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The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I declare the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament open. The first speaker on the list is the representative of Czechoslovakia, but first of all I shall call on the United Kingdom representative who has asked for the opportunity to correct a point contained in his statement of yesterday.

Mr. ORMSEY-GORE (United Kingdom): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am afraid that inadvertently, in my impromptu reply to some remarks by the representative of Bulgaria, I may have misled him. I was discussing what I referred to as the Soviet plan of March 1956, but I was actually reading from the Soviet plan introduced in March 1957, which was of course, as representatives know, based on their proposals of 1956. On looking at page 15 of the English text of the verbatim record I see that the Secretariat has, in fact, corrected me and has put in the figures for March 1957, which was in fact the document from which I was reading, but later on I went on to say:

"That was to take place two and a half years after this plan was introduced which was in March 1956." (TNCD/PV.11, page 15)

Well, of course it should be March 1957 and the reductions would have taken place one and a half years after the introduction of the plan, not two and a half years after. I do not think it alters significantly the argument I was making, but I wished to make this correction in case I had misled the representative of Bulgaria and others in this Committee.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): The discussion which has taken place in our Committee so far has already produced some positive results. The exchange of views in our Committee during the past two weeks has clarified our approaches to certain problems and has answered a number of questions raised either by the delegations from the Socialist countries or by those from the Western countries. It is generally recognized, as we understand the present situation, that the goal of our work is general and complete disarmament. The basic task of our Committee has been clearly laid down in General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV), voted for by all the member States of the United Nations. The representatives of the Western countries have confirmed in their interventions — at our meeting yesterday, for instance, it was the representative of Canada — that they do consider this
resolution to be the basis for our work. On the other hand, however, it seems that there is still no agreement on the methods by which to attain this goal. In our view the method proposed at our ninth meeting on 25 March by Mr. Eaton and elaborated at our meeting on 28 March by the representative of Italy and at yesterday's meeting by the representative of Canada would not lead to the achievement of this goal.

The Western representatives propose, it would seem to us, to begin an abstract discussion on the details of control, giving as a reason the necessity to pass on to concrete negotiations. There is full agreement between us so far as the necessity to undertake concrete negotiations on concrete measures of general and complete disarmament is concerned. However, there appears to be an obvious difference of opinion as to what should be considered as the discussion of concrete questions of disarmament. In our opinion it is indisputable that we cannot proceed to discuss the details of control, as has been proposed by Western representatives, while there remains an absence of agreement on what its subject is to be; that is, agreement on concrete disarmament measures.

In this connexion, we should like to stress once again a fact that has already been pointed out many times: the representatives of Socialist countries, in common with the representatives of Western countries, cannot accept disarmament without control. Such a course would be contradictory to the task entrusted to us by General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) — to work out measures of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The approach proposed by the Western representatives would, in our opinion, lead to an isolated and abstract discussion of control, without previous agreement on disarmament measures. At the same time, it would be contradictory to the basic principle of control already agreed upon: that there should be no disarmament without control, and no control without disarmament. In the opinion of the representatives of the Socialist countries, the implementation of disarmament measures, and the provision of adequate control, should commence simultaneously.

In drawing up a treaty on disarmament, it is quite logical to require agreement on concrete disarmament measures as a prerequisite to working out concrete control measures, and I should like to repeat that if we are to discuss disarmament measures we should discuss concrete figures and concrete proposals for measures which must be implemented in various stages of general and complete disarmament. Moreover, let us deal at the same time with control measures.
Our doubts concerning the attitude of Western representatives to the question of our further work were increased even more yesterday by the intervention of the Canadian representative, who said:

"... nor can I see that the resolution lays a mandate on this Ten Nation Committee to draft a disarmament treaty on the lines of that programme or any other programme." (TNCD/FV.11, page 13)

We cannot agree with this statement, which was obviously made with the concurrence of other Western representatives. We are convinced that the provisions of General Assembly Resolution 1378 (XIV) on this question are quite clear. If concrete measures of general and complete disarmament are to be worked out, as set down in the resolution, then it is clear that this must be done in the form of an agreement. The representatives of socialist countries clearly understand the requirement, if we are to pass on to concrete discussion, for the elaboration of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

What is involved in preparing an agreement for a treaty on general and complete disarmament? In our opinion it means commencing concrete negotiations on a programme of general and complete disarmament -- from beginning to end: it means commencing at least the preparation of general provisions for inclusion in an agreement on general and complete disarmament. The most useful and successful method of procedure would be to compare the respective positions and find mutually acceptable solutions of all questions which may arise. In our view, we should first agree upon a definition of general and complete disarmament, and upon the scope of the measures which should be carried out within its framework.

This task is the more urgent because at our meeting two days ago, Mr. Eaton on the one hand confirmed that one of our tasks was, in the sense of General Assembly Resolution 1378 (XIV):

"... to work out the measures for general and complete disarmament." (TNCD/FV.10, page 22)

and, on the other hand, he also said:

"... the definition of general and complete disarmament which has been adopted by the Soviet Union ... is not a definition to which we subscribe..." (ibid.)

In this situation, as we see it, it is necessary to agree first of all on a definition of general and complete disarmament: to find a common point of
departure for the preparation of a treaty on that subject. The representatives of Socialist countries have expressed, repeatedly and quite clearly, their view on this question. However, we still lack a completely clear answer from the representatives of Western countries.

In order to avoid any confusion or misunderstanding I should like to summarize once again the scope of the disarmament measures which, with effective international control, would ensure that disarmament would be general and complete. The measures are: disbandment of all armed forces; destruction of all types of armaments; the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons; cessation of the production of all types of these weapons; their elimination from the armaments of States, and the liquidation of stocks; complete cessation of production, and liquidation, of all kinds of rockets, rocket weapons of all ranges, including cosmic military missiles; liquidation of all kinds of alien military bases on foreign territories, and all missile launching installations; liquidation of military production; abolition of war ministries and general staffs and all kinds of military and para-military establishments and organizations; and a cessation of the financing of military budgets.

It goes without saying, and this has already been pointed out many times by the representatives of the Socialist countries, that all these disarmament measures which are proposed to be implemented within the four-year period would be carried out under effective international control. At this stage of our deliberations, I should like to enquire of the delegations of the Western countries whether they do agree that the scope of the disarmament measures which I have just summarized and which are proposed to be included in the programme of general and complete disarmament should form the basis for the elaboration of a future treaty on general and complete disarmament. We would be very grateful indeed for a clear answer to this question. We should like to state once again that we are ready to examine carefully and with full attention all possible amendments or modifications and to discuss any proposals which would lead to general and complete disarmament.

I should now like to deal with the distribution by stages of disarmament measures and with time-limits which, in our opinion, are needed for the accomplishment of general and complete disarmament. If our interpretation of the present situation is correct, the discussions which have already taken place in our Committee have to some extent brought closer together the respective positions both on the question of stages and on the question of time-limits. General
agreement on the necessity of spreading out the whole programme of general and complete disarmament amongst particular stages follows from the understandable fact that, with due regard to the complexity of all the problems which are necessarily involved and which have to be solved, it is impossible to carry out all measures at once; they have to be carried out in stages. At the same time we understand that one stage must be linked to another stage and that these stages cannot be separated from each other. This means that the whole programme of general and complete disarmament must be implemented precisely in compliance with the envisaged treaty or, in other words, the programme of general and complete disarmament shall be carried out by States in strict conformity with a time-limit specified in the treaty; and its implementation may not be suspended or be made contingent upon the fulfilment of any conditions not provided for in the agreement.

As regards concrete proposals, it is well-known that the proposal of the Soviet Union envisages the realization of the measures necessary for general and complete disarmament in three stages which are balanced both from the point of view of scope and from the point of view of time. The plan of the Western countries also contains certain stages and each stage includes certain steps. Thus we can also see some concerting of opinion that the programme of general and complete disarmament has to be carried out in stages which should be linked together. At the same time it seems to us that at the present time the ground has to some extent also been cleared so far as the question of time-limits for the realization of the programme of general and complete disarmament is concerned. The programme of the Soviet Union proposes to accomplish both the practical stages and general and complete disarmament as a whole in certain time-limits agreed in advance. In this connexion I should like to recall that the delegations of the Socialist countries have consistently pointed out that they consider the fixing of binding time-limits for the implementation of various disarmament measures, as well as for the whole programme of disarmament, to be one of the basic requirements for its effective and complete accomplishment. We have also stressed that it would be possible to guarantee reliable and effective control of the implementation of agreed disarmament measures only if time-limits were fixed. That is exactly why we insist on fixing binding time-limits for the accomplishment of general and complete disarmament. We have already had the opportunity to demonstrate that the time-limits proposed by our delegations are based on the scrupulous evaluation of
realistic possibilities and that they are based on practical experience gained by
a number of States, especially during the period after the Second World War.

The proposal of the Western countries does not contain concrete data on time-
limits within which the respective disarmament measures, the various stages and
the programme of disarmament as a whole should be carried out. Nevertheless, we
are under the impression that after some confusion and misunderstandings have been
cleared up, our respective positions on this question have come closer together.
This has been facilitated to some extent by the misunderstanding which occurred at
our meeting last Friday caused by incorrect English interpretation of some parts
of the speech of Mr. Martino. Statements made in this connexion by Mr. Martino
and by Mr. Ormsby-Gore at our meeting on 25 March have indicated that the question
of the fixing of time-limits for implementation of the programme must not
necessarily create an obstacle to our work. I think the common desire is to come
to an agreement. This assumption on the part of our delegation is based particu-
larly on the statement of Mr. Ormsby-Gore who said on 25 March 1960 that:

"... you can forecast what you hope will happen but ... it is not a rigid
time-limit. You can mention a specific date by which time certain countries
must have carried out their obligations. That is quite understandable, and
I agree that this would have to be part of any treaty we arrive at."

(Mr. Nosok, Czechoslovakia)

(TNCD/PV.9, page 22)

Mr. Ormsby-Gore clearly stated at yesterday's meeting that mentioning a
specific date is different from a forecast, and we hope that he still adheres to
this view. A treaty on general and complete disarmament would contain the very
obligations mentioned by Mr. Ormsby-Gore in his statement. If it would be possible
to fix time-limits for the accomplishment of agreed, separate disarmament measures,
then there would not be, as we see it, serious obstacles to outlining a time-limit
for the implementation of the programme of general and complete disarmament as a
whole. The whole disarmament programme is nothing but a complex of separate
disarmament measures which are to be implemented within agreed time-limits. To
calculate the time-limits for the whole disarmament programme we have only to put
together all the time-limits envisaged and agreed on for the individual measures
in agreed stages. The programme of general and complete disarmament put forward
by the Soviet Union proposes a period of four years, this period to begin at the
coming into force of the treaty on general and complete disarmament.
I should now like to dwell briefly on the question of the standpoint of the delegations from socialist countries which, for incomprehensible reasons, is being systematically distorted despite repeated explanations on our part. This question has already been clearly answered -- that the convening of the General Assembly or of a world conference on disarmament should take place before -- and I stress the word "before" -- the inception of the realization of a programme of general and complete disarmament. We cannot understand why this question continues to be artificially distorted by the representative of France who, despite the explanation repeatedly given at our meeting yesterday by the representative of Poland, said: "That is a point which we shall have to clear up". (TNCD/FV.11, page 32)

As far as the distribution of disarmament measures by stages is concerned, the procedure envisaged by the Soviet proposal is as follows: in the first stage, a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments; in the second stage, the completion of the disbandment of the armed forces retained by States and the elimination of all military bases in the territories of foreign states; and in the third stage, the realisation of all other measures including complete nuclear disarmament. The distribution of disarmament measures by stages was explained during yesterday's meeting by the leader of the Bulgarian delegation, Mr. Tzvetanov, and it is therefore unnecessary to elaborate further on these questions. The fact that in the Soviet programme complete nuclear disarmament is provided in the third stage does not mean that the socialist states would refuse an earlier solution of this question of complete and consistent nuclear disarmament. The representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, has already stated here quite unequivocally:

"If, however, the Western Powers express their readiness to accept a complete ban on atomic and hydrogen weapons -- to eliminate these from national armaments and destroy the stocks of such weapons -- right at the beginning of the disarmament programme, there will be no obstacle on our part to an agreement on this question; ..." (TNCD/FV.5., page 43)

In this connexion I should like to mention the intervention made yesterday by the United Kingdom representative who again attempted to give the impression that there was some contradiction between the standpoints of the Czechoslovak and the Soviet delegations on the question of the timing of the realisation of complete nuclear disarmament in the programme of general and complete disarmament.
We must express our surprise at the way in which Mr. Ormsby-Gore discussed this question. We believe that he too is aware of the standpoint of the socialist countries, which is shared by Czechoslovakia, on the question of the prohibition of nuclear weapons. In the course of the post-war years the Governments of the socialist countries have repeatedly manifested their consent to the immediate and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. This standpoint is still valid today, and if the Western countries agree, it will be possible, of course, to realize the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, their elimination from the armaments of states and the immediate destruction of their stocks -- as emphasized by the representative of the Soviet Union at our fifth meeting -- at the beginning of the programme of general and complete disarmament.

The delegations of the socialist countries deem it necessary to begin general and complete disarmament by reducing armed forces and conventional armaments. It seems that there is agreement on this question as will be seen from Mr. Eaton's statement at our ninth meeting.

In the view of the delegations of socialist countries, the measures I have summarized in my intervention today form the basis of future agreement on general and complete disarmament. We are very much interested in the concrete character of the work of our Committee and in achieving our common goal in the shortest possible time. In order that the work of our Committee be concrete, we deem it necessary to proceed immediately on the basis of the results of our past discussions towards a joint formulation of basic principles and provisions for an agreement on general and complete disarmament. We would therefore be grateful to the delegations of the Western countries if we could have a clear answer to the question I raised in the first part of my intervention this morning, namely: do the delegations of the Western countries agree with the scope of the disarmament measures we have summarized, which are proposed to be included in the general and complete disarmament programme, and that these measures should form the basis for the elaboration of a future treaty on general and complete disarmament? I will conclude my statement with this question.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): My delegation will study the statement of the Czechoslovak representative with all due care, but I should like to thank Mr. Nosek here and now for clearing up the misunderstanding which arose between him and Mr. Martino as a result of a mistake in the record and differences of interpretation.
I should now like to say a few words to Mr. Zorin, with his permission. He reminded me yesterday that he was still waiting for me to reply to the questions he had asked me at the meeting on Monday last, arising out of what I had said in explanation of the Western proposals for the establishment of the international control organization. The Soviet Union representative will, I hope, forgive me for allowing a few days to elapse before my reply; but I myself was hoping he would give me at yesterday's meeting the clarification I had asked of him with regard to the international control organization provided for in the Soviet plan, and in particular the time at which, in his opinion, the organization ought to be brought into operation.

If I have understood our discussions here aright, the delegations of the socialist countries, despite their reluctance to discuss the problem of control, are agreed that the inspections must start immediately the disarmament measures begin to be implemented. I imagine therefore that those delegations ought not to have any objection to establishment of the organization right at the outset, and that this is one of the first questions on which we ought to be able to reach agreement.

Leaving that aside until I can learn the views of the socialist countries' representatives on the subject, I should now like to answer Mr. Zorin's questions.

Mr. Zorin began by appearing to criticize me for having said nothing in my statement about considering the concrete disarmament measures which must form the whole programme of general and complete disarmament. But, unless I am mistaken, I clearly indicated in my statement the desirability of examining a perfectly concrete, practical and well-defined problem, that is of examining part of the "indissoluble ... duality" of disarmament and control. (TNCD/FV.10, page 5).

This is a very different thing from what Mr. Zorin yesterday stated that I said:

"... the representative of Italy ..., proposed that we should begin by considering the question of the whole system of control measures ..."

(TNCD/FV.11, page 38)

Again, Mr. Zorin appeared to doubt that it would be ---

"... the task of our Ten Nation Committee to prepare in great detail an agreement for setting up an international disarmament organization, and transmit it to other states for them to accede to it." (TNCD/FV.10, page 18)
I would point out to Mr. Zorin that -- I think this is undeniable -- when I made that remark I certainly did not mean it was the sole task of our Committee to prepare an agreement on the subject, nor did I desire to restrict or to limit its powers. I thought that was obvious.

Lastly, Mr. Zorin asked me a question which has no direct bearing on the creation of an international disarmament organization. He asked whether my delegation assumed --

"... that we will have to work out an agreement or a treaty on general and complete disarmament as such -- on all the disarmament measures which, taken together, will constitute the programme of general and complete disarmament?" (Id.)

It does not really seem necessary to give my delegation's views on this again, because they were very clearly expressed at the meeting of 21 March:

"... this discussion can be really decisive if we bend all our efforts to a search for speedy agreement on the specific measures without which a disarmament programme could not be achieved. This agreement, which would establish a basis for joint work and a fruitful initial understanding, could be followed by other discussions and other agreements aimed at the ultimate goal." (TNCD/FV.5, page 13)

In other words, my delegation considers that we must set to work with a will and with every sense of urgency on all measures which can lead towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective control, in accordance with the terms of the United Nations General Assembly resolution. We consider that the five Powers' plan is fully in harmony with that goal. The Ten Nation Committee must obviously study each of the technical problems, one by one, in a practical and realistic way, with the object of bringing the desires of the different sides into harmony on each problem and thereby clearing the way for the preparation of a treaty.

This progressive convergence of views which I hope will take place among us as examination of the various questions proceeds would be needed in order, little by little, to reduce mutual distrust and gradually to restore an atmosphere of mutual confidence, which is so important for the achievement of the goal we have set ourselves,

Obviously the agreements reached between us should be submitted, by the most appropriate means, to all states for their accession and we consider the most appropriate means to be the general disarmament conference as provided for in the second stage of our plan.
The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): If no other member wishes to speak I shall read the draft communique for today's meeting:

"The twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament was held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 30 March, under the chairmanship of the representative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

"The next meeting of the Conference will take place on Thursday, 31 March, at 10.30 a.m."

If there are no objections I shall regard the communique as adopted.

The meeting rose at 11.26 a.m.