

The process which has gone on could be described as follows: At the beginning of the negotiations in March, each side introduced a plan. After examining these plans, both sides concluded that the plan of the other side was not satisfactory. Subsequently after further reflection, each side introduced new proposals. These later proposals contained elements of balanced concessions to each others point of view. This development represented the normal course of a negotiation. Yet it was just at the stage when new proposals had been introduced by both sides that the negotiations were broken off. In other words, the interruption took place at the least logical time.

### Negotiations Must Go On

No matter how difficult the task of achieving agreement may appear, or how slow the progress may seem, there can be no valid reason for not pursuing disarmament negotiations with patience and perseverance. Those countries which have been given and which have accepted the responsibility for negotiation are bound to continue their search for agreement. World opinion expects no less of them, as we saw last year when the General Assembly unanimously pronounced that disarmament was the most important subject facing the world today. It is this expectation, on the part of the world community, which underlines the seriousness of the interruption in the work of the 10-Nation Committee just when it appeared that progress was being made. Let me illustrate this.

If the latest Soviet and Western proposals are compared, it becomes clear first of all that there is agreement on a number of general principles. East and West agree that the goal is general and complete disarmament. This is defined as the disbandment of all armed forces of all states except those required for internal security (that is police or "militia") and those required as the states' contribution to an international force to maintain peace under the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

It is recognized by both sides that general and complete disarmament requires the elimination of all weapons, except those required for the forces just mentioned. It is also agreed that the principle object of general and complete disarmament is the elimination of the weapons of mass destruction--nuclear, chemical and biological--and the means of delivering them.

It is agreed further that the process of disarmament throughout must be under effective international control--and by control is meant verification and inspection. Furthermore, it is agreed that an organization to carry on this control must be set up within the framework of the United Nations, that disarmament should be such that no nation or group of nations will gain a military advantage at any stage or through any measure.