PRIVATE

ENDC/PV.3
16 March 1962

ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRD MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 16 March 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:	Mr. SAN THIAGO DANTAS
	Mr. C.A. BERNARDES
	Mr. RODRIGUES RIBOS
	Mr. de ARAUJO CASTRO
Bulgaria:	Mr. C. LOUCANOV
	Mr. M. TARABANOV
	Mr. K. CHRISTOV
	Mr. V. PALINE
Burma:	U Thi HAN
	Mr. J. BARRINGTON
	U Tin MAUNG
	U Aye LWIN
Canada:	Mr. H. GREEN
	Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
	Mr. J.E.G. HARDY
	Mr. C. IGNATIEFF
Czechoslovakia:	Mr. V. DAVID
	Mr. J. HAJEK
	Mr. E. PEPICH
	Mr. M. ZEMLA
Ethiopia:	Mr. K. YIFRU
	Mr. T. GEBREGZY
	Mr. A. MANDEFRO
	Mr. M. HAMID
India:	Mr. V.K. KRISHNA MENON
	Mr. M.J. DESAI
	Mr. A.S. LALL
	Mr. A.S. MEHTA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:	Mr. A. SEGNI
	Mr. C. RUSSO
	Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
	Mr. F. SENSI
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. LACHS
	Mr. M. BIEN
	Mr. T. WISNIEWSKI
Romania:	Mr. C. MANESCU
	Mr. G. MACOVESCU
	Mr. C. SANDRU
	Mr. M. MALITZA
Sweden:	Mr. O. UNDEN
	Mrs. A. MYRDAL
	Baron C.H. von PLATEN
	Mr. G.A. WESTRING
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. M. FAWZI
	Mr. A.F. HASSAN
	Mr. A. TALAAT
	Mr. M.S. AHMED
United Kingdom:	The Earl of HOME
	Mr. J.B. GODBER
	Sir Michael WRIGHT
	Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK
United States of America:	Mr. D. RUSK
	Mr. A.H. DEAN
	Mr. W.C. FOSTER
	Mr. C. BOHLEN
Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. O. LOUTFI
Deputies to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General:	Mr. T.G. NARAYANAN
	Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): The third meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament is called to order.

The list of speakers so far includes the representatives of Brazil, Italy and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. de SAN THIAGO DANTAS (Brazil) (translation from French): Brazil accepted its inclusion in the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament in full awareness of the extent of the responsibilities it will have to share.

Although responsibility for preserving world peace rests primarily with the nuclear Powers, which alone possess the means to destroy it, progress in an international campaign to reduce the immediate risks of war can certainly not be made unless the nations that are not armed join with those that are, in a common endeavour to eliminate a danger which threatens them all with equal intensity.

The mutual fear of the States which possess nuclear and thermonuclear weapons at the most advanced stage of technological development, and are able to produce them, stock them, modernize them and deliver them on their targets, is not enough to avert the danger of war or even to make it more remote. Technological progress can go through periods of equilibrium during which the potentialities for mutual destruction are equal, but there may also be periods during which one State or group of States gains an offensive or defensive advantage over its adversary - an advantage which may tempt it to seek a decision.

Of course, the political leaders, who command a global view of the problem, have other means of evaluating the risk which go beyond mere consideration of the military issue. Hence those who consider the ideological conflict from the more limited viewpoint of present technological superiority or economic advantage are sure to exert pressure for war at such a moment, which is enough to raise the potential danger of destruction to the highest level.

Again, the danger tends to increase as technical progress spreads to wider areas and other States gain access to nuclear or thermonuclear weapons through their own resources or through political alliances. The increase in the number of those with power to take the initiative introduces new independent variables into the equation of forces. Once nuclear peace is broken, if only in a small geographical area, the chances of preventing hostilities from spreading to become the centre of a world conflict are reduced to a minimum.

(Mr. de San Thiago Dantas, Brazil)

Already, therefore, the preservation of peace can no longer be ensured by seeking military superiority or by any of the formulas on which the great States based their power politics in the pre-atomic era. If we want peace, it is peace and not war that we must prepare for, and for that task the armed and the unarmed States are equally fitted and equally responsible, provided that they are aware of the dangers to which their peoples are exposed and are determined to face the problem in an independent and objective spirit. The experience of the last few years teaches us that this problem can be approached in two ways. The first is to propose to the other party something which we know in advance it will not be able to accept without weakening its position, while the position of its opponent is not correspondingly weakened. It is this procedure which has made the problem of disarmament the preferred field for the cold war. Thus proposals which are not feasible are put forward by either side in the expectation, not of any real progress in disarmament, but of an immediate political advantage before international public opinion.

The second method, which is unfortunately much less frequently adopted, consists in exploring the limits of compromise consistent with maintenance of the present levels of security and negotiating up to those limits. This is clearly the only way to achieve effective progress in disarmament and, paradoxical though it may appear, it is not the nations that possess nuclear weapons, but, on the contrary, those that do not, which can create the more favourable conditions for the use of this method.

Disarmament proposals which bear the imprint of the cold war are not, in fact, submitted by a nuclear Power in the hope of misleading another nuclear Power, but in order to obtain credit for them with world opinion. It is before world opinion and especially the public opinion of other Powers which desire conditions giving them prosperity and confidence in the future, that such proposals can be made and accepted at their face value and can evoke sympathy or antipathy, thus bringing a political advantage to those who take the initiative of submitting them. The day the unarmed Powers, thirsting for a lasting and final peace, decide to denounce and reject such mere cold war proposals instead of helping to strengthen purely polemical positions adopted by either of the military blocs, the political effect of such proposals will soon be neutralized and even eliminated. The necessary conditions for a disarmament policy leading to real results could then be established without further delay.

(Mr. de San Thiago Dantas, Brazil)

Such is the position that the Brazilian delegation intends to adopt in the work of this Committee. Brazil belongs politically and culturally to the West and seeks to solve its economic and social problems within the framework of representative democracy, but apart from its participation in mutual assistance treaties for the defence of the American hemisphere against aggression either from within that hemisphere itself or by extra-continental Powers, Brazil is not a member of any politico-military bloc. We wish to make a contribution to disarmament consistent with the priority we invariably give to peace in our foreign policy, and we are sure that the best way of doing so is to preserve our independence of judgement and the authority of our voice, in order to lend them to everything calculated to promote effective and immediate disarmament, and to refuse them to everything that merely aggravates polemics, emphasizes antagonisms, impresses public opinion or delays settlements.

Brazil understands and appreciates the efforts made by both the United States of America and the Soviet Union to ensure that the successive stages of disarmament will be properly matched by the simultaneous establishment of effective international control. It believes, however, that consideration of these two aspects does not exhaust the subject, and that there is a third, parallel consideration of which is essential if we are not to risk rendering a large number of proposals utopian. I refer to the reconversion of an economy strongly influenced by arms production, as the economies of the nuclear Powers are today, to social and economic objectives, in the exclusive interests of peace.

We know the importance of military programmes as regards capital investment, volume of orders and mobilization of manpower. The United Nations Secretariat has recently submitted an important and objective report to us on this subject. Both in countries with centrally planned economies and in free-enterprise countries the cessation of orders would raise serious internal problems if it meant simply closing down factories, dismissing workers and releasing public funds. It is essential to plan the reconversion of an economy dominated by arms production into a peace economy: the resources of the different countries, which are now mobilized in the world cause of security, would then be combined within the framework of an international organization and used to solve another world problem: short-term elimination of the poverty of peoples and the unjustified economic inequality of States.

(Mr. de San Thiago Dantas, Brazil)

In the absence of a plan for economic reconversion, disarmament may mean a disequilibrium with dangerous consequences for the armed nations themselves. It is encouraging to think that the cure for this disequilibrium is within our reach, and that it can provide an opportunity for substantial progress, not only for the armed nations, but for all the unarmed as well.

Another matter which seems to us to merit clear and constructive treatment, is the specific security of nations which have no nuclear or thermonuclear weapons and have no say in the final decisions on their tactical or strategic use. Article 1 of a treaty signed by twelve Powers on 26 December 1959 provides that the Antarctic shall be used only for peaceful purposes, while Article 5 prohibits nuclear explosions and the depositing of radioactive materials there. On 28 November 1961 the United Nations General Assembly approved resolution 1652 (XVI) which declares the African continent a denuclearized zone that is to be respected as such. Brazil supported that resolution. Measures of this kind, whatever their effectiveness, show the desire to restrict the area of atomic danger. They also express the rejection of any attempt to legitimize the use of weapons of indiscriminate mass destruction.

Agreement to the use of this type of weapon on its territory by a State which has no part in the decisions relating to such use, impairs its sovereignty and might affect relations between the government concerned and the people it represents. Not only would the country be exposed to unforeseeable reprisals but, above all, it would be accepting an indeterminate share of responsibility without any corresponding share in the power of initiative.

Another matter on which I wish to inform the Committee of Brazil's point of view is the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, particularly tests in the atmosphere. Brazil expressed its disapproval in the most unequivocal terms when the Soviet Union, in October last year, conducted a series of such tests, thereby assuming responsibility for reopening technical competition when an encouraging truce had prevailed since 1958. Similarly, Brazil expressed the hope that the still conditional decision of the United States of America to resume such tests would not be carried out. There are two reasons which compel us to adopt an attitude of inflexible opposition and express condemnation towards these tests: the first is the conviction that they, more than anything else, stimulate the attempt to secure temporary offensive or defensive superiority, which is an inevitable source of

(Mr. de San Thiago Dantas, Brazil)

pressure for war in the State that is in the better position; the second is the fear of radioactive contamination of the biosphere, which gradually reduces the margin of tolerance and endangers not so much the present, but the future of the human race. Considering that at the present stage of technology the use of nuclear energy even for peaceful purposes leaves a residue which must reduce this inextensible margin, it is easy to see the significance of such competitive tests, having regard to our duty to future generations.

Here, I should like to recall the words of Mr. Jules Moch, the representative of France -- a country whose absence from this Committee is regrettable -- applying them specifically to nuclear tests: "No disarmament without control; no control without disarmament; but all the disarmament that can be controlled."

Having heard the statements made yesterday by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union, I find that their positions do not appear to have changed substantially; but I thought I saw shades of difference in the presentation of certain aspects of the problem, especially with regard to the suspension of nuclear tests, which lead me to believe that rapid and genuine progress is possible in this matter. We are able to state that in our opinion there should be no insurmountable obstacles to the achievement of prompt and positive results on the suspension of nuclear tests.

The technicians of the nations most advanced in nuclear science are, I believe, agreed on the possibility of effective control of tests under water, in the atmosphere and in the biosphere, without more thorough on-site inspections and checks being necessary. We therefore consider that these tests should be suspended immediately. As regards underground tests, studies should be undertaken without delay to determine the minimum degree of on-site inspection that is essential to ensure that the undertakings given are being fulfilled.

It seems that an agreement on this point could soon be reached; it could be worked on by a sub-committee which should be set up for that purpose at once.

Brazil welcomed the Joint Statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations by the United States of America and the Soviet Union as one of the most promising events of last year in the field of international relations. The text was transmitted to the President of the General Assembly by Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Zorin on 20 September 1961. This statement affirms in paragraph 1 that "the goal of negotiations is to achieve agreement on a programme which will ensure

(Mr. de San Thiago Dantas, Brazil)

that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (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". To that end, the two great Powers "call upon other States to co-operate" and among them they wished to include Brazil, as provided in the proposal submitted to the General Assembly and approved by resolution 1722 (XVI).

Brazil will approach this task in a spirit of unfailing co-operation.

Mr. SEGNI (Italy) (translation from Italian supplied by the Italian delegation): The Italian delegation, and I believe all other delegations here, have listened with the greatest attention to the important statements made by the representatives who spoke before me.

Their sense of responsibility and their general tone seems to augur well for the beginning of our labours. We are confident that the work of this Committee can lead to a lasting peace that will safeguard the freedom of all peoples - not a mere armistice.

Thanks to the direct contacts between the various governments and particularly between the Governments of the United States and the USSR, and thanks to the Joint Statement (A/4879) of September 1961 before the General Assembly of the United Nations, some of the difficulties have been partially overcome, and I feel that that agreement is a first token of goodwill and a commitment on the part of all.

For this reason I believe that the reconvening of the Committee on Disarmament is of primary importance. I believe, too, that it is significant that this should take place at Foreign Minister level and later, if circumstances so require, at the level of heads of government of the participating States.

I wish to extend my warmest greetings not only to the representatives of the governments which took part in the work of the Ten Nation Committee but also, and especially, to the representatives of those countries which are participating in these negotiations for the first time and which, ever since the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, Italy had hoped would be invited to participate in the work of this Committee.

(Mr. Segni, Italy)

We are opening today a new chapter in the history of disarmament. We know from our past experience what difficulties await us; we must seek to bear in mind the lessons of the past.

Earlier negotiations did not, unfortunately, lead to any concrete agreement; nevertheless I would not like to consider them utterly useless or sterile. The debates were at times lively and even harsh, which is not surprising when we consider the vast interests at stake; but the exchanges which took place in the past, either within more restricted bodies or within the General Assembly of the United Nations, have helped the problems to mature. We have learned to know each other better, so that today we are able to start work on ground that has been cleared to some extent. We are thus able to resume our work enriched by useful experience, and I am sure I am interpreting our unanimous hopes when I say that this work should not be suspended until, answering the appeals of all the peoples of the world, we have attained our goal -- that is, general, complete and controlled disarmament, as a result of which all the resources of the peoples will go to improve their wellbeing and peace will be achieved, with the assurance that it will not be broken by sudden aggression.

There is no doubt that the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations (A/4879) by the United States and the USSR, which the United Nations General Assembly approved at its last session, constitutes an important meeting-point. This was the fruit of long labours and could almost certainly not have been achieved without the earlier debates in the Ten Nation Committee.

We are thus beginning our work on the basis of a joint agreement, however general in terms. It is our duty to widen and to clarify this basis, extending ever more and more completely the agreements which already exist in it in nuce. We know, of course, that the road to be travelled is still long and that it is strewn with obstacles -- technical, psychological and political. For its part, Italy will face them, fully determined to exert every effort to achieve the goal that has been set and to assure to the world a future of peace and security based on the twin principles of co-operation among all peoples and the rule of law.

To attain this goal despite all the difficulties, we must forgo preconceived ideas and forswear impatience. Our horizons must be vast, but none the less practical and realistic, for this peace and this security can be achieved only at the cost of prolonged, tireless and courageous efforts.

(Mr. Segni, Italy)

Disarmament can also involve certain dangers and courage is therefore needed to overcome the first obstacle, constituted by mutual fear and distrust, while we proceed towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament. It requires genuine courage to destroy weapons, but our peoples demand of us that we make this effort within the insuperable limitations set by the essential requirements of national security.

We are all fully conscious of our responsibility and we have therefore assembled here not to engage in an involved and sterile exchange of charges and countercharges, but to find a way out of a very disturbing situation.

We are assembled here to explore together, honestly, loyally and sincerely, a form of agreement which will remove mortal dangers and ensure security, so that our peoples can live and labour freely in honourable and dignified peace.

The Italian Government has already associated itself with the United States proposals for general and complete disarmament, in the drafting of which we collaborated actively, together with our other allies. As the Italian delegation will explain in greater detail later, there is in these proposals an honest and fair basis for agreement. They are fully in line with the principles laid down in the Joint Statement.

I refer specifically to paragraphs 5 and 6 of that document, in which it is clearly stated that disarmament measures will have to be well balanced during the various stages and undertaken from beginning to end under effective international control. As far as Italy is concerned, we are prepared to accept within this framework any type of control, however strict, which may be agreed upon on the international plane.

In speaking of the above-mentioned proposals I do not, of course, wish to claim that our suggestions are the only valid ones and that they alone can lead to an agreement. We are prepared to examine any proposals, any methods of work, that may be put forward so long as they are put forward in the same spirit that animates us -- that is to say, so long as they aim at general, complete and well-balanced disarmament in which no side would obtain advantages at the cost of others at any stage and which would allow of no evasions or frauds that might later endanger peace.

We attach particular importance to the methods the Committee may adopt to achieve its aims; these methods are not merely a matter of procedure, but the concrete means that will facilitate an agreement. I gather from the remarks of previous speakers that there may be a consensus of opinion that will enable the Committee to do useful work.

(Mr. Segni, Italy)

I am referring to the setting up of sub-committees which would examine the various problems simultaneously in order to achieve positive results in the various fields at the same time. I personally wish to support such an approach, which I regard as being the most effective one and the most closely in line with the sense of urgency that should be ever present in our minds, since we are called upon to submit a report embodying tangible results to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by 31 May 1962.

The problem of disarmament is also a problem of mutual confidence. Initial results are therefore needed to create this confidence and to impel us towards our next objectives. I am sure that these initial results, however limited, would be welcomed by all the peoples of the world with a feeling of considerable relief, it being understood that, being aware of the objectives we have set ourselves, we would not stop there, but would continue our labours tirelessly, taking advantage of these first favourable results and of the improved general atmosphere.

In this connexion, while I intend to examine more thoroughly the important documents which the Soviet delegation submitted to the Conference yesterday, as well as those submitted earlier by the same delegation to the United Nations, and with which we are familiar, I would like to note with satisfaction and with hope the measures of immediate disarmament which Mr. Rusk introduced at our meeting yesterday and which, if accepted, would represent a valuable first step in our work, while at the same time giving the peoples of the world cause for immediate relief.

I wish to refer in particular to the proposal for a 30 per cent reduction in all armaments within a given time, including those representing a major threat, that is, nuclear delivery vehicles, and to the proposals dealing with the cessation of production of fissionable materials for military purposes and the transfer of 50,000 kilograms of existing weapons grade materials to non-weapons purposes.

Such measures, together with the others put forward yesterday by the United States representative, could also represent -- and this should be particularly emphasized -- a first achievement of one of the objectives of disarmament, namely, making available important resources for the improvement of the economic and social conditions of all the peoples of the world. Mr. Rusk also drew our attention to the need to take prompt action in the matter of the cessation of military thermonuclear tests. The Italian delegation associates itself wholeheartedly with this appeal. This is a matter of the utmost urgency, as Italy has pointed out repeatedly during past debates in the United

(Mr. Segni, Italy)

Nations General Assembly. An agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests, which would obviously include the necessary verifications, appears to be an absolute necessity, and we are confident that it will be possible to examine immediately the procedures best adapted to the attainment of this objective.

We dare not conceal from ourselves the fact that the present hour is grave indeed. Everyone knows that the weapons now available to both sides are of such destructive power that, as President Kennedy reminded us in his noble message yesterday, a general conflict would threaten the very existence of mankind. Faced with such a calamity, which our conscience refuses to contemplate because it would be the denial of every human ideal, we must act with the utmost urgency to allay the tragic threat of a thermonuclear holocaust.

I deem it necessary, therefore, to insist on the absolute need for restoring among us as soon as possible a climate of improved understanding and mutual confidence. The armaments race, as we know, is the offshoot of mutual fear and distrust, and creates that sinister spiral with which, unfortunately, we are all too well acquainted. We must, above all, put an end to this trend by avoiding every move, every action, which may carry the implication of intimidation or threat, and by confirming our undertaking to resolve existing problems through peaceful negotiation in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Once the trend has been stopped it will be possible to reverse it.

We wish to assure those peoples who differ from us in their concept of life that we, who belong to an ancient and great civilization that finds inspiration in the principles of freedom, harbour no plan, no desire to interfere in any manner whatsoever with their peaceful development and progress.

The firm will for peace of the people and the Government of Italy has been stated many times. Nevertheless, I consider it my duty to proclaim it anew most solemnly here today in this hall when we are about to begin our work, and to assure you that it will never wane.

The CHAIRMAN (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): I should now like to speak in my capacity as Chairman and as representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

The Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament is beginning its work at a time when it is clear to the whole world that the solution of the disarmament problem -- the most pressing issue of our day -- would be of truly momentous significance for the fate of mankind. It is therefore only natural that the peoples of all countries -- and among them the peoples of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic -- should view the present negotiations with hope and should count on their resulting in agreement on general and complete disarmament.

The extensive exchange of messages in connexion with the initiative taken by Mr. N.S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, has revealed a universal recognition of the personal responsibility of the leading statesmen of the participating countries for the solution of the disarmament problem, a responsibility which would undoubtedly be emphasized by their personal participation in the work of the Committee. The Czechoslovak Government continues to hold the view, expressed in the messages from the President and Chairman of the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the leading statesmen of the other countries represented in the Committee, that the participation of Heads of Government or Heads of State in the work of the Committee would create the most favourable conditions for the fulfilment of this responsible task.

The delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic approaches the work of the Eighteen Nation Committee in the belief that the urgency and importance of the disarmament question call for the maximum efforts from all member States to ensure that the Committee's work leads to positive results.

The government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic warmly welcomes the fact that representatives of neutral States are also to take part in the work of the newly established Eighteen Nation Committee. The governments of these States have in the past frequently expressed their support for general and complete disarmament and have made a number of proposals to promote its achievement. On behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, I should like to express the firm conviction that the participation of their representatives will have a beneficial influence on the work of our Committee.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

Conditions in the Committee, in which all three groups of States are represented and whose composition also takes into account the interests of different geographical regions, are favourable to the achievement of definite results by the negotiations. This will also be facilitated by the directives for the work of the Committee contained in the United States - USSR Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations of 20 September 1961, which was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its sixteenth session.

The Committee is meeting in circumstances which impose an extremely heavy responsibility on all its members. The feverish nuclear arms race which is still in progress increases the danger of a conflict that would have unimaginable consequences for all the peoples of the world. Everyone knows that intensified arming always heightens the danger of war. Yet even today this danger has not been eliminated.

There is much evidence that, in their views on foreign policy, certain circles in the West which derive immense profits from armaments are still banking on war, despite the suffering which it would bring to the peoples.

In view of the radical advances in military technology, there is also a serious danger of a military conflict being caused accidentally, as a result of a technical fault in the means of delivery of nuclear weapons or in the radar warning system, the misinterpretation of certain measures taken by the other side or the mental derangement of some member of the staff servicing weapons of mass destruction. This danger is stressed by responsible leaders of all countries in the world and attention was also drawn to it by representatives of delegations who have spoken before me.

Finally, the possibility must not be underestimated of a nuclear world war being provoked by aggressive circles in one of the less important countries which regards a conflict involving the Powers and the principal military alignments as a means to the attainment of its own expansionist objectives. Such circles, as we know, exist in the Federal Republic of Germany, where they exert considerable influence. They are pursuing an irredentist policy aimed at modifying the frontiers established in Europe as a result of World War II. Any attempt on their part to secure their aggressive demands will mean a military conflict, a conflict which these circles are directly and openly interested in provoking.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

This has finally been recognized by realistic people in the West. Mr. Henry Kissinger, adviser to President Kennedy and a recognized authority in the United States and in other NATO countries, made the following statement in his book, The Necessity for Choice :

"An attempt by Germany to play off the West against the East would prove disastrous for the peace of the world -- as has been demonstrated twice within a generation." (page 132)

This danger is also inherent in the attempts to make NATO into a fourth atomic power and to make atomic weapons available to former Nazi generals so that they may make a further attempt to attain the goals they previously failed to attain under the leadership of Hitler. Further confirmation of the fact that such aims are being pursued by the Command of the Bundeswehr and the leading circles of the Federal Republic of Germany was given by Chancellor Adenauer himself in his interview on 14 March 1962 with the correspondent of the DPA Agency.

The peoples of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, like the peoples of many other countries, have had bitter practical experience of German imperialism and militarism. We are therefore keeping a close watch on dangerous developments in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is essential to take energetic steps while there is still time to ensure that aggressive forces which, twice within the lifetime of one generation, have plunged the world into war, should not only not obtain nuclear weapons but should be deprived of the means of waging war which they now possess and which they might use in a fresh attempt to carry out their aggressive designs.

All these facts confirm the importance of the tasks assigned to the Committee and underline the responsibility which the States represented in it bear towards the peoples of the world. The General Assembly of the United Nations, in its resolution 1378 (XIV), rightly described the question of general and complete disarmament as the most important one facing the world today, and, so far from having diminished, its importance is even greater today.

There can be no doubt that many obstacles will have to be overcome on the way to the achievement of agreement on general and complete disarmament. We are all aware that the decision by the United States Government to conduct a further series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere is having an extremely adverse effect on the circumstances in which the Conference of the Committee is taking place.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

We are convinced that the problem of nuclear tests can be solved on the basis of a mutually acceptable agreement and that the proposals of the USSR Government offer good prospects for such an agreement. It is however aessential that all participating States should desire this with equal sincerity.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomed the fact that at yesterday's meeting Mr. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, submitted on behalf of the Soviet Government a draft Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. This proposal is further evidence of the tireless efforts of the Government of the USSR to find a solution to the problem of general and complete disarmament which would finally deliver mankind from the threat of war and would ensure the nations of lasting peace.

The draft Treaty of the USSR Government is fully in accordance with all the principles set out in the Joint Statement and provides for the implementation of general and complete disarmament under strict international control within the shortest possible period. Therefore, in our view, it provides the best basis for concrete negotiations in the Committee with a view to the preparation of a draft Treaty on general and complete disarmament.

The provisions of the Soviet draft, which have been worked out in detail and are clearly formulated, offer a realistic, precisely defined and acceptable means of fulfilling the task entrusted to the Committee.

With the implementation of each stage of the Soviet proposal the peoples would be brought considerably closer to the attainment of that most humane objective, the creation of a world without war and without arms. The implementation of the measures proposed for the first stage and, above all, the complete destruction of the means of delivery of nuclear weapons and the simultaneous dismantling of military bases in foreign territory would, to all intents and purposes, eliminate the danger of a surprise nuclear attack by one State upon another.

In the second stage, in which all types of weapons of mass destruction would be destroyed and armed forces and conventional armaments would be substantially reduced, the danger of nuclear war would be completely eliminated and the possibility of any war being precipitated would be considerably diminished.

Finally, at the third stage the military machinery of States would be completely abolished and the material means of waging war would be eliminated altogether.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

At the same time, in our view, the Soviet draft Treaty ensures equal security for all States at every stage and rules out the possibility of any State gaining unilateral military advantages of which it might take advantage to attack other States. International security would be completely safeguarded not only during the process of general and complete disarmament but also after its completion. This, however, cannot be said of the other proposals which have been submitted.

Considerable attention is given in the Soviet draft treaty to the question of control. It provides for reliable control over the implementation of all the disarmament measures from the very outset until their completion. At the same time, the principle is consistently followed that the scope and nature of the control measures must be in keeping with the scope and nature of the disarmament measures. This precludes the possibility of control being misused for the purpose of espionage, whereby a potential aggressor would secure an opportunity of preparing a sudden attack against other States, because he would know exactly the location of the targets which he would wish to destroy in the first instance when launching his attack.

A thorough study of the draft treaty on general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet delegation shows that in preparing this draft the Soviet Government has on a number of points taken into account the views which other countries have insisted on in the past.

All this bears witness to the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union to ensure that a mutually acceptable decision on general and complete disarmament may be reached in the shortest possible time.

While the Czechoslovak delegation considers the draft submitted by the Soviet Union to be the best basis for the negotiations of the Committee, this, of course, does not mean that we would refuse to consider seriously and in a businesslike manner other proposals and drafts as well, in so far they ensure the fulfilment of the basic task of the Committee, that is the reaching of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under reliable international control.

However, in this connexion we must note with regret that the proposals, about which the United States representative, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, spoke at our meeting yesterday, afford no assurance that this task will be fulfilled.

We shall still have an opportunity to deal more thoroughly with these proposals but we can say even now that in effect they are once again merely proposals for separate measures of disarmament, under which the scope of control would greatly exceed the scope of possible disarmament measures or proposals which generally put control before disarmament. We are convinced that this way does not lead to

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

The authors of these proposals maintain that before achieving agreement on general and complete disarmament certain measures should be carried out to ensure international security.

No one denies the usefulness of such measures, but they must be measures which would indeed ensure international security and, at the same time, create the prerequisites for the achievement of the main purpose, which is general and complete disarmament.

In this connexion I should like to emphasize once again that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, together with other socialist countries, is prepared to discuss and to carry out concrete measures which would lead to a relaxation of international tension, to an increase of confidence in the relations between States and thereby to the creation of favourable conditions for general and complete disarmament.

At the sixteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Czechoslovak delegation expressed its agreement with the measures proposed on 26 September 1961 by the Government of the Soviet Union, to which the Minister of Soviet Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, referred yesterday.

In this connexion, I should like in particular to draw attention to the proposals concerning the creation of de-nuclearized zones. Such measures would undoubtedly lead to a reduction of tension and to increased security in certain areas of the world, especially in such sensitive areas as Central Europe.

Basing itself on this point of view, the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic recently expressed its full support for the proposal of the Government of the People's Republic of Poland regarding the creation in Central Europe of a zone that would be free from nuclear weapons. This zone would include, in addition to Poland and Czechoslovakia, the territory of the two German States. As is known, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Germany has already expressed its agreement with this proposal. I wish to state that the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is prepared to accept the obligations entailed in the creation of such a zone if similar obligations are accepted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Negotiations on such measures could be carried on at the same time as the negotiations on a treaty for general and complete disarmament, but they should not divert the Committee from its main task.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

The people of Czechoslovakia are busily engaged in carrying out far-reaching plans for the building of a highly-developed socialist society in our country. Soon we shall set about preparing a 20-year plan of development, which will ensure that by 1980 the industrial production of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will have increased five-fold compared with 1960. This will create a broad material basis for the further substantial improvement of the standard of living of our people.

In order to carry out these far-reaching plans we need peace. That is why our people persistently demand that an end be put once and for all to the arms race and that radical measures be taken to ensure lasting peace for our people and for the peoples of the whole world.

The President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Novotny, speaking at the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, stressed in this connexion that:

> "The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers serious and effective consideration of the question of general and complete disarmament as one of the main tasks of the fifteenth session of the United Nations Assembly. To realize general and complete disarmament under effective international control is in our opinion the most urgent task of the present day."

The elimination of the intensive production of armaments would release considerable economic resources which are now being spent on the production of means of destruction. Under general and complete disarmament, these resources could be utilized for the benefit of mankind, to ensure further economic development and to carry out radical measures aimed at raising the standards of living of all the peoples of the world, particularly of those of the economically less-developed countries.

The urgency of the problem of disarmament demands that our Committee should waste no time in carrying on its work. This, no doubt, was the guiding idea of the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly when it adopted the decision that this Committee should submit a report on the results of its work before 1 June of this year. The results can be positive, if all the countries represented on this Committee display goodwill and make sincere endeavours to reach a mutually acceptable agreement.

(The Chairman, Czechoslovakia)

It is our wish that the work of this Committee should mark a decisive change in what has been so far the gloomy balance sheet of negotiations on disarmament. We are fully aware that general and complete disarmament would be a decisive step towards improving the relations between States and would finally eliminate the danger of war.

For this reason we shall strive sincerely to ensure that the Committee's work leads to successful results, that is to the elaboration of a draft treaty on general disarmament.

The delegations of India and Ethiopia have expressed a wish to speak on questions of procedure. I call upon the representative of India, Mr. Krishna Menon.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I am not at the present time going to make a statement on the merits of the question on behalf of my delegation. The reason why I submitted a formal request to speak, instead of merely raising my hand and asking to be recognized, was that I thought it would add some order to our proceedings here.

At the beginning of this Conference, the representative of the United States, more particularly than others, referred, if I may say so, quite frankly and helpfully to the requirement of informal discussions so that we may be able to proceed in a workmanlike fashion. If I am not mistaken, from all that we have heard most of the Foreign Ministers will be leaving Geneva in eight, nine or ten days' time, and this Conference has already been in progress for three days.

I should like also to preface my observations by saying that my delegation has had informal consultations on some aspects of this matter with those countries that are not committed to various proposals and propositions either here or elsewhere, and not with the main participants in this question.

Our proposal, therefore, is that, at a pre-subcommittee stage, we should have informal meetings of all delegations in this room in addition to such talks, bilateral or trilateral, as may take place.

We have already had the main statements of the Western and the Eastern positions from the United States and the Soviet Union. And, if I may say so, we have had a statement from Brazil to which we find ourselves much closer than in years gone by.

I want to think aloud on this matter, and I hope the Committee will forgive me. We want to come here, shall we say, simultaneously with these formal meetings and have the two co-chairmen and their allies sit round the table and say, "We

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

have this difficulty about this matter and we have that difficulty about that matter". Without too much commitment they could help us to clarify these problems. For example, we have a treaty in very considerable detail set out by the Soviet Union. There will be something like that, one assumes, from the other side at some other time. We meet here on the basis of the eight points. Now we could ask for clarification on some of those matters, particularly with regard to how to reconcile that with the necessity of proceeding in stages and, on the other hand, how to reconcile stages with the concept of general and complete disarmament. We also have the question of partial measures -- I am using the word "partial" not in the political sense but in its literal sense: measures which are not complete disarmament.

Now there would not be any use at informal meetings to make the speeches that have been made for so many years. But we could ask for points of clarification on this, that or the other question, questions such as the elimination of carriers; we could ascertain the objections, and so forth. We are not experts in this matter. We read mainly from the pronouncements of the United States and the Soviet Union in their publications and apply such common sense as we can. There are questions dealing with detection and inspection. There is the question of free zones, which concerns us very much, particularly the Asian-African countries. Not speaking for my Government but speaking for myself, I very much doubt whether, in the event of any catastrophe, any zones would be particularly free. But still we can make a beginning.

I do not want the intervention that we make to become what in some other context has been called a procedural wrangle. At these informal meetings we could have the advantage of the assistance of the two main participants -- and I do not mean to exclude the other nuclear Powers -- in furnishing clarifications. The informal meetings should not become mere replicas of the meetings of the main Conference, where speeches and counter-speeches would be made. We would come here in the afternoons simultaneously with these formal meetings, and, with as little procedural formalities as possible, we could obtain more information. That would help us in the other and even more informal meetings we have with the individual leaders of delegations. In this way, even before the heads of delegations leave -- I am not thinking of myself, since I have to leave on Wednesday -- we would place this Conference in a more business-like position. So far -- and I do not say this with any intention of criticizing anyone -- we have not learned very much that we did not know before.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

It has been agreed that there is no question of our coming here to make proposals which are to be put to the vote. My suggestion is put forward in the hope that we can do very much more, and that our Conference will not be unduly prolonged.

As has been repeatedly pointed out from more than one side, we have to make some kind of a report to the Disarmament Commission by June. It would not be good for the world if we made a report in which we simply said that we had agreed to defer the matter. That would have a very bad psychological effect. I would like the delegations of both the Soviet Union and the United States to accept the fact from us that we have our public opinion to consider -- I do not say that we have to "educate" our public, but we have to appreciate the impact upon it. If public opinion responds more or less to one side or the other, it will be easier to find reconciliations.

For these reasons I am submitting this proposal, which is not contradictory to anything that has been said so far. If we do not proceed in this manner but leave it to individual delegations to see Mr. Rusk, Mr. Gromyko or someone else, some people who are busybodies may do so more than others. Supposing very informally I go and speak with Mr. Rusk: I would not know to what extent what he has said to me and what I have said to him is in propriety communicable to the other side, and vice versa. We have given a great deal of thought to our suggestion and we have discussed it with some of our colleagues. Of course we are not all of identical opinion, but we would like to bring to bear the impact of countries which are not committed one way or the other to this matter.

Therefore, I do hope that the whole of the Committee, and more particularly the parties principally concerned in the sense of having the arms to throw away, will give immediate consideration to this proposal. I do not say that we should come back here at three o'clock, but perhaps we could come back at four o'clock or at four-thirty. And once again I would request that when we come back we should not be told, "You are out of order", or "You are in order", or things of that kind. We should proceed as we did in the Laotian Conference, to a certain extent, with some limited amount of success. This would be a procedure worth considering, and I hope that it will have the support of everybody concerned.

Mr. GEBREGZY (Ethiopia): Fortunately for me, I do not have to make a long statement. For the same reasons he has expressed, my delegation supports the submission by the Defence Minister of India. We wish to state just one point. We are newcomers here and we should not wish to fumble by making a long and formal statement in such a forbidding place. We should prefer to get some clarification and some understanding of the proposals already submitted. Therefore we are very much in favour of making these meetings, as much as possible, more and more informal. We would thus very much appreciate it if this Committee adopted the suggestion of the Defence Minister of India.

Lord HOME (United Kingdom): I think there is a great deal to be said for what Mr. Krishna Menon has proposed. We all want to clear our minds on the very complicated questions which were raised by both Mr. Rusk and Mr. Gromyko yesterday. I would only make the plea that, if we have informal meetings of this kind, they be limited to the heads of delegations -- or at any rate we ought only to have one person from each delegation, because then it can be informal. I should think no records need be taken. That would help us to understand the position. But perhaps the best thing to do would be to ask the co-Chairmen if they could make a recommendation to us about Mr. Krishna Menon's proposal. I personally would hope that it could be accepted.

Mr. SAN THIAGO DANTAS (Brazil) (translation from French): I also support Mr. Krishna Menon's proposal, which seems to me to be very constructive.

Mr. RUSK (United States of America): I think there is great merit in Mr. Krishna Menon's suggestion. I think we ought to take maximum advantage of the presence of Foreign Ministers and chiefs of delegations who may be leaving in the course of the next week or ten days. I would be very happy to consult the other co-Chairman to try to reach a prompt recommendation on this matter. I do think that there is something to be said for finding, if the Secretariat could provide it, a smaller room, for a smaller group, because it is difficult in this room not to make speeches to each other.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): We are all in favour of having the two co-Chairmen consult, but today happens to be a Friday. I do not know whether it came from the United States co-Chairman or the Soviet Union co-Chairman but from the very beginning they have ruled out the weekend, saying we should meet from

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Monday to Friday. It is an English habit; I do not know whether the Americans and Russians have taken it on -- but still there it is, and it means putting the thing off for another three days. I hope they can consult quickly and enable us to meet this afternoon, if they agree.

My second point is with regard to what Lord Home said. I entirely agree with the idea of having a small gathering. So far as my delegation is concerned, the Foreign Secretary, who is with me, is in the same position as I am: he has to return home. A permanent representative of our delegation will be here afterwards. So it could be left to our good sense to limit the number and not bring in a whole lot of people. If it is not put in an elastic way, the procedure becomes impractical. If I might put it this way, it is useless for me to put forward what I think are brilliant suggestions -- naturally I always think so -- and then for the person who has to carry on not to know the little nuances and inflexions that are brought out in the informal discussions. As has been said, no records should be kept. I am quite certain that both Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Rusk have been informed and know themselves that procedures of this kind have been helpful in the Laos Conference. I know it is still dragging on, but it would probably have dragged on even more otherwise.

Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): While I have no objection to what is being suggested, I was wondering whether it is not put forward too early for those of us who have come to this type of conference for the first time. Two major statements have been made, and certain proposals have been submitted. I do not think we have had sufficient time for studying these proposals and asking questions directly or indirectly about them to be able to participate in any intelligent discussion on the type of suggestion that is now being made. I think that perhaps the weekend will give us an opportunity to look at this matter quite critically so that early next week we shall be in a position to discuss the matter intelligently.

Besides, apart from the two Foreign Ministers who made statements, from our own point of view there are other nuclear Powers concerned in this whole discussions: that is, the United Kingdom and France, Unfortunately, France is not here. From our own point of view, on the African scene, we are very much interested in a certain reaction from some quarters. Unfortunately, the French representative is not here. Whatever is being discussed, the attitude of France in relation to atomic explosions on the African continent must be very material to us. Consequently,

(Mr. Wachuku, Nigeria)

seeing the list of representation at this Conference -- we have the Western Powers and the Eastern Powers and then we have the eight non-aligned Powers that have been entrusted with a very grave responsibility by the United Nations -- I should think that there is a very serious responsibility devolving on our shoulders, those of us who have been given a specific injunction by the United Nations to attend this Conference, to form a kind of bridge between the two contesting Powers.

I think that before we rush into these informal discussions we should be given a chance to consult among ourselves on certain attitudes, after studying these documents. Otherwise I shall find myself in a very difficult position when, ignorant of what has been going on before and of many people's reactions to this, I shall find myself suddenly in the midst of the great Powers discussing most complicated problems without careful examination of the proposals that have been put forward already. I understand that the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom is speaking next week. I shall wish to hear what he has to say on this matter before I can discuss intelligently the question as a whole. And if France were to change its attitude and come next week, I would be in a position to know how the minds of the nuclear Powers are working. But I think I would be rushed too much if I were called upon now to attend informal discussions without having a balanced opinion on the way their minds are working.

While I am not opposed to informal discussions, from the point of view of my delegation the timing is important.

Mr. FAWZI (United Arab Republic): My delegation finds itself in basic agreement with the idea expressed by our colleague, Mr. Krishna Menon, and also with the amendment concerning timing which was suggested by our colleague from Nigeria. My thought about this aspect of timing is that perhaps Monday would be a good day to begin those informal talks even if, as expected, the formal statements by the various delegations which have not yet spoken have not all been made.

The CHAIRMAN (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): We have had a number of observations relating to the procedure of the work of the Conference. I think it would be useful for the two Co-Chairmen to study these various suggestions and we could then discuss them at a meeting of the Conference. Are there any objections?

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I should like to submit that it was not suggested that there should be a compulsory meeting. Some of us want clarifications, and those clarifications are best obtained in the presence of everybody else. So far as my delegation is concerned, we have read and understood what the main speakers have said. I am not saying that there will not be any more intelligent or fruitful observations to come hereafter, but our submission is that the sooner we begin these informal meetings, the better, because we must do as much as possible before the heads of delegations go away. It is not necessary, I submit, for those who are not ready to do so to intervene at this stage; the Conference will still go on. No one has suggested that anything we have agreed upon should be scrapped. If Mr. Rusk and Mr. Gromyko, after consultation, are willing to call us today, tomorrow, or the day after, from our point of view it would be more suitable. But if the consensus is to agree with what the representatives of Nigeria and the United Arab Republic have said, we naturally have to conform to it and do the best we can.

The CHAIRMAN (Czechoslovakia (translation from Russian): Mr. Krishna Menon's remarks will be among the matters to be discussed by the Co-Chairmen.

I shall now read out the draft communique on today's meeting:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its third meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Vaclav David, Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

"The representatives of Brazil, Italy and Czechoslovakia made statements.

"Statements on procedural questions were made by the representative of India and certain other representatives.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Monday, 19 March 1962, at 10 a.m."

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): If we include the paragraph beginning "Statements on procedural questions were made", the various newspapers will print this and it will appear as though Ethiopia and India have raised some procedural objections and have become involved in a procedural discussion. Perhaps what should be put in is something to the effect that "procedural matters were raised

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

in order to obtain clarifications and in order to have more informal discussions". Otherwise, as I said, it would look as if a procedural argument had been going on in this Committee. I should be happy if the Secretariat would amend the communique in that way so as to give some idea what this is all about.

Mr. GEBREGZY (Ethiopia): I would prefer that the "other delegations" which participated in the procedural discussion should be mentioned. The term "other" makes me most unhappy.

Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): I do not know whether I am mistaken, but I think it was decided that this matter should be referred to the co-Chairmen. I think the communique should state that procedural matters were discussed by the various delegations and they were referred to the co-Chairmen. Otherwise it will be left up in the air.

Lord HOME (United Kingdom): Whenever we talk about procedural matters do we have to let the Press know? I cannot see why we should say anything about it at all. It is a perfectly ordinary matter among ourselves which we are discussing and which the co-Chairmen are going to discuss. Until we have a recommendation, I cannot see why we should say anything.

Mr. TELLO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): I do not think it is necessary to put anything in the Press communique about a procedural question having been raised. It has been referred to the two co-Chairmen, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the United States and the Soviet Union. Let us wait and see what they have to say and then issue the Press communique. At this stage it would be rather premature and perhaps undesirable.

Mr. SEGNI (Italy) (translation from French): The Italian delegation supports the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN (Czechoslovakia) (translation from Russian): We have before us a proposal to delete the following sentence:

"Statements on procedural questions were made by the representative of India and certain other representatives".

Are there any objections to that deletion? Since there are none, that sentence will be deleted.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its third meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Vaclav David, Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

"The representatives of Brazil, Italy and Czechoslovakia made statements.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Monday, 19 March 1962, at 10 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.