

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



# 799th PLENARY MEETING

 Friday, 18 September 1959,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Address by H.E. Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. . . . .	31

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

Address by H. E. Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the  
Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Re-  
publics

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): On behalf of the United Nations, I welcome Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the representative of a State that is a signatory of the Charter, an original Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. At a time when the eyes of all mankind are turned to the United Nations, your Excellency's presence here answers to the universal desire for peace and friendly relations among all nations. I invite Your Excellency to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. Nikita S. KHRUSHCHEV, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (translated from Russian): My visit to the United States of America at the invitation of its President, Mr. Dwight Eisenhower, coincides with the opening of the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly. Allow me first of all to express my sincere thanks to the Members of the Assembly and the Secretary-General for this opportunity to speak from the lofty platform of the United Nations. I appreciate this honour all the more because the Soviet Union will today submit for the consideration of the General Assembly highly important proposals on the most vital of all problems, one that is causing great concern among the nations. I am referring to the problem of disarmament.

3. Never before in history have the people placed such high hopes in an international organization as they have in the United Nations. Born at a grim moment when the rumble of the final battles of the Second World War had not yet subsided and the ruins of devastated towns and villages were still smouldering, the United Nations, expressing the thoughts and aspirations of millions of suffering people, proclaimed that its main purpose was to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. Today more than eighty States have joined together in the United Nations. Its ranks have been swelled by many States which, during the recent war, were among the enemies of the countries that had laid the foundations of this Organization.

4. More than fourteen years have elapsed since the establishment of this international forum, yet the purpose for which it was created has not so far been

fully achieved. The people still live in a constant state of anxiety about peace and about their future. How can they fail to feel that anxiety when military conflicts flare up and human blood is shed first in one part of the world and then in another? The clouds of a new war, clouds that at times become dark and threatening, are looming over a world that has not yet forgotten the horrors of the Second World War.

5. Tension in international relations cannot continue forever. It will either reach a pitch when there can be only one outcome—war—or it will be removed in time through the joint efforts of States. The peoples expect the United Nations to redouble its efforts to promote confidence and mutual understanding among States and the consolidation of peace in general.

6. Controversial problems in international affairs may be successfully solved if States concentrate on what brings them closer to one another rather than on what divides the present world. No social or political differences, no ideological or religious distinctions should prevent the States Members of the United Nations from reaching an agreement on the main question, namely that all States must, unswervingly and as a sacred duty, observe the principles of peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation. If, on the other hand, first place is given to differences and social distinctions, then all our efforts to preserve peace will be doomed to failure. Crusades to exterminate heretics by fire and sword, such as those organized by the fanatics of the Middle Ages, cannot be undertaken in the twentieth century without the risk of confronting mankind with the greatest disaster in its history.

7. The United Nations is itself the very embodiment of the idea of peaceful co-operation among States with different social and political systems. We need only look around at the many States in this hall with their different social systems: what a multitude of races and nationalities they represent and what varying outlooks and cultures!

8. In view of the different approaches of States to controversial questions and their different conceptions as to the causes of the present international tension, we must face the fact that persistent efforts, restraint and wise statesmanship on the part of Governments will be required in order to remove these differences. The time has come when the efforts of the United Nations to strengthen peace must be bolstered by the efforts of the heads of government of States and by the efforts of the broad masses of the people who are in favour of peace and security for all. There is every indication that the time has come to embark on a period of international negotiations, conferences and meetings of statesmen in order that, one after the other, urgent international problems may find a solution.

9. It is our view that, if relations between States are to be based entirely on the principles of peaceful coexistence, an end must be put to the "cold war". The nations cannot allow the unnatural state of the "cold war" to continue any longer, just as they cannot allow an epidemic of the plague or cholera to rage unchecked.

10. What do we mean by terminating the "cold war" and what does that entail?

11. In the first place, calls to war must cease. There is no point in concealing the fact that some near-sighted statesmen continue to deliver belligerent speeches. Is it not time to put an end to sabre-rattling and the uttering of threats against other States?

12. The "cold war" is doubly dangerous because it is being waged in the midst of an unbridled armaments race which is growing like a snowball and intensifying the feeling of suspicion and distrust among States.

13. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the "cold war" started and is continuing at a time when the vestiges of the Second World War are still far from being eliminated, when a peace treaty has not yet been concluded with Germany, when an occupation régime is still being maintained in the heart of Germany, in Berlin, in the territory of its western sectors. Removal of this source of tension in the centre of Europe, in what is potentially the most dangerous area in the world because of the close proximity of opposing military alignments, would provide the key to an improved international climate. We urge the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France to make every effort to bring about an agreement on real steps towards the achievement of this goal.

14. Who can deny the vital importance of broader contacts between peoples in terminating the "cold war" and improving the international atmosphere? We are in favour of more extensive mutual visits by statesmen as well as representatives of political, business and social service circles, and of broader international economic, cultural, scientific and technical co-operation.

15. I should like to say that the United Nations will fulfil its noble mission far more successfully if it succeeds in ridding itself of the elements of the "cold war" which often hamper its activities. Surely it is the "cold war" that has produced the intolerable situation in which the People's Republic of China, one of the most powerful countries in the world, has for years been deprived of its legitimate rights in the United Nations.

16. It is inconceivable that anyone should seriously believe that a lasting, dependable solution of major world problems can be achieved without the participation of the great People's China, which is nearing its glorious tenth anniversary.

17. Allow me to express the following views on this question quite frankly. Everyone knows that when a person dies he is eventually buried. No matter how dearly beloved the deceased may be, no matter how sad the parting, life compels everyone to face reality: a grave or mausoleum is quietly prepared and the deceased is removed from the dwelling place of the living. This was so in ancient times and remains so in our day. Why then must China be represented in the United Nations by the corpse of reactionary China,

in other words by the Chiang Kai-shek clique? We believe it is high time that the United Nations, too, acted the way everyone does towards a corpse, by removing it from the premises so that the real representative of the Chinese people may take his rightful seat in the United Nations.

18. After all, China is not Taiwan by any means. Taiwan is only a small island, a province; in other words, it is only a small part of a great State, China. China is the People's Republic of China, which for the past ten years has been developing at a rapid rate and which has its own stable Government, recognized by the whole Chinese population, and legislative bodies elected by the entire population of China. China is a great State, the capital of which is Peking. Sooner or later Taiwan, as an inalienable part of the sovereign Chinese State, will be united with the rest of People's China, in other words the rule of the Government of the People's Republic of China will be extended to the island. The sooner this happens, the better.

19. The restoration of the legitimate rights of People's China will not only greatly enhance the prestige and authority of the United Nations but will also be a significant contribution towards the promotion of an improved international climate in general.

20. I should like to express the hope that the United Nations will find the strength to rid itself of the sediments of the "cold war" and to become a truly universal organ of international co-operation working effectively for the cause of peace throughout the world.

21. It may be asked, however, whether the abolition of the "cold war", the strengthening of peace and the peaceful coexistence of States, supremely noble and attractive goals though they may be, are attainable, realistic aims. Can relations between States be placed on a new basis already now, under present conditions?

22. From this rostrum I state most categorically that the Soviet Government considers the achievement of these aims not only urgent, but also quite realistic. The Soviet Union is convinced that the necessary conditions now exist for a radical improvement in international relations, and for the total abolition of the "cold war" in the interests of all mankind.

23. Let us consider, if only briefly, the most important events of the past few months as they affect the problem of reducing international tension.

24. The calling of the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva in May 1959 at which plenipotentiaries of both German States took part for the first time, was in itself an expression of the new spirit in international relations, which is one of realism and mutual understanding. The results achieved in Geneva could not, of course, be regarded as sufficient to ensure the practical solution of urgent international questions. It is, however, encouraging to note that detailed and frank discussion of the problems on the agenda of the Geneva Conference made it possible, as was stated in the final communiqué of the Conference, to bring the parties closer together on a number of issues. In this way a fairly good basis was laid for further negotiations, which may lead to agreement on still outstanding problems.

25. It is especially heartening that important steps have been taken for the development of Soviet-American relations. Scarcely anyone doubts that the development of the international situation as a whole depends

to a large extent on the future course of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two strongest Powers in the world. That is the very reason why the first signs of the new approach in Soviet-American relations is meeting with the warmest approval throughout the world. The ice in Soviet-American relations has undoubtedly begun to break up and we are sincerely glad of this.

26. The exchange of visits between the Heads of Government of the USSR and the United States may prove to be a turning-point in the sequence of events that are promoting improved Soviet-American relations. We have had and will continue to have exchanges of opinion with the President of the United States on questions of Soviet-American relations and pressing international problems. We believe that Mr. Eisenhower wishes to contribute to the removal of tension between States.

27. At one of his Press conferences the President of the United States expressed his readiness to conduct realistic negotiations with the Soviet Union concerning a reasonable and mutually guaranteed plan for general disarmament or for disarmament covering particular types of weapons, and to make a real beginning in settling the problems of a divided Germany and to help in other ways to reduce tension throughout the world. May I express the hope that my exchange of views with President Eisenhower will be fruitful?

28. We belong to those who hope that the exchange of visits between the leading statesmen of the United States and the USSR and the forthcoming meetings and conversations will be a direct contribution to the ending of the "cold war" provided, of course, that there is a desire on both sides to achieve that aim. That is how we regard our visit to the United States of America and the forthcoming visit of President Eisenhower to the Soviet Union.

29. Reference might also be made to many other facts indicative of the new favourable trends in the international situation.

30. Signs of improvement in relations between States are not of course the result of a chance combination of favourable circumstances. It seems to us that the world is in fact entering a new phase in international relations. The grim years of the "cold war" cannot fail to leave their trace upon everybody. The ordinary people and political leaders in the most widely differing countries have given the matter much thought, and have learned a great deal. Everywhere the forces actively favouring peace and friendly relations between peoples have grown immeasurably stronger.

31. It would of course be unjustifiably optimistic to maintain that the atmosphere of distrust and suspicion between States may already be relegated to the past, that peace on earth is already secured and that States need no longer persist in their efforts in that direction. Unfortunately that is still far from being the case. In many States there are still active and influential circles that hamper the relaxation of international tension and sow the seeds of further conflict. These people defend old and obsolescent ways and cling to what remains of the attitudes of the "cold war".

32. The course of events, however, especially recently shows that any attempt to prevent a relaxation of international tension, or to put spokes in wheels,

can lead only to the discomfiture of those who refuse to give up such attempts, because the people will not support them.

33. We live at a time when mankind is making vast strides forward, and we are witnessing not only the swift development of industry, science, and technology, but also rapid changes in the political patterns of large areas of the world. Once backward peoples are freeing themselves from colonial dependence, and new, independent States are arising in the place of former colonies and semi-colonies. Permit me with all my heart to address the warmest greetings to the representatives of such States present in this hall.

34. At the same time it must be recognized that not all the peoples who are entitled to be represented at the United Nations have representatives here yet. The Soviet Union like all freedom-loving nations warmly wishes success to the peoples who are still in a state of colonial dependence and are fighting resolutely for their national liberation from colonial oppression.

35. The last strongholds of the decaying colonial system are crumbling away for good, and that is one of the most significant factors of our time. If we look at the map of Asia and Africa we shall see the spectacle of the liberation of hundreds of millions of people from foreign exploitation after centuries of repression.

36. Future generations will bestow high praise on the exploits of those who led the struggle for independence in India and Indonesia, in the United Arab Republic and Iraq, Ghana, Guinea and other States, just as the present citizens of the United States of America revere the memory of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson who led the American people in their struggle for independence.

37. I wish to take this opportunity of saying, from this platform of the United Nations, that the Soviet Union views with the most sincere sympathy and the most profound understanding all the peoples in the different continents who are defending their freedom and national independence. I believe this view to be entirely in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, whose cornerstone is recognition of the rights of peoples to free and independent existence and development.

38. Who but the United Nations should be the first to extend a helping hand to the peoples who are becoming independent and to ensure their inalienable right to be the masters of their own destiny and to shape their lives without pressure or encroachment from outside? Is it not also the duty of the United Nations to further in every way the economic advancement of the new States which are rising from the ruins of the colonial system and to help them develop their national economies more rapidly? This can be achieved only by granting them large-scale economic assistance without the imposition of any political or other conditions. This is precisely the Soviet Union's position on the question of economic aid which we are, and intend to continue, rendering to many States. It seems to us that such a position is fully in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

39. The Soviet Union would also be prepared to join with other Powers in rendering economic assistance to the so-called under-developed countries by using a part of the resources that would become available

in the Soviet Union and other States after the conclusion of an international disarmament agreement and the reduction of military budgets. We have already stated our readiness to assume such an undertaking and I am empowered by my Government to repeat this here now.

40. There is another highly important source which in our view should be extensively drawn upon to render assistance to the economically under-developed countries. The peoples of many of these countries have won political independence, but they are, as previously, subjected to cruel economic exploitation by the nationals of other countries. Their oil and other national resources are being plundered and exported at absurdly low prices, while bringing in huge profits to the foreign exploiters.

41. In common with the representatives of many other States, we consider that in providing economic assistance there can be no question of placing those who have never taken any part in the exploitation of the former colonial countries on the same footing as those who continue remorselessly to pump out the wealth of the under-developed countries. It would be legitimate and just if the foreign exploiters restored even a part of the wealth which they have accumulated by exploiting the oppressed peoples so that this wealth, returned to the under-developed countries in the form of aid, could be used for the development of their economies and cultures and for raising the living standards of the peoples of those countries.

42. The Soviet Union has rendered and will continue to render genuine and disinterested assistance to the under-developed countries. We shall not be found wanting in this.

43. Today the various artificial obstacles to the full and comprehensive development of international trade seem to be absurd survivals of another age. The entire system of trade discrimination should have been summarily buried long ago.

44. As you know, the Soviet Union has consistently advocated the greatest possible development of trade ties between States on the basis of equality and mutual advantage. We are firmly convinced that trade provides a good foundation for the successful development of peaceful co-operation between States and the strengthening of confidence between peoples. We consider this view to be fully in accordance with the United Nations Charter, which commits all States Members to the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

45. We are all of us faced with many unresolved international problems. Not all of them are of equal importance or urgency. Some of them concern relations between individual countries; others affect the interests of peoples of a number of countries and continents. There is, however, one problem whose solution the people of all countries big and small await with hope, irrespective of their social systems and ways of life. It is the problem of disarmament. Success in finding a correct solution to this problem will to a great extent determine the direction in which mankind is to go, whether it will be towards war with its disastrous consequences or whether the cause of peace will prevail. The peoples are thirsting for peace; they want to live without fear for their future, without fear

of losing those who are dear to them in the conflagration of a new war.

46. For centuries, the peoples have dreamed of putting an end to the destructive methods of waging war. The best minds of mankind, the greatest public leaders and statesmen, and the parties having the closest ties with the working people have advanced and championed the demand for disarmament. But instead of having disarmament, the world has for several decades been racked by the fever of armaments.

47. Who can honestly maintain that the armaments race has helped to solve a single international problem, even the simplest. On the contrary, the armaments race only complicates and confuses the solution of any issue in dispute.

48. Never in the entire history of mankind has the armaments race gone forward at such a speed, and never has it been fraught with so many dangers, as today, in the age of the atom, of electronics and of the conquest of cosmic space.

49. It is only a short time ago that quick-firing automatic weapons, tanks, long-range artillery and aerial bombs were regarded as the most terrible and the most powerful means of exterminating human beings. But can they be compared with the weapons which are available today? We have now reached the stage where it is difficult to conceive of a weapon more powerful than the hydrogen weapon, the force of which is practically unlimited. If all the means of destruction which were available to mankind in the past were to be combined, their power would represent only an insignificant fraction of that now in the hands of the two or three great Powers which possess nuclear weapons.

50. I am revealing no great secret when I say that the explosion of one, mark you, only one large hydrogen bomb would release enormous destructive energy. I had occasion recently to read the statement of Mr. W. Davidon, a United States specialist in nuclear physics, that the explosion of a single hydrogen bomb results in the release of an amount of energy greater than that produced from all explosions set off by all countries in all wars in the history of mankind. He, to all appearances, is right. Is it possible to disregard the fact that the destructive force of weapons of war has reached such tremendous proportions? And can it be forgotten that there is now not a single place on the globe that is out of reach of nuclear and rocket weapons?

51. It is difficult to imagine the consequences, for mankind, of a war in which these monstrous means of destruction and annihilation were used. If such a war were allowed to break out, the number of victims would be counted, not in millions, but in many tens, and even hundreds, of millions of human lives. It would be a war in which there was no difference between the front and the rear, between soldiers and children. It would result in the laying in ruin of many large cities and centres of industry, and in the irrevocable loss of the greatest cultural monuments, created over the centuries by the efforts of human genius. Nor would such a war spare future generations. Its poisonous trail in the form of radio-active contamination would long continue to maim people and claim many lives.

52. A dangerous situation has developed in the world today. Various military alliances have come into existence, and the arms race is proceeding without a moment's pause. So much inflammable material has been accumulated that a single spark would suffice to face us with the possibility of an immediate catastrophe. The world has reached a point where war may become a reality as the result of some ridiculous accident, such as a technical fault in an aircraft carrying a hydrogen bomb or a break-down in the normal mental processes of the flyer behind the controls.

53. Over and above this, it is well known that even now the arms race is placing a heavy burden on the nations. It results in higher prices for national consumption goods and in the reduction of real wages; it has a harmful effect on the economy of many States, and it disrupts international trade. Never in history have so great a number of States and such large numbers of people been engaged in military preparations as in our day. If we add to the members of the armed forces those who are directly or indirectly connected with the production of arms and are involved in various types of military research, we find that more than 100 million people have been taken away from peaceful work and that these include the most energetic and efficient labourers, scientists and technicians. A tremendous amount of human energy, knowledge, inventiveness and skill is being poured into a bottomless pit, as it were, and devoured by growing armaments.

54. The annual military expenditures of all States at the present time amount to approximately \$100,000 million. Is it not time to call a halt to this senseless squandering of national resources and national energies on preparations for war and destruction?

55. The Soviet Government, guided in its foreign policy by the principle of the peaceful coexistence of peoples, stands for peace and friendship between all nations. The aim—the only aim—of our domestic policy is to create a life worthy of the best ideals of mankind. Our seven-year plan is inspired by a love of peace and by concern for the welfare and happiness of the people. The aim of our foreign policy—its sole and unvarying aim—is to prevent war and to ensure peace and security for our country and for all countries.

56. Some leaders of the Western countries had calculated that the "cold war" would result in the exhaustion of the material resources of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and that their economy would be undermined. But their calculations have not proved correct. Although the Soviet Union has definite burdens to bear in connexion with armaments, it is none the less ensuring the rapid development of its economy and the ever greater satisfaction of its people's growing needs. The material requirements of the people could, of course, be better satisfied if the armament burdens were eliminated.

57. The Soviet Union is a determined and consistent champion of disarmament. Our State has no classes or groups that are interested in war and the armaments race or in the conquest of foreign territories. Everyone is agreed that, to achieve the magnificent aims which we have set ourselves in the matter of improving the well-being of the Soviet people and executing the plans for the building-up of our economy, we need peace. Like other States which cherish peace, we should like to convert our entire economy and

resources to peaceful purposes in order to provide our people with an abundance of food products, clothing, housing and other benefits. But under the present conditions of an armaments race we are unable to devote all our efforts to peaceful construction without endangering the vital interests of our people and the interests of our country's security.

58. All nations need peace. At the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union submitted specific disarmament proposals to the United Nations. We proposed the complete prohibition of atomic weapons, a substantial reduction in armed forces and armaments, and a sharp cut in arms expenditures. We advocated the liquidation of foreign military bases existing in other countries and the withdrawal of Governments' armed forces from foreign territories.

59. We have given proof of our desire to solve the disarmament problem, not only by words, but also by deeds. The Soviet Union has more than once shown initiative and taken concrete steps towards putting an end to the armaments race and proceeding as rapidly as possible to the implementation of practical disarmament measures. Immediately after the end of the War, an extensive demobilization of the armed forces was carried out in our country. The Soviet Union completely eliminated the military bases which it held on the territory of foreign States at the end of the Second World War.

60. I may remind you that over recent years the Soviet armed forces have been reduced unilaterally by a total of more than 2 million men. The armed forces of the USSR in the German Democratic Republic have been reduced considerably, and all Soviet troops have been withdrawn from the Romanian People's Republic. We have also made a considerable cut in military expenditures.

61. In 1958 the Soviet Union unilaterally suspended atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, in the hope that this noble initiative would serve as an example to other Powers. One can only regret that this hope was not fulfilled. The Soviet Union has now decided not to resume nuclear explosions in its country if the Western Powers do not resume the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Only in the event of their renewing their nuclear weapons testing will the Soviet Union be released from the commitment which it has assumed.

62. The problem of disarmament has been under discussion in the United Nations and other international forums for over fourteen years, but thus far no practical results have been achieved. What is the reason for this state of affairs? I have no desire to stir up the past or to engage in an analysis of the obstacles and disagreements which developed in the course of the disarmament talks; still less do I wish to level accusations against anyone. This is not the main thing today. It is our deep conviction that the main thing is to remove the principal obstacles which have piled up along the road to disarmament and to attempt to find a new approach to the solution of this problem.

63. Experience in disarmament negotiations has made it clear that one of the fundamental obstacles obstructing agreement is the question of control. We have advocated, and still advocate, strict international control over the fulfilment of a disarmament agreement, after such an agreement has been reached. But we have always been opposed to the idea of divorcing

the control system from the disarmament measures—to the idea that the control organs should become, in effect, organs for the collection of intelligence data under conditions in which no disarmament would actually take place.

64. We are in favour of genuine disarmament under control, but we are against control without disarmament. The opponents of disarmament can easily make any measure conditional upon demands for control which are of such a nature that, in the circumstances of a universal arms race, other States cannot meet them. It is plain that even those States which, for one reason or another, press such far-reaching demands for control would themselves have no inclination to accept those demands in practice if it came to the point of implementing them.

65. Other difficulties also arise. So long as disarmament is conceived of as merely partial, and it is assumed that after the conclusion of a disarmament agreement some sorts of armament will be retained, States would be left with the physical capacity for an attack. There would always be the fear that, with the types of arms and armed forces remaining, it would still be possible to launch an attack. Awareness that that possibility would persist has impeded the disarmament negotiations considerably.

66. Many States have feared that disarmament measures would affect precisely those types of weapons in which they have the greatest superiority and which they consider particularly necessary to them. In such circumstances, in an atmosphere of "cold war" and mutual suspicion, it is natural—if we speak seriously and not for propaganda purposes—that no State could disclose its military secrets, the organization of its defence and war production, without prejudicing the interests of its own national security.

67. All representatives will agree, I am sure, that we must direct the collective intelligence of all States, as of the United Nations, towards the search for a new approach to the solution of the disarmament problem.

68. Our task is to find a lever with which, when we grasp it, we can stop mankind from sliding into the abyss of war. There is one necessity today—to eliminate the very possibility of an outbreak of war. So long as large armies, air forces, navies, and nuclear and rocket weapons exist, so long as the young people who come into the world make the arts of war their first study, and so long as the general staffs plan future military operations, there will be no guarantee of a lasting peace.

69. The Soviet Government, after examining from all angles the situation which has arisen, has reached the firm conclusion that the way out of the impasse must be sought through general and complete disarmament. This approach completely eliminates the possibility of any State gaining military advantages of any kind. General and complete disarmament will remove all the obstacles that have arisen during discussion of the questions involved by partial disarmament, and will clear the way for the institution of universal and complete control.

70. What does the Soviet Government propose?

71. The essence of our proposals is that, over a period of four years, all States should carry out complete disarmament and should divest themselves of the means of waging war.

72. The result of this is that land armies, naval fleets and air forces will cease to exist, that general staffs and war ministries will be abolished, and that military training establishments will close down. Tens of millions of people will return to peaceful, constructive work.

73. Military bases in foreign territories will be done away with.

74. All atomic and hydrogen bombs at the disposal of States will be destroyed, and all further production of such bombs will cease. The energy of fissionable materials will be devoted exclusively to peaceful economic and scientific purposes.

75. Military rockets, whatever their range, will be abolished, and rocket technology will remain solely in the service of transport and the conquest of cosmic space for the benefit of all mankind.

76. States should be allowed to retain only strictly limited police (militia) contingents—of a strength agreed upon for each country—equipped with light firearms and intended solely for the maintenance of internal order and the protection of the citizens' personal safety.

77. In order that no one may violate his undertakings, we propose the creation of an international control organ in which all States would participate. There should be established, for the control of all disarmament measures, a system which would be set up and operated in conformity with the stages in which disarmament was carried out.

78. If disarmament is general and complete, then, once it is accomplished, control will also be general and complete. States will have nothing to hide from each other; none of them will have a weapon to raise against another; and the controllers will then be able to display their zeal to the maximum.

79. This solution of disarmament questions will provide complete security for all States. It will create favourable conditions for the peaceful coexistence of States. All international problems will then be solved, not by force of arms, but by peaceful means.

80. We are political realists, and we appreciate that a certain time will be required in which to work out so broad a disarmament programme. While this programme is being evolved, and while the various issues are being settled by agreement, we must not sit with folded hands and wait.

81. The Soviet Government considers that the elaboration of a programme of general and complete disarmament should not delay the settlement of a question so acute and eminently ripe for solution as that of discontinuing nuclear weapons tests for all time. Every prerequisite for such a solution now exists. We hope that the appropriate agreement on the discontinuance of tests will be concluded and brought into force without delay.

82. The danger of rocket and nuclear war suspended over the peoples demands bold, far-reaching decisions for the securing of peace.

83. A decision to carry out general and complete disarmament within a short space of time, and the execution of that decision, would mark the beginning of a new stage in international life. Agreement among States to undertake general, complete disarmament

would afford convincing practical confirmation of the absence of any aggressive designs on their part and the presence of a sincere desire to build their relations with other countries on a foundation of friendship and co-operation. With the destruction of weapons and the disbanding of armed forces, States would be left without the material capacity to pursue any policy but a peaceful one.

84. When complete disarmament had been achieved, mankind would experience a feeling like that of a traveller in the desert, overcome with fatigue and tortured by the fear of dying of thirst and exhaustion, when after long wanderings he reaches an oasis.

85. General and complete disarmament would make it possible to switch vast material and financial resources from the production of death-dealing weapons to constructive uses. The energy of the peoples can be directed to the creation of material and spiritual values beautifying and ennobling the life and labour of man.

86. The execution of a programme of general and complete disarmament would make it possible to convert enormous resources to the building of schools, hospitals, houses and roads, and to the production of foodstuffs and industrial goods. The resources released would render possible a considerable reduction of taxes and prices. This would have a favourable effect on the populations' living standards and would be welcomed by millions of ordinary people. With the money that States have expended for military purposes in the last decade alone, they could erect over 150 million houses in which, with every comfort, many hundred millions of people could live.

87. General and complete disarmament would also create completely new opportunities for the assistance of States whose economies are at present still underdeveloped and stand in need of co-operation from more advanced countries. Even if only a small part of the resources released by the cessation of military expenditure on the part of the great Powers were devoted to assisting such States, this could literally usher in a new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

88. All the artificial obstacles to the development of international trade which today exist in the form of discriminatory restrictions, lists of prohibited items and so on would disappear. The industry of such countries as the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, West Germany and other highly developed States would at last be able to secure large orders from other countries. The use of the resources released by disarmament would provide the populations with the widest possible opportunities for employment. Hence there is no truth in assertions that disarmament would lead to a crisis or an economic slump in the industrially highly-developed countries of the capitalist world.

89. When it is physically impossible for any State to engage in military operations against other States, international relations will begin to develop under the banner of trust. Suspicion and fear will vanish; all countries will be able to behave towards one another as genuine good neighbours. The door will stand wide open to economic, commercial and cultural co-operation between all States. For the first time a reliable and lasting peace, to which all peoples so strongly aspire, will become a reality.

90. In the conviction that these great aims can and must be achieved by the joint efforts of all States, united under the banner of the peaceful principles of the United Nations Charter, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is presenting, for the consideration of the United Nations, a declaration on general and complete disarmament, together with specific proposals on the subject.<sup>1/</sup>

91. It goes without saying that, if at present the Western Powers do not, for one reason or another, express their readiness to embark upon general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Government is prepared to come to terms with other States on appropriate partial measures relating to disarmament and the strengthening of security. In the view of the Soviet Government, the most important steps are the following:

(1) The establishment of a control and inspection zone, and the reduction of foreign troops in the territories of the Western European countries concerned;

(2) The establishment of an "atom-free" zone in Central Europe;

(3) The withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territories of European States and the abolition of military bases on the territories of foreign States;

(4) The conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the member States of NATO and the member States of the Warsaw Treaty;

(5) The conclusion of an agreement on the prevention of surprise attack by one State upon another.

92. The Soviet Government considers it appropriate to recall its disarmament proposals of 10 May 1955,<sup>2/</sup> which outlined a specific scheme for partial measures in the field of disarmament. It is convinced that these proposals constitute a sound basis for agreement on this vitally important issue.

93. This is not the first time that the idea of general and complete disarmament has been put forward by the Soviet Union. Our Government presented an extensive programme for complete disarmament in the period between the two world wars.<sup>3/</sup> Opponents of disarmament were then wont to say that the Soviet Union had made the proposals because it was economically and militarily weak. This false argument may have misled some people at that time, but today it is obvious to everyone that to talk of the weakness of the Soviet Union is absurd.

94. The new proposal of the Soviet Government is prompted solely by the desire to ensure lasting peace between nations.

95. We say sincerely to all countries: As against the slogan "Let us arm!", which still enjoys currency in some places, we advance the slogan "Let us disarm completely!" Let us compete as to who builds more homes, schools and hospitals for his people and produces more bread, milk, meat, clothing and other

<sup>1/</sup>Subsequently distributed as document A/4219.

<sup>2/</sup>Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for April to December 1955, document DC/71, annex 15.

<sup>3/</sup>See League of Nations publications, IX. Disarmament, 1932.IX.63 (documents Conf.D. 82 and 87), pp. 124-137.

consumer goods; let us not compete as to who has more hydrogen bombs and rockets. That will be welcomed by all peoples of the earth.

96. The United Nations, whose General Assembly I have the honour of addressing today, can and must play a major role in international affairs. Its importance is determined by the fact that all the countries of the world are represented in it. They have united in order to consider together the urgent problems of international relations. If two or more States are unable to reach agreement among themselves, the United Nations must help them. Its function in such a case is to plane down the sharp edges in relations between States which can produce conflict, strain and even war. If it performs its primary task of strengthening universal peace and the security of peoples, the United Nations will receive the respect due to it, and its authority will increase.

97. I must say in all candour, however, that today the United Nations is unfortunately, in a number of cases, not carrying out its functions along those lines. Sometimes, indeed, a faulty posing of problems in the United Nations results in unnecessary strains in relations between Governments.

98. Why is this happening? For the reason that not all the States Members of the United Nations have the necessary respect for that body, in which mankind places so many hopes. Instead of consistently supporting the authority of the United Nations, so that it will really be the most authoritative international organ and the Governments of all countries will always come to it when they have to solve vitally important problems, some States try to exploit it in their own narrow interests. An international organization cannot, of course, act effectively on behalf of peace if within it there is a group of countries whose policy is to impose the will of certain States upon others. A policy of this kind will undermine the foundations of the United Nations. If matters continue to develop in this direction—in the direction of what might be called factionalism—the result will be to make relations between States worse rather than better. The United Nations will be transformed from a body expressing the interests of all its Members into an organ of a group of States, pursuing the policy of that group rather than the policy of ensuring peace throughout the world. The first result of this will be to engender a lack of respect for the United Nations; but subsequently it may lead to the disintegration of the Organization, as happened in the earlier case of the League of Nations.

99. The distinguishing feature of a properly functioning international body is that such a body decides issues not by formally counting up votes, but by searching intelligently and patiently for a just solution which is acceptable to all. One cannot, indeed, conceive of States agreeing to carry out an unjust decision which has been adopted against their will. This sort of thing leaves a bitter taste in their mouths. How many such cases have there been in the history of the United Nations! The United Nations must therefore adopt only such decisions as are voted for by all, seeing that such

decisions reflect the will of all and the interests of all. Our generation, and the historians of the future, will recognize decisions of that kind as being the only correct and only possible ones.

100. A group of States which at any time commands a majority can, of course, secure the adoption of a decision which is advantageous to it. But that is only a Pyrrhic victory. Such "victories" do damage to the United Nations, and are instrumental in ruining it.

101. It must also be remembered that a majority in the voting on a given question before the United Nations is a variable quantity and may change to the disadvantage of those who today rely so frequently on the voting mechanism. As the Russian saying goes, "You must reap what you have sown". The wisest and most far-sighted policy is, therefore, that of jointly seeking mutually acceptable solutions, dictated solely by a concern to ensure peace throughout the world and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States.

102. When the United Nations Security Council was created, there was taken as a basis for its work the idea of agreed decisions. At the same time, special responsibility for maintaining peace was entrusted to the great Powers, whose representatives are the permanent members of the Security Council. In order to avoid complications in international relations, it was recognized as necessary to establish the principle of great Power unanimity in the Security Council; this went by the name of the right of veto.

103. Some people oppose the veto. If there is no veto, however, there will be no international organization; it will collapse. The veto principle makes it incumbent upon the great Powers, in all questions requiring consideration by the Security Council, to reach a unanimous decision which will ensure the effective maintenance of peace. It is better to strive for unanimous decision by the great Powers than to decide international issues by force of arms.

104. I have tried to express frankly a number of thoughts about the international situation and about what we conceive the tasks of the United Nations to be. We are confident that the proposals we have presented on the instructions of the Soviet Government will meet with the sympathy of most people in all nations of the world, as well as with that of the delegates sitting in this hall.

105. I wish to assure the representatives to the General Assembly that the United Nations will continue to find in the Soviet Union a most active participant in all efforts designed to rid mankind of the burden of armaments and to strengthen peace throughout the world.

106. I thank you for your attention.

107. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): On behalf of the representatives here present in the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his statement, which we have all listened to with the interest that it deserves.

*The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.*