



Thursday, 31 October 1957,  
 at 3.20 p. m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 24:

- Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction (continued):
- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
  - (b) Expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee;
  - (c) Collective action to inform and enlighten the peoples of the world as to the dangers of the armaments race, and particularly as to the destructive effects of modern weapons;
  - (d) Discontinuance under international control of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons . . . . . 105

**Chairman: Mr. Djalal ABDOH (Iran).**

**AGENDA ITEM 24**

**Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments; conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction (A/3630 and Corr.1, A/3657, A/3674/Rev.1, A/3685, A/C.1/793, A/C.1/797, A/C.1/L.174, A/C.1/L.175/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.176/Rev.2, A/C.1/L.177, A/C.1/L.178/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.179 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.180, A/C.1/L.181) (continued):**

- (a) Report of the Disarmament Commission;
- (b) Expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and of its Sub-Committee;
- (c) Collective action to inform and enlighten the peoples of the world as to the dangers of the armaments race, and particularly as to the destructive effects of modern weapons;
- (d) Discontinuance under international control of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons

1. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that the world awaited an answer to the question whether the great advances of modern science were to be used to annihilate the human race or to bring about a new era of world prosperity. The Dominican Republic had co-sponsored the twenty-four-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.179 and Corr.1 and Add.1) in the belief that it would help to direct all energies towards the second goal. Contrary to the Soviet proposals, it offered both guarantees and hope; it would cause common sense and reason to prevail over dilatory tactics and the continued threat of nuclear attack. Until such time as the Soviet Union made some gesture to indicate a return of confidence, the twenty-four-Power draft resolution represented a minimum of progress towards disarmament; it should be a first

step taken in a spirit of international co-operation. In a world full of uncertainty in the atomic age, it was the duty of the United Nations and the peace-loving States to deliver humanity from danger. That was a heavy and urgent responsibility, but it must be assumed. By appealing to reason, the United Nations should seek to avoid world suicide.

2. Mr. ADJEI (Ghana) said that his country's policy was based on peace, friendly relations with all States and the conviction that nations should be able to develop tolerance in the interests of security in a world where all countries were interdependent.

3. Disarmament was perhaps of greater concern to the small States of Asia and Africa than to the great Powers themselves. In seeking to achieve it, the Powers should also try to find a basis for an agreement to outlaw war forever as an instrument of national policy. The scientific knowledge and resources of all countries, including atomic energy, should be directed instead to conquering the real enemies of man: poverty, disease, illiteracy and squalor. Ghana appealed to the United States and the Soviet Union to come together and agree to put an end to the arms race in the name of the millions who were fighting those real enemies and who looked to the statesmen of the world to give them peace of mind. Ghana's position on the draft resolutions before the Committee would be guided by those considerations.

4. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) expressed the profound hope of his country that the great Powers which possessed nuclear weapons would resolve their differences and thus enable the world to enjoy the benefits of technological advances, including the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

5. The various draft resolutions tabled represented different approaches to a constructive solution. El Salvador therefore supported the suggestions made earlier by the Ecuadorian representative (882nd meeting) to establish a working party, which would include some of the sponsors of draft resolutions, to reconcile the various points of view and produce an agreed joint draft resolution on the substance of the problem.

6. Without prejudice to its position in favour of the Ecuadorian suggestion, the delegation of El Salvador wished to explain its views on several of the individual proposals. It would vote for the Belgian draft resolution (A/3630/Corr.1) because there was an urgent need for objective information, to be disseminated under United Nations auspices, for the purpose of enlightening the peoples of the world regarding the destructive effects of nuclear weapons. It could not vote for the Indian draft resolution which sought to expand the membership of existing disarmament organs (A/C.1/L.177); El Salvador considered that it would be more practical to adopt the Mexican suggestion (699th plenary meeting) for the appointment of a

United Nations commissioner for disarmament, and regretted that it had not been presented as a draft resolution. Moreover, although parts of the Indian draft resolution proposing the establishment of a scientific-technical commission to work out an adequate inspection system (A/C.1/L.176/Rev.2) might usefully be incorporated in the twenty-four-Power draft, El Salvador could not vote for the proposal as a whole because it would isolate the question of suspending tests of nuclear weapons from the rest of a comprehensive disarmament programme. For the same reason, it could not support the Japanese draft resolution regarding suspension of such tests (A/C.1/L.174).

7. El Salvador would support the twenty-four-Power draft resolution because it offered a better prospect for resolving the differences between the great Powers and the fullest guarantees regarding the reduction of existing dangers. It would further support the inclusion of a paragraph in that text confirming the previous recommendation, made by the Assembly in its resolution 914 (X), that part or all of the savings effected as a result of disarmament measures should be progressively diverted to the economic development of the under-developed countries.

8. Mr. NISOT (Belgium) said that his delegation's draft resolution (A/3630/Corr.1) passed no judgement on the substance of the problems and consequently was not incompatible with any of the solutions recommended. The draft merely established a procedure for studying how most effectively to enlighten the peoples as to the effects of modern weapons and the necessity for effective measures of control. It made only that general indication, taking care not to be specific with regard to either goals or methods. It was based on a premise which had been endorsed by all political régimes represented in the Committee, namely that public opinion was the corner-stone of the democracies and that the peoples should be the sovereign judges of what their Governments should do or refrain from doing in their name. The draft resolution asked the United Nations to seek means of imparting objective information to the peoples so that they would be able to exercise wisely their power of judgement. The draft committed no one and prejudged nothing.

9. Since the Belgian proposal was not directly related to the other draft resolutions, which dealt with the substance of the questions, he would have no objection if it were voted on immediately.

10. Mr. MOCH (France) said that he was prepared to vote in favour of the Belgian draft resolution at any time. He would point out, however, that if it were given priority—and he had no objection to according it that priority since it stood in a class by itself—he would ask that priority should be given to the twenty-four-Power draft resolution in the voting on the substantive drafts. In so doing, he would endeavour to show that the other substantive proposals were incompatible with it and that a vote in support of the twenty-four-Power text would imply a rejection of the other four draft resolutions.

11. Mr. LALL (India) said that, without prejudice to the Belgian draft resolution, his delegation could not accept the view of the French representative regarding priorities to be given to the remaining draft resolutions. It was his delegation's understanding that the question remained open and that there would be a discussion on the question of priorities before the voting.

12. After a brief procedural discussion the CHAIRMAN pointed out that under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the Belgian draft resolution, having been submitted before any of the others, would have priority unless the Committee decided otherwise. However, the voting on the draft resolutions would not start until all those who wished to speak on them had expressed their views, and the discussion on the voting procedure, including the question of priorities, should also be deferred until that time. It was the Chair's intention to proceed to the vote on Monday, 4 November 1957, provided there were no more speakers on the draft resolutions.

13. Mr. LALL (India) and Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Chairman's interpretation of the procedure to be followed.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.