We have pointed out to the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada that while their statements, in general, have contained isolated comments on the new proposals submitted by the Soviet Government on 25 February for the Sub-Committee's consideration, and on the draft resolution we introduced on 8 March, they have not shed sufficient light on the reasons for the attitude of those countries. That, evidently, is not a matter of chance. It is presumably due to the fact that while they have taken an unfavourable position on the Soviet proposals, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada are unable to produce any convincing arguments to support it.

Let me try to give a brief summary of the position of the Western countries, as expounded in this Sub-Committee by Mr. Nutting, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Moch and Mr. Robertson during the discussion of the Soviet proposals. Such a summary will, in our view, be of some use in helping us to understand the situation which has now arisen in the Sub-Committee.
In the first place, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada have expressed disagreement with the Soviet Government's proposal for the destruction of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons. They have openly stated that they cannot entertain the idea of the destruction of stocks of these types of weapons unless agreement both on this point and on the carrying out of the relevant measures is made contingent upon the solution of all the other questions connected with the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons.

They reject the USSR proposals on the pretext that the latter cannot be entertained unless they are forced into the general programme of the Franco-British proposals; an argument which clearly demonstrates their desire to be rid of the new Soviet proposals.

Similarly, they refuse even to entertain the idea of such vital measures as the destruction of existing stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons being carried out at once, without awaiting the settlement of other questions connected with the reduction of armaments and the total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

The representatives of the Western Powers have taken the same line in connexion with the Soviet proposal for the limitation of national armaments, armed forces and military appropriations.

What is the meaning of the position the representatives of the Western Powers have taken on the Soviet proposals for the destruction of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons and for the limitation of armaments? If we strip the statements made here by certain members
of the Sub-Committee of meaningless generalities about their willingness to promote disarmament, generalities which we have heard often before, and examine the real meaning of the line they have taken, it is easy to see that it simply conceals their unwillingness to help to put an end to the armaments race, to bring about the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

That is the only possible interpretation of the position that has been taken in this Sub-Committee by the Western countries, in particular the United States of America, which sets the pace.

The representatives of the Western countries have also expressed disagreement with the Soviet proposal for convening in 1955 a world conference on the question of the general reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons, to be attended both by States Members of the United Nations, and by States not members of the United Nations.

Thus on the one hand obstacles of every kind are being raised to prevent the necessary agreement being reached during the present discussions in this Sub-Committee, and on the other, objections are made to convening a world conference on the general reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to be attended by the largest possible number of States. Clearly, all this offers no evidence whatsoever of any willingness to promote the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons. On the contrary, like the negative position that has been taken on the Soviet
proposals for the destruction of stocks of atomic weapons and the limitation of armaments, it serves as proof, if proof were needed, that the Western countries intend to continue in the future to pursue the policy of the armaments race, in atomic and hydrogen as well as conventional weapons.

In discussing the Soviet proposals, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada have yet again followed their usual line by attempting to make out that the USSR is opposed to control. As you are aware, the proposals we submitted for the Sub-Committee's consideration on 25 February provide for the institution of the requisite international control over the execution of the decisions for the destruction of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the limitation of armaments. The Soviet Government has made both these and its other proposals known to the whole world, and all attempts to give the impression that the Soviet Government makes no provision for the need for control over the destruction of stocks of the aforementioned types of weapons and over the limitation of armaments are therefore absolutely without foundation.

Such attempts to distort the position of the Soviet Union on this question are not new, and merely testify to the fact that the proponents of the armaments race are seeking every possible pretext to prevent the attainment of agreement -- in the present instance, agreement on the destruction of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the limitation of armaments; armed forces and military appropriations.
In their search for trumped up and factitious arguments, the representatives of the Western Powers have made one of their principal points the allegation that the Soviet proposals are unacceptable because they are advantageous to the East and disadvantageous to the West.

Explaining this point, Mr. Nutting, Mr. Lodge and Mr. Moch said that the destruction of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons would make the Soviet Union much stronger than the Western Powers, because the USSR is much more powerful in conventional weapons. In making this assertion, the representatives of the Western Powers did everything they could to emphasize the supremacy of the West in atomic weapons.

Leaving aside the question of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons, since in the absence of any figures on the subject such arguments are worthless, we must point out that statements of this kind show that the Governments of the Western Powers are once again seeking a pretext for preventing the attainment of agreement on the vitally important question of the destruction of stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Since, however, mention has nevertheless been made here of the strength of East and West in atomic and hydrogen weapons, I must remind you that certain hot-heads who have advocated the armaments race have miscalculated in the past.
As regards conventional armaments, we have pointed out on a number of occasions that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States keep trying to minimize the numbers of their own armed forces and on the other hand to exaggerate in every possible way the size of the Soviet forces. In particular, let me remind you again of the exchange of notes on this subject between the Governments of the USSR and the United Kingdom. The only possible conclusion that can be drawn from these arguments on the part of the representatives of the Western countries is again that the latter are opposed to the Soviet proposals because fundamentally these proposals are directed against the armaments race, in atomic and hydrogen as well as conventional weapons, whereas the position of the Western countries is based on the intensification of the armaments race.

Certain members of this Sub-Committee have even gone so far as to allege that the Soviet Union's proposals are the product of some kind of "fear". That, to say the least, is a peculiar argument. No, the Soviet proposals were certainly not dictated by fear. They were dictated by a desire for the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of peace amongst the peoples of the world; a policy which is consistent with the vital interests not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union but of the people of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and Canada and of all other countries of the world. We are firmly convinced of that, for only the deaf can fail to hear the cries of alarm for the future of the world which are
more and more being voiced by the peoples, and their increasingly persistent demands for an end to the armaments race and for the exclusively peaceful use of atomic energy.

These proposals can be unwelcome only to those whose plans are poles apart from the goal of strengthening peace, only to people who are re-arming the Nazis of yesterday, who are forming military blocs aimed against the Soviet Union and who, for some years now, have based their policy on the theory of "positions of strength" -- a policy which, incidentally, has met with little success.

Be that as it may, some representatives in this Sub-Committee -- and this applies particularly to the representative of the United States -- are making every possible attempt to emphasize "the strength of the West". They are obviously doing so in order to "strengthen" their position in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Need I say that as in the past, this method will not bring those who use it the desired results? To come to the Sub-Committee and boast of the strength of the West means to make no serious attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union on the vital questions of disarmament and the prohibition of atomic weapons. To resort to such methods is to bring about the failure of these talks. But it is quite certain that that is not in the interests of the United Nations, which has instructed this Sub-Committee to explore the possibilities of reaching the necessary agreement.
In conclusion, I must point out that at a time when talks are taking place in this Sub-Committee on important questions on whose solution the maintenance of peace largely depends, the official activities of the Governments of the Western Powers are directed towards intensifying the armaments race and, in actual fact, towards impeding the course of our talks in this Sub-Committee. The same object is being pursued through all media of propaganda in the Western countries; and propaganda of this kind, the tone of which is set by official circles, by the Governments of the Western Powers, is daily becoming more intense.

This, in broad outline, is the position of the representatives of the Western countries in this Sub-Committee.

It is readily apparent that such a position is far from facilitating the success of the Sub-Committee's work.