

I think any objective observer would agree that the Western Powers have adopted a co-operative attitude in reviewing the disarmament problem in the Sub-Committee. This, unfortunately, is more than can be said for the Soviet attitude during the London discussions. Listening to Mr. Malik in London in 1954 made us feel we were still back at Lake Success in 1946. The Soviet Union delegation repeated once more the age-old proposal for an arbitrary one-third reduction of the armed forces of the great Powers without first ascertaining the respective strengths of the Powers at the present time. They have also asked once again for the dismantling of military bases established by the Western Powers under NATO, but have said nothing about Soviet bases or other forms of military assistance.

The end of the London talks should not be regarded as a final breakdown of negotiations on the problem of disarmament. As I indicated earlier, the Sub-Committee was called upon to submit a report to the Disarmament Commission by mid-July. The members of the Sub-Committee considered that the time had come to inform the Commission of its work without prejudice to the final outcome of efforts to reach a settlement. There is no doubt that the differences between the positions of the East and the West in this matter have been narrowed during the lengthy discussions which have taken place in recent years, and it is fair to suggest that these positions may have been further narrowed during the London talks.

One thing is certain: The responsibility for any progress made lies entirely with the West. The Western Governments have made an earnest attempt to meet the criticism of their position by the Soviet Union. Had there been any evidence from the Soviet Union delegation of a wish to negotiate seriously on this subject, I feel confident that greater progress might have been made.

---

S/C