

DISARM IN THE NAME OF HUMANITY

(Continued from P. 2)

"I would also recall that I suggested here last March that outer space be considered by the Committee of the Whole as a collateral measure. However, the co-chairmen have not yet agreed to place this item on the agenda for consideration by the Committee of the Whole. I hope that in the near future the question of banning weapons of mass destruction in outer space will receive the detailed examination it warrants.

GENERAL DISARMAMENT PROBLEMS

"I turn now to the task of reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament; in my view, a special effort is needed in the following main areas of the two plans before the Conference:

- (1) conventional armaments and armed forces;
- (2) chemical and biological weapons;
- (3) fissile materials and nuclear weapons;
- (4) nuclear-weapons carriers.

"Although serious differences have emerged with regard to some of these questions, on others there are elements common to the proposals of the United States and those of the Soviet Union, which I believe can be built up into significant agreement. I deal first with those items where the chances of early agreement are the greatest.

"The proposals of the two major powers on conventional disarmament lead to the same goal - the elimination of all arms and of all forces except those needed for the maintenance of internal security and international peace. The differences separating them have now been reduced by the Soviet acceptance of the idea of percentage reductions in this field. We consider that percentage reduction is the most logical and equitable method of achieving the goal and we are glad that the U.S.S.R. has accepted the principle. We hope it will come to recognize the virtue of extending this principle to the elimination of other means of waging war.

"The United States and the U.S.S.R. now agree that conventional armaments will be reduced by a total of 65 per cent in the first two stages of disarmament. With regard to armed forces there is a continuing difference over levels which should apply at the end of Stage I. However, there is virtual agreement on a level of about one million men at the end of Stage II.

"Here is a large and important area where the two sides are now very close together. This is an extremely significant development, for it means that agreement on the whole question of conventional disarmament has come within the reach of the Conference. Surely...further negotiations can remove remaining points of difference....

"Taken together, the other three points I have mentioned comprise the whole field of mass destruction weapons - namely, chemical and biological weapons, nuclear weapons, and the means for their delivery. How to deal with these weapons is the most crucial issue in the whole disarmament problem. Where do the two major powers stand on this?

"First of all, both countries have in the past endorsed the idea of joint technical studies in the field of chemical and biological weapons. During the first

round of the negotiations, the United States Delegation offered to bring such studies forward from the first stage of disarmament to the present negotiating period prior to the signature of a treaty. We have not had a reaction to this suggestion from the Soviet Delegation, but from their proposals of September 23, 1960, we assume that they are not opposed to the idea of a study in this area. Furthermore, we have evidence of numerous statements that the Soviet Union is anxious to make an early start in dealing with weapons of mass destruction in general. The Conference should therefore agree now on an immediate study of this question....

METHOD AND DEGREE

"Second, there is the elimination of nuclear weapons and fissile material. Under the United States plan the production of fissile material for weapons would be stopped in the first stage, and transfers from the past production to non-weapons purposes would begin. This process would be carried forward during the second stage until nuclear weapons, and fissile material for use in their fabrication, would have been reduced to so-called 'minimum levels'. While containing no provisions on this in Stage I, the Soviet plan calls for all such weapons and their components to be destroyed in Stage II. What then is the difference between the two sides? One calls for complete reduction and the other for reduction to 'minimum levels' by the end of Stage II. Surely these statements show that the main problem is one of method and degree - how precisely to bring about these reductions, and when. In our opinion, agreement on these questions can be reached by a more intensive effort.

"Third, there is the question of eliminating nuclear-weapons carriers; the issues involved here are among the most central to the negotiations and there are considerable differences between the two great powers. Both plans call for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons vehicles. If the differences were only of staging and timing, there would indeed be ample room for negotiations and compromise as to what might constitute a mutually-acceptable, balanced and verifiable reduction. But while, under the United States outline, the powers move towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons carriers by a 30 percent reduction in the first stage and by a balanced elimination of the remainder in Stages II and III, the Soviet Union claims that complete abolition could be achieved in the first stage. The discussions in this Conference have shown that a 100 percent reduction in the first stage would be incompatible with the principle of balance to which Mr. Menon referred this morning and would raise grave verification problems. I am convinced that opportunity for genuine negotiations will exist only if neither side holds to totally uncompromising positions....

"In conclusion, my principal purpose in addressing this Conference is to lay this point squarely before you: This is the time and this is the place for action on disarmament; if we cannot make progress in this Committee, which is ideally constituted for the purpose, then what real possibility remains for coping with this most vital problem facing mankind?"