

Insistence on reactionary concepts of sovereignty is not good enough in the modern world and it has been expressly disavowed in the last paragraph of our resolution which pledges all nations to renounce the "individual exercise of such rights of national sovereignty in the control of atomic energy as are incompatible with the promotion of world security and peace". World security, everyone now admits, requires international control of atomic energy and by our resolution, rights of national sovereignty must not be permitted to stand in the way of such control. Surely, no one can refuse to accept that principle. To put it another way, in this resolution we state in effect that in the field of atomic energy we can have no solution that does not involve a willingness on the part of all governments to exercise their rights, cooperatively rather than individually. No amount of double talk or sophistry can obscure the essential truth of this statement. If any delegation, by insistence on a reactionary and negative interpretation of national sovereignty, frustrates the effort we are making to ensure that atomic energy shall be used only for peaceful purposes, it will bear a very heavy responsibility.

The final principle which I want to mention, and which underlies the resolution which we are putting forward, is that we must not give way to despair or defeatism in this matter. It may even well be that the development of atomic energy in the U.S.S.R. may hasten agreement, by giving the rulers of that country more knowledge of the fateful implications for good or for evil, of this power, and more understanding of the scientific processes which any adequate system of control must take firmly into account. As Soviet knowledge and experience grows, and as our own sincere desire to find an agreed solution becomes understood, the Assembly and the Soviet plans may be brought closer together.

This process might be facilitated if the permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission could examine in greater detail than heretofore the positive and constructive side of atomic energy development. There is, of course, much still to be learned in this field, but it is clear already that this development holds the promise of great good for mankind. The secrecy which must surround this subject as long as security considerations remain paramount will, of course, interfere with such an examination. Nevertheless, even with this limitation, some valuable work could be done. We could at least find out how political insecurity hampers the development of atomic science; hinders the spread of knowledge, and the sharing of facilities among those nations most in need of technical assistance and industrial development. To these nations the promise of atomic energy applied to the arts of peace is of particular importance. To them, there should be great hope in the international cooperative effort for the peaceful exploitation of such energy, which the "majority plan" provides.

I have suggested that this Committee in dealing with the present difficult situation should be guided by certain considerations—keeping the door open; keeping our minds open; maintaining our sense of responsibility and refusing to gamble with the peace and security of the men and women, all over the world, whom we here represent. I have stressed the dangers that would arise if we should mislead the world.

It seems to me, however, that we must not only avoid misleading world public opinion. We must seek positively to inform it on this vital subject. In this connection, I would commend, for careful study not only by delegates here, but by people everywhere, the statement recently submitted to the Assembly by the Representatives of China, France, the United Kingdom,