

The Agency and the Scientific Conference are, I believe, two distinct operations neither of which would benefit from any attempt to confuse the two. The two operations are mutually supporting and aimed at the same general objective--the most rapid and effective international co-operation in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. The first--the Agency--is essentially a diplomatic operation, while the second is essentially scientific. The immediate object of the diplomatic negotiations is an appropriate piece of international machinery to assist in international co-operation. The conference will be producing ideas as to what the Agency should do, what forms of co-operation it should encourage, what priorities, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I began my statement by saying that international co-operation had been the outstanding feature in nuclear physics since the turn of the century and that without it we could never have pried open those few secrets of matter and energy to which we have now been given some degree of access. I think, for example, of that December day in 1942 when, through the efforts of scientists from a dozen nations, the first nuclear chain reaction was achieved in an old squash court under the west stands of the University of Chicago athletic stadium. To other fellow scientists who had contributed their knowledge and efforts from further afield, the now famous pre-arranged message was flashed: "The navigator has landed. The natives are friendly".

Since 1942, the forces of atomic energy have not always proved friendly to man. Indeed fears have been expressed, notably by those in the best position to speak with authority from full knowledge of the facts, that atomic energy could now be used in such a way that organic life on this planet would be destroyed. On the other side of the coin there is the dazzling possibility of a more abundant life in larger freedom made possible for all peoples through the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses. This is indeed a choice, as Mr. Bernard Baruch once said before the United Nations, between the quick and the dead. Our response to this choice cannot and must not be dictated by any narrow or shortrun concept of our national interests. We seek no special advantages for ourselves. We are not trying to turn the atom into a gimmick in the Cold war. Is it too much to hope that, in the situation in which we find ourselves as human beings on this planet, we might be able to agree to make a common attack upon the remaining problems which still bar us from the fullest utilization of atomic energy for peace? And might we not, in that joint enterprise, regain sufficient mutual trust to carry us forward in the common endeavour to eliminate all possibility of atomic energy being used for anything but peace?