

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

## PLENARY MEETING



Wednesday, 8 April 1953, at 10.30 a.m.

## SEVENTH SESSION

## Official Records

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
Consideration of the items on the agenda of the meeting .....	681
Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments: report of the First Committee (A/2373) .....	681

**President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).****Consideration of the items on the agenda of the meeting**

*Pursuant to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss items 17 and 71 of the agenda of the General Assembly.*

1. The PRESIDENT: Since it has been decided not to have a general discussion on items 17 and 71, statements in connexion with them will be limited to explanations of vote, either before or after the vote is taken. I hope that representatives will find it possible to limit their explanations of vote to seven minutes each.

**Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments: report of the First Committee (A/2373)**

[Agenda item 17]

*Mr. Thors (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2373) and then spoke as follows:*

2. Mr. THORS (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee: The Disarmament Commission has a great task before it. It can only succeed in its work if all the members of the Commission will sincerely and genuinely co-operate. The events of the last few days inside the United Nations, and in international affairs in general, give us some reason to hope that at last the Disarmament Commission will be in a position to fulfil its duties and may report some progress.

3. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly now has before it the draft resolution of the First Committee. When that draft was examined in committee, the USSR delegation explained its views in sufficient detail in connexion with the discussion of the report of the Disarmament Commission; when the vote was taken, it voted for the preamble to the draft resolution, against paragraph 1 and for paragraph 2, with the amendment concerning the reference to a resolution previously adopted by the General Assembly, resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952.

4. The commendation in paragraph 1 of the Disarmament Commission for its efforts to carry out the instructions laid down by the General Assembly at its sixth session greatly complicates the position of the Soviet Union delegation, since, as is known, we did not support that resolution at the time, but voted against it. Accordingly, the USSR delegation considers that the present statement to the effect that the Commission has carried out its tasks and therefore deserves commendation is unwarranted. For those reasons, the USSR delegation could not then and cannot now accept such an appraisal of the Commission's work and proposes in its first amendment, which is now also before this meeting, that the commendation of the Disarmament Commission should be deleted. The USSR delegation proposes that the General Assembly should confine itself to stating that it takes note of the report of the Disarmament Commission.

5. With regard to paragraph 2, which contains a reference to General Assembly resolution 502 (VI), although some parts of that resolution were acceptable to the USSR delegation, others were not. Thus the present reference, in a new draft resolution, to a previously adopted resolution which the Soviet Union delegation did not support and against which it voted at the time, is also quite unacceptable to us now and also places us in a difficult position.

6. The USSR delegation would therefore consider it appropriate, with a view to reaching agreement on all those highly important questions which, for the most part, are set forth in the preamble and paragraph 2 of the draft resolution—not including the reference to resolution 502 (VI)—for the Assembly to adopt the USSR amendments.

7. The USSR delegation has no objections or comments to make on the remainder of the draft resolution proposed by the First Committee.

8. The USSR delegation accordingly proposes that the draft resolution should be amended as follows [A/L.149]:

In paragraph 1 of the operative part, delete the clause following the words "Disarmament Commission".

In paragraph 2, delete the words "*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952 and".

Combine the amended paragraphs 1 and 2 into a single paragraph 1 as follows:

"*Takes note* of the report of the Disarmament Commission and requests the Commission to continue its work for the development by the United Nations . . ."

9. In submitting these amendments, the Soviet Union delegation wishes to point out that, in the interests of reaching agreement on this manifestly important issue, it decided not to press for the discussion of its own draft resolution, which was discussed in the First Committee and the main points of which received considerable support from other delegations. The USSR delegation is prepared to vote for the draft submitted by the First Committee, provided, of course, that the amendments we now propose are adopted by the General Assembly.

10. The USSR delegation wishes to take this opportunity to express the hope that other delegations too will meet its proposals half way, just as the USSR delegation is going half way to meet the proposals of the authors of this draft resolution, with a view to reaching an agreement on this very important question, which may pave the way for subsequent agreement on other questions which are still outstanding.

11. Mr. TJONDRONEGORO (Indonesia): I should like to say a few words on the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union to the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee on the report of the Disarmament Commission and to explain the vote of my delegation.

12. It may be remembered that when the two draft resolutions and the amendments thereto on the item now under consideration were put to the vote in the First Committee, my delegation noted with regret that little, if anything, had been achieved in the last year to indicate any meeting of minds on the part of the big Powers concerning the disarmament question.

13. The course of the debate in the Committee offered us no further encouragement in this respect, and we felt then that a vote in favour of either of the draft resolutions would serve no practical purpose and could certainly not help to reduce the tension and distrust prevailing among the big Powers. Consequently, we abstained on both the fourteen-nation draft resolution and the USSR draft resolution as a whole.

14. In the paragraph-by-paragraph voting which preceded the vote on the draft resolutions as a whole, however, my delegation indicated that there were parts of both proposals for which it could cast a favourable vote and parts on which it found it necessary to abstain. When, therefore, the fourteen-nation draft resolution was put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, my delegation voted in favour of the preamble, abstained on paragraph 1, as amended by Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Yemen, and on that part of paragraph 2 which reads "*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI)", and, finally, voted in favour of the rest of paragraph 2 and the other remaining paragraphs as amended. In the case of the Soviet Union draft reso-

lution, my delegation voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the operative part but abstained on the remainder.

15. Since then, however, the situation with regard to many of the major issues which, up to now, have divided the big Powers, has developed in such a way as to bring my delegation to hope that the way may finally be open for some constructive steps to be taken with regard to the entire disarmament question. We are strengthened in this hope, in particular, when we remember that the USSR delegation had already made what we considered to be conciliatory gestures in the committee stage of the debate by casting its vote in favour of some parts of the fourteen-nation draft resolution. I note with satisfaction that it voted in favour of what is to be considered as the substance of the Western proposal, namely, paragraph 2 of the operative part although not including the phrase "*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI)".

16. Bearing this in mind, and having in view other subsequent developments and the statement we have just heard from the representative of the USSR, we feel that the Soviet Union amendments may well provide a starting-point and a sound working basis from which such progress may be made. We are aware, of course, that some objections may be raised to the deletions suggested therein, but we would respectfully remind the General Assembly that in the past resolutions have been adopted which did not reaffirm in their operative parts previous resolutions on related matters.

17. It is the opinion of my delegation that, in the final analysis, even after making the deletions which have been suggested, what remains is, after all, still a well-phrased, adequate and useful document in its over-all context and one which could certainly be instrumental in bringing about more desirable conditions on the new international scene. Indeed, in our opinion, if the General Assembly were to accept these amendments as submitted by the Soviet Union delegation, a common meeting ground might be provided for the big Powers on the issue of disarmament, and in this way a considerable step forward might be taken towards eliminating the mutual distrust which has divided the world.

18. For these reasons, and in view of the fact that it will also be consistent with the stand taken by it at the committee stage, when it abstained on those parts of the fourteen-nation draft resolution which the USSR amendments now seek to delete, my delegation will vote in favour of those amendments. If those amendments are adopted, my delegation will then vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

19. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): The Czechoslovak delegation made it quite clear, during the consideration in the First Committee of item 17 of the agenda, "Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments", that it fully supported the principle of reduction of armaments and the unconditional prohibition of atomic, bacterial and other weapons of mass destruction. The Czechoslovak delegation also stated that that attitude was strictly in accordance with the spirit of its country's foreign policy. Czechoslovakia feels that war must never be looked upon as an instrument of international policy; it wants world peace, interna-

tional security and peaceful co-operation with all peace-loving peoples. This position in favour of peace and peaceful co-operation with all peace-loving peoples continues to guide my delegation in its attitude towards the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the First Committee [A/2373] and the amendments proposed by the USSR delegation [A/L.149].

20. When the draft resolution today submitted to the General Assembly by the First Committee was voted upon in that Committee [581st meeting], the Czechoslovak delegation voted in favour of most of the text, but against the draft resolution as a whole. My delegation felt that paragraph 1 and the first part of paragraph 2 of the operative part set forth principles that it could not support. That is why today the Czechoslovak delegation welcomes the amendments suggested by the USSR delegation. These amendments, permeated by the spirit that has always marked the peaceful and constructive proposals of the delegation of the Soviet Union, are aimed at rectifying the errors in the draft resolution as submitted by the First Committee. Moreover, they make an important contribution to the text of the draft resolution, which in this form could be adopted unanimously by the General Assembly. My delegation is convinced that the adoption of the amendments proposed by the USSR delegation in a spirit of collaboration would make the draft resolution submitted to us by the First Committee more effective.

21. For all these reasons the Czechoslovak delegation warmly supports the USSR amendments and will vote for them.

22. The adoption by the General Assembly of the USSR amendments will enable my delegation, which wishes to see the development of peaceful collaboration among peoples, to vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee.

23. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom): My delegation has, of course, carefully considered the Soviet Union amendments [A/L.149]. I think it will be clear to members of the General Assembly that, as Mr. Vyshinsky himself has just pointed out, these amendments faithfully reflect the position adopted by the Soviet Union when the vote was taken in the First Committee on the draft resolution sponsored by my own and a number of other delegations. In the First Committee, in fact, the USSR delegation voted against paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution and against the opening words in paragraph 2 of the operative part. Those opening words of paragraph 2 reaffirmed the General Assembly resolution of 11 January 1952. The Soviet Union did, however, admittedly vote in favour of the remainder of paragraph 2, containing a definition of the Disarmament Commission's task.

24. I have seen it suggested, in the Press and elsewhere, that the Soviet Union vote in the First Committee and its action in submitting these amendments to the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee represent a major concession. I hope, indeed—we must all hope—that this may be so and that, when the Disarmament Commission reconvenes, we shall find that the Soviet Union either has abandoned its insistence on its own proposals for disarmament or is, at any rate, prepared to consider alternative pro-

posals reasonably and dispassionately. If it were prepared to do that, I am sure we should all welcome it very much and should feel far greater confidence than hitherto in the possibility of the eventual reaching of an agreement in the Commission.

25. I really do not think it should be necessary for me to say that we, for our part, are sincerely anxious that agreement on this very important subject should be reached. We are certainly determined, so far as it lies in our own power, to do everything we can to facilitate such agreement. It is in this spirit that we have approached the present USSR amendments.

26. The first amendment would delete from paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution the words "and commends the Commission for its efforts to carry out the instructions laid down by the General Assembly at its sixth session". As is known, the United Kingdom is a member of the Disarmament Commission, and I should not want it to be thought that we necessarily wish to congratulate ourselves on the work which we and other members of the Commission have done. This is not, however, an amendment which we should normally be disposed to accept, since we do believe that the Commission, taken as a whole—or, at any rate, a great majority of its members—has made a sincere and determined attempt to carry out the instructions which the Assembly gave it during the last session. I do not think that anyone who has read the Commission's report could have any doubt about that. We are, however, as I have already said, most anxious to reach agreement.

27. We would not wish, therefore, to insist on any minor point if that should be thought to stand in the way of a larger agreement here and now. Hence we should be prepared to accept this particular amendment. We trust that we shall thereby be doing something, at least, to improve the atmosphere in which the Commission will resume its labours when it next meets.

28. The second Soviet Union amendment is a different matter. It would, I think we must all recognize, have the effect of positively deleting the reaffirmation of the resolution adopted by this Assembly last year. I must say, frankly, that this is something which my delegation, at any rate, could not accept. After all, resolution 502 (VI) was adopted, after a long debate, by an overwhelming majority in the Assembly, and it contains principles to which we attach very great importance. If we did not reaffirm it, its validity would no doubt remain technically unimpaired, but I think the effect of taking the words out of the draft resolution would inevitably, at this stage, give the impression—rightly or wrongly—that the principles were to some extent being undermined or abandoned.

29. I know, of course, that the Soviet Union does not agree with all the principles to which I have referred; and I know also that these differences of view are something which we shall have to try to reconcile in the Disarmament Commission when it meets. But for our part, we stand by the principles, and we certainly hope that the General Assembly, which endorsed them last year, will still regard them as valid.

30. In conclusion, my delegation would, for its part, be prepared to accept the first Soviet Union amend-

ment. If other delegations do not object to this, I would hope that the amendment might be incorporated in the draft resolution of the First Committee. We must, however, ask for a vote to be taken on the second amendment, and we shall ourselves have to vote against it.

31. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): My delegation has carefully studied the USSR amendments to the draft resolution on disarmament adopted by the First Committee. Our test—and we feel that it would be the test of the members of the General Assembly as well—is whether the adoption of these amendments would strengthen or would weaken genuine disarmament efforts. We, for our part, have reluctantly concluded that their adoption would in fact weaken these efforts, and I regret to add that the statement made this morning by the representative of the Soviet Union merely serves to confirm this conclusion. I should like to explain why I say that.

32. With regard to the first USSR amendment, proposing the deletion of the commendation of the Disarmament Commission for its efforts since the sixth session of the General Assembly, this is a matter of language rather than of substance. It is in that respect quite different from the second Soviet Union amendment. The first amendment would delete the commendation of the Disarmament Commission and those representatives who loyally attempted to carry out the mandate and principles established by the General Assembly. We think it wholly appropriate, as the Committee itself did, to express the satisfaction of the General Assembly with the work of the members of the Commission. However, we do not consider that this is a matter of sufficient importance to warrant drawing an issue. We of course would not consider that the adoption of the first amendment would in any way support the previously expressed Soviet Union view that it was the United States, or the United Kingdom, or France which obstructed the Commission's work, and we do not think that any such inference can be drawn.

33. With regard to the second USSR amendment, my delegation will vote against it. This proposes the deletion from paragraph 2 of the draft resolution approved by the Committee of the reaffirmation of General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952. This resolution, which is basic to the disarmament efforts of the United Nations itself, established the Disarmament Commission and defined its terms of reference. It was adopted after thorough discussion and was reaffirmed by the First Committee on 23 March of this year by a vote of 49 to 5. The Soviet Union amendment would, in our view, simply turn back the clock. It would scuttle, or threaten to scuttle, the important accomplishments in the disarmament field of the sixth session of the General Assembly, of the Disarmament Commission and of the present session of the Assembly.

34. In the First Committee, the USSR representative made clear his intention, and I feel that my statement was justified that Mr. Vyshinsky's remarks this morning had reaffirmed the position taken by the representative of the Soviet Union in the First Committee. In the Committee, on 19 March, the Soviet Union representative attacked the General Assembly resolution of 11 January 1952. He did so in somewhat more

blunt and pointed terms than he used this morning, but the effect was precisely the same and the meaning and intention have not changed. The USSR representative in the First Committee argued that the Disarmament Commission should have confined itself to considering the proposals which the Soviet Union had presented at the sixth session of the General Assembly. That was the argument put forward and that was the intention underlying the Soviet Union amendments as they were explained to the First Committee.

35. General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) constitutes the United Nations mandate and guidance to the Disarmament Commission; it is therefore a basic document. We are dealing not simply with a title, a mere name or style of a General Assembly resolution, but with the very terms of reference of the Disarmament Commission itself. This is not merely a matter of words and phrases; it is the question whether we should go forward on the solid basis of the accumulated wisdom and experience slowly and painfully built up in the United Nations over the past six years in this matter, or whether, as the USSR Government now suggests, we should in effect wipe the slate clean and start all over again. This is indeed a high price to pay in order to reach an unknown destination.

36. May I call to the attention of the General Assembly some of the more important guiding principles established by resolution 502 (VI) which were opposed by the Soviet Union delegation at the sixth session and which, as was indicated again this morning by Mr. Vyshinsky, are still opposed by the Soviet Union delegation; for that, indeed, is the only reason advanced for the adoption of the second Soviet Union amendment.

37. First, the 1952 resolution on disarmament—the basic mandate and the guiding principle in the field of disarmament—laid down the policy that there must be “progressive disclosure and verification on a continuing basis of all armed forces . . . and all armaments”. Secondly, it laid down that “such verification must be based on effective international inspection to ensure the adequacy and accuracy of the information disclosed”. Both these points have been attacked repeatedly by the USSR delegation as unwarranted and inadmissible. Thirdly, it provided that; “unless a better or no less effective system is devised, the United Nations plan for the international control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons should continue to serve as the basis for the international control of atomic energy”. Fourthly, it provided that “there must be an adequate system of safeguards to ensure observance of the disarmament programme”. These are some of the basic and indispensable elements which form part of the fibre and core of the United Nations programme and policy.

38. If the Soviet Union amendment were accepted, the Soviet Union, as we believe it is its intention, would be in a position, at the very least, to cast doubt upon the General Assembly's support of these principles which have been repeatedly endorsed by the majority of the Members of the United Nations. The USSR amendment would raise the question whether the General Assembly continued to support the United Nations plan for the control of atomic energy. It would lead to doubt as to whether the General Assembly continued to support its 1952 decision that the



progressive and continuing disclosure and verification of all armed forces and armaments was a first and indispensable step in carrying out an agreed disarmament programme.

39. I shall conclude by saying that the United States Government welcomes any signs that the new Soviet Union leadership is interested in negotiating constructively for solutions to the many problems which confront us, including disarmament. However, we seek the substance, not the shadow, of agreement. It is, of course, too early to tell whether we are going to be able to make significant progress in the disarmament field. Certainly, the USSR amendment which I have been discussing does not promise to contribute to such progress. Yet my Government remains deeply interested in the considered judgment of the Soviet Union Government on the possibilities of honest and constructive disarmament negotiations. We hope for a positive and tangible response from the Soviet Union Government when the Disarmament Commission resumes its work.

40. The draft resolution as adopted by the First Committee does not in any way preclude the submission by the USSR Government in the Disarmament Commission of any proposals that that government, or any other member for that matter, desires to put forward. For our part, we pledge ourselves to continue to work constructively for a genuinely safeguarded system of disarmament, and at the same time to give sympathetic and honest consideration to any concrete and practical proposals which the Soviet Union Government may make towards this end.

41. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): During the examination of the Disarmament Commission's report in the First Committee, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR pointed out the basic defects in the Commission's work. We pointed out that instead of working out practical measures for the reduction of armaments and armed forces, which in our view should have been its principal task, the Commission repeatedly tried to substitute for the question of the reduction of armaments that of the illegal collection of information concerning the armed forces of individual States although, as is well known, with the adoption of a decision concerning the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons, all States would have been bound to submit full information concerning their armed forces and armaments to the United Nations.

42. Despite all its efforts, the USSR delegation in the Disarmament Commission failed to induce the Commission to deal effectively with the question of the reduction of armaments and armed forces and, above all, of course, with that of the prohibition of atomic weapons. We are driven to the conclusion that the Commission's work has not been fruitful and the United Nations has still not taken any definite decisions with regard to measures for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

43. Although the work of the Disarmament Commission failed to achieve its objectives, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR deems it advisable that the Commission's mandate should be prolonged, in order that it may proceed forthwith to elaborate practical

measures for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and for the prohibition of atomic weapons. The first question to be examined should, of course, be that of the reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the great Powers.

44. The Soviet Union delegation has presented a number of amendments to the First Committee draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission. It is our profound conviction that all these amendments are intended to facilitate the unanimous adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution on such a very important question as the reduction of armaments and armed forces. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the USSR delegation's amendments and will vote for the First Committee draft resolution as a whole if these amendments are adopted by the General Assembly.

45. Mr. MENON (India): Our position on the draft resolution submitted in the First Committee has not changed since the termination of the proceedings in committee. On that occasion, on behalf of the Government of India, my delegation stated<sup>1</sup> its view that disarmament was possible only if there was agreement among the major Powers. That is the essential, unalterable and indispensable condition, and therefore it appeared to us that the function of the Assembly and of all its organs was to do everything possible to create conditions whereby the differences among Powers would be eliminated. Therefore we abstained from voting on those parts of the draft resolution that was finally adopted which allocated blame or praise or which represented a conflict. We voted for the operative parts of both draft resolutions. At the same time, it was our good fortune to be able to point out that the operative parts of the two draft resolutions asked for the continuance of the Commission, and therefore proclaimed to the Assembly and to the world that, in spite of all the differences that existed, the great Powers wanted to bring about disarmament by discussion and by negotiation and that it was the necessary thing to do.

46. Over and above that, my delegation, in speaking on the draft resolutions at that time, pointed out that advances had been made in the Disarmament Commission in spite of all the conflicts, advances, for instance, in the integration of the two types of armaments—conventional and unconventional. Another advance was, as we said, that the Soviet Union had agreed to simultaneous treatment in controlling weapons of mass destruction and their prohibition. Some advances have been made in this direction. That is our general approach to this problem, and for these reasons we shall support the Soviet Union amendments.

47. We shall also ask that the draft resolution of the First Committee should be voted on in parts, as it was voted on in committee, and that in paragraph 1 the words "to carry out the instructions laid down by the General Assembly at its sixth session" should be put to the vote separately. It is necessary for us to say that any resolution on any subject adopted by the Assembly remains on record and is valid until it is rescinded by the normal procedure. It therefore appears to us that for the Assembly to reaffirm its

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, First Committee*, 581st meeting.

previous resolution on this matter would be useful only if it was intended that that, and that alone, should be the guiding line of further discussion.

48. Our total approach to this problem is that in the Disarmament Commission every proposal or approach that enables the great Powers to meet and to come to some agreement must be made available to them and that these approaches or proposals must be explored. I should like, however, to state that we think the Soviet Union amendment to delete the words about commendation unnecessary; we see no objection whatsoever to commending the work of the Commission, because all its members have made their contribution. So while we are not considering moving a further amendment to the USSR amendment, we should like to express the view that we are not anxious to see the words "commends the Commission for its efforts ..." removed from paragraph 1.

49. With that observation, I should like to say that we shall support the Soviet Union amendments and we shall vote on the other clauses as we voted in the Committee. If the USSR amendments are not adopted, and if the draft resolution that was adopted in committee is put to the vote as it stands, we shall vote for the draft resolution as a whole because we want to be a party to the decision of the General Assembly that the work of the Disarmament Commission should continue. We shall have registered our view that the Commission should not be limited in its work by the conflicts of the past. For that reason, we shall vote against the various clauses to which we object. Having done that, and having registered our view, we shall vote for the draft resolution as a whole, whether with the Soviet Union amendments or without them, because we want the work of the Commission to continue.

50. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia): I should like shortly to indicate the reasons why Australia is not prepared to accept in particular the amendment moved by the Soviet Union to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution, namely, to delete the words "*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) ...".

51. There are two amendments which have been moved by the USSR. The first is to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, to omit the words of commendation of the Commission "for its efforts to carry out the instructions laid down by the General Assembly at its sixth session". For our part, we have heard no reasons why these words, which were deliberately inserted, should now be omitted. However, if, as we understand it, the general view of the Assembly is that these words should now be omitted since they are not a matter of great substance, we are not prepared to oppose the amendment.

52. Different considerations apply when one comes to consider the second amendment moved by the representative of the Soviet Union. During the course of the debate in the Committee, I mentioned two things, among others: one was that no progress could be made by the Disarmament Commission until such time as there was a change of heart on the part of the USSR; secondly, I said that we in Australia placed the utmost importance upon the principle of inspection of armaments on a continuing basis, so as to ensure that any scheme of disarmament would be correctly policed and so that the world could be equally sure that no nation

would take advantage of the position against the interests of others. Therefore it was to us a principle of outstanding importance.

53. I am sure the representative of the Soviet Union will forgive me when I say that one cannot merely accept his "say-so" in the sense that if, in point of fact, we agree to his amendment, then everything will be all right. On the contrary, to agree to his amendment would be to throw away specific principles laid down by the General Assembly at its sixth session, in Paris, upon which the Commission should operate. As the representative of the United States has pointed out, they were deliberately thought out and were the result of great labour and consideration.

54. I wish now to indicate the substance of this dispute because one reads from time to time that the Soviet Union has made a tremendous concession in this particular debate—a view which I frankly do not share—and it is important to point out the issue which we have to consider. The terms of reference of the Disarmament Commission were the principles and the directions embodied in resolution 502 (VI). Under this resolution, these, together with certain USSR proposals, were referred to the Commission for examination. The proposals in the General Assembly resolution contained principles of cardinal importance.

55. The representative of the Soviet Union presented the present amendment to paragraph 2 with very disarming and apparent candour. He said, in effect: "If you accept this amendment, we will go along with the whole resolution." In truth, what he really means is: "If you emasculate the resolution, we will go along with it," because the whole sense of this resolution is contained in paragraph 2, the reaffirmation of the General Assembly resolution which gives effect to these two very important and vital principles.

56. The view of the Australian delegation is that, as to the first amendment, if I may repeat what I have said, we have heard nothing at all which would justify the omission of the words which have been put in. However, we are not prepared to stand in the way of the omission of those words, since that apparently is the general view of the Assembly, as we too are desirous of making some progress upon this vital and difficult subject of disarmament.

57. As to the second amendment, for the reasons which I have given, we are not in a position to give any support to it. I regret very much to say that the Soviet Union apparently is not prepared to vote for the draft resolution if the words which it insists be omitted are not omitted, because its representative has said in effect that if we agree to omit those words, then he will support the resolution; if not, he will not. That amounts to asking the Assembly to engage in a somersault for the purpose of getting apparent agreement, not real agreement, in respect of so vital a subject as that with which we are dealing.

58. In conclusion, it is relevant to point out that this clause was adopted by a vote of 49 to 5, with 6 abstentions, and the draft resolution as a whole was finally adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions. It was a matter of great deliberation on the part of the Assembly, because it involved the consideration of very vital principles. For those reasons, Australia is not prepared to accept or vote for the second USSR amendment, and

it hopes that the Assembly will stand fast by its resolution on this point.

59. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): Disarmament interests the major Powers from a political point of view, but it interests everyone from the human and technical points of view. It is from the point of view of international law that I shall approach the amendments submitted by the USSR delegation to the draft resolution which we approved by a great majority in the First Committee. At the outset, I must state that I welcome the fact that the Soviet Union, instead of submitting a separate draft in some way contradictory to ours, has merely submitted two amendments. I must say more, with all the frankness which I can muster.

60. It must be recognized that these two amendments, one of which is very simple and the other very important, leave four major points standing in the draft resolution adopted by the Committee. This, to be frank, constitutes an advance on previous positions of the Soviet Union, because, notwithstanding the amendment of paragraph 2 of the operative part by the deletion of the words "*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952," the following principles remain: regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments.

61. I am gratified that the USSR today accepts the principle of balanced reduction as one of the principles governing the work of the Disarmament Commission. The point about the one-third reduction previously proposed was that it was not a balanced reduction.

62. Again, I am gratified that the Soviet Union, in allowing that paragraph to stand, today accepts—as it apparently did in the proposal it submitted in the First Committee—the idea that the reduction of conventional armaments must be based on a just and fair balance of forces which could never be expressed by a rigid mathematical formula.

63. Paragraph 2 (c), which would remain, is also important: it provides for "the effective international control of atomic energy to ensure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only."

64. The Assembly will recall that, when the atomic bomb was being discussed, the Soviet Union insisted on a preliminary, unconditional and spectacular prohibition which, if I may say so without offending anyone, was addressed to the gallery, because without effective control it could be only a verbal prohibition. Today the USSR accepts these words in the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee which are the very expression of good sense and general opinion: "effective international control of atomic energy to ensure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only". This creates a scale of values, because prohibition is not left dangling. Control is established first, and that effective control guarantees the subsequent prohibition.

65. Yet, although I am gratified at this progress in the USSR proposal and amendments, just as I was gratified in Paris, at the sixth session, when the Soviet Union representative accepted continuous—although not permanent—inspection and also when he hinted that the veto would not apply to the decisions of the

international control organ, yet, on a careful study of the two amendments, I feel bound to say that I regret very much that the USSR delegation should wish to delete the commendation of the Disarmament Commission. Applause is a form of intellectual charity, if not of intellectual justice. Why grudge applause? We are all aware that the Disarmament Commission has done a great deal of work and has worked continuously, and that the Soviet Union representative has taken part in that work. I believe that the praise of the Commission applies to everyone and excludes no one, but I see that the USSR representative wishes to dispense with that applause. Courtesy is always a form of charity, and I greatly appreciate it, particularly when the applause and praise are not merely charitable but also just.

66. Since, however, the matter is one of form, we see no objection to voting for the first amendment, in the spirit which the USSR delegation wishes us to adopt in this discussion.

67. As regards the second amendment, serious difficulties arise. The Indian representative stated here that General Assembly resolutions can be voided only if they are explicitly revoked. That is correct in law, but, when a resolution is adopted on some matter and another resolution is then adopted without reference to or reaffirmation of the principles of the former, then obviously the moral force and even the legal authority of the earlier text is thereby weakened. It is extremely difficult, and even dangerous, not to refer, in a resolution on a given question, to previous resolutions on that subject. It is even more dangerous if, as in this case, we have a resolution which reaffirms the previous one and we then approve an amendment which specifically deletes the reaffirmation. If we adopted the amendment, we should be considered—quite rightly—to have lost faith in the principles which we had proclaimed, or to be refusing to give them all the authority which we had previously said they had.

68. There is another, very interesting, matter, which was dealt with admirably by the United States representative and now also by the Australian representative. After the representative of the Soviet Union had accepted the principle of continuous—though not permanent—inspection, he accepted the principle that control was indissolubly linked with prohibition and the right of inspection indissolubly linked with control. He also implied that the decisions of the international organ should not be subject to veto. The only remaining point concerned sovereignty, because continuous and effective—though not permanent—inspection obviously presupposes a limitation of sovereignty.

69. The USSR point of view was to reject that limitation absolutely, invoking a principle which must be called obsolete—an antiquated concept of sovereignty. To that antiquated concept of sovereignty advanced by the Soviet Union we opposed the modern concept of sovereignty.

70. Sovereignty is the freedom of the State within the framework of international law, just as the freedom of the individual is bounded by the law of the State. Since we have proclaimed a rule of international law which we are seeking to strengthen through the United Nations, sovereignty clearly operates within that rule. All modern authorities recognize that that rule of international law develops according to the requirements

of the times, that new international standards are established every day, and that international law applies wherever the legal mind finds an applicable international standard. We thus consider international law to be a living thing, and our view is that the sphere of sovereignty is progressively diminishing.

71. Today we all agree, particularly since the discovery of the hydrogen bomb, that it is impossible to leave atomic energy to the individual discretion of certain Powers, that this is a matter which vitally affects the existence of mankind as a whole, and that man will either perish, or will save himself by establishing an effective international control of atomic energy, that is, an international control which will have to lay down rules limiting, and rightly limiting, national sovereignty. The time will come when a country whose sovereignty is limited by international control will not regard that limitation as a slight but as a safeguard established in the interests of mankind, and will feel honoured by submitting to it.

72. The point at issue—the apple of discord as it might be called—is thus the concept of sovereignty. Our concept of sovereignty is that it is subject to international law and morality. I like to fancy that the Soviet Union is changing; its views on this question ought to change. Perhaps today, as certain periodicals and sociologists assert, the Soviet Union realizes that coexistence among nations requires a change in its concept of sovereignty. But if that change is now occurring, as I hope it is, in the USSR, it is unfortunately not reflected in this amendment. We are asked to delete a few words from our draft resolution, but those words involve our entire spiritual position, which we cannot abandon.

73. The Peruvian delegation will therefore be obliged to vote against the second USSR amendment.

74. Mr. DE SOUZA GOMES (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation wishes to explain very briefly the reasons which prompt it not to vote in favour of the second amendment submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union to the draft resolution on disarmament proposed by the First Committee. The amendment would, if approved, entail a major deletion from the text already approved by the First Committee by an overwhelming majority. According to this amendment, the General Assembly should make no mention, in its resolution, of General Assembly resolution 502 (VI), which contains the terms of reference adopted by the General Assembly for the guidance of the Disarmament Commission.

75. The deletion proposed by the Soviet Union could easily lend itself to the interpretation that the General Assembly wishes to annul those terms of reference. Such an interpretation appears to us to be most harmful to the Commission's work.

76. The principles embodied in General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) are still considered by the majority of the Member States as the most adequate for the common purpose we all have in mind—the development by the United Nations of comprehensive and co-ordinated plans, under international control, for the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments, for the elimination of all major weapons adaptable to mass destruction, and for the effective international control of atomic energy to ensure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

77. Moreover, such principles are in no way rigid and do not prevent consideration of any concrete plan advanced by one of the members of the Commission. In this connexion, I recall the very broad terms of paragraph 3 (c) of General Assembly resolution 502 (VI):

“The Commission shall be ready to consider any proposals or plans for control that may be put forward involving either conventional armaments or atomic energy. Unless a better or no less effective system is devised, the United Nations plan for the international control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons should continue to serve as the basis for the international control of atomic energy . . .”

It is thus clear that resolution 502 (VI) does not put the Commission in a straitjacket and that its only purpose is to provide the Commission with a set of general and flexible norms indispensable to the proper conduct of its work.

78. As I had the occasion to point out during the debates in the First Committee, the Brazilian delegation is firmly convinced that, however discouraging the results of the first year of work of the Disarmament Commission, there is no room for despair. We cannot ignore the fact that progress in this field is intimately connected with non-technical factors beyond the control of the Commission. We are reasonably entitled to hope that, if the recent indications on the part of the Soviet Union are matched with positive deeds, the Disarmament Commission will find itself this year in a better position to accomplish a constructive task.

79. Mr. AZKOUR (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): As the representative of a country which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee, and which, moreover, has just been elected a new member of the Disarmament Commission, I should like briefly to explain my delegation's attitude towards the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union.

80. My delegation is glad to note that the disagreement to which these amendments have given rise between the USSR delegation and the sponsors of the draft resolution—or rather, the majority of the First Committee—is not on the objectives to be achieved or the safeguards to be established, but simply on the ways and means of achieving those objectives and establishing those safeguards. Thus the second Soviet Union amendment proposes the deletion of the passage in paragraph 2 which “*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952.”

81. That resolution contains two sets of principles: first, the principles determining the objectives to be attained and the safeguards to be established; secondly, the means, methods, procedures, plans and programmes whereby those objectives and safeguards may be achieved.

82. We believe that the principles of the first group are the important ones, that should guide any action taken by the United Nations to attain the objectives of disarmament.

83. Nevertheless, the Disarmament Commission should enjoy the greatest possible freedom with regard to the second set of principles, that is to say, the means,



techniques, programmes and plans for implementation. Such freedom is required by the very nature and purposes of the Commission's work. The final result of the Disarmament Commission's work will not be the establishment of a set of principles to be proclaimed by the United Nations or of recommendations to be made by the General Assembly to the Member States. The positive result will be the preparation of a treaty among States. Such a treaty is based upon the voluntary acceptance of the terms of that treaty by those States. Since we know that the Soviet Union must certainly be one of the signatories of the treaty, particularly a treaty on disarmament, if it is to be effective, we can see that an even greater freedom of action is imperative in deciding on the ways and means of dealing with the problem and finding practical methods of implementation.

84. Under the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee, the governing principles, that is, the objectives to be attained and the safeguards to be established, are not merely reaffirmed but actually reproduced in essence. Thus the draft resolution "requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its work for the development by the United Nations of comprehensive and co-ordinated plans providing for:

"(a) The regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and armaments;

"(b) The elimination and prohibition of all major weapons, including bacteriological, adaptable to mass destruction;

"(c) The effective international control of atomic energy to ensure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only."

A very important clause comes next:

"The whole programme to be carried out under effective international control in such a way that no State would have cause to fear that its security was endangered."

85. The Soviet Union, as its representative has stated, agrees with these governing principles, these objectives and safeguards; it is prepared to vote for this text. But with regard to the means, the practical methods of giving effect to these purposes, the Soviet Union wishes to enjoy more freedom in the Disarmament Commission by the deletion of the words "*Reaffirms* General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952."

86. As a new member of the Disarmament Commission, and since the essential principles are not altered by the deletion of these words, and since, too, the existence of that resolution will in no way be affected if no reference is made to it in the present draft, my delegation will vote for the first USSR amendment and will abstain on the second; it may be held, indeed, that, although it would do no harm to reaffirm resolution 502 (VI), it can do harm not to reaffirm it. Accordingly, my delegation will take the position that I have just explained.

87. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation has followed the debate on this question of disarmament with great interest. Although it may appear a little unrealistic to speak about disarmament in these times when the great Powers are daily devoting more and more money to the armaments race, it is of primary interest to the other

Members of the United Nations that that race should be brought to an end. As a result of the armaments race, the economic life of the world is based on artificial foundations, and the fear of imminent war is aggravated.

88. It is the opinion of my delegation that the final objective of any disarmament plan or of any action directed towards an effective limitation of armaments must be the prevention of war, and not simply the regulation of the types and quantities of armaments that countries may possess or use. The basic function of the Disarmament Commission must not be to regulate the kinds of armaments that may be used or to determine the maximum levels to which States may arm themselves or to try to establish a balance of power among the States that might take part in an armed conflict. The task of the Disarmament Commission cannot be one of regulation or rationalizing war. The Commission must be an effective tool in preventing war.

89. If there is one subject under consideration by the United Nations which requires agreement among the great Powers, it is this matter of disarmament. The lack of agreement among the great Powers was the reason for our abstaining in the vote in the First Committee, for we feel that any action that is taken in opposition to, or without the support of, those directly concerned is doomed to produce no positive results.

90. My delegation is in entire agreement with the views expressed by the representatives of Indonesia, India and Lebanon concerning the amendments on which we are about to vote. The first amendment, eliminating the words "and commends the Commission . . ." does not in any way change either the form or the substance of the draft resolution. We even adhere to the view that the Assembly and committees should refrain from exchanging eulogies and commendations. This is not a charity organization. As for the second amendment, which calls for the deletion of the reference to resolution 502 (VI), my delegation does not attribute any legal or other value to it. It would be very dangerous to accept the idea that a resolution loses its force if it is not quoted at every session of the General Assembly. All the principles of law favour the opposite theory, as do political interests, for we should be introducing a system, or an element, of great instability if we were to have doubts about all the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at earlier sessions that are not quoted at the current session when similar questions are debated. Neither the force nor the authority of a legal criterion depends on the number of times it is repeated; they are based upon its content or substance.

91. If, therefore, a single text can be agreed upon, we shall vote for it; if the division among the great Powers persists, we shall again have to abstain.

92. Mr. ZEINEDDINE (Syria): My delegation is very appreciative of the conciliatory spirit which prompted the USSR delegation in the submission of its amendments.

93. The adoption of these amendments, in the present circumstances, might not only assist the Soviet Union in avoiding the embarrassment of voting expressly and explicitly for the reaffirmation of General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952, but it might also help to create the conditions for a meeting of minds among the members of the Disarmament Commission

on the crucial question of disarmament. Yet the impression might be conveyed, rightly or wrongly, that the value of General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) was somehow diminished by deleting, at this advanced stage of our deliberations, the provisions which reaffirm it. It is fortunate that all the members of the Commission, and other members, can submit their proposals to the Commission. This leaves the way wide open for the consideration of all such proposals, whether General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) is or is not expressly reaffirmed. Its objectives are reiterated in the present proposal. No course that is followed will hamper the rights of the members of the Commission, nor will it substantially influence the situation. After all, disarmament can only be realized by the agreement of all concerned.

94. This being the case, my delegation considers it appropriate to abstain in the vote on the second Soviet Union amendment, thus implying our wish to see real progress achieved in the Commission.

95. All the big Powers are certainly interested in achieving disarmament. Small countries like mine, situated in the shadow of world tension and its impending dangers, are equally interested to see a general disarmament realized. I take it that it is not with the texts of the resolutions that we are mainly concerned, but with a solution which can be attained by eliminating the distrust which torments the world and frustrates the will for a durable peace and international co-operation.

96. Mr. SOURDIS (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): The participation of a small country like mine in a debate which really involves only the great Powers can be explained only by the fact that Colombia is one of the countries sponsoring the draft resolution before the Assembly, and that it is a member of the Disarmament Commission. But perhaps our very smallness makes it possible for countries like mine to see things more objectively.

97. It is true, as various speakers here have said, that a General Assembly resolution can be considered void only if expressly revoked by another resolution. But while there are explicit revocations, certain acts can also be interpreted as implicit revocations, especially if, as in this case, the body which approved the resolution subsequently declines to reaffirm it when asked to do so.

98. In the circumstances, and with all respect for the speakers who have expressed other points of view, the Colombian delegation cannot vote in favour of the second amendment proposed by the Soviet Union, lest it should be interpreted as an implicit revocation. I have dealt with the second amendment first because I consider it the most important one.

99. As for the first amendment, the Colombian delegation feels that it concerns what is really a mere expression of courtesy, which should not, perhaps, be a subject for debate. In view, however, of the understanding developing among the great Powers—which small countries like mine welcome with much enthusiasm—I wish to say that, as far as my delegation is concerned, we shall substitute one courtesy for another, withdrawing the expression of courtesy we wanted to extend to the Commission for its work, and voting instead for the USSR amendment, thereby showing a courtesy to the Soviet people, who greatly deserve it.

100. This subject ought to be the most important one before the United Nations. It is no exaggeration to say that, with the discovery of nuclear fission, war and peace, and, more specifically, the weapons used, have undergone a tremendous development. There are now weapons belonging to the eras preceding and following the splitting of the atom. Earlier weapons were more or less destructive but they left the human race alive. Today, ever since the discovery of nuclear fission, weapons have acquired such extraordinary powers of destruction that, perhaps for the first time in history, man finds himself threatened by a weapon whose destructive power is such as to endanger the very existence of mankind. In other words, what is now at stake is not merely the victory of one State over another or the more or less destructive power of weapons, but the very existence of the human race.

101. In view of the importance of this debate, I do not think that this explanation of my delegation's vote was superfluous.

102. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has requested to speak in order to reply to certain specific observations which have been made with regard to the USSR amendments and observations made with regard to his own statement. I shall therefore call on the representative of the Soviet Union for that purpose.

103. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should not have invoked rule 74 of the rules of procedure if my delegation and a number of others had not considered the question at issue to be highly important and, in any case, sufficiently so to warrant the elimination of all possible misunderstandings, exaggerations and misgivings, none of which can ever be recognized as a good counsellor in matters of moment.

104. I shall begin with Mr. Gross's statement. He objected to our second amendment and considered it essential to retain in the First Committee's draft resolution the form of words reaffirming resolution 502 (VI). It has rightly been said here that it is not essential to reaffirm any given resolution in every case and in every connexion. Mr. Gross, however, considers it necessary to reaffirm this particular resolution, believing that its authority will otherwise be weakened. I do not consider that argument at all convincing, since if the word "reaffirms" were deleted from the draft and if the United States delegation were to vote for the draft without the word "reaffirms"—reaffirms, that is, General Assembly resolution 502 (VI)—that could not be taken to mean that the United States rejected resolution 502 (VI).

105. The question is quite different and so is the line of reasoning. What are we now discussing? We are discussing the question of requesting the Disarmament Commission to continue its work on the basis of the principles set forth specifically in paragraph 2 (a), (b) and (c) of the operative part of the draft resolution. Does this mean that none of these principles is subject to amendment or modification or that our views in their regard are already crystallized and rigidly defined to the point where, like the words of the Koran, they are not subject to modification in any way? Our delegation takes a different view of the matter. We are considering this question now in order that we should be agreed

when we meet in the Disarmament Commission to begin new work, or to continue our old work, inspired by the same intention of reaching agreement and settling problems which are still outstanding.

106. For these reasons, I consider that all Mr. Gross's arguments are based on a misunderstanding, on the idea that if he fails to utter this letter or that word, if he fails, in other words, to make obeisance once more to the resolution adopted at the sixth session of the General Assembly, he will be regarded as an apostate. I think we may be sure that he will not be suspected of any apostasy, but that it will simply be understood that the other party is not obliged to observe resolution 502 (VI) on all points and in every detail.

107. I would ask Sir Gladwyn Jebb, Mr. Gross, Mr. Lodge, and other representatives who have objected to this, whether they think that no modifications can be made in the Disarmament Commission. Or do they think that this is holy writ, from which it is impossible to depart by one jot, or, as Luther said: "Here I stand. I can do no other." If Mr. Gross takes this attitude, the Disarmament Commission is hardly likely to make any progress and will obviously be unable to do so. I therefore regard Mr. Gross's first argument as unconvincing.

108. His second argument was that we should "reaffirm" the resolution in order to strengthen it. If that is so, he obviously considers that it is not strong enough. He is not altogether convinced that the resolution fully reflects the wishes of the whole Assembly as at present constituted and in the present circumstances. He is afraid that it may be subjected to substantial modification, and now, hurriedly anticipating events and disregarding the present situation and the new circumstances, deems it necessary at all costs to stand firm on his old position. But is he sure that this position is sacrosanct and inviolable? We are not sure of this. We know that life goes forward, life changes relations, relations change with events and the shape of events is not always the same tomorrow as it was yesterday.

109. We argue from this point of view and admit that we have differences. Mr. Belaúnde, who spoke here with his usual eloquence and with a fervour which might have been more appropriate in the Committee than in the Assembly—though this is due to his ardent nature and to the youthful spirit with which he is so strongly imbued, and which is most welcome—went so far as to say: "Your requests are such, your proposals are such, but abandon them, abandon them!" In fact, he is asking us to abandon all our positions on such questions as disarmament, atomic energy, and the like. But this is not the point. This is not, in my opinion, the question with which we are dealing today. We shall continue to discuss matters with those who disagree with us, and they may perhaps yield on some point. Hence, I cannot understand how they interpret the portion of the draft resolution which they are defending here, which "requests the Disarmament Commission to continue its work for the development by the United Nations of comprehensive and co-ordinated plans . . .". How do they conceive of the possibility of co-ordinating plans, if their plan is already prepared and if they propose that we should subscribe to that plan without even thinking of amending it in any way?

110. If that is their reasoning, then their phrase in the draft resolution about "the development . . . of compre-

hensive and co-ordinated plans" has no real significance. My own interpretation of this phrase, which has real significance—and I am sure that the majority of those present interpret it similarly—is that co-ordinated plans are plans which are the result of a joint endeavour, which means that there must be some possibility of reaching agreement, the prime requisite for which is willingness to make mutual concessions. Without this there can be no "co-ordinated plans". Hitherto, they have repeatedly said to us: "The Soviet Union and its representatives often speak of their love of peace and of their willingness to compromise, but where are their deeds?" But I would ask, has not the Soviet Union proved by many deeds the serious intentions which motivate its foreign policy, a policy which is consistent, unchanging and clearly justified? And where, may I ask, are their deeds? Their deeds are not to be seen. We hoped today that they would show their willingness to seek agreement. They have not yet done so.

111. The Indonesian representative was right, I consider, when he pointed out that the USSR amendment, far from emasculating the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee, as the Australian representative put it, leaves the essential part of the text completely intact. The essential part of the draft resolution is the preamble, which states that "under the Charter of the United Nations, all States are bound to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force . . .". We are in favour of this preamble.

112. It is further stated in paragraph 1 that the Assembly takes note of the Commission's report. We agree with this. Our amendment to that paragraph has met with approval.

113. Paragraph 2 reaffirms resolution 502 (VI) and indicates that the purpose of this is to enable the United Nations to develop co-ordinated plans for the purposes indicated in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). This raises highly important issues. Those who have objected to our second amendment understand full well that the purpose of this wording is to reaffirm resolution 502 (VI), when that resolution contains, together with acceptable provisions, certain others which are unacceptable but on which, we hope, agreement may be reached if we begin to dig the tunnel of friendship from both ends, and not from one end only, the other side deciding merely to observe and await events, or, in Mr. Churchill's words, to "wait and see". Wait and see! This can lead to nothing. It is not enough to wait, we must have action; it is not enough to see, we must have participation, active participation.

114. We admit that the resolution contains both good and bad provisions. It is to be hoped that the Commission will proceed in its work on the basis of these principles, especially since this resolution will not be the only one to be considered by the Disarmament Commission. Let us not forget another resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth session—resolution 504 (VI), of 19 January 1952—under which the General Assembly referred to the Disarmament Commission the proposals contained in paragraphs 3 to 7 inclusive of document A/C.1/698, the USSR draft resolution, "together with any other pro-

posals which may be made during the present session of the General Assembly on matters falling within the terms of reference of the Disarmament Commission". Consequently, the General Assembly acknowledged in advance that there might be other proposals than those set forth in resolution 502 (VI) and that such proposals could serve as amendments or additions to any measures provided for in that resolution. This is a matter for the future. This question will be settled in the Commission, where we shall discuss it.

115. I think I may say that the impression created is that those who disagree with us are intransigent towards the USSR amendments and are willing to make concessions only within the bounds of courtesy. Mr. Gross spoke here of conciliation and promises. But promises alone, unless they are confirmed by deeds, are meaningless.

116. I shall not dwell on the statements of Mr. Belaúnde and others, because they constituted repetitions of one idea, namely, that we shall make no progress unless the draft resolution contains the phrase: "Reaffirms General Assembly resolution 502 (VI)". There seems to be a conflict between two principles, one of which I would call the principle of the letter and the other the principle of the spirit. Some representatives say in effect that the letter is all and that the spirit is unimportant. We hold the opposite view, that the letter is important only in so far as it corresponds to the basic, paramount principle: the bringing about of a peaceful atmosphere in which we can embark on the only road which is open to a self-respecting international organization such as our United Nations must be, and will be, however difficult this may prove.

117. I therefore invite and urge all the representatives to support our amendment. It will enable us to advance more freely towards the goals about which so many words have been spoken here, but which call for deeds.

118. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the amendments submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.149].

119. The first amendment, to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, would appear to have met with general acceptance. If, therefore, no representative requests a vote, I would suggest that the amendment to paragraph 1 should be adopted without a vote.

*The amendment was adopted.*

120. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the second amendment, to paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

*The amendment was rejected by 33 votes to 10, with 13 abstentions.*

121. The PRESIDENT: The rejection of the amendment to paragraph 2 makes it unnecessary to vote on the third Soviet Union amendment.

122. A request has been made for a vote by parts on the draft resolution [A/2373], as now amended.

123. The Soviet Union representative will address the Assembly on a point of order.

124. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): On behalf of my delegation I ask that two separate votes should be taken on paragraph 2; the first, on the words "Reaffirms General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952 and . . .", and the second on the remainder of that paragraph, "requests the Disarmament Commission . . .".

125. The PRESIDENT: The request of the Soviet Union delegation will be granted.

126. I put to the vote now the preamble to the draft resolution.

*The preamble was adopted by 58 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

127. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will next vote on the amended paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution. This paragraph reads:

*"Takes note of the report of the Disarmament Commission."*

*The paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

128. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the first part of paragraph 2, reading:

*"Reaffirms General Assembly resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952 and . . ."*

*The first part of the paragraph was adopted by 38 votes to 6, with 16 abstentions.*

129. The PRESIDENT: A vote will now be taken on the remainder of paragraph 2.

*The remainder of the paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

130. The PRESIDENT: A vote will now be taken on paragraph 2 as a whole.

*The paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

131. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on paragraph 3.

*The paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

132. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 52 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.*