 (b) of the original draft resolution, some delegations misconstrued the reference in sub-paragraph 1 (a) to “all armaments,” and my delegation, together with that of France, the United Kingdom and the United States has, therefore, been happy to accede to Mr. Vyshinsky's suggestion that the reference there should be explicitly to conventional armaments and to conventional armaments alone, leaving sub-paragraph 1 (b) to cover our intention to prohibit weapons of mass destruction of every type.

31. Before I come to the third revision which concerns sub-paragraph 1 (c), I should like to make one more observation on sub-paragraph 1 (a). It has been suggested that it might be preferable to omit the reference to “regulation and limitation” of armed forces and armaments so that this sub-paragraph would refer only to major reductions. This, as representatives will remember, is what was done in the Franco-British memorandum of 11 June 1954 [DC/53, Annex 9]. Nevertheless, it has seemed to us desirable to retain the reference not only to reductions but to the regulation and limitation of armed forces and conventional weapons.

32. The point is, I think, more than academic. Only a day or so ago my friend the representative of India expressed his delegation's concern [693rd meeting] lest reference to major reductions of all armed forces and all conventional armaments imply that every country, how-

ever low its present level of forces may be, should be expected to lower them further. This of course is not necessarily the case. The important point is that the levels of all forces and all conventional armaments be subject to international regulation and to agreed limitations, and that the over-all effect of these regulations and limitations should be a major reduction in the present level of world armaments which weighs so heavily on the resources of mankind. The intention is, obviously, that those countries now heavily armed should accept major reductions in the levels of their forces and weapons, but we must recognize that some countries may not be armed at all, and some countries may have the minimum of forces required to maintain internal order. Obviously our general language must not preclude a sympathetic and realistic agreed solution for exceptional cases.

33. I might also mention that the goal of the international regulation of armed forces and armaments is specifically enshrined in our Charter itself. I refer, of course, to Article 26.

34. I now come to the third revision, which affects the text of sub-paragraph 1 (c) of the draft resolution. Here the reference to regulation and limitation is omitted, at the request of the Soviet delegation. It has seemed to us that, provided that these important points are covered in sub-paragraph 1 (a), and provided that the over-riding principle of common sense and security remains embedded in the final phrase at the end of paragraph 1, it is unnecessary to repeat here the reference to regulation and limitation. Our Soviet Union colleague wished to have this reference omitted here; the delegations of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada preferred it in. But since, in the judgment of these four delegations, there could be no substantive danger involved as all parts of the programme envisaged, in any case, form a single co-ordinated whole, we accepted the omission here in order to reach agreement with our Soviet Union colleague.

35. Perhaps the most important of the revisions concerns operative paragraph 2. As we originally drafted it, this paragraph referred explicitly to the Franco-British proposals [DC/53, Annex 9] alone, stating that they had been accepted by the Government of the Soviet Union as a basis for a disarmament convention. It then went on to refer in general terms to “other proposals within the Commission's terms of reference”. This would, of course, cover the Soviet draft resolution of 8 October 1954 [A/C.1/750], as well as the United States working paper of 25 May 1954 [DC/53, Annex 4], and any other proposals that have been or may be submitted. The Soviet delegation, however, asked that there be included a specific reference to the Soviet proposals, which, as you know, cover a number of points which, in our view and that of the other co-sponsors, differ quite substantially from the Franco-British proposals in certain important particulars. As the Soviet delegation attached great importance to this point, we agreed to meet its desire for an explicit reference to the Soviet proposals, in listing the various proposals which the Disarmament Commission should take into account in its search for an acceptable solution of the disarmament problem. But in that case it seemed to us only reasonable also to refer explicitly to the United States working paper of 25 May 1954. Naturally the Disarmament Commission is also to take into account any other proposals within the Commission's terms of reference—a provision which, I need

hardly point out, refers not only to the past, but also to any proposals which any delegation may put forward in the future.

36. I regret to say that the Soviet delegation, after careful study, felt unable to co-sponsor the draft resolution if it included in paragraph 2 explicit reference to the United States working paper of 25 May which outlines, as members of this Committee know, the United States views on the rights, functions and powers of an international control organ.

37. The Soviet delegation has several times made it clear that it is unable to accept the proposals put forward in that paper. Naturally, Mr. Martin made it clear to the chairman of the Soviet delegation that, as we saw it, requesting the Disarmament Commission to "take into account" a particular document does not in any sense involve the co-sponsors' approval of all the contents of that document. If it did, the Canadian delegation, and also our associates, would have been quite unable to agree to the inclusion in paragraph 2 of our draft resolution of a reference to the Soviet resolution, with certain parts of which we have already expressed our inability to agree.

38. Had the key phrase in this operative paragraph been not "taking into account" but "on the basis of," the Canadian delegation for one could not have agreed to include a reference to the Soviet resolution, and we would have understood more easily the Soviet delegation's inability to accept inclusion of a reference to the United States working paper.

39. In any case, the Canadian delegation, together with our associates, the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States, suggested as an alternative for this paragraph a text which would not refer specifically to any of the main proposals which we wish the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee to examine. We put forward the following suggestion for operative paragraph 2:

"Requests the Disarmament Commission to seek an acceptable solution of the disarmament problem, taking into account the various proposals referred to in the preamble of the present resolution and any other proposals within the Commission's terms of reference."

On this basis, I am happy to say that the Soviet delegation, after careful study, was able to agree to the text.

40. As will readily be seen, the new version of operative paragraph 2, of course, refers back to the preamble of the draft resolution, the third paragraph of which refers both to the Soviet draft resolution [A/C.1/750], which this Committee has been considering, and to the fourth report of the Disarmament Commission of 29 July 1954 [DC/55], and explicitly to the documents annexed thereto. Among these annexed documents are the Franco-British proposals of 11 June 1954 [DC/53, Annex 9], and the United States working paper of 25 May 1954 [DC/53, Annex 4]. All of these documents, therefore, are among those which the Disarmament Commission would now be requested to take into account in its search for an acceptable solution of the disarmament problem.

41. This then represents a full and candid account of the revisions we have made, and the reasons for them. I have already expressed the satisfaction of the co-sponsors of the first version of this draft resolution that the Soviet Union has now agreed to join us in

proposing this revised text for the sympathetic consideration of this Committee. I feel sure that all members of the Committee will share our satisfaction that on this question of procedure at least, the five members of what has come to be known as the London Sub-Committee have reached agreement.

42. I freely admit, of course, that reaching agreement among five countries, even on the terms of a procedural draft resolution on a subject as vital as this, has been far from easy. I trust that all members of the Committee will bear this point in mind. Naturally, when we come to try to work out the terms of a disarmament convention itself, it will be vital to avoid any possible ambiguities. For the present stage, however, I trust that the Committee will share my view that the present formulation, while not perhaps perfect, is satisfactory as a vehicle for a framework of general objectives and for a procedure which will allow substantive negotiations to go forward with the optimum chance of success.

43. Before I conclude, I should like to pay tribute, on behalf of the Canadian delegation, to the patience, flexibility and readiness to co-operate which we have found in the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States, which, during the past eight days have been our associates in these negotiations with the Soviet Union. The readiness on the part of our colleagues to keep their eye's on the main objective, and to accommodate themselves on non-essentials to the wishes of their colleagues in the interest of co-operation and of progress, has won our admiration. Our objective and that of our associates has, of course, been in the realm not of mere words but of acts. Inevitably, negotiations on a subject which deals even procedurally with the vital security of nations, and which attracts a great deal of attention and comment in many parts of the world, are complex, and the negotiators have to be sensitive at all times to a wide variety of considerations. I should also like to thank the chairman of the Soviet delegation for his unfailing courtesy at all times throughout our talks.

44. Finally, I should add, in all seriousness, a warning against any hasty or irresponsible optimism. The debate of the past few weeks in this Committee has made it crystal clear that the gap which still divides us from the Government of the Soviet Union on the nature and scope of an acceptable disarmament programme, and particularly on the all-important matter of control, remains deep and wide. In a few particulars, that gap has been narrowed. That is heartening. But a very wide gap still remains on points of substance. Facile optimism or wishful irresponsibility would be fatuous and could be a grave disservice to the cause of peace.

45. So too, we think, would be cynicism or despair over the great and vital points on which major differences remain. The sound attitude, I suggest, is that we should take heart that at least on procedure, and on a broad definition of objectives, five nations are now agreed, but that we should be careful not to overestimate this very limited step forward.

46. When we have finished the general debate, our task will be to set up machinery for the long and difficult negotiations which obviously lie ahead of us. Patience and perseverance will certainly be essential in the future, as they have been in the past. But we trust that the Committee will share my delegation's

view that the draft resolution which now stands in the name of Canada, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States, provides an acceptable next step.

47. Before concluding, might I refer to the Indian delegation's request for the views of the Canadian delegation on the questions which the chairman of the Indian delegation put to Mr. Lloyd a few days ago [693rd meeting]. In so far as those questions were not answered in the statement I have made today, I can assure him that we shall look into the matter and will try to give him our views at a later meeting of this Committee.

48. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): The procedural agreement just announced by the representative of Canada—an agreement which now provides for the co-sponsorship by all five members of the Disarmament Commission's Sub-Committee of the draft resolution originally submitted by Canada—very properly refers this question to that Sub-Committee. We join with our other co-sponsors in welcoming this agreement, and we pledge the continued efforts of the United States to achieve fully safeguarded disarmament.

49. The Sub-Committee will be able to probe into the many technical aspects of disarmament. These technical aspects have been brought forth during our debate on this subject and have shown the divergences which exist. But the deliberations of the Sub-Committee will test the extent to which good faith animates the Soviet Union in its present approach to disarmament matters. We await that test with interest. The work that we shall undertake will call for constructive and unremitting efforts from every Sub-Committee member, and the United States will do its part.

50. In common with my colleague from Canada, I wish to comment very briefly on the questions posed to the former co-sponsors of the draft resolution by the representative of India, Mr. Menon, the other day [693rd meeting], of which we were reminded today by Mr. Borooah. Since this seems to be a day somewhat devoted to unanimity, I am very happy to tell him that the United States, having studied the questions and the answers of the representative of the United Kingdom [694th meeting], finds itself in full accord with his answers. There may be some aspects of clarification or even elaboration which the United States might wish to add to Mr. Lloyd's answers. However, these are of a highly technical nature and I do not propose to burden the Committee with them today. If the representative of India is desirous of our doing so, we shall be happy to submit them to him in writing, but they will not in any sense affect the substance of the answers.

51. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): The delegations of the United Kingdom and France have expressed a wish to speak now if the speakers on my list—the representatives of Lebanon, the Soviet Union and India—do not object.

52. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I personally, Mr. Chairman, have no objection to our following the procedure you suggest. But before the representative of Lebanon speaks, I should also like to have the opportunity to make a few observations on the statements by the Canadian representative, Mr. Johnson, and by

the United States representative, before my statement on the substance of the matter now on the agenda.

53. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): I think we can follow that procedure. If there is no objection, I shall call on the representatives of the United Kingdom and of France, and then on the representative of the Soviet Union, before we proceed with the general debate.

54. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I am grateful to the Chairman and to the Committee for allowing me to intervene for a moment. I only intervene at this point to say how warmly we welcome the statement just made by the representative of Canada to the effect that the Soviet Union has decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution, which has been amended as the result of the private negotiations described by Mr. Johnson. This revised draft resolution is acceptable to my delegation and we are ready to co-sponsor it.

55. I should like, if I may, to congratulate the Canadian delegation on the part it has played in bringing these negotiations to a successful conclusion.

56. I am glad that the Soviet Union delegation has been able to join with the United Kingdom and the other co-sponsors in co-sponsoring the draft resolution [A/C.1/752/Rev.2] as revised.

57. While recording this satisfactory development, I feel bound to point out that it would be wrong to suppose that five-Power sponsorship of this draft resolution is, in itself, any indication that the basic differences between the Western and the Soviet proposals for disarmament have been, or will shortly be, resolved. Our present debate here has clearly revealed that we are still far from that goal. Nevertheless, it is something to have achieved unanimous agreement among the five members of the Disarmament Commission's Sub-Committee, even though it does not amount to more than agreement on what is in effect primarily a procedural resolution. It can, however, give us legitimately some grounds for hoping that, during the more detailed discussions in the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, when we get to grips with the basic differences between us to which Mr. Lloyd drew attention in his speech on 20 October [694th meeting], it will then be possible to continue the valuable process of clarifying the respective positions and making some further progress towards narrowing the field of difference.

58. Mr. MOCH (France) (*translated from French*): First of all, I should like to follow the United Kingdom representative in congratulating the Canadian representative on the detail and clarity of the account he has given us and to ask him to convey our gratitude to Mr. Martin, the chairman of his delegation, who conducted these negotiations with a zeal and intelligence which were met by an equal willingness on the part of the Soviet Union delegation to reach an agreement acceptable to all.

59. I am happy to note that, for the first time since 1946, a joint draft resolution has been submitted by the representatives of the five Powers which in 1954 made up the London Sub-Committee. This new gesture is a happy omen for the rest of our work and the French delegation, which as you all know, has spared no efforts in the search for conciliation, is glad to be able to express its great satisfaction after so many disappointments and disillusionments.

60. The French delegation hopes that this date of 22 October will mark the dawn of new and rapid prog-

ress towards disarmament. But, precisely because it has never despaired but has always retained a reasonable and reasoned optimism, it deems it its duty to emphasize that our joint draft resolution [A/C.1/752/Rev.2] records agreement on some principles, but not on all, and on the procedure to be followed.

61. This draft resolution, therefore, enables us to continue our work more easily but it does not in itself, settle all the difficulties. As my colleagues have pointed out, there are still some quite substantial difficulties which will have to be the subject of our future discussions. Henceforth, however, we may hope that we shall manage to overcome them methodically, one after another. The French delegation will continue, in the future as it has done in the past, but with a zeal redoubled by these first agreements, to seek the necessary *rapprochement* which will make it possible for the security of all States to be increased simultaneously and for the nations to be freed from the anguish of a thermo-nuclear war.

62. May this day of 22 October be the first of the era of the consolidation of peace! That is the French delegation's ardent wish.

63. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I, for my part, should like to confirm that Mr. Johnson gave a completely impartial and accurate account of the course of our negotiations in connexion with our joint sponsorship of the Canadian draft resolution and of our attitude thereto.

64. I should also like to say that these negotiations, and above all the results of these negotiations, have once again fully confirmed the soundness of the general principle to which the Soviet Union has always adhered and will in future adhere—the principle of the value and great importance of negotiations as part of the process of settling particular questions. As has been rightly remarked, what is involved here is of course an agreement on procedure, but an agreement on procedure is nonetheless an agreement, and an important agreement, because procedure in itself is important in any kind of work, including political work.

65. If a particular procedure is imposed against the will of other participants and in opposition to another procedure which, in turn, is also defended without any attempt to make mutual concessions and without any regard for mutual interests in the matter of the arrangement and organization of the work, then even an agreement on procedure will scarcely be possible. If procedure is important in itself, an agreement on procedure is also important. We are of the opinion that procedure is extremely important.

66. If you have the Canadian draft resolution clearly in mind, you will remember that it deals with quite a number of important questions which are far from being of a procedural nature and come within the category of questions of principle. And that is precisely why the Soviet delegation gave it so meticulous and careful an examination; that is why it considered it with such attention and assiduity, studying it, weighing each of its provisions, not only from the formal but also from the political point of view. It did so, because it is profoundly convinced that a correctly drafted resolution on matters which, though primarily procedural, also have a political character, will better ensure the success of the body whose work it will subsequently have to guide than a resolution which, though perhaps

beyond reproach from the formal point of view, fails to give serious attention to the political questions connected with such procedural provisions. The latter type of resolution would, in our opinion, prove less satisfactory and hence would provide less assurance of success to the body which would have to base its activities upon it.

67. Of course, the fact that we have succeeded in achieving an agreed course of action on the procedural draft resolution [A/C.1/752/Rev.2] which to some extent is, in effect, a programme for the work of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, does not mean that all difficulties have been removed from our path. None of us are sufficiently naïve to believe that, because we have reached agreement here, all difficulties have been disposed of and we can give ourselves over to rejoicing.

68. Nor do I think that there should be any among us who, even on an occasion like the present, cast doubt on the good faith of certain of their colleagues, as the representative of the United States of America has done. I must confess that his statement was incomprehensible to me. Why did he suddenly, now of all times, have to express the opinion that if the Soviet Union would display good faith, certain favourable results would ensue, as if it would occur to anyone who was seriously concerned with ensuring that our work in the Disarmament Commission and the Sub-Committee should seek to solve hitherto unresolved problems and settle hitherto unsettled tasks and questions, to question the good faith of any of those taking part in this work? We, at least, in spite of all our disagreements with our future partners in the work to be undertaken on the basis of this draft resolution on procedure, are far from questioning the good faith of any of them, however ardently they defend their views, diametrically opposed to our own though they may be.

69. I think we are entitled to ask and expect that the same attitude should be adopted towards ourselves, because if any other attitude is adopted, it can be predicted that our work will be fruitless.

70. I see, unfortunately, that some of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution do not realize the full importance of the statements they make on the subject of and in connexion with our decision to associate ourselves with the Canadian draft resolution.

71. I am very well aware that we shall encounter many more obstacles and difficulties in the course of our future work, but as Mr. Moch so rightly said, this is the first time since 1946 that the five Powers, which include four of the great Powers, have acted unanimously, even on a procedural matter. We attach to that fact a significance far beyond the limits of procedure. I think we are right in doing so. What is at issue here is obviously not a question of procedure, but the fact that all these five States (which include four of the so-called great Powers) consider it possible to work together in the hope of achieving substantial success. That, I think, is a more correct way of looking at the matter.

72. It has been said by Mr. Moch that this draft resolution marks the dawn of further successes. Perhaps it is not yet the "dawn"; it may only be the first glimmer of the dawn, but it undoubtedly paves the way to further success. There can be no doubt about that.

73. We are told that we must guard against any false optimism. I agree that we must guard against everything false, including optimism. But I would emphasize that we also consider it necessary to renounce false pessimism arising from causes such as prejudice, bias and an inability to understand the attitude of the opposite side and to appreciate the motives underlying its proposals, which leads to their misinterpretation as a result of an incorrect approach. Such factors give rise to what I should call "false pessimism". We can do without both false optimism and false pessimism. What we need is objectivity and an honest intention to use every effort to achieve the settlement which—and this is not idle or exaggerated talk, but the literal truth—is expected of us by all the nations of the world.

74. It is with this feeling and this hope that we approach a reality such as the joint Canadian, French, United States, United Kingdom and USSR draft resolution, a draft resolution which has here—rightly, of course—been described as procedural, but which goes far beyond the bounds of that definition. We regard the resolution as highly important from the viewpoint of international political relations.

75. We are convinced that we should calmly concentrate our attention on our present agreement and on those points on which we are in accord, without preconceived notions and without too many backward glances at our past disagreements. It was no coincidence that we felt it necessary to emphasize that our proposals were based on the Franco-British proposals [DC/53, Annex 9], which in our opinion are extremely important and should serve as directives for the work of the Commission. That also is why the Soviet delegation regards the Canadian draft resolution, as amended in accordance with and taking into account the desires of the Soviet Union—a resolution which the five Powers took part in drafting—as a document which will provide the Disarmament Commission and the Sub-Committee with some guiding principles, which are admittedly far from complete and might rather be described as cautious, tentative, or even minimal for the correct conduct and successful accomplishment of their work.

76. We therefore express our complete satisfaction over the fact that now, for the first time since 1946, we have before us a document which has been jointly submitted for consideration here by the five Powers.

77. The CHAIRMAN (*translated from French*): The representative of Lebanon is the next speaker on my list, but he has informed me that he is not ready to speak today. The representatives of the Soviet Union and of India were to have followed him but they too

have told me that they will be unable to speak before Monday.

78. That being so, I think that we shall be forced to adjourn the meeting and to meet again on Monday at 10.30 a.m.

79. When the general debate is completed, we shall immediately begin to discuss the draft resolutions and it is obvious that there will be no justification for further adjournments. On Monday, therefore, as soon as we have completed the general debate, we shall take up the study of the draft resolutions and shall continue without interruption until we have finished with them.

80. Mr. MOCH (*translated from French*): I wish to apologize to the representative of India for having devoted my brief statement just now to the first rays of dawn to which Mr. Vyshinsky referred and hence having failed to reply to the questions he put to me and to the other sponsors of the draft resolution.

81. May I reply very simply to the Indian representative by saying that on all the questions he put to the sponsors of the original Franco-British proposals the answers given by Mr. Lloyd in his farewell speech [694th meeting] here before leaving to take up his new office were agreed upon between us and I have therefore no difficulty in endorsing them.

82. Mr. MENON (India): I thank the representative of France for his reply.

83. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (*translated from French*): Since no other member of the Committee wishes to speak this afternoon, and I am not on the list of speakers and have not spoken in this debate, the Chairman will perhaps allow me, as the representative of a small Power, to express our satisfaction and joy at the agreement which has just been reached.

84. We are all the more pleased because—as has been made clear by all who have spoken—we are far from being over-optimistic; we are all aware of the difficulty of the work and we all realize that this is not a final agreement. It would be incorrect, however, to say that it is merely an agreement on the question of procedure. The parties concerned have not reached an agreement on the closure of a meeting or on the adjournment of a debate; they have at least been able to draw up a plan of work. We are all delighted about this agreement and, if I may venture to say so on behalf of us all, we hope that this time the work of the Sub-Committee will be crowned with success. The eyes of the world are upon those five countries; they must bear that in mind and we hope that they will not disappoint us.

The meeting rose at 4.5 p.m.