

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE  
ON DISARMAMENT**

---

PRIVATE  
ENDC/PV.10  
27 March 1962  
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TENTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 27 March 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. MANESCU

(Romania)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. de MELLO-FRANCO  
Mr. RODRIGUES RIBAS  
Mr. de ARAUJO CASTRO

Bulgaria:

Mr. C. LOUCANOV  
Mr. M. TARABANOV  
Mr. V. PALINE  
Mr. N. MINTCHEV

Burma:

Mr. J. BARRINGTON  
U Tin MAUNG

Canada:

Mr. H. GREEN  
Mr. E.L.M. BURNS  
Mr. J.E.G. HARDY  
Mr. G. IGNATIEFF

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. V. DAVID  
Mr. J. HAJEK  
Mr. E. PEPICH  
Mr. M. ZEMLA

Ethiopia:

Mr. K. YIFRU  
Mr. T. GEBRE-EGZY  
Mr. M. HAMID  
Mr. T. NEKASHA

India:

Mr. M.J. DESAI  
Mr. A.S. LALL  
Mr. A.S. MEHTA  
Mr. C.K. GAIROLA

## PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:

Mr. C. RUSSO  
Mr. F. CAVALLETTI  
Mr. A. CAGIATI  
Mr. C. COSTA-RIGHINI

Mexico:

Mr. M. TELLO  
Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO  
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG  
Miss E. AGUIRRE

Nigeria:

Mr. J. WACHUKU  
Mr. A.A. ATTA  
Mr. A. HAASTRUP  
Mr. V.N. CHIBUNDU

Poland:

Mr. A. RAPACKI  
Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI  
Mr. M. LACHS  
Mr. M. BIEN

Romania:

Mr. C. MANESCU  
Mr. G. MACOVESCU  
Mr. M. MALITZA  
Mr. E. GLASER

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL  
Baron C.H. von PLATEN  
Mr. G.A. WESTRING  
Mr. M. STAHL

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. A.A. GROMYKO  
Mr. V.A. ZORIN  
Mr. V.P. SUSLOV

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN  
Mr. A. El-ERIAN  
Mr. M.S. AHMED  
Mr. S. ABDEL-HAMID

United Kingdom:

The Earl of HOME  
Sir Michael WRIGHT  
Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK  
Mr. A.C.I. SAMUEL

United States of America:

Mr. D. RUSK  
Mr. A. DEAN  
Mr. W.C. FOSTER  
Mr. C.C. STELLE

Special Representative of the  
Secretary-General:

Mr. O. LOUTFI

Deputy to the Special Representative  
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Romania) (translation from French): I declare open the tenth meeting of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. RUSK (United States of America): I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues in allowing me to make some additional remarks on the subject of general and complete disarmament now that we are coming to the end of the second week of our discussions.

We believe it is appropriate at this point to take some stock of where we stand and where we should go next and to try to get a clear picture of the pattern of our future work, in order that we may move with purpose and not merely drift.

A number of Foreign Ministers have departed, and others will be leaving this week, as I myself expect to this afternoon. But I shall be ready to come back at any time that my return would advance our work here; and I am sure that my colleagues round this table would be ready to do the same.

The Foreign Ministers of the Nations represented here came to Geneva, I would suggest, for three broad purposes. The first was to do what they could to prepare the atmosphere for the discussions. The second was to establish an agreed programme of work. The third was to present authoritatively, and to exchange views on, the basic positions and approaches of their Governments. These objectives have been achieved with varying amounts of success; we could have wished for more, but we could easily have had less.

The political atmosphere which has surrounded the opening of the talks in this room has been, on the whole, good; the discussions have revealed a seriousness of purpose and a generally constructive tone. I do not mean, of course, that no differences have been expressed. We do not believe that we would perform any service to the world or to our work if we attempted to conceal difficulties and issues for the sake of a false appearance of harmony. However, we have been encouraged by the minimum of recrimination and vituperation. We hope that this approach will be maintained, for progress in these matters depends upon our keeping dispassionate negotiation from being submerged in torrents of invective from any side.

The Conference on Friday adopted a plan of work proposed by the co-Chairmen (ENDC/12). This is an important step forward, although we believe that, since there is much yet to be resolved, there will necessarily be further discussion on this matter as the days unfold. I shall have additional views in this regard to present on behalf of the United States this morning.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

In fulfilling our third purpose each of us has set forth in broad terms the basic attitudes of our respective Governments on the subject matter of this Conference. Each Foreign Minister has put forward ideas and suggestions worthy of the most serious scrutiny. These provide a framework for moving into more detailed discussions of the problems the Conference has met to resolve.

In my first statement at this Conference (ENDC/PV.2, page 15) I referred to the United States programme (ENDC/6) for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world and made several new specific proposals for consideration within that programme. Today I should like to comment on the overall approach represented by the United States plan. For this plan is not simply a collection of isolated and unrelated measures; it represents a carefully co-ordinated approach to the goal defined in the Joint Statement of Principles (ENDC/5) agreed last September. Now, for the first time since the President's presentation of the plan, we are met in a forum charged with the negotiation of binding agreements.

It would, I think, be useful to recall President Kennedy's statement of the purposes and objectives of the plan we put before you. On 25 September, before the United Nations General Assembly, he said:

"It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machinery of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no State a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs -- not with the big Powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament -- true inspection -- and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession." (A/PV.1013)

To meet the problems of a world in uneasy peace, in the midst of an arms race and seriously divided in ideological aspirations, there are several main areas of disarmament which deserve the primary attention of this Conference. They are areas common to both the United States and the Soviet programmes for general and complete disarmament. In the light of these common areas, I should like to trace the main threads of policy objectives that run through and give unity to the fabric of the United States plan.

(Mr. Rask, United States)

One of these is a series of related measures directed towards the containment and reduction of the nuclear threat. The programme we lay before the Committee for consideration is a programme of action which begins now and which converges from many fronts to contain, to reduce and to eliminate this threat.

In my statement of 23 March (ENDC/PV.8) I emphasized one important step of this kind which, this very month, lies within our grasp. It is a sound agreement to end all nuclear weapon tests.

On 15 March (ENDC/PV.2) I stressed two additional steps, which also could be put into effect without delay, to get to the roots of the problem of the nuclear threat. One is a cut-off of production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. The other, to begin at the same time, is the transfer of 50,000 kilogrammes of weapon-grade fissionable materials to non-weapon purposes.

Let me digress a moment here to answer a question put to us by a number of delegations: how much is 50 metric tons of U-235? Lord Home has already given one indication: its value is considerably more than \$500 million. It could, if combined with other ingredients, produce warheads with tens of thousands of megatons of explosive power.

The United States also proposes that any fissionable materials transferred between countries for peaceful uses of nuclear energy shall be subject to appropriate safeguards to be developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Finally, the United States would prohibit the relinquishment of control of nuclear weapons and information and material necessary for their manufacture to any nation not owning such weapons.

These measures would contain and reduce the nuclear threat. This is very important but it is not in itself enough. We must, as rapidly as scientific knowledge can point the way for us, seek to eliminate nuclear weapon stockpiles. Let us begin now to mobilize the best scientific resources of our respective nations to concentrate upon this task.

All these things should be done within the first stage of the disarmament programme.

In the second stage we propose that stocks of nuclear weapons shall be progressively reduced to the minimum levels which can be agreed upon as a result of the findings of a nuclear experts commission; the resulting excess of fissionable material should be transferred to peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

There is another area where action cannot be long postponed. Space is our newest ocean of discovery. Let us build upon the areas of peaceful co-operation in space which are now being developed in the United Nations and elsewhere, as an outgrowth of the recent exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Let us extend these areas to the field of disarmament.

We have proposed that the placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction be prohibited. We propose that States shall give advance notification to participating States and to the international disarmament organization of launchings of space vehicles and missiles, together with the track of the vehicle. In one sense, these measures represent another facet of the containment of the nuclear threat.

Let us begin, and continue until the job is done, in a third area to reduce and eliminate strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, other forms of armaments, and armed forces. Let us move boldly and across the board so that no nation can charge imbalance in the process.

I have already put forward, on Thursday 15 March (ENDC/PV.2, page 21) the United States proposal for a 30 per cent reduction in the first stage of nuclear delivery vehicles and of major conventional armaments. I have said that comparable reductions should be made in the subsequent stages. This proposal, in the United States plan, is accompanied by related measures to deal simultaneously in all stages with major elements of military power, including reductions in force levels of States and restrictions and limitations on production and testing of major armaments, as well as limitations on production and testing of weapons designed to counter strategic delivery vehicles. The United States also proposes the mobilization of scientific talent to find ways to reduce and eliminate chemical and biological weapons.

A fourth area also requires action. The United States plan calls for world-wide measures to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation and surprise attack. On 15 March I put forward four specific proposals in this field: involving advance notification of military movements, establishment of observation posts, establishment of aerial inspection areas and mobile inspection teams and establishment of an international commission on measures to reduce the risk of war. Such steps are admittedly no substitute for disarmament, but until disarmament is fully achieved they can make an important difference.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

The United States basic position with respect to verification is known to the Committee. It is that secrecy and disarmament are fundamentally incompatible; but it is also that the measures agreed to must be subject only to that verification which is necessary in order to determine whether the agreed measures are in fact being carried out. This is the only manner in which disarmament can proceed with the certainty that no State will obtain military advantage by violation or evasion of its commitments during the disarmament process.

A major problem of past general disarmament negotiations has been the lack of opportunity to explore the key question of verification thoroughly, objectively and constructively. This Conference provides such an opportunity. The United States is willing to consider seriously any proposed verification system in the light of the degree of assurance of compliance that it would provide, and in the light of the significance of possible violations. The United States recognizes that considerably less than total access to a nation's territory may suffice.

For example, it is possible, we believe, to design an adequate verification system, based on the concept that, although all parts of the territory of a State should be subject to the risk of inspection from the outset, the extent of the territory actually inspected in any step or stage would bear a close relationship to the amount of disarmament and to the criticality of the particular disarmament measures.

The United States believes, as I suggested on 15 March, that this concept could be implemented by a system of zonal inspection which would be generally applicable to measures eliminating, limiting or reducing armaments and forces. A system of zonal inspection would limit the extent of territory actually inspected during the early phases of disarmament; it would require far fewer inspectors than would be required to verify implementation of disarmament simultaneously in all parts of a nation from the outset.

At the same time it could have complementary provisions providing for full verification of arms destroyed and full verification of limitations on declared facilities such as test sites, or missile launchers, or factories or military laboratories. As disarmament proceeded, there would be increasing assurance -- as more and more zones came under inspection -- that no undeclared armaments or forces were retained and that no clandestine activities were being pursued. Such a zonal approach, we feel, would meet the Soviet requirement that

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

full inspection be related to full disarmament and our view that inspection should develop progressively with disarmament.

The United States is prepared now both to make suggestions as to the details of such a plan and to explore the possibility of designing a zonal verification system which would be applicable to an agreed programme of disarmament.

Organizational arrangements must be worked out to put disarmament and verification measures into effect.

Isolated initial measures might be undertaken without such arrangements. We believe, however, that any comprehensive agreement embracing a number of important arms reductions will require supervision by an international disarmament organization. The Joint Statement of Agreed Principles envisages such an organization; so do the plans of the Soviet Union and the United States.

At an early stage this Conference will have to determine the shape and duties of that organization, as well as its place within the structure of the United Nations.

A still larger task confronts us as we put a disarmament programme into effect -- a task neither less intricate nor less difficult than the attainment of general and complete disarmament itself. This is the creation of the kind of world in which national and international security will be maintained by means other than national armed forces. For if we are to destroy the armed forces which protect us today we must be able to look to other methods of protecting one's safety against another's internal security forces, subversive activities or surprise rearmament.

So disarmament must be accompanied by the strengthening of institutions for maintaining peace and settling international disputes by peaceful means. I do not think there is any dissent from this proposition though there may, of course, be important differences as to method. The essential point is that progress must be made in this area to ensure that lack of international security does not become a brake impeding implementation of the later stages of disarmament.

Before moving on to the plan of work which the United States proposes for this Conference I should like to address myself to some questions which have been raised about the United States plan for general and complete disarmament.

The first is why the United States is willing to reduce nuclear delivery vehicles by "only" 30 per cent whereas the Soviet proposal is to reduce them by 100 per cent in the first stage.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

The fact is that the United States and the Soviet Union are agreed that we should achieve general and complete disarmament. The first part of paragraph 1 of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles so states. The objective, therefore is to reduce national armaments to nothing -- to zero per cent. This is in the Soviet plan; it is in the United States plan. There is no significant difference between the Soviet Union and the United States as to the amount of disarmament sought.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union, in getting to that condition of general and complete disarmament -- from the present levels to zero -- must pass by the 90 per cent, the 70 per cent, the 50 per cent and so on, levels of retained arms, whatever our arrangements. So here, too, there can be no significant difference between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The fundamental problems are two.

The first is how to disarm in such a way that at no time in the process will the security of any nation be impaired. The solution of this first problem, of course, requires that the sequence of reductions -- of kinds of arms and of their sites -- be such as not to create a critical imbalance.

The second problem is how to keep the development of United Nations dispute-settling and peace-keeping institutions abreast of disarmament.

The problem of maintaining military balance as we move to general and complete disarmament was raised by the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia last Wednesday. Mr. Yifru stated (ENDC/PV.6, page 21) that he would like to have an explanation of how the United States proposal to reduce nuclear delivery vehicles and major conventional armaments by 30 per cent fits in with point 5 of the Agreed Principles. Point 5, of course, states that:

"All measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all." (ENDC/5, page 2)

The United States proposal is based on the conviction that there is a tolerable balance today, and that across-the-board, carefully implemented, progressively larger percentage reductions serve disarmament most while disturbing balance least.

The thought behind the approach is that reductions in this manner will in fact leave nations with compositions of armaments -- that is, an armaments mix --

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

which are organically sound, which they and their neighbours understand, and to which they are accustomed.

The difference, as the percentages of cuts go higher and higher, is only that the overall levels of arms will go lower and lower. The across-the-board, carefully implemented, percentage-cut approach avoids the shock of removing, by major surgery, a disproportionate part of any one component of an intricately integrated military mix upon which a nation has come to rely in protecting its security.

The United States believes that it has taken important steps towards evolving a realistic plan of work for this Conference. With the innovation of informal meetings supplementing plenary meetings we have taken a very significant step away from the tradition of past disarmament conferences. We have agreed that the plenary meetings will pursue the primary objective of elaborating agreement on general and complete disarmament.

With the establishment of the three-nation Sub-Committee on a Treaty for the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests we have implicitly recognized the utility of sub-committees, on which my delegation believes we will increasingly come to rely.

The United States makes the following proposals regarding our specific programme of work for the following weeks.

In the plenary Conference we believe that we should identify the major substantive areas of a disarmament programme and begin, as quickly as possible, to determine how these will be dealt with in an overall agreement on general and complete disarmament. We should, as we have agreed, consider the Soviet approach in each of these areas, as set forth in its draft proposal of 15 March (ENDC/2). Simultaneously, we would consider the approach in each of these areas as set forth in the United States programme of 25 September 1961 (ENDC/6), which will, in the near future, be resubmitted in more detailed and elaborated form.

Our objective should be to reach a common understanding of how all these aspects can be fitted into a master agreement for general and complete disarmament, drawing upon the best of all the proposals presented in these two programmes submitted and in those which come from other quarters.

The United States suggests that we take up the following broad areas in whatever order would be deemed most useful by the Conference as a whole:

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

First, measures for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as indicated in paragraph 3(b) of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles (ENDC/5) of 20 September 1961;

Second, measures for the elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction, including orbiting vehicles, and for the reduction and elimination of all armed forces, conventional armaments, military expenditures, military training and military establishments, as indicated in paragraphs 3(a), (b) and (e) of the Agreed Principles;

Third, measures for the creation of an international disarmament organization within the framework of the United Nations and for effective verification of the disarmament programme, as indicated in paragraph 6 of the Agreed Principles; and

Fourth, measures to strengthen institutions for the maintenance of peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, including the establishment of a United Nations peace force, as indicated in paragraphs 1(b), 2 and 7 of the Agreed Principles.

In all these areas we should consider the sequence and balance of measures within stages and the time-limits for each measure and stage as indicated in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Agreed Principles.

The United States believes that as these broad discussions are continued in plenary meetings, and with the objective of achieving an agreed approach in all these areas, it will be desirable for the plenary Conference to set up working and reporting sub-committees to deal with more detailed matters of a technical or treaty-drafting nature.

For example, we believe that it would be desirable to set up in the near future sub-committees of the plenary Conference to study the technical problems involved in the elimination of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to work out the control problems. Similarly, a sub-committee should be established to examine the problem of securing the controlled reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. We believe that it will be desirable to establish a sub-committee to work out agreed categories for the elimination of nuclear delivery vehicles and conventional armaments and the measures of control which will be necessary to police their elimination. And the United States believes that it will prove useful to establish, in due course, a sub-committee to examine the potentialities of the zonal and random sampling approach to inspection that we have proposed.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

This is not an exhaustive list, and we are sure that other members will have suggestions for similar working groups as we proceed in our discussion.

We have now agreed also to establish a Committee of the Whole to deal with problems that might be pursued separately from an over-all agreement. There will be many suggestions for items to be placed on the agenda of this Committee. Although the Sub-Committee on a Treaty for the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests was established before we had agreed to set up the Committee of the Whole, we believe this Sub-Committee should most logically operate within the framework of the Committee of the Whole. I believe all members here have agreed that the objective of a nuclear test ban treaty should be pursued as one separate from the over-all objective of general and complete disarmament.

The United States proposes two further items for the agenda of the Committee of the Whole. First, we propose that that Committee consider as a matter of urgency an agreement for the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. While this measure would obviously be a necessary part of a programme for general and complete disarmament, as provided in both the Soviet and the United States plans, we believe also that this measure should not be delayed. We feel that it can be put into effect separately and as a matter of the highest priority.

The United States will also wish to reach agreement in the Committee of the Whole on measures for the reduction of the possibility of war by surprise attack, miscalculation or failure of communications. We will specifically propose that the Committee of the Whole, perhaps in a sub-committee, explore on an urgent basis the four measures which I proposed in my opening statement (ENEC/PV.2) of 15 March and to which I referred earlier today.

The United States makes the above proposals in the hope that they will lead to a useful exchange of views and to agreement on precisely how we shall proceed in our work here. The organizational arrangements which we have already agreed upon and which we hope will be elaborated in the days ahead provide a good basis for advancing our work. Let me emphasize that, as we look upon our programme of work, the Conference must and should examine every proposal made by every delegation which is relevant to the work of the Disarmament Conference; our suggestions are in no sense intended to exclude any proposal from any quarter on any point.

(Mr. Rusk, United States)

In conclusion, I would like to repeat the commitment of the United States to the goal of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The United States has established a major new agency to develop our proposals to reach that goal, and we are willing to negotiate as constructively and as patiently as is necessary to reach agreement.

A great service would be performed by this Conference if it took steps this spring:

to reverse the upward spiral of destructive capability which, if unchecked, could by 1966 be double what it is today;

to reverse the trend towards diffusion of nuclear capability to new nations;

to produce agreement on measures to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation or surprise attack -- for the longer we permit the risk of nuclear war to hang over our heads, the more important it is that the risk be made as small as possible.

The co-Chairmen have recommended a plan of work. This has now been adopted by the Conference and I have made some proposals about how we might proceed under that plan. Let us now get to work and make a good beginning. We need not be discouraged if we encounter difficulties in our early deliberations, because we are talking about nothing less than the transformation of the history of man. But it is important to begin -- and with actual, physical disarmament. A good beginning will hasten us on our way to the full disarmament we seek, in a world at peace.

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): At its meeting of 23 March the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament approved the procedure to be followed in its future work. We reached a unanimous decision to give our main attention to the elaboration of an agreement on general and complete disarmament and to do our utmost to accomplish this task.

There is no need to emphasize how important it is that the Committee should cope with this matter. In his message to Mr. John Kennedy, President of the United States of America, dated 21 February 1962, Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, pointed out that "General and complete disarmament, that is, the total elimination of all weapons, and especially nuclear weapons, has become in our time a vitally important problem, taking precedence of

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

all others" (ENDC/8, page 14). I am convinced that all the participants in the negotiations agree with the truth of these words. This is evidenced by the Committee's decision to regard as of primary importance the elaboration of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

The decision we have adopted relates by its nature to the procedure of work of the Committee. It would be wrong, however, to underestimate its significance. This significance consists in the fact that a very clear aim has been put before the Eighteen Nation Committee.

We must faithfully follow the charted course without deviating from it and without losing sight for a moment of the principal aim, namely, the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, which would deliver the peoples for ever from the burden of armaments, and thereby from the danger of war.

Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, stressed in his speech to his constituents on 16 March that "the Soviet Union has made and will make every effort to achieve this. Today, as never before, in the relations among countries it is necessary to show a realistic approach in order to prevent the catastrophe that a thermonuclear war could bring".

The peoples are awaiting a solution of the disarmament problem, being fully aware of the burdensome load placed upon their shoulders by the enormous expenditures on armaments and of the terrible consequences which the arms race may have. What a joyful sigh of relief will go up from them, when the resources which are now being expended on the production of weapons of destruction are diverted towards increasing the material well-being of people, the development of science and culture and peaceful constructive effort.

In the memorandum submitted for the consideration of the Eighteen Nation Committee (ENDC/3), the Soviet Government expressed its profound conviction that the problem of disarmament could be solved if, of course, a desire for this were shown by all States, especially those possessing the most powerful armed forces and armaments. We appeal to all the participants in the negotiations to show this desire.

The Soviet Government takes for granted that, now that there is common agreement regarding the general aims and principles of disarmament and that agreement has been reached on the main direction of the negotiations, the aim of which must be general and complete disarmament, the work of the Committee must assume a concrete, business-like character.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

Judging from the discussions that have taken place so far, this desire is shared by the other participants in the negotiations, and we can proceed to consider section by section and paragraph by paragraph the proposals which have been submitted to the Committee. Of course, in doing so, it would be reasonable to take up the document which most fully covers disarmament measures and control over disarmament, and clearly determines the sequence of their implementation, in short, gives the fullest and clearest picture of the whole process of general and complete disarmament from beginning to end. Such a document is already at the disposal of the Committee -- it is the draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament under Strict International Control submitted by the Soviet Government on 15 March (ENDC/2).

It should be understood that what I have said does not at all mean that insufficient attention will be given to the proposals of other delegations regarding general and complete disarmament. That is not the intention of the Soviet Government. On the contrary, we have in mind the simultaneous and thorough examination of all other proposals covering the questions under consideration in any particular stage of the negotiations when our draft treaty is discussed.

I will take the liberty of availing myself of the words of Mr. Menon, the representative of India, who compared the forthcoming work of the Committee to the building of an edifice, when one brick is closely fitted to another so that the edifice will stand. It is precisely in the examination, of which we are speaking, that it will be possible to select the best bricks for the edifice of general and complete disarmament.

Any builder, in setting about his work, must first of all have before him a clearly-defined purpose -- why and wherefore he is raising the edifice. If we now turn to what the Committee must prepare, namely, a draft agreement or treaty on general and complete disarmament, that purpose must obviously be reflected in the introductory part of the draft treaty, in its preamble and general provisions relating to the entire process of disarmament.

An agreement on general and complete disarmament is a document of historic significance. Such an agreement would mean a radical change in the relations among States. With the destruction of weapons and the abolition of armed forces there would remain no material possibilities for States to pursue a policy other than a peaceful one. When not a single State will in fact have the possibility of unleashing warfare against other States, international relations will develop in an

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

atmosphere of confidence. Reliable and lasting peace, which all the peoples desire, will become a reality for the first time.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize that an agreement that would result in such radical changes in international life, that would have such far-reaching implications for the development of relations among States should reflect the desire of the peoples that the military machine of States should be dismantled and consigned to the scrap heap, and that inviolable peace should be firmly established on earth.

As pointed out in the memorandum submitted to the members of the Committee of Eighteen by the Soviet Government, mankind has always placed on disarmament its best hopes for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. These aspirations of the peoples should be reflected in the introductory part, the preamble, of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

After being stated in the general provisions of the treaty, the desire of the peoples for the creation of a world without armaments or wars, for a world in which relations among States would be based on genuine co-operation should then find expression, in the later sections of the treaty which lay down the stages of disarmament and the methods of implementation at each stage, in specific obligations to be assumed by States, strictly defined in treaty language. That is why we examine the preamble of the treaty in relation to the specific obligations which States will have to assume with respect to general and complete disarmament.

For this very reason, I propose today to discuss the preamble of the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Government. In doing so, we will also express our views on the corresponding sections of the proposals submitted by the United States on 25 September 1961 during the sixteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I shall of course, in making this statement, take into account the views expressed at that meeting by Mr. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, on behalf of the United States Government.

All members of the Committee have before them the Soviet draft treaty. I shall not therefore read out the text of its preamble, but will go straight on to an exposition of its main provisions.

The first paragraph of the preamble scarcely calls for detailed comment. It expresses a simple and clear idea, namely, that in concluding a treaty on general

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

and complete disarmament, States will be acting in accordance with the aspirations and will of the peoples, who are calling for the immediate implementation of general and complete disarmament.

The second paragraph of the preamble expresses the general conviction that war cannot and must not serve as a method for settling international disputes and that it must forever be banished from the life of human society. This is all the more necessary at the present time when States possess such destructive types of weapons as nuclear weapons and rocket devices for their delivery, while the precipitate development of means of mass annihilation continues. In his speech to his constituents on 16 March, Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, stated:

"The appalling destructive power of present day nuclear devices, the ability to deliver them to any point in the world are now such convincing arguments that human logic cannot but demand the speediest solution of the disarmament problem."

The contents of the second paragraph of the preamble of the Soviet draft Treaty correspond to point 1 of the Agreed Principles for general and complete disarmament drawn up by the Soviet Union and the United States and approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Many if not all of the Ministers who are taking part in the work of the Committee have emphasized in their statements the need to eliminate war and to destroy the means of waging it. Mr. Rusk, the Secretary of State of the United States, dealt with this point, saying that "we must eliminate the instruments of destruction". Mr. Wachuku, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria, also did so, stating that "the consequences of any future war is total disaster to mankind" and that "we have the responsibility of devising a practical means to eradicate war and armaments from our world and our society". Mr. Tello, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Mexico, pointed out that "the first objective .... the only one of essential and lasting value, is to eliminate war." The representatives of all the socialist countries that are members of the Eighteen Nation Committee referred in their statements to the need for the speedy and final banishment of war from the life of human society.

Thus it is already possible to note general agreement with regard to the second paragraph of the preamble also.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

I think there is no special need to say much about the third paragraph of the preamble to the Soviet draft Treaty. Our common purpose, which we recognized as long ago as 1945 in signing the United Nations Charter, is to save all the nations from the horrors of war. It should, of course, be included as one of the basic provisions of the preamble to the document the Committee is to prepare.

We note with satisfaction that our views on this subject coincide with those of the United States, which also considered it necessary to cover this point in its disarmament proposals -- in the second paragraph of what may be regarded as the preamble.

I turn now to the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Soviet draft Treaty. It expresses the idea that general and complete disarmament under strict international control is a sure and practical way to fulfil mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth. I think all members of the Committee will agree that this paragraph essentially expresses the idea which is at the core of the resolution unanimously adopted by all Members of the United Nations on 20 November 1959 (1378 (XIV)), which proclaimed the question of general and complete disarmament to be the most important one facing the world today, and also of the resolution adopted at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly on 20 December 1961 (1722 (XVI)), under which this Committee was set up.

In his first statement in the Committee Mr. Rusk quoted the words of Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States, that "in the long run, the only real security in this age of nuclear peril rests not in armaments but in disarmament". Mr. Menon, the representative of India, convincingly demonstrated in his statement that general and complete disarmament is the course that will lead most quickly and surely to an inviolable and lasting peace.

Mr. Loucanov, the Bulgarian Minister for Foreign Affairs, reminded us of the statement by Mr. T. Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party: "We -- mankind -- will remove the danger of a new nuclear missile war only if we bring about general and complete disarmament". One cannot but agree with this sober assessment of the situation that prevails today.

We note that the third paragraph of the introductory part of the United States proposals of 25 September 1961 refers to the need for "a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

international control" (ENDC/6, page 1). This warrants the conclusion that there is general agreement on the text of the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Soviet draft treaty.

The next two paragraphs of the preamble, the fifth and the sixth, set the aim of freeing mankind from the senseless waste of labour on the creation of weapons and other means of annihilating human beings and of directing all resources towards ensuring the further growth of welfare, and socio-economic progress in all countries in the world. This idea was expressed in the statements by the representatives of Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia and other countries.

In the general debate members of the Committee have referred to the report recently issued by the United Nations on the economic consequences of disarmament (E/3593). This report contains telling information on the huge burden imposed on mankind by the arms race, on the vast, indeed, the astronomical sums swallowed up by this race, and on the large numbers of men and women in the prime of their creative powers who are either under arms or engaged in the production of weapons of destruction. This report also refers to the great projects mankind can carry out when these vast resources are released by general and complete disarmament and are directed towards satisfying the peaceful needs of human beings.

The Soviet Union considers -- and this is reflected in the draft treaty we have submitted -- that part of the funds released as a result of the disbanding of armies and the cessation of military production should be used for economic and technical assistance to less-developed countries. The United States proposals also contain the idea that the resources of nations should be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advance.

In view of all these facts, I am justified in saying that there are apparently also no difficulties in reaching agreement with regard to the fifth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble to the Soviet draft treaty.

The seventh paragraph of the preamble stresses the need to build relations among States on the basis of the principles of peace, good-neighbourliness, equality of States and peoples, non-interference, and respect for the independence and sovereignty of all countries. This paragraph describes one of the basic tasks which must be accomplished during the implementation of general and complete disarmament. The present situation in the world, in which relations among States are poisoned by mistrust and suspicion, must make way for a different situation, for trust and good-neighbourliness.

(Mr. Gromyko, USSR)

The entire legacy and residue of the "cold war" must be completely eradicated so that relations based on co-operation and mutual understanding may be established among States. This point was mentioned by the representative of Poland, Mexico, Bulgaria, Romania, Nigeria, and some other States, who emphasized the need for adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence not only in theory but also in practice, and for strict observance of the principles of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other peoples and States.

I believe that the next paragraph of the preamble, which reaffirms the indisputable principle that all parties to a future agreement must be guided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, is also acceptable to the members of the Committee.

The last paragraph of the preamble states the resolve of States to implement forthwith general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control and to conclude a treaty for that purpose. That is why we have come here. This is the task which the peoples have entrusted to us.

I have tried to explain, paragraph by paragraph, the ideas contained in the preamble of the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union. A study of the statements made by the members of the Committee has convinced us that the views expressed in the Committee concerning the aims and purposes of an agreement on general and complete disarmament are fully reflected in the introductory part of the draft treaty. We also find that, on a number of points, there is a measure of agreement with the proposals submitted by the United States on 25 September 1961 and also with some of the ideas expressed at this meeting by the United States Secretary of State concerning the general aims of disarmament. All this facilitates the attainment of agreement on this first part of the draft treaty, which clearly and precisely sets out the aim -- the general and complete disarmament of States.

The Committee has before it an opportunity to take a first step, to lay the first brick of an agreement -- the adoption of the preamble as set out in the draft treaty submitted for your consideration. This could be done, in our opinion, without protracted debate.

Mr. GREEN (Canada): In my statement of 19 March (ENDC/PV.4) I referred to seven areas in which there are elements common to both the United States and the Soviet disarmament proposals. I suggested then that this Conference should try to achieve early agreement on concrete measures in those fields.

(Mr. Green, Canada)

Certain of the seven points which I mentioned, such as measures relating to nuclear vehicles and conventional armaments, should properly be dealt with in the context of general disarmament. However, measures such as those dealing with outer space and surprise attack should be dealt with in the Committee of the Whole which has been set up to discuss collateral or initial measures.

Several initial or collateral measures have been referred to by representatives around this table. In the opinion of my delegation, it would be useful to begin with the question of outer space. I suggest this area as a point of departure for two reasons. First, all governments are agreed that it is of over-riding importance to ensure that the rapid development of science in this field will not be used for destructive purposes. Second, there are clear provisions common to both the United States and the Soviet plans which should enable us to reach agreement on a measure which would help to achieve this goal.

For example, in article 14 of the Soviet draft treaty it is provided that "the placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of special devices capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction" should be prohibited (ENDC/2, page 11). The United States plan contains similar proposals in section E of stage I. In the same section of the United States plan, provision is also made for advance notification of launchings of space vehicles and missiles (ENDC/6, page 5). The USSR draft treaty contains an almost identical proposal in article 14. My delegation considers that it would be of great significance to give formal recognition to the large measure of agreement which already exists on these two points in the United States and Soviet disarmament plans. I would point out further that there has been quite widespread agreement on this question in other forums, for example in the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and in exchanges of messages between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev. Today the field of outer space is probably the most encouraging field for agreement among the nations.

In our opinion, it would be desirable to set out these two requirements in the form of a declaration by all members of this Conference, to which other States could later subscribe. What we have in mind might be expressed on the lines of the following draft declaration:

"The Governments of Brazil, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, India, Italy, Mexico, Nigeria, the People's Republic of Poland, the People's

(Mr. Green, Canada)

Republic of Romania, Sweden, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America,

"Desiring to facilitate the achievement of an international agreement to ensure that outer space will be used for peaceful purposes only,

"Solemnly declare that henceforth

- (a) the orbiting or stationing in outer space of devices for delivering weapons of mass destruction shall be prohibited;
- (b) they will give advance notification of launchings of space vehicles and missiles to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and, upon its establishment, to the international disarmament organization."

Representatives will probably have noted that a statement was made yesterday by the delegation of the Soviet Union in New York giving particulars of their launchings. Earlier, similar information was given by the United States delegation.

I am aware that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is now meeting in New York. It is a source of encouragement to us all that the Soviet Union and the United States have made a good start on co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space, both bilaterally and through the United Nations Committee. But, as the title of the Committee itself indicates, its activities are specifically restricted to co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

It is not my purpose here to set down in full the requirements for co-operation in outer space. Rather, we wish to achieve two specific ends: first, that outer space shall not be used for the stationing or orbiting of mass destruction weapons; and, second, that the fear of the illegitimate use of space vehicles and missiles shall be greatly reduced through the advance notification to an international authority of any proposed launchings. These two measures provide for early action which would improve the climate of international confidence necessary to ensure full co-operation in outer space. The acceptance of the proposed draft declaration would be a major advance towards a rule of peace and law in outer space.

My delegation has put forward the specific language of a proposed draft declaration only as a suggestion. In order to permit a prompt and full discussion of this question, I would propose that the Committee of the Whole should meet at the earliest opportunity -- I hope not later than tomorrow morning -- and that the subject of outer space should be the first item of business.

(Mr. Green, Canada)

The co-operative attitude which has been shown in this Conference has been very encouraging, and I refer in particular here to the constructive statements made this morning by the two co-Chairmen. I think that their statements were businesslike and extremely helpful, and this, I believe, is a very encouraging sign. I am confident that it would further the work of this Conference if the Committee of the Whole were to meet, say, tomorrow morning. We have, as is known, placed great emphasis on this Committee of the Whole because we believe it is vital that agreement should be reached quickly at this Conference on at least some measures which are not directly involved in the main negotiations -- that is, of course, the negotiations for a treaty on general and complete disarmament. These collateral measures, I believe, are the ones on which there is very little disagreement and on which we could quickly come together. In so doing, we would establish the reputation of this Conference round the world as a conference which is going to obtain results. This would bring hope to the people of every nation, in place of the present distress and discouragement. I think it would be a very important factor in bringing about the eventual success of the Conference on the main issue of general and complete disarmament. I therefore appeal to my fellow representatives, particularly to the co-Chairmen, to accept this suggestion that the Committee of the Whole should meet tomorrow and that it should take up as the first business the question of outer space.

Of course, I have another good reason for making this suggestion: I have to return to Canada on Thursday and I want to be able to report to Parliament that the Committee of the Whole is actually at work. This would make my task a great deal easier and I would be able to deal more effectively with our Opposition, which, of course, does not lose many opportunities to point out failures by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I make this plea to the Conference and, in particular, to the co-Chairmen.

Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): The agreed procedure (ENDC/12) lays down very clearly that the primary objective to be pursued by the Committee in its plenary sessions is the reaching of agreement on general and complete disarmament. The procedure also lays down which drafts must be taken as a basis for our negotiations.

The Czechoslovak delegation believes that the most important task now is to determine the correct course to be followed in our further work so that agreement

(Mr. David, Czechoslovakia)

may be reached in the shortest possible time. If agreement is reached on the correct course of our work, this will enable us in the future to avoid a number of difficulties and to ensure that our work in carrying out the main task of the Committee will make speedy headway so that by 1 June we shall be able to submit a satisfactory report to the appropriate bodies of the United Nations.

We have listened carefully to the statement made by the representative of the United States, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and to the proposals he has submitted. Naturally, we shall carefully study and reflect on these proposals and we shall deal with them in greater detail in due course. Nevertheless, we can state already that the proposals which have been submitted by Mr. Rusk today as a new approach are merely a variation of the well known proposals which were put forward by the United States President, Mr. Kennedy, in September 1961 at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly and which the United States delegation has already submitted to our Committee (ENDC/6). In our view, these proposals do not constitute an effective and well-balanced plan for general and complete disarmament.

In the view of the Czechoslovak delegation, the most appropriate course to adopt for our future work would be to take as a basis the most extensive and comprehensive plan before the Committee, namely the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control submitted by the USSR delegation. Why is it most appropriate?

A careful comparison of the plan submitted by the USSR delegation and the United States plan clearly shows the advantage of the Soviet plan. The USSR plan is a realistic, carefully and concretely elaborated draft treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. It constitutes a logical and organic whole. It contains provisions which would ensure within a short period -- approximately four years -- through a number of stages -- the complete liquidation of the military machinery of States. Moreover, at all stages the individual measures would be mutually balanced in such a way as to fully ensure equal security for all signatory States. The draft treaty also provides for appropriate control measures for each stage and for each proposed measure of disarmament. Therefore the draft treaty is fully in accordance with the joint statement of principles of the Governments of the USSR and the United States of 20 September 1961 and with resolution 1722 (XVI) adopted at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

(Mr. David, Czechoslovakia)

On the other hand, President Kennedy's plan of September 1961, which has been submitted to the Committee by the United States delegation and on which today's statement by the United States representative, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, was based is not an organic whole, but is a grouping of a number of individual measures, mainly having to do with control. It provides in practice for more essential disarmament measures only in the third stage, and moreover, it contains no provisions as to when this stage would be implemented. I leave aside the fact that, unlike the USSR plan, the United States plan is not in the form of a treaty, on which the Committee should set to work without delay.

With regard to a number of the provisions, the Czechoslovak delegation has some serious reservations which it will state in due course.

For this reason we believe that we should take as the basis for further negotiations the draft treaty submitted by the USSR delegation, as being the most precise and most concrete plan for general and complete disarmament so far submitted to the Committee.

The best method, the one which the Soviet delegation has suggested and which the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko, has already begun to follow in his statement of today, would be to start with a discussion of the Soviet draft treaty, article by article, beginning with the preamble, and taking into account any observations and additions to its individual provisions. Such an approach would, in our opinion, bring us more rapidly than any other way to the fulfilment of the task with which our Committee has been entrusted.

On the other hand, the Czechoslovak delegation cannot agree with those views which, in our opinion, would merely lead to complications and delays in the fulfilment of our task. In our opinion, no positive results can be brought about by attempts to place side by side in a mechanical way certain measures provided for at different stages and in different contexts of the two plans, and to seek for correspondence between them.

Two weeks have already gone by since our Committee began its work. The delegation of Czechoslovakia has noted with satisfaction the agreement reached on the question of the procedure for the further work of the Committee. Nevertheless we cannot get away from the impression that this result is rather a modest one, if we take into account the fact that fourteen days of intensive negotiations between the Ministers were needed to achieve it.

(Mr. David Czechoslovakia)

Our delegation believes that the time has definitely come for us to start, at last, to carry out the main task of the Committee and to concentrate our efforts on coming as quickly as possible to an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

We are well aware that we shall come up against a good many difficulties, the reason for which is the fact that not all the members of our Committee have the same sincere desire to fulfil the hopes of world public opinion which is waiting for decisive progress to be achieved at last on the question of disarmament, which affects so vitally the interests of mankind. I hope you will pardon me for these remarks, but the actions of certain delegations in our Committee, as well as the practical steps taken by their Governments, are inevitably bound to make us doubt whether they are really making efforts to solve the problem of general and complete disarmament as quickly as possible. Nevertheless we are still firmly convinced that if all the delegations display the utmost goodwill and the necessary understanding in the search for a mutually acceptable agreement, we shall be able to achieve positive results in our work and set about elaborating a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Mr. TELLO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): In the first place, I should like to convey to the Soviet Union and the United States of America, through their Foreign Ministers, my sincere congratulations on the encouraging start made in New York on the discussions concerning the peaceful uses of outer space.

Secondly, I wish to associate myself most enthusiastically with the proposal put forward a few minutes ago by the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs. I do not think it can be said that there is any contradiction or overlapping between that proposal and the work being done in New York. On the contrary, it seems to me that if we could adopt such a proposal in a relatively short time we should, as it were, be echoing what is being done in New York and thus confirming that our Governments' wishes are the same, whether they are expressed in one place or in another.

I therefore support the proposal made by the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs that the draft he has suggested be examined as soon as possible -- it would be desirable to begin tomorrow.

Lord HOME (United Kingdom): As I have to leave for home this afternoon -- although I shall be very glad to come back at any time if the Committee should require it -- I would value the opportunity to make one or two comments on the speeches that we have heard this morning.

I find myself, if I may say so, in almost total agreement with everything said by Mr. Gromyko. When I wrote that sentence down, I had to look at it several times to make sure that it was right. It was, I am glad to say, and that gives me considerable encouragement.

I should like to give more thought to what Mr. Gromyko said concerning the preamble to the Soviet treaty. At any rate I should like at some future time to make certain proposals or additions -- indeed there may be others who would like to do the same -- and I do not know what kind of preamble would emerge. But I have very little, if any, quarrel with the sentiments which he expressed.

Secondly, I doubt whether there has ever been a more important statement made to a disarmament conference on behalf of a great Power than that which was made by Mr. Rusk this morning. The significance of this statement might have been lost on the Committee: that it was made after Mr. Rusk had had the opportunity of a first study of the Soviet proposals. I take it that at a later stage Mr. Rusk's proposals will be embodied in a paper which we can lay beside the Soviet draft treaty so that we shall be able to study and compare them. I think Mr. Rusk's statement was one of the most significant that I have ever heard, and I cannot agree with my Czechoslovak colleague that it should in any way be ignored or dismissed as a mere part of previous statements, because it is a most significant addition to what we heard at an earlier date.

I do not remember, either, a conference where the basic positions of the various members have been made so clear so early. At first glance, there are considerable differences between the Soviet and the United States plans, but these certainly ought not to be exaggerated. What we want now, I am quite certain, is a most penetrating study, in the hope that we would find them much closer -- as I think that they are -- than at first sight they seem.

The United States plan, as I understand it, contains a continuous programme, of which the first stage is put at the point of the 30 per cent level of destruction of weapons. But the whole takes place in nine years. In nine years total disarmament is reached. The Soviet plan proposes total disarmament in four years. Therefore, it seems to me, the main question that we have to ask ourselves

(Lord Home, United Kingdom)

is this -- and Mr. Rusk put it very well in his speech: how do we get from zero per cent to 100 per cent through the 30 per cent which Mr. Rusk proposes? I think sometimes we handicap ourselves by words, and "stages" may convey something too abrupt or a break between one process and another. Although analogies are always dangerous, the conception might perhaps be more that of a relay race in which as soon as one lap is checked in, the next one begins. In that way there is a continuous process until disarmament is complete. The analogy of an edifice and the words "master agreement" have been used, and I do not complain of either. What we have to do is to reconcile these two plans and to produce a plan from this Conference which is decided and agreed upon by us all.

I do not believe that after the speech Mr. Rusk has made today there can any longer be any serious doubt in anybody's mind that the West is anxious to destroy offensive weapons both in the nuclear and in the conventional field.

My colleagues will note that in his speech Mr. Rusk does not insist on any special order in which these matters should be taken up, but he himself has put first the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; second, measures for the elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction, and so on into the conventional field. If we take the Soviet plan and the United States plan together, the two plans should enable us to destroy arms -- to use a phrase which has been often used and is a good one -- right across the board and in this way really to take the offensive capacity out of national armies. That, I believe, should be our objective.

I hope, therefore, that all doubts as to the West's sincerity in this matter have been dismissed, because we want to see weapons destroyed now, on the largest scale and in a continuous programme of destruction.

There is a point -- we shall come back to it -- which has been very prominent in the case of the nuclear tests, and that is the question of verification. I think a lot depends on what is written into the Soviet plan as to the function of the international disarmament organization. When does the international organization, for instance, come into a factory? And how far and at what point can it check the turnover from military production to civilian production? Very much will depend on the answer to that question when we come to study the subject of verification in relation to general disarmament, because clearly we must be certain that if we destroy arms they will not be replaced -- in other words, that

(Lord Home, United Kingdom)

each stage is completed and that we move straight into the next period of destruction of weapons.

Perhaps I might say one word about the proposal which has been made by Mr. Green, because from our very first discussions in this Committee I have been greatly attracted by the suggestion he has made. We must not allow ourselves in any circumstances to be sidetracked from our main purpose, which is to achieve general and complete disarmament in a steady and continuing programme.

But there are other measures which are collateral to disarmament and which, if we were able to agree on them, would generate an atmosphere of confidence not only in this Conference but far outside. One is clearly outer space. Therefore, while in the Committee of the Whole we shall have to mention certain points in regard to Mr. Green's draft declaration, we are in full agreement with his general purpose.

I would suggest that it would be very valuable for the Committee successively to consider other matters. I have said before that I do not think that so far we have given enough attention to the enormous importance of putting aside fissile material for civilian purposes. I hope my colleagues will study the speech Mr. Rusk made today because his proposal would save the world from the manufacture of tens of thousands of nuclear warheads, and this material could be transferred to civilian purposes. Therefore, I hope that the Soviet Union will very seriously consider putting aside an equal quantity -- whatever it may be -- with the United States and any other nation that has this material, so that it may be used for peaceful purposes in future under international supervision.

Then, again, I think there is a real future in anti-surprise attack measures -- that is something which would give a lot of confidence to a lot of people -- and in the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons. While I do not in the least want to suggest that we should lose sight of outer space, I would make a plea that we should add to an agreement on outer space agreement upon the other matters also.

I must say that I agree with the Minister of External Affairs of Canada: I think this has been a good morning and that we are beginning to see a lot in common between the Soviet plan and the United States plan. If we work on this with a sincere purpose, we ought to be able to produce a master plan of our own which can lead to the physical destruction of weapons, beginning very soon and going on without check until the business is complete.

Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): First I wish to thank the representatives of the two Power blocs who spoke this morning.

I wish to deal with two points.

The first concerns the collateral measures. I would suggest that the two co-Chairmen should prepare a list of some of these agreed collateral measures; perhaps other representatives may be able to suggest additional ones. In that way the Committee would be in a position to know the number of such subjects that we may discuss. This would prevent us from making statements in a disorderly manner whenever something came up. If we prepared a list of collateral measures, these could be taken up one by one and we might be able to arrive at decisions more quickly. As everybody here knows, there is one subject that is of particular interest to Africa: the denuclearization of Africa. In other words, when the co-Chairmen draw up the list, they should include that subject so that we will be able to take a position on it when it is discussed. There is also the matter that was raised this morning by the Minister of External Affairs of Canada. If we list a number of these questions, as distinct from the main subject matter of this Committee, general and complete disarmament, that will, I think, facilitate our work here.

The other matter to which I should like to refer relates to the favourable reception -- for which we are most grateful -- which was given by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union to the suggestion we made that everything possible should be done to remove all the cold-war elements poisoning relations between the great Powers and also between other countries. This consideration is dealt with in the preamble to the Soviet draft treaty. I sincerely hope that when the Soviet and United States proposals are considered, the question of the propaganda that is continuously put out in connexion with conflicts between the various ideologies will be seriously examined.

As I said in my statement to the Committee (ENDC/PV.8), we feel very strongly that we shall engender confidence in the minds of people everywhere if we remove these elements suggesting that ~~one~~ political, social and economic system cannot exist side by side with another.

I do not think that sufficient importance has been attached to this particular aspect of disarmament. Ideas are very very powerful, and by them minds can be poisoned and fears engendered. On behalf of my delegation and my Government I feel very strongly that one of the reasons for the distrust that

(Mr. Wachuku, Nigeria)

exists is what we read in the newspapers -- one ideology seeking to subvert the other. If we are going to make headway in this Conference I think we must agree that this use of propaganda for subversion in order to undermine one system and to supplant it by another is a bad thing. I think that, apart from physical disarmament, we need a little intellectual and spiritual Spring-cleaning. I hope that the two Power blocs can agree not to engage in a war of words, by radio, television and other means, in order to poison the minds of their own nationals and make them believe that they cannot exist side by side with the nationals of other countries as friends and brothers, as members of common humanity. If we can get that idea incorporated in the preamble, that we declare ourselves opposed to propaganda of that sort and that from now on the two Power systems should instil into their own children and citizens that these are things of the past, I think we shall have made real progress. As I have already said here, the nations now becoming independent have a lot to learn from the great Powers in the way of technology, science and other developments. Instead of subversion, the tendency to destroy the human spirit, emphasis should be laid on the finer elements, qualities and achievements of mankind; emphasis should not always be laid on differences and difficulties and on making one side feel that unless the other is wiped out it cannot exist.

I felt I should make this statement now because it is probable that I shall be leaving Geneva tomorrow as I have to go before Parliament to seek money for my Ministry. I wish to emphasize this point as much as possible, particularly since the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union commented favourably on it. I hope, also, that the Secretary of State of the United States will bear this statement in mind as he leaves Geneva. If we can reduce the propaganda in this particular field that we continually read in the newspapers, hear on the radio and see on television, I think we shall be doing something to bring about the confidence needed to resolve the basic conflict about inspection, verification and so on. If we can eliminate this aspect I think there will be a better prospect of disarmament becoming a practical reality.

Those are the two points which I felt I ought to make this morning. I hope that those of us who are not great Powers will give them very serious consideration, so that, by being included in the preamble or as a collateral point, this particular aspect may be considered and thrashed out. If in this Conference we can

(Mr. Wachuku, Nigeria)

achieve that end I think we shall have done quite a lot for our common society, the community of States. When we report to the United Nations we shall at least be able to say that not only have we dealt with physical disarmament but have also done a certain amount of disarmament in the intellectual, ideological, moral and other spheres.

Mr. LOUCANOV (Bulgaria) (translation from Russian): Last week saw the end of the statements by the delegations and what might be called the general debate. This is the first meeting of the Committee following the end of these general statements. In accordance with the procedure adopted by common agreement, we should, obviously, at this first meeting set about our main task, the elaboration of a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament.

I realize that, on account of the imminent departure of some of our colleagues, it has been necessary for them to put forward some additional considerations, which is quite natural. And it is a very good thing that it turned out to be so.

It seems to me from what we have heard today from the various speakers, and especially from the statements made by the United States Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, we could draw the conclusion that the Committee will perhaps very quickly be able to record a certain first preliminary success, perhaps the first success, as far as speed is concerned, in the history of bodies of this kind. We could do this so that Mr. Green may depart from here sufficiently armed against his opposition.

I have in mind the adoption of the initial proposal contained in the Soviet Government's plan and in that of the United States Government. I consider -- and it seems to me that the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Gromyko, has today adduced excellent reasons to prove this -- that the formulation of the draft preamble of the Soviet treaty is more precise. Obviously, we could agree very quickly to this preamble to the document.

I do not know whether the debate on this question should be continued or perhaps we could ask someone to prepare an agreed text of the preamble in time for tomorrow's meeting. That would be quite realistic in my opinion. Perhaps the delegations of our co-Chairmen and, perhaps, the presiding delegation today, could prepare an agreed draft preamble to the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament and submit it to us tomorrow morning. I take the liberty of putting forward this concrete proposal.

Mr. RUSSO (Italy) (translation from French): It has been made very clear and definite this morning that today's meeting is of particular importance, because of the various statements which have been made.

Mr. Rusk, the United States Secretary of State, in his remarkable speech, which is a positive contribution to the work of our Conference, stressed specifically that the Conference has three basic purposes. The first is to create a favourable atmosphere for discussion. It seems to me that this purpose has been achieved, and my impression has been confirmed by the other important statements we have heard today.

The second purpose is to adopt a programme of work, and I think the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union pointed out clearly and definitely that the agreement reached on procedure constitutes an important step which should not be underestimated, for it concerns the very substance of our work.

The third purpose is to present our different points of view frankly, without trying to conceal the difficulties which arise. We should also seek the points on which agreement can be reached, in order that our work may lead to concrete and positive results as quickly as possible.

Mr. Gromyko referred to the preamble to the draft Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament under Strict International Control submitted by the Soviet Union, and observed that there seemed to be general agreement on its actual principles. Of course, there is still a certain amount of work to be done, but I think that on the essential points our views are in fairly close agreement. We have reached the stage at which we must pass on from general principles to concrete conclusions. A first phase of our work is thus coming to an end and we must pass on from general considerations to a more precise study.

It is in this connexion that the comments made by the United States Secretary of State offer us some possibilities for making fairly rapid progress, having regard to all the facts, towards the final goal we have set ourselves, namely an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

If we consider the points on which agreement is possible and the method of work which should enable us to reach agreement, this first step, accomplished in a satisfactory general atmosphere, should, given mutual confidence, enable us to overcome the difficulties which are sure to arise in the course of our work. Mr. Rusk's observations should therefore be taken into consideration by each of us if we wish -- and we all do wish -- to achieve satisfactory results quite soon.

(Mr. Russo, Italy)

Side by side with the problem of general and complete disarmament, which remains the primary objective of this Conference -- and no one, I am sure, would wish to turn aside from it -- we must also consider what have been described as initial measures. Mr. Green, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, called our attention to that point. I believe, therefore, that these measures should be studied parallel to the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee on general and complete disarmament, and it would be advisable to draw up an order of priority for them. The co-Chairmen would have to make a special effort first, after which the Committee itself would begin to examine the measures, in order to seek the desired agreement. What I have said about general and complete disarmament also applies here. Not only the delegations here present, but all the peoples of the world will feel greatly encouraged when it is learnt that this Conference has managed to move on from the phase of general discussion to that of agreements on specific, practical points. Even if those points are only of small consequence, it will be a good beginning, after which we can expect to make serious and regular progress, justifying the hopes that have been placed in our work.

I should now like to give an assurance that the Italian delegation, for its part, is resolved to continue to contribute as much as it can to this effort, knowing full well what is expected of us and, in particular, that we cannot permit ourselves to fail.

The CHAIRMAN (Romania) (translation from French): Since no one else has asked to speak, I take it that the list of speakers is exhausted.

Before closing this meeting, I should like to express my satisfaction that the Committee has today begun its work on the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament, as provided in paragraph 1 of the agreement on procedure adopted last Friday (ENDC/12).

I must remind you that the representative of Canada has proposed that the Committee of the Whole should meet tomorrow. I believe the co-Chairmen agree to this proposal on the understanding that the Committee will decide on its own agenda. If there are no objections, the Committee of the Whole will therefore meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

It was so decided.

Mr. RAPACKI (Poland) (translation from French): Should we not now deal with the formal proposal made by the representative of Bulgaria?

The CHAIRMAN (Romania) (translation from French): But that has already been approved.

Mr. RUSK (United States of America): As regards the suggestion made by the Bulgarian representative, Mr. Loucanov, I wonder if the following idea would not facilitate our work. Our delegation does not have any serious objection to the ideas expressed in the preamble submitted by the Soviet Union, but I do think, that there are certain omissions in it that we would need to consider. In the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles and in the United States plan submitted last September there are certain ideas which seem to us to be appropriate to a preamble. For example, in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles reference is made to the fact that:

"... it is important that all States abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means".

(ENDC/5, page 1)

The ideas there are important and somewhat different from those expressed in the Soviet draft.

Further, we believe it appropriate in a preamble to make reference to that part of the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles which states that:

"(b) such disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter." (ibid.)

Our Nigerian colleague, Mr. Wachuku, has made a comment with respect to the preamble, and it is entirely possible that other delegations will have other observations or suggestions to make. I wonder whether we should not permit all delegations to hand in informally to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General any suggestions or material that might be suitable for a preamble; two co-Chairmen, with the possible assistance of other delegations, would then be in a position to try to reach an agreed draft. In this way each delegation would be given a chance to make such comments as it would wish to make, and then we could move toward a joint draft.

Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I have expressed certain considerations regarding the order in which we should deal with the various questions. It seems to me that these considerations are in keeping with the general feeling which became evident in the conversations between us, and in the speeches in which the representatives of States made their main statements regarding the policy of their governments on disarmament.

It seems to me that it would be perfectly right and proper to go through the draft treaty submitted by the Soviet Union, starting with the preamble. That is where we should start; obviously not from the end or from the middle, but from the beginning. We have stated -- and I think there should be no misunderstanding on this score -- that in our opinion we should consider, simultaneously with the discussion of the preamble proposed by the Soviet Government in the draft treaty, all other proposals relating to the preamble, whether they have already been submitted or will be made later. No one will be frustrated. All considerations submitted on this score will be examined. This is the simple wish we have expressed. It seems to us that this would be the appropriate procedure. Naturally, in the course of discussing the preamble, we should examine those considerations which have been expressed here, in particular by Mr. Rusk. That is what I ask to be done. I do not think anyone need fear that his interests would be prejudiced or he might be passed over. There is no danger of that.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its tenth meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. C. Manescu, Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of Romania.

"The representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Nigeria, Bulgaria and Italy made statements.

"The Committee of the Whole of the Conference will hold its first meeting on Wednesday, 28 March 1962, at 10 a.m.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 29 March 1962, at 10 a.m."

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.