

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



Thursday, 18 September 1958,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 9: General debate (<u>continued</u>):	
Speech by Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	21

President: Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Sessions of the United Nations General Assembly are events that always compel us to undertake a comprehensive review of the international situation and to see how our Organization is fulfilling the primary task defined in its Charter, which is to ensure the maintenance of international peace. This is particularly true of the present thirteenth session of the General Assembly because the current international situation remains extremely tense and is liable to flare up at any time, thus placing a special responsibility upon the United Nations.

2. Hardly a month has elapsed since the States represented in the United Nations met in this very hall for the third emergency special session of the Assembly to consider the dangerous situation which arose in the Near East as a result of the landing of United States troops in Lebanon and United Kingdom troops in Jordan. Today the world is once again faced with a serious and dangerous situation, on this occasion in the Far East where United States naval and air forces are being hurriedly dispatched and where the United States Government has for many years been acting as an aggressor, having laid its hands on territory which has been Chinese from time immemorial.

3. There would seem to be no dearth of proposals which would provide a basis for agreement on entirely feasible steps towards liquidating the "cold war", ending the arms race and promoting confidence and peaceful co-operation among States.

4. It is common knowledge that for over six months, the attention of the whole world has been focused on the Soviet Government's proposal to hold a conference of the Heads of Government of the States of the East and West for the purpose of reducing international tension. Why has this proposal taken hold of people's minds? Because everyone appreciates the danger of the present situation and sees how the world is being pushed step by step toward a military catastrophe as a result of the policy pursued by certain Powers.

5. There is, furthermore, a growing awareness of the fact that such a conference, at which the responsible

leaders of the Powers would meet for a frank discussion of the most urgent questions, would be the simplest way of finding means to prevent mankind from sliding into war. Hence, the idea of holding a conference is in the interests of every nation, in the interests of every individual, wherever he may live—in the West or in the East, in the North or in the South.

6. It must, however, be noted that, during the preparatory negotiations for the conference, attempts were made to prevent it from being held by means of presenting proposals which, as the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom were themselves well aware, could only serve as a means of impeding agreement and not as a basis for its attainment. For this reason, and for this reason alone, a summit conference has not yet been convened, though the need for it grows more pressing with every day that passes.

7. As we know, there are other widely supported proposals designed to terminate the "cold war", for instance, the proposals for the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and co-operation among European States, for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] and the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, for the establishment of a zone free of nuclear and rocket weapons in the centre of Europe and of course the ever-crucial proposals on disarmament, including those relating to the prohibition of atomic weapons and the elimination of the threat of atomic war.

8. Nobody can reproach the Soviet Union and the other socialist States with having taken no genuine measures to reduce international tension and strengthen peace. Does not the fact that the Soviet Union has reduced its armed forces by over 2 million men during the past three years speak for itself? And does not the unilateral cessation of nuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union point in the same direction?

9. If we analyse the present international situation, we may well ask what accounts for the fact that the world has recently more than once been within a hairbreadth of catastrophe?

10. If we get down to the root of the matter, we must admit that the policy of forging aggressive military blocs, the "positions-of-strength" policy pursued by certain circles in the United States, is responsible for the present aggravation of the international situation. Is this not demonstrated by the now imminent threat of a military conflict in the Far East involving the biggest world Powers? The fact that it has hitherto been possible to avert a catastrophe in time is primarily due to the unity of the peace-loving States and of all the forces that stand for peace and to their determination to do everything in their power to check and repel aggression.

11. As indicated by the decisions concerning the

withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan, which were adopted at the recent emergency special session of the General Assembly, our Organization has vast opportunities to further peace, provided that it does not submit to pressure by certain Governments which are disposed to view the United Nations, not as a centre for harmonizing the actions of States in the interests of peace, but rather as a machine for rubber-stamping resolutions that are to one Power's liking.

12. The disarmament question is certainly the most urgent and important of the pressing problems which the course of events is imposing upon the United Nations. In these days few people are unaware of the full danger of the continuing arms race which, like a mountain avalanche, is absorbing material and human resources on an ever-increasing scale and diverting them to the production of means of destruction.

13. Mankind has more than once been a victim of the policy of unrestrained accumulation of weapons in the arsenals of States. But will anyone dispute the fact that all the means of destruction possessed by mankind throughout the ages, including the period of the Second World War, taken together, would make up an insignificant fraction of what is now in the hands of two or three Powers? It does not require vivid imagination to envisage the fatal consequences of the current arms race if it is not brought to an end, if specific measures are not taken to curtail it, and if the use of weapons of mass destruction is not prohibited in good time.

14. Never before in peace time have such vast numbers of human beings been involved in war preparations. The following figures may be cited for purposes of comparison: whereas in 1929, during the temporary lull between two world wars, the direct military expenditure of all countries amounted to \$4.2 thousand million; in 1957, twelve years after the end of the Second World War, this expenditure rose to over \$100 thousand million. It should be noted that of this latter sum over \$60 thousand million represents the share of States members of NATO.

15. Other figures are equally significant. The number of men in the armed forces of States today is known to be in the tens of millions. It is also well known that for every individual serving in the armed forces there are several others working for the forces—in industry, agriculture, transport, communications, scientific research institutions, and so forth.

16. According to the most conservative estimates by economists, at least 100 million individuals are now directly or almost directly involved in war preparations. They are, as a rule, the most active and highly skilled individuals who are at the peak of their creative abilities. Judge for yourselves how much human energy, labour, knowledge and inventiveness are wasted for the sake of achieving aims which are fundamentally alien to the interests of the peoples—for the sake of preparing for a new world holocaust.

17. There was a time when States built up their armaments and carried out war preparations within their own national boundaries, on their own soil. While such a procedure cannot be justified, for it still constitutes preparation for war, the United States introduced an even more dangerous practice after the end of the Second World War. It has been doing everything in its power to cross the boundaries of other States and to

deploy within those States its armed forces and equipment, its atomic and rocket bases. It is seeking to impose one-sided agreements upon these States regarding the establishment of such bases and, in the event of resistance, it literally turns on the screw. One by one, more and more countries in Europe, North Africa and Asia, particularly those dragged into military blocs by the United States, are being caught up by the wave of feverish preparations for war on the North American continent.

18. Today we thus have not only a build-up of armaments by individual States, which has reached dangerous proportions, but a whole system of military and other commitments which are used to expand the arms race, to impel other States into undertaking increasingly intensive preparations for war. Take, for example, such countries in the North Atlantic bloc as Norway or Denmark. These States and their peoples can scarcely be suspected of harbouring aggressive intentions; yet, under United States pressure and contrary to the interests of their own security, they are being involved, step by step, in preparations for war.

19. The immense harm done to mankind by the arms race is in no way limited to the fact that it creates and, as each day goes by, increases the material resources without which an aggressor would be incapable of starting a war. The production of armaments, which is continuing on an ever-growing scale, is causing suspicion and tension in international relations, as is quite understandable in the circumstances, and those States which would like to devote all their energy and resources to peaceful construction and to improving the level of living of the people, are compelled to be constantly on their guard and to counter the arms race imposed upon them by taking the necessary measures to strengthen their own security.

20. The arms race and the state of "cold war" which have obtained in the world for some years now are affecting one sphere after another of peaceful relations between States and are precluding the establishment of sound, normal relations between them. They are leaving their mark on every aspect of the life of States and on the level of living, daily activities and way of life of their citizens. In many countries, excessive expenditure on armaments has seriously disrupted the economy. Ever greater sacrifices are being required of the taxpayer.

21. Instead of using the funds contributed to the budget by the population for the construction of houses, schools and hospitals, increasing old age pensions and sickness benefits, improving the national educational system, giving the working people broader access to the treasures of culture and art, thousands of millions are being poured into the production of means of destruction as if into a bottomless pit. Those who are deriving ever larger profits from the manufacture of weapons are thriving on military orders. For them, the end of the arms race would mean the loss of guaranteed, fantastically high profits. Would such people be disposed to reduce armaments when every day and hour their thoughts are concentrated on ensuring that the war production machine forges ahead at full speed?

22. Can the United Nations content itself in such a situation with the role of an outside observer? I can

well imagine that there are some in this hall who will deny that the United Nations has played such a role. Yet that view cannot be upheld without contradicting the facts. It is, after all, a fact that, because of the position taken by the Western Powers and particularly the United States it has not been possible for the United Nations to act as a body directing the efforts of States towards the implementation of disarmament—that is, of course, if we are talking about practical results and not about disarmament negotiations and the many tons of paper consumed by the records of the meetings held on this question. Naturally the Governments of a number of Powers would have no objection to the Soviet Union's disarming unilaterally while they built up their own armaments. But is that not asking too much of us?

23. The Soviet Government is ready and eager, as in the past, to carry on productive disarmament negotiations and is convinced that the more thoroughly questions relating to disarmament are studied at the General Assembly's current session, the more the cause of disarmament stands to gain. In its opinion, however, it is clearly futile to participate in any negotiations if they are to continue to be dominated by countries belonging to NATO. The participation of the USSR in such negotiations would only help to create the illusion that something was really being done to solve the disarmament problem, while those opposed to disarmament would continue to follow their previous course of accelerating the production of armaments, thus deceiving the peoples. Clearly the Soviet Union cannot associate itself with those who base their policy on the deception of peoples. Those Governments will not find in the Soviet Union a partner in any such doings. We have said this before and continue to say it, frankly and openly, in the United Nations and elsewhere.

24. Negotiations on disarmament should be conducted on a basis of equality. The Soviet delegation would be in favour of the establishment of a disarmament commission at least half of whose members would be chosen from among the States which are not members of the military blocs established by the United States and the United Kingdom, in other words, from among the socialist and neutral countries.

25. Plain common sense tells us that the longer the formulation of concerted measures on disarmament is delayed and the higher the mountains of stockpiled weapons grow, the more difficult it will be to begin disarming. Yet we should not forget another no less dangerous aspect of this matter. The technical characteristics of nuclear weapons are such that, once they have been placed in a state of combat readiness, they can be activated by the efforts of one or two individuals. Already, as we know, the number of existing nuclear weapons is considerable and more and more people are learning how to use them. There need only be, say, one mentally unbalanced person among them for a populated area of one country or another accidentally to become the site of a nuclear explosion. That in turn might lead to a series of atomic attacks and counter-attacks which no Government could foresee and which, like an irreversible chain reaction, no one could halt once it had been set in motion.

26. All these are facts, cold facts which no one familiar with the situation can in good conscience deny. When the advocates of the armaments race sometimes tell us that they, too, are opposed to atomic

war, that they shudder at the very thought of such a war, we may well ask how such statements of theirs can be reconciled with the facts which I have just mentioned, facts of which they cannot be ignorant and which increase the danger of atomic war with every passing day.

27. At this point I should particularly like to refer to the statements and declarations made by representatives of those countries which do not produce atomic weapons but which are bound hand and foot by their commitments in connexion with NATO and other aggressive military blocs. They often say that they are resolutely opposed to atomic war and that, far from intending to contribute to the outbreak of an atomic war, they are bent upon furthering the cause of peace. Yet their intentions and even the intentions of their Governments are one thing, while the objective logic of facts is quite another. There is good reason for the saying that the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

28. What is the use of their good intentions if the question of whether or not a nuclear weapon is to be used depends largely on the United States general or officer or even simply the airman who has his finger on the trigger of this fearful weapon? If in the past a spark at Sarajevo could kindle the flames of the First World War, because preparations were being made for it, if the attack on Ethiopia, the seizure of the Sudetenland by the Nazis and other similar actions by the Fascist aggressors could light the first fires which led to the conflagration of the Second World War, again because preparations were being made for it, then what of the situation that exists today, to say nothing of that which may confront us tomorrow, considering that the fuel for such a conflagration is now a hundred, even a thousand, times more dangerous than it was before? Add to all that the fact that today there are quite a number of people who are by no means opposed to atomic war, who in fact even extol it and are trying to accustom mankind to the idea that it is inevitable.

29. As a result of the growth of the forces standing for the defence of peace, war in our time is not inevitable and it is on this fact that the Soviet State has based and is basing its actions in the realm of foreign policy. Disarmament, in which the peoples see a reliable means of taking the sting out of aggression, can and must become a reality today. It does not matter if we start with isolated steps, provided that they are effective steps in the right direction.

30. The Soviet Government has been and remains an advocate of a radical solution of the disarmament problem involving a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments and the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, including a cut-off of their production and their elimination from arsenals. Yet our attempts to reach such a comprehensive understanding have invariably come up against the insurmountable wall of reservations and objections put forward by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries which have associated themselves with the policy of NATO. In the circumstances, the only practical way out of the present situation is to tackle the problem gradually, by stages, setting apart for early consideration those matters which are most urgent and ripe for solution.

31. The Soviet delegation submits for consideration by the current session of the General Assembly a memorandum of the Soviet Government on measures in the field of disarmament [A/3929], which outlines a programme embodying specific proposals with regard both to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments and to nuclear weapons. Provision is also made for the establishment of the appropriate international control over the implementation of disarmament measures. The Soviet delegation hopes that these proposals will be given due consideration by the Governments of the States represented in the United Nations.

32. In examining the disarmament question at the current session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Government considers that the United Nations should concentrate on the following urgent problems:

(1) The immediate and general discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests;

(2) The banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space;

(3) The reduction of the military budgets of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France.

33. The Soviet delegation proposes that the above questions, the solution of which would do much to advance the cause of disarmament and would contribute substantially to the easing of international tension, should be discussed as separate, independent items of the Assembly's agenda.

34. The question of the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, which we once again have before us in its entirety, need not in fact have appeared on the Assembly's agenda, for there was ample opportunity to solve it long before the current session. Indeed, after one of the three "atomic Powers", namely, the Soviet Union, unilaterally discontinued the testing of all types of nuclear weapons in the spring of 1958, all that was necessary to ensure the discontinuance of test explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs everywhere and for all time was for the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to respond by following the USSR's example. It is true that if that had been done, the agenda of our session would have been poorer by one item, but it may be presumed that nearly all of those here present would have been quite willing to forgo the item and would have expressed their satisfaction on that score.

35. Why did that not happen? Seek as we may, we cannot find two answers to that question. The facts which are known to all make it plain that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom do not wish to put an end to nuclear tests or in general to abandon the policy of engaging in an unrestrained atomic arms race. That and that alone explains why the explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs have not been silenced.

36. The United States Government's answer to the Soviet Union's discontinuance of test explosions of nuclear weapons was to carry out its largest series of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific Ocean in the period from April to September 1958. Similarly the United Kingdom Government did not hesitate to carry out test explosions of nuclear weapons. Those

two Governments did not even make any particular effort to conceal their haste to exploit the discontinuance of testing by the Soviet Union in such a way as to gain certain military advantages for themselves.

37. Such actions on the part of the United States and the United Kingdom have, of course, released the Soviet Union from its pledge not to carry out atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, a commitment which it undertook in the hope that the Western Powers would follow suit. Obviously the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom went a little too far, allowing themselves to be carried away by the idea of continuing to devise and test new types of nuclear weapons while the Soviet Union would sit with folded hands watching what they were doing and would not draw from the situation the appropriate conclusions in the interests of its own security.

38. There is not and cannot be any justification for the refusal of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to discontinue testing atomic and hydrogen weapons immediately and unconditionally. Yet the statements made by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on 22 August 1958 [A/3895, A/3896] lead us to fear that they would rather go on assuming full responsibility for preventing a positive solution of the question of a general renunciation of nuclear test explosions than discontinue their testing of atomic and hydrogen bombs.

39. All manner of far-fetched and fallacious arguments are being put forward in order to evade agreement on this question. By now everyone realizes the groundlessness of the assertions, which were widely made until very recently, that nuclear explosions could not be detected from a distance and that it would therefore not be feasible to control the observance of an agreement to discontinue tests. At the recently concluded Conference of Experts to Study the Possibility of Detecting Violations of a Possible Agreement on the Suspension of Nuclear Tests, held at Geneva, eminent scientists, specialists in atomic research from eight countries, made a comprehensive study of the possibilities of detecting nuclear explosions and reached the unanimous conclusion that it would be entirely practicable and feasible to establish control over nuclear tests.

40. Yet the advocates of continued nuclear tests are not daunted by the fact that their assertions run counter to the conclusions of both science and common sense. It apparently causes them little embarrassment that the position which they hold today is in direct contradiction to the line they were taking only yesterday. Just a short time ago they were asserting that they could not discontinue tests because it was allegedly impossible to ensure control over implementation of an agreement on the discontinuance of test explosions. Today they themselves are obliged to admit that the detection of nuclear explosions from a distance does not present any particular difficulties, yet they still refuse to discontinue tests. If we failed to get anywhere with the control question, these people reason, let us try some other way of complicating the attainment of agreement to discontinue test explosions. Thus we are confronted with a whole host of excuses and preliminary conditions.

41. A careful reading of the statement made by the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom on 22 August 1958 will show that there are so

many "firstlys", "secondlys" and "thirdlys" that the crux of the matter, namely, the discontinuance of tests, is completely obscured. Particularly indicative is the fact that one of the conditions put forward is the stipulation that the period of suspension of testing should be limited to only one year, and extension of the one-year agreement to be contingent upon the attainment of "satisfactory progress"—I repeat "satisfactory progress"—towards the settlement of the general problem of disarmament. Yet just one of those conditions is sufficient to demolish the assertions of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom that they are ready to discontinue nuclear tests. They are trying to link the simple and straightforward question of the discontinuance of tests to other more complicated questions of disarmament, to embroil it in a labyrinth of endless negotiations where at every step the Western Powers themselves have put innumerable obstacles in the way of an agreement.

42. While aware of what, to judge from their present position, can be expected of our partners, the United States and the United Kingdom, the Soviet Government has nevertheless agreed to open negotiations on the discontinuance of nuclear tests with the United States and United Kingdom Governments on 31 October 1958. It is entering these negotiations with a clear objective and a definite programme: the negotiations must ensure the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests by all States for all time and must not serve as a screen behind which agreement on a general discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests will continue to be sabotaged. We state here and now that this is what the Soviet Union will demand at the forthcoming negotiations, and let no one reproach us if we expose all those who attempt to go on sabotaging agreement on the discontinuance of tests.

43. Perhaps some of the representatives present in this hall will ask why the General Assembly should deal with the question of the discontinuance of nuclear tests if the Powers directly concerned are to open negotiations on that question on 31 October. I must take exception to this line of thinking. It cannot but contribute to the success of the negotiations among those Powers on which the discontinuance of tests directly depends if the General Assembly discusses and adopts appropriate recommendations on this question, which is of concern to all States. We are convinced that the Assembly would be doing a disservice to the cause of peace if it placed its reliance on the negotiations among the three Powers and failed to raise its own voice in favour of the immediate discontinuance of nuclear tests.

44. I should now like to turn to a problem to which few people were giving any thought as recently as a year ago, but which is attracting more and more attention at the present time. It is generally acknowledged that the greatest scientific and technical achievement of our age is the launching of artificial earth satellites, which has inaugurated man's invasion of cosmic space. This has infinitely broadened the opportunities for gaining knowledge of the universe around us and subordinating to man's reason and will the mighty forces of nature which he has discovered.

45. Like many other outstanding discoveries and achievements of scientific thought, however, these achievements can be used to the detriment of mankind as well as for its welfare. Everything depends

on what direction is given to the mastery of cosmic space—whether it is directed towards solving the problems of peaceful construction or serves the ends of destruction and war. In this regard, moreover, a great deal depends on the United Nations, which can and must take the necessary steps to prevent the latest achievements of science from being used for the further expansion of the arms race.

46. The invasion of cosmic space cannot be permitted to redound to the disadvantage of mankind, as happened, for example, in the case of the splitting of the atom, when the opportunities for the peaceful use of atomic energy were disregarded for many years and scientific thought was directed primarily towards the creation of weapons of mass destruction. Long before means were found of harnessing atomic energy in the interests of technological progress, it was put to use in the last stages of the war against Japan. Even today, moreover, the International Atomic Energy Agency prefers to deal with papers and resolutions rather than provide practical assistance to countries which need it.

47. In March 1958, the Soviet Government submitted for consideration by the thirteenth session of the General Assembly proposals for the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries, and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space [A/3818]. In view of the gigantic strides which science is making in the invasion of the cosmos, the Soviet delegation feels that these proposals should be discussed as an important separate item on the agenda of this session.

48. There is, of course, nothing surprising in the fact that in the Soviet Government's proposals the problems of the use of cosmic space are indissolubly linked—I repeat "indissolubly linked"—with the problem of the elimination of foreign bases on the territories of other countries. These are in reality simply different aspects of one and the same problem. After all, no one can deny that it is not the intercontinental missiles as such which are dangerous, but rather the atomic warheads with which both intercontinental and shorter-range missiles, not to mention bombers, can be equipped.

49. Of course, various States have different methods of delivering nuclear warheads, and these differences must be taken into account. The United States, for example, is irked by the fact that the Soviet Union has intercontinental ballistic missiles. But how can the Soviet Union be asked to close its eyes to the fact that the United States has established and is continuing to establish numerous military bases, whose aggressive purposes are frankly stated by United States military as well as political figures, near our frontiers on the territories of foreign countries?

50. When people propose to us that the problem of the peaceful use of cosmic space should be separated from the problems of disarmament, while remaining silent about the United States bases on the territories of other countries, their designs are all too nakedly apparent. In effect, it is proposed that the Soviet Union should be deprived of effective means of self-defence—no one, certainly, will deny that—whereas the United States should retain its military bases. The Soviet Government naturally cannot agree to a proposal to ban only intercontinental ballistic missiles, since that would place the Soviet Union in a position of inequality and would be prejudicial to its security.

51. A solution to the problem must be found which will place neither the United States nor the Soviet Union nor any third State in a privileged position and will meet their security interests in equal measure. Such a solution is the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes together with the simultaneous elimination of foreign bases on the territories of other countries, above all those of Europe, the Near and Middle East, and North Africa.

52. There are statesmen who believe that the world's future lies in the accumulation of every possible instrument of destruction. They view even the exploration and mastery of the cosmos in terms of filling with weapons the vacuum that girdles the earth. It is not by chance that all manner of literature dealing with a future war in the cosmos has appeared in the Western countries; nor is this by any means a matter of innocuous science-fiction novels, but rather propaganda for an annihilating war among the States which actually exist on our planet. These people think of the cosmos as a place from which atomic and hydrogen bombs hurtle down upon the cities and populated places of belligerents. The Soviet people cannot concur in these views. The Soviet delegation will expand its ideas on this subject in greater detail when the relevant agenda item is under discussion.

53. Disarmament is a complex and many-sided problem, and any projected measure in this field affects the most vital interests of States—those of their security. Experience has shown that this problem cannot be solved at one stroke and in its entirety in the present atmosphere of "cold war" and acute distrust among States. In these circumstances, only those who base their entire policy on the continuation of the arms race can refuse to seek measures to check and arrest the accumulation of arms—measures which may be limited at the start, but which are nevertheless concrete and capable of producing results even now.

54. A State's budget reflects as though in a mirror its economic life, its efforts in the area of peaceful construction and in the military sphere. A reduction in armaments inevitably leads to a decrease in budgetary appropriations for that purpose, and, conversely, curtailment of the funds earmarked for military purposes in the budget is a means of ensuring a reduction in armaments.

55. As we know, the proposal for a co-ordinated reduction of the military budgets of States was taken up during the disarmament negotiations, but it must be bluntly stated that the representatives of the Western Powers never had any taste for this proposal. Indeed, it was taken up only in connexion with other questions, and it was precisely this linkage that complicated the task of reaching an agreement on military budgets. At the present session, the Soviet Government proposes that this question should be considered as a separate measure which must be carried out regardless of whether it proves possible to reach an agreement on other disarmament problems. If we wish to find a way out of the vicious circle in which the disarmament negotiations are caught, then it must be broken at some point.

56. The Soviet Government's proposal is to reduce the military budgets of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France by 10 to 15 per cent and use part of the savings so effected for assistance

to the under-developed countries. We propose that part of the funds released as a result of the reduction in the military sections of budgets should be used to meet the urgent needs of the under-developed countries and that this assistance should be provided on a non-reimbursable basis. The countries which need such aid will themselves undoubtedly be able to determine the most expedient and effective ways of utilizing it—of utilizing it, moreover, not at some distant future date but here and now, and with no conditions of any kind attached.

57. Perhaps some will think that this proposal has its dangerous aspects, that it may lead to the curtailment of military production. But what if this prospect frightens those who have firmly committed themselves to the policy of the arms race and have made the production of instruments of death into a source of profits? The peoples, for their part, have nothing to fear from a reduction of armaments.

58. The Soviet delegation will submit an appropriate draft resolution on the reduction of these State budgets for consideration by the General Assembly in the conviction that a reduction in military expenditures will promote a slackening of the arms race, help to ease international tension, and permit a substantial reduction in the tax burden.

59. These, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, are the paramount problems in the field of disarmament which await consideration at the present session of the General Assembly.

60. A no less responsible task confronts the United Nations in connexion with the situation in the Near and Middle East. Two great Powers have committed aggression against two small Arab countries. The United States and the United Kingdom have sent their troops into the territory of Lebanon and Jordan in an effort to establish military, political and economic control over those countries and to pose new obstacles to the consolidation of the Arab peoples' independence.

61. This new aggression by the Western Powers in the Near East produced an outburst of indignation throughout the world and was condemned by the General Assembly. The keynote of the entire third emergency special session of the Assembly was the unanimous demand for the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from Lebanon and Jordan and the cessation of interference by foreign Powers in the domestic affairs of the Arab States. This demand found expression in a unanimously adopted Assembly resolution which spoke of the early withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon and United Kingdom troops from Jordan [resolution 1237 (ES-III)].

62. The immediate withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom troops from the Near East is the first and indispensable conditions which must be fulfilled if that region is to cease to be a smoking volcano which constantly threatens to inundate many countries and perhaps even the entire world with the lava of war. So long as there are United States soldiers in Lebanon and United Kingdom soldiers in Jordan, there is and will be no peace in the Near East; it would be dangerous to delude oneself on that score.

63. That is why the peoples, including our Soviet people, greeted with approval the General Assembly resolution affirming the necessity for the early withdrawal of foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan. The

time has come to see what action has been taken to comply with this United Nations decision. The Soviet delegation noted that the situation in Lebanon and Jordan has remained virtually unchanged, the foreign occupation of those States is continuing, and no date for the withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon and United Kingdom troops from Jordan has as yet been set. The statement by the United States Government that two of its battalions have been withdrawn from Lebanon has not changed the situation in the slightest, since what is needed is not a reduction in the United States and United Kingdom troops in Lebanon and Jordan, but their complete withdrawal down to the last soldier.

64. We cannot permit the negotiations which the Secretary-General of the United Nations is conducting to be used by the United States and United Kingdom Governments as a screen and a pretext to delay the withdrawal of their troops from Lebanon and Jordan. To put it bluntly, who will believe that the United States and the United Kingdom need anyone's special assistance to "facilitate" the withdrawal of their troops from those two countries? After all, they needed no help when they sent their troops into Lebanon and Jordan. And yet, when it became a question of withdrawing them, difficulties of some kind seem to have presented themselves, and for two months now the American and British have been unable to bring themselves to carry out this task, as though their soldiers in Lebanon and Jordan had been stricken with paralysis of the limbs.

65. At the third emergency special session, Mr. Dulles, United States Secretary of State, and Mr. Lloyd, United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, lulled us with vague promises that the troops of their countries would be withdrawn. It was easy to see what such promises were worth even then, and during the ensuing period even the most credulous realized that those promises had been used merely as a smoke-screen to conceal completely different plans. The fact that the United States and the United Kingdom have not yet withdrawn their troops from Lebanon and Jordan entitles us to ask whether they are not planning some sort of provocation as a pretext for further delay in withdrawing those troops.

66. The Soviet delegation reserves the right to request, within the next few days, that the actions of the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan and the delay in compliance with General Assembly resolution 1237 (ES-III) concerning the withdrawal of their troops should be examined at this session as a separate item if the delay continues.

67. The United States Government has of late persistently pressed a plan for the establishment of a so-called stand-by United Nations force to be sent into the territory of various States; the champions of this proposal do not even attempt to hide that their primary intention is to send troops yet again into the countries of the Arab East.

68. The Soviet delegation has already clearly stated its attitude to such plans at the recent emergency special session of the General Assembly. They can only be regarded as an attempt, on the part of those who suffered a political setback over their intervention in the Near East, to devise new, partly disguised ways of interfering in the affairs of the Arab countries and

other States under cover of the United Nations. Surely, the cold shower which those who engineered the aggression against Lebanon and Jordan received at the Assembly's special session should have sufficed. Yet today we see that it has not entirely deterred those who like to lord it in someone else's house. It is clear that, whatever the cost, they want to keep United States guns and tanks in the Near East in some guise or other, for example in the guise of a "stand-by United Nations force" and this does not apply to the Near East alone. I need hardly point out how greatly support for such plans would endanger the cause of peace and the United Nations itself.

69. The USSR delegation cannot pass over in silence the tragic events which have been taking place in Algeria for almost four years now. Unless we shut our eyes to evident facts we must recognize that in reality a war is being waged by a vast French army against the well-organized army of the Algerian National Liberation Front, which is fighting for its country's independence. It brings in its wake the loss of human life, the destruction of material wealth, and untold suffering for the people of Algeria. We think it is high time to put an end to this war, so destructive for Algeria and unpopular even in France itself.

70. There is a good deal of talk these days about the holding of a referendum in Algeria on the new French constitution, the adoption of which will determine Algeria's destiny. But how can we talk of free expression of the Algerians' will in connexion with this referendum, when there is in that country an army almost 800,000 strong which is suppressing by fire and the sword the national liberation movement of the Algerian people struggling for their independence?

71. The Soviet delegation considers that at this juncture France would do great service to the cause of world peace by eliminating this dangerous hotbed of war in North Africa. The French Government has every opportunity to do this by entering into direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front in Algeria with a view to resolving the Algerian conflict by peaceful means. This is the only way the war in Algeria can really be ended.

72. Furthermore, how can one speak without indignation of what the United Kingdom is presuming to do to two small Arab States—Yemen, and Muscat and Oman? For several years now the population of these countries has been subjected to barbarous raids by British bombers and incursions by British forces. What right has the Government of the United Kingdom—which is a Member of the United Nations and as such bound to respect our Charter—to resort to aggressive acts against these States? Can the United Nations ignore the crimes visited upon Yemen and upon Muscat and Oman? The Soviet delegation considers that the United Nations should have come to the defence of the peoples of these countries by condemning the aggression.

73. Less than two months after the intrusion of United States and United Kingdom troops into Lebanon and Jordan, the attention of the whole world is being focused on new dangerous actions on the part of the United States of America, this time in the Far East.

74. What is happening in the Far East? Underlying the menacing situation which has arisen there is the fact that a few years ago the United States committed aggression against China by seizing historic Chinese

territory—the island of Taiwan and the archipelago of P'eng-hu—and that it still continues in unlawful possession of these territories. It has converted them into a military base for itself, directed against the People's Republic of China and other peace-loving States, and is protecting with its weapons a clique of traitors who have fled from the wrath of the Chinese people.

75. The Government of the United States now threatens to spread the aggression by extending it to the off-shore Chinese islands, which lie a few kilometres from the mainland of China and which have been seized by the Chiang Kai-shek agents of the United States. The United States threatens to set its armed forces in motion in order to hinder the People's Republic of China in its lawful endeavours to liberate these off-shore islands.

76. The United States Seventh Fleet, which is in the Taiwan Strait area, is engaging in provocative military demonstrations, cruising in the approaches to the ports of the People's Republic of China. Under the eyes of the whole world, steps are hurriedly being taken to strengthen this fleet. Aircraft carriers, other United States warships and air force units are being transferred to Chinese waters in the Taiwan area from North America and from United States bases in the Philippines, Okinawa, the Hawaiian Islands and even the Mediterranean. United States warships and aircraft continue to trespass upon Chinese territorial waters and air space, while the supply of weapons to the Chiang Kai-shek group is continuing at an intensified rate.

77. All these military preparations are accompanied by an unbridled campaign of slander and threats against the People's Republic of China on the part of leading political and military figures in the United States, who evidently fail to realize that by acting in this way they merely strengthen still further the determination of the great Chinese people to free Taiwan, their own inalienable territory. That the Chinese people should do this is as inevitable as that night should follow day.

78. The greatest frankness in speaking their minds is often shown by representatives of military circles in the United States, who are not particularly concerned with diplomatic etiquette or political camouflage. Thus Vice Admiral Roland Smoot, commanding the United States forces on Taiwan, stated in public not long ago that the United States, together with the Chiang Kai-shek group, intended to "strike a blow at Communist China", and even promised to "lick" the People's Republic of China. There are even representatives of United States military circles who, having lost all sense of reality, are trying to frighten China with United States atomic weapons. Such statements on the part of United States generals and admirals are obviously a reflection of definite plans entertained in the highest leading circles of the United States. It is not idly that the United States Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy, echoes Smoot and his colleagues, not even flinching from uttering open threats against the People's Republic of China.

79. But McElroy was not the only one. The very "heaviest artillery" was brought to bear in Washington. The United States Secretary of State made, in the course of a few days, a series of statements which, on the most indulgent interpretation, can only be regarded as an open, gross threat of force against the People's Republic of China.

80. The Government of the United States not only continues to excuse United States occupation of the island of Taiwan, but presumes to go even further: it is arbitrarily establishing some sort of sphere of interest and even zone of operation for its armed forces in other parts of China's territory, more particularly in relation to the off-shore group of islands which lie within the territorial waters of mainland China and cover the approaches to the ports and large cities of the People's Republic of China. For the United States Secretary of State and its President, Mr. Eisenhower, have "recognized" that these islands are "required in insuring the defence" (their own words) of Chiang Kai-shek and the "security" of the United States, and in this connexion they declare that the United States has "deployed its armed forces" for action against the People's Republic of China.

81. References to "considerations of the defence" and "security" of the United States, which are still being used in leading United States circles in an attempt to cloak the activities of the United States in relation to China, are so absurd as scarcely to require refutation. We can hardly expect to find, anywhere in the world, people who are fools enough to believe that considerations of "defence" have prompted the United States to seize alien lands over 10,000 kilometres from United States territory. We can only ask what the Government of the United States would have said if another State had seized, say, Long Island, which lies at the entrance to the port of New York, and held it by force of arms, allegedly in the interests of its own defence.

82. But what false arguments aggressors use in order to absolve themselves! Juggling with universally known historical facts, they do not even flinch from referring to the lamentable memory of the Munich Agreement of the Western Powers with Hitler, asserting that they are intervening in China's affairs and threaten the People's Republic of China because they do not want another "Munich". But who can fail to see that connivance at United States aggression against the Chinese people, in the form, in particular, of the seizure of Taiwan and the attempts to extend the aggression to the off-shore islands of China, would indeed be a repetition of "Munich"? Anyone who folded his hands and failed to set his face firmly against the current provocative acts of the United States in the Far East would range himself alongside those United Kingdom, French and United States leaders who showed indulgence towards the aggressor on the eve of the Second World War, who abetted him, and who bear a heavy responsibility towards history and towards the peoples of the world for the unleashing of that war.

83. The attempts to give the actions of the United States against China a semblance of "legality" by referring to the treaty obligations of the United States to Chiang Kai-shek are just as unconvincing. From the legal standpoint this "argument" carries no more weight than would that of a man who picked someone's purse on the pretext that he was under an obligation to give the money to somebody else. The Chinese people have not asked the United States Government to assume any obligations whatsoever with regard either to Taiwan or to any other part of China's territory. Hence in a statement issued by Chou En-lai, the Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, on 6 September on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China it is stated with entire

justification that no so-called treaty concluded between the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek clique has any validity whatsoever for the Chinese people and can in no circumstances legalize the aggressive acts of the United States.

84. Let there be no mistake about the true meaning of the United States Government's present actions in the Far East and the consequences they are bound to have unless they are stopped in time. The United States Government is acting rashly in uttering threats and in embarking on adventures in its policy towards People's China. Those who are behind the military provocations against China appear to have forgotten that China is a mighty Power, whose people stand firmly behind their Government and have already considerable experience in repelling foreign usurpers.

85. It must not be forgotten that China is not alone; that the People's Republic of China has true allies ready to come to its aid at any moment in order to rebuff the aggressor by concerted efforts; and that among these allies is the Soviet Union. I take the liberty of recalling the words of N. S. Khrushchev, Prime Minister of the USSR, in a letter of 7 September 1958 to Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States. This letter states:

"...Let us, therefore, make this quite clear, for any misunderstandings and equivocal statements are most dangerous things in such matters.

"An attack on the People's Republic of China, which is a great friend, ally and neighbour of our country, is an attack on the Soviet Union. Loyal to its duty, our country would do everything to defend, jointly with People's China, the security of both countries and the interests of peace in the Far East and throughout the rest of the world."

The actions of the United States in the area of the Taiwan Strait, and its whole policy towards People's China, are arousing protests throughout the world and among the closest allies of the United States. In the United Kingdom, for example, even the press organs most loyal to the tenets of "Atlantic solidarity" have noted with horror in the past few days that the United States is prepared to unleash a world war for the sake of its adventures in Chinese territory, and recognize that Washington's actions "make even America's best friends despair". Even in the United States there is obviously a growing recognition of the fact that the present course of the United States Government in the Far East is lawless and dangerous, and constitutes a threat to peace in that area and throughout the world.

86. No one who really has the interests of peace at heart can fail to condemn the policy of threats and provocations, the policy of war, pursued by the United States against China; and one simple fact will become increasingly obvious, namely, that in the Far East there can be no lasting peace until the United States armed forces are withdrawn completely, once and for all, from the Chinese island of Taiwan and from the Taiwan Strait, until the United States ceases interfering in China's affairs.

87. The actions of the United States in the area of the Taiwan Strait focus particular attention on one method which certain Western Powers, and primarily the United States, have acquired the habit of using to gain their ends in the international arena. I refer to the

technique of military demonstrations on an international scale, the dispatch of warships and air force units to the ends of the earth, to the borders of States which they intend to subject to pressure or to direct force in order to impose their will upon them. I need mention only a few events of this year in order to make clear the extent to which these techniques have come into use.

88. When the legitimate Government of Indonesia took steps to suppress a group of insurgents in that country, the United States Secretary of State considered it proper to interfere openly in Indonesia affairs at the very height of the armed struggle. He made a public statement against the Indonesian Government while United States naval units appeared in the vicinity of Indonesia's coast.

89. The United States Government also found an excuse to send its marines into the territory of Cuba.

90. Were not these also the very methods employed by the United States and the United Kingdom this summer in the Near East? On that occasion, the excuse was provided by internal developments in Lebanon, Iraq and Jordan. The United States Sixth Fleet rushed to the shores of Lebanon and trained its guns on the country's capital. The United States Air Force blockaded the approaches to Beirut airport, and the British began a demonstrative concentration of their armed forces in Cyprus. Finally, as you know, United States forces made a direct armed intrusion into Lebanon and British forces into Jordan.

91. Today we perceive the same pattern. Once again United States naval and air force units are engaged in provocative demonstrations and threats are being uttered, this time against the People's Republic of China.

92. Large United States naval and air force units are rushing hither and thither, all over the face of the globe; they are being used by the United States Government as a sort of "big stick"—to use an expression which has gained currency in United States diplomatic parlance—held over the heads of States which refuse to submit to the dictates of Washington. It could be said that aircraft carriers, cruisers, bombers and fighters have become auxiliary instruments of the "diplomacy" of the United States Department of State.

93. We can only conclude from this that those circles in Washington which bear the responsibility for the present foreign policy of the United States have adopted the same methods of blunt threats and sabre-rattling as were once used by Hitler in preparing attacks on his victims. If threats of force are unavailing in one place today, then they must be used in another place tomorrow. But if those who utter threats are permitted to behave as they please and are not checked in time, then there is but one short step from the threat of arms to the actual use of arms.

94. We are entitled to ask, Who has authorized the United States Government to assume the role of an international policeman, to interfere in the affairs of other States and to make whatever arrangements for them that it may deem fit? How can this practice of military demonstrations and this exertion of pressure on other countries be accurately described? If it were not too charitable to do so, we might describe them as a form of modern international piracy and a recrudescence of ancient methods of colonial pillage. In

modern times, however, such conduct is as infinitely more dangerous as are rockets, jet aircraft and atomic bombs when compared with the halberds and muskets of the Middle Ages.

95. In the opinion of the Soviet Government, the General Assembly should adopt a decision prohibiting States from engaging in such movements of their naval and air forces for purposes of blackmail, intimidation and the preparation of aggression, and requiring that such forces should be kept within their national frontiers.

96. A peculiar result of the policy of the United States towards the People's Republic of China is the abnormal situation which we have witnessed for almost ten years in the matter of Chinese representation in the United Nations. It is because of the hostile and aggressive attitude of the United States Government towards the People's Republic of China—and for that reason alone—that there are no representatives of China in our midst.

97. In the United Nations, we have representatives of eighty States. These include representatives of Powers great and small, of ancient States and of young countries recently created. We all hail this and welcome the fact that our organization is so broadly representative. Can we then regard it as normal, even for one minute, that there are in our midst no representatives of one of the greatest and most ancient States in the world, China, which is one of the sponsors of the United Nations and within whose borders live approximately a quarter of the world's inhabitants? We must inevitably ask ourselves how long the United Nations will tolerate such a situation, which prevents it in many cases from speaking as a truly international organization.

98. For many years now an unseemly farce has been played in the United Nations around the question of the representation of China. Representatives of some Governments have on several occasions, without batting an eyelid and in all apparent seriousness, voted for the fiction that China is not China at all and that the impostor representing the Chiang Kai-shek clique is entitled to occupy the seat which belongs to the representatives of the legitimate Government of the great Chinese people.

99. We have long been waiting for the United Nations to put its house in order and to free the seat which rightly belongs to the representatives of the People's Republic of China. The delegation of the USSR urges that this be done.

100. The sabre-rattling of the United States in the Far East has also clearly encouraged the American puppet in South Korea, Syngman Rhee, who is again becoming active and is preparing a "march to the north". There can be no doubt as to the ignominious end which awaits the organizers of such an adventure. And there can be no doubt either that Syngman Rhee's supporters would not dare to engage in any military provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea without the approval and direct support of those who bear the responsibility for Syngman Rhee's conduct, namely the United States, which to this day maintains its forces in South Korea.

101. Again, why does the United States keep its forces in South Korea even after all the Chinese people's volunteer units have been withdrawn from North Korea. In Washington nothing is said on this subject; everybody remains silent. Perhaps the United States delegation

will inform the General Assembly from this rostrum when American forces will leave Korean soil? The United States Government does not and cannot have any justification for keeping its forces there. It must either withdraw them or let the entire world conclude that Washington is nurturing plans for a new aggression in that part of the world.

102. The events of recent months in the Near East and in the area of the Taiwan Strait have again demonstrated the true significance of the policy of erecting military blocs. Relying on a system of such blocs—NATO, the Baghdad Pact and the South-East Asia Treaty Organization—the United States has been able to use the ports, airfields and principal means of communications of West Germany, Italy, Turkey, the Philippines and other participants in these blocs, with the tacit or openly expressed support of the Governments of those countries, for transporting troops to areas where it commits aggression. It should now be clear to all that, in order to achieve their ends, the sponsors of military blocs do not hesitate to set the entire mechanism in motion and to drag in their partners behind them.

103. It may be said that this does not mean that the countries which now render assistance to the United States and the United Kingdom, even by permitting the use of their territories, wish to be drawn into dangerous events. Experience of the past shows, however, that an aggressor can drag many a country into an adventure involving interests alien to it merely because it had assumed in advance obligations devised for that very purpose.

104. Behind the false phrases about "joint defense against the communist threat", the "solidarity of the western world" and similar deceitful nonsense there are obvious dangerous designs. It is extremely difficult to convince a Ruhr miner or a southern Italian farm-labourer that his soil was used as a bridge-head for United States intrusion into Lebanon because of the need to combat "international communism". And what are the views on "Atlantic solidarity" of the inhabitants of tiny Iceland, against which its NATO "ally", the United Kingdom does not hesitate to send its fleet merely because the Icelanders dared to proclaim their sovereign rights over their country's territorial waters.

105. There is thus no cause for surprise in the fact that some of the members of the Western blocs are beginning to show concern and mistrust regarding the policy of the United States and the United Kingdom, and that increasingly more noticeable cracks are appearing in these military blocs.

106. The Soviet Government has always opposed the division of the world into military groups of States, as their existence seriously poisons international relations and is fraught with the danger of a military clash between them. The Soviet Government, together with the Governments of the other signatories of the Warsaw Treaty, has stated that it desires to find means of relaxing tension in relations between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the States members of NATO. That is in fact the purpose of the proposal for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between these two groups.

107. As a consistent advocate of the cause of peace among nations, the Soviet Union is ever concerned

about assuring security in Europe. In its view, European security can be truly assured only if the efforts of all European States are united, if they are brought closer together in the interests of peace and if broad co-operation is established between them. In this connexion, the conclusion of a treaty of friendship and co-operation by the European States, and the United States as well could be of great benefit.

108. We are living in tense and complicated times, with the world divided to opposing military groupings of Powers and with States having at their disposal unprecedented means of destruction. In these circumstances, the responsibility of statesmen for the policy they pursue, their responsibility towards peoples, is greater than ever before. It is only natural, therefore, that questions affecting the basic trends of their foreign policy should today be regarded by all States as of unprecedented acuteness.

109. If we assess the international situation by looking at the present state of international relations as a whole, and as it is in reality, it immediately becomes obvious that mankind must now choose between two courses of action for the future.

110. One course is to intensify further the differences and the animosities and to deepen the mistrust prevailing between the main groupings of States. This is the course we are being driven to adopt by the advocates of the "cold war" and of the policy of "proceeding from positions of strength". It is the course of those who daily engage in malevolent war propaganda. The adoption of this course would lead to a further widening of the present division of the world into military groupings, to an even greater hostility in their mutual relations and to a transformation of the entire world into one vast military camp bristling with every type of modern weapon, and we would be faced with the dangerous consequences which such a situation engenders.

111. The other course is the resolute renunciation by States of the use of force in their relations with other States; the cessation of war propaganda; strict respect of the right of all peoples and of all States to live their own life and to determine for themselves the system which they prefer; and the abandonment of the frenzied armament race in favour of the development of peaceful co-operation between States, without any attempt to place one country under another's control. This second course acquired its own distinct and clear-cut designation in international relations long ago. I have in mind, as you well know, the principles of peaceful coexistence between all States. These are based on the recognition of the simple fact that all States which now exist, regardless of their social systems, are situated on one planet and that there is no escaping that truth.

112. The fact that the world is indivisible was generally recognized already in the third decade of this century. The truth of this concept should therefore be even more manifest today, when technical development has reached such a level that all States, wherever they may be situated, have for practical purposes become close neighbours. They should consequently strive to develop peaceful relations between themselves if they do not wish to see the world engulfed in the conflagration of an atomic war.

113. The possibility of securing the conditions for stable and peaceful coexistence between States, regardless of their social structures, depends to no

small degree on the establishment of mutual trust and co-operation in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. We already drew attention to this, as you will recall, at the twelfth session of the General Assembly. ^{1/}As you know, the Soviet Government proposed to the United States Government the conclusion of a treaty of friendship, which could lay a solid foundation for co-operation between the two countries for many years. We have also submitted to the United States broad and concrete proposals for the development of economic co-operation. The fact that these proposals, which cover the most important questions in the relations between the USSR and the United States, have hitherto come to nought can be explained by the attitude of the United States, and of the United States alone, although we are convinced that an improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States would serve the interests of the United States and of its people no less than those of the USSR and of the Soviet people. The only persons who can fail to see this are those who have grown accustomed to thinking in terms of military blocs and cannot imagine a situation in the world in which all the barricades of the "cold war" have been pulled down.

114. The Soviet Government has always proceeded and still proceeds from the conviction that peaceful coexistence between States is inconceivable without free economic intercourse, without a large-scale development of international trade or without strict respect for the sovereign rights of States to dispose of their riches and natural resources. The Soviet Government considers that one of the principal keys to a lasting peace is trade freed from artificial restrictions and conditions which in recent years have been determined more by the general staffs of certain countries than by business circles, trade based on the principle of mutual benefit and the full equality of the parties.

115. Peace today can be compared with a boat in the ocean, which is in peril of being submerged by the waves. Yet some statesmen, instead of struggling to avert disaster, have begun to rock the boat so that it is already beginning to take on water. This, in their language, is called "keeping the world on the brink of war". They are doing it even now, today. Meanwhile, what human society needs is not a contest in the production of means of death and destruction or in the glorification of war. If rivalry, or rather competition, between States with different social systems is inevitable, then let it be competition in raising the welfare of the people and in amassing spiritual riches. Such competition will not divide peoples but will bring them together, directing their efforts to the service of peace and progress.

116. Our session is due to examine a number of questions which have a vital bearing on our quest for this goal. Permit me to express the hope that the General Assembly will prove itself equal to the tasks confronting it, and that the results of our work will contribute to the strengthening of peace.

117. The Soviet delegation, for its part, will do all in its power to contribute to the success of this session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, First Committee, 935th meeting.