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The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): In the absence of the representative of Romania I have assumed the Chair, being the next in order for the chairmanship of this Conference. I declare open the forty-eighth meeting of the Conference.

In my capacity as representative of the United Kingdom I would like to make a short statement reporting on the conversation I had with Mr. Zorin, the head of the Soviet delegation, yesterday evening. I called on Mr. Zorin and asked him whether it was the intention of his delegation to abandon all hope of further negotiation before the letter from Chairman Khrushchev had even been seen by the Heads of the Governments to which it had been addressed. I then went on to explain to him what we considered to be the juridical position of the present Conference. I said that the Soviet Union and its allies could not bring these meetings to an end by unilateral action. I referred to the fact that the Conference had been set up as the result of an agreement among four Foreign Ministers and said that the action of one of those Foreign Ministers could not terminate the proceedings. I also called attention to resolution 1378 (IX) of the General Assembly and told Mr. Zorin that in those circumstances the Western delegations would continue the Conference.

In reply, Mr. Zorin said that the Soviet Union had not stopped the Conference but that the Conference had come to an end because the West -- so he alleged -- would not discuss disarmament measures. I then asked Mr. Zorin whether he was even prepared to wait in Geneva until the Heads of Government had had a chance to reply to Mr. Khrushchev. Mr. Zorin replied, "I have nothing more to say", and he referred to his statement yesterday morning that:

"... the Soviet Government is breaking off its participation in the Ten Nation Committee..." (TNCD/PV.47, page 7)

Finally, I criticized the action of the Polish Chairman, connived at by the Soviet Union, in refusing to allow even inscribed Western representatives to speak and said that this was behaviour which had no parallel in any previous international meeting. I reproached Mr. Zorin for his special responsibility in breaking off the talks in view of the fact that he had already been informed that new Western proposals were about to be submitted. He refused any further discussion of this matter.
I thought I should draw the attention of my colleagues to this conversation in order that we should be quite clear about what has now taken place. We now recognize the fact that the Soviet Union, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania and Czechooslovakia have declined to attend the forty-eighth meeting of the Conference.

Does any other representative wish to speak at this time? If not, I propose a short suspension of the meeting for an off-the-record discussion among the five delegations here.

I hear no objection, and we shall therefore suspend the meeting for a few minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 10.45 a.m. and resumed at 10.55 a.m.

Mr. MOCH (Franco) (translation from French): The representatives of the Western Governments take note of the refusal of those of the Eastern Powers to participate further in the work of the Ten Nation Conference. This unilateral decision is contrary to the agreement concluded on 7 September 1959 between the four Foreign Ministers. It is all the more inopportune in that it was taken less than four weeks after the new Soviet plan had been presented, and barely a few hours after the return of the United States representative from Washington with new proposals which the Western representatives had just begun to study.

The representatives of the Western Powers call the attention of world opinion to the statements contrary to the facts made in this connexion by the representatives of the East.

It is wrong to state that the negotiations reached a standstill because of the Western Powers, for the latter were still studying a plan of vital importance for all nations, the examination of which would quite clearly have required more than four weeks, and were preparing counter-proposals. The Eastern representatives preferred to break off negotiations abruptly rather than take cognizance of those proposals. That default makes it impossible to proceed with the work.

It is wrong to maintain that the Western objective is control without disarmament. It has always been, and remains, general and complete disarmament
under effective control. For control to be effective the international inspectors must verify not only the accuracy of declarations, i.e. that they tally with the stocks declared, but also their honesty, i.e. that there are no clandestine stocks. The Eastern representatives have always refused to give a clear and precise answer to this question of principle.

The Western representatives earnestly draw attention to the fact that no disarmament will ever be possible unless the nations of the world are certain that it is being properly carried out by all.

It is wrong to claim that the Soviet plan ensured the security of all States. Some of its provisions gave the East an immediate military advantage; others were so vague, or had to be implemented within such short time-limits, that propaganda must have played a larger part in their presentation than any desire to disarm.

The Western representatives asked precise and clear questions about the Soviet plan. Many replies essential for a proper understanding of the plan were never given them, in spite of their repeated urging. Similarly, all their requests for clarification of obscure or impracticable provisions led to nothing but mere repetition of those provisions, without further explanation.

The Western representatives also take note of the act of intimidation attempted by the Polish Chairman of the first part of the meeting of 27 June. During the five successive statements by the Eastern representatives, two Western representatives had asked to speak: one in writing, the other orally, but on two occasions. Although duly notified, the Chairman attempted to close the meeting improperly after the statements by the Eastern representatives, in order to leave unfounded accusations on the record and prevent any reply. This significant act, unworthy of any assembly, was also ill-conceived, since the Western representatives properly continued the meeting after their colleagues' default.

Apart from these intimidation tactics, the successive and abrupt volte-face decided on in Moscow should be known and meditated on. The most recent of them is glaring. At the meeting of 24 June, the representative of the Soviet Union put numerous questions to the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, who took the trouble to be in a position to answer him at the next meeting on 27 June.
That day, having received instructions, he put an end to the negotiations without seeking to know either those answers or the new American proposal. Such behaviour can only increase distrust and tension.

It has thus been proved that the Soviet representatives presented plans, not in order to have them discussed and to seek an agreement, but to get them accepted en bloc or to exploit them for propaganda purposes.

Already responsible for the failure of the Summit Conference, the Soviet Union is also responsible for the cessation of negotiations on disarmament. It does not appear to be in any hurry to see them succeed, for it is putting them off for four months by referring them to the regular session of the United Nations General Assembly. That is further proof that the Soviet Union is mainly interested in propaganda.

The Western representatives clearly reaffirm their determination: neither now nor in the future will they give way to attempts at intimidation. But as representatives of the free world they have sought, and will seek again with all their strength, to fulfill the hopes of mankind and to build a disarmed world delivered from the nuclear threat.

Mr. Eaton (United States of America): Speaking on behalf of my Government and on behalf of all the Governments represented here, I should like, in closing, to extend our thanks to the Secretary-General, to Dr. Protitch, to Mr. Epstein and to the entire Secretariat, including the interpreters and the verbatim reporters, for the excellent way in which they have serviced this Conference.

The Chairman (United Kingdom): I am sure it would be the wish of all representatives here to associate themselves with those words of thanks which have been expressed by Mr. Eaton, and it will be so recorded.

I think it would also be the wish of the meeting that we have the verbatim record of today's meeting made public as soon as possible, in conformity with the decision which we took concerning the verbatim record of yesterday's meeting.

If I hear no objections, I shall take that as agreed.

We now have the problem of reporting our proceedings here to the United Nations. I think the only proper action we can take in the circumstances is to
Ask the United Nations Secretariat to forward all the verbatim records and documents of our meetings to the United Nations. Does that meet with the agreement of all the representatives present? It is so agreed.

I think a request on those lines to the United Nations Secretariat should appear in the communique of our meeting today.

Does any other representative wish to speak? If not, I should like, on your behalf, to add some words of thanks to the Swiss Government, which has acted as our hosts while we have been here, and also to the authorities of Geneva. I hear no objection, and it will be so recorded.

We shall now turn to the communique. I shall read out the suggested text:

"The forty-eighth meeting of the Conference of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament was held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 28 June 1960, under the chairmanship of the representative of the United Kingdom.

"The Conference requested the United Nations Secretariat to forward all records of the Conference to the United Nations".

I am just considering whether the records of the Conference should be sent to the United Nations Disarmament Commission or whether they should also go to the General Assembly.

Mr. MARTINO (Italy) (translation from French): I think we could use the wording which appears in the communique of 7 September 1959 on the setting up of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament. It reads as follows:

"For this purpose the four Governments have agreed that the Committee will present reports on its work" — here the word "reports" will have to be replaced by the words "the records of the Conference" — "to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and through it to the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council."

(DC/144, pages 2 and 3)

This is the wording I think we might adopt:
"to forward all the records of the Conference to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and through it to the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council".
The CHAIRMAN (United Kingdom): I think that is a sensible proposal and, if everyone agrees, it will appear in the text of the communiqué, which now reads as follows:

"The forty-eighth meeting of the Conference of the Ten Nation Committee on Disarmament was held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on 28 June 1960, under the chairmanship of the representative of the United Kingdom.


"The Conference decided that the verbatim record of the forty-eighth meeting should be made public as soon as possible."

"The Conference adjourned at 11.10 a.m."

Are there any other comments on the communiqué? If not, I shall regard the communiqué as adopted.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.