



Texts of Speeches by

V. M. MOLOTOV

**on General Reduction
of Armaments**

at the General Assembly
of the United Nations

November-December, 1946

Texts of Speeches By

V. M. MOLOTOV

*Minister for Foreign Affairs of the
USSR, Head of the Soviet Delegation
to the General Assembly of the
United Nations Organization*

on

**GENERAL REDUCTION OF
ARMAMENTS**

at the

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

November-December, 1946

NEW YORK CITY

Contents

	Page
Speech of November 28.....	3
Speech of December 4.....	10
Speech of December 13.....	16

Published by
The Embassy of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics
at 3031 Gates Road, N. W., Washington 8, D. C.
December, 1946

Speech of November 28

In Committee I

I

The Problem of Reduction of Armaments

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen:

TODAY we begin the examination of the question of a general reduction of armaments. It is unnecessary to dwell on the importance of this question today. The timeliness of the discussion of this problem is evident.

Still fresh in everyone's memory are the great events of the Second World War when tens of millions of people were mobilized for active service, when the fronts stretched for many thousands of kilometers, when whole countries were given over by the enemy to a "flood of pillage," when the sacrifices of the war reached vast and unprecedented proportions. The Second World War in many respects overshadowed the First World War in its dimensions and, in fact, spread over the whole world.

If the lessons of the First World War were insufficient to prevent the sanguinary events of the last few years, the Second World War should convince us at last that it is essential to take serious measures now to prevent another similar war. This is particularly felt by the people of those countries which experienced the invasion and brutality of the fascist hordes, the disaster of enemy occupation and the disorganization of all economic life, and who will for a long time to come be engaged in healing their war wounds and restoring devastated towns and villages, for which they must strain all their efforts, as the people of the Soviet Union are now doing.

The war ended in a glorious Allied victory. Our common enemies are defeated and disarmed. We have every possibility of keeping the former aggressors under the control of the peace-loving states, of not allowing them to rearm and again threaten aggression.

There has been created an international organization whose task it is to defend the peace and security of the peoples, and to

prevent the rise of new aggression. We must all work in the direction of strengthening trust and friendly relations among peoples, developing international cooperation in the interest of the consolidation of universal peace, the national liberation of dependent countries and a real advance in the well-being of the peoples, the working masses.

In these conditions, a general reduction of armaments will serve the cause of peace and international security, by strengthening confidence among large and small nations. The examination of this question by the United Nations should put an end to the armaments race which has started, and which promises nothing good, but already shows upon whom the main responsibility for its consequences lies. At the same time, general disarmament is essential in order to reduce military budgets and cut state expenditure on the production of armaments, without which it is impossible to lighten the burdens of taxation borne by the people, who will be unable to carry this load for long without complaint. Thus, the reduction of armaments is essential and urgent and serves the vital interests of large and small states.

A general reduction of armaments should extend to all countries and cover all forms of armaments. Only in this case will it achieve its aim.

The opinion was expressed at the General Assembly that the initiative of the Soviet Union in the matter of the reduction of armaments was proper, in view of her powerful armies. Well; the Soviet Union indeed created a powerful army, when it was necessary, in order to defend her national honor and liberty, and when this was required by all the freedom-loving nations which were subjected to fascist aggression. But the situation has changed since the forces of aggression have been smashed and peace re-established. That is why the Soviet Government, true to the interests of peace and friendship among nations, took the initiative in raising the question of a general reduction of armaments.

First, it is a matter of reducing armies, the numbers of which should be diminished in the period of peace which has begun. It is also a matter of reducing naval and air armaments, the size of which is now in certain cases quite inappropriate to peace conditions. It would be well if the powers possessing the most powerful naval and air forces were to take the same course as the Soviet Union and display corresponding activity in the matter of the reduction of armaments.

Naturally the problem of the reduction of armaments includes also the question of technical military means. It is just for this reason that the question of a general reduction of armaments was raised, and not simply of a reduction of the armed forces. Everyone understands that the problem of armament reduction touches not only upon army and navy personnel but also includes the question of military technique, the question of technical military means, regarding which in some cases measures for reduction should be taken and in other cases measures for their direct prohibition.

The Charter indicates the power of the General Assembly in relation to the problem of the reduction of armaments. Article 11 of the Charter says the General Assembly is invested with power to consider "the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments." In conformity with this the Soviet Government has proposed that the General Assembly pass a decision recognizing the necessity of a general reduction of armaments.

We do not think that the General Assembly can at this moment make a detailed decision on this question. It should, in our opinion, recommend that the Security Council work out appropriate concrete instructions. The recommendation adopted by the General Assembly should be the starting point in this matter, which is of extreme political importance.

II

Prohibition of Atomic Weapons

THE question of atomic weapons assumes great importance in connection with the consideration of the problem of reduction of armaments.

The following proposal appears in the Soviet Government's draft: "The implementing of the decision concerning the reduction of armaments should include as a most urgent task the prohibition of the production and use of atomic energy for military purposes."

The General Assembly at its London session at the beginning of this year passed a decision establishing an Atomic Energy Commission. In defining the powers of the Commission the decision provides that it should work out a proposal concerned with the "exclusion from national armaments of atomic weapons and of

all other basic types of armaments which could be used for mass destruction."

The General Assembly, therefore, has already recognized the necessity of raising the question of prohibiting the use of atomic energy for military purposes. We must draw our conclusion from this decision. It would be an error to put off making a decision on this subject, as it might give rise to doubt as to the real character of the above-mentioned decision of the General Assembly.

In conformity with this decision of the General Assembly the Soviet representative on the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. A. A. Gromyko, moved the following two proposals:

1. Draft of an international convention to prohibit atomic weapons.

2. Plan of work of the Atomic Energy Commission for the initial period.

In the draft of the international convention for the prohibition of the production and use of atomic weapons, the views of the Soviet Government on this question are set forth. This draft is based on a realization of the great significance of the discovery of atomic energy, inasmuch as this discovery will be used for improving the life of the peoples of the whole world, for increasing their welfare, and for advancing human culture. At the same time mention is made of the fact that the use of atomic weapons is dangerous, not so much for armies as for cities and their populations. It is well known that many articles have recently been written just to create a panic about atomic bombs, although no one has yet proved, and no one can prove, that atomic bombs can play a decisive part in the course of a war. It is, however, unquestionable that for large cities, and, therefore, for civilian populations, the use of atomic bombs may have extremely serious consequences.

Considering all this, as well as the above decision of the General Assembly, the Soviet Government has submitted a draft for an international convention prohibiting the production and use of atomic weapons, and suggested the outlawing of atomic weapons by this convention. This draft provides that governments should undertake not to use atomic weapons under any circumstances, to forbid their production, and to destroy stocks of atomic bombs.

Furthermore, the Soviet Government has submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission a plan of work for this Commission in its first period, which provides for the working out of the above convention, as well as for determining measures for prohibiting the

production and use of atomic weapons and all other armaments which could be used for mass destruction. At the same time it was proposed that measures be worked out for control over the use of atomic energy and over the observance of the terms of the international convention for the outlawing of atomic weapons; also that a system of sanctions be worked out against the unlawful use of atomic energy.

These proposals of the Soviet Government have as yet received no support in the Atomic Energy Commission. It is, however, quite obvious that they conform to the interests of all peace-loving peoples, and that they serve to strengthen confidence among them, not to mention the fact that they are the direct conclusions of decisions accepted earlier by the General Assembly.

Indeed, about 20 years ago, an international agreement was concluded prohibiting the use in war of asphyxiating and poisonous gases and liquids, and also of bacteriological methods. Since then no one has had any doubt that this course of action was entirely right. It is not hard to imagine how much greater could have been the suffering and the number of victims in the last war if there had not been this prohibition of the use of poisonous gases and liquids and dangerous bacteriological methods for purposes of war. But if this was right in relation to gases and bacteriological methods, all the more proper is a corresponding prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes.

Refusal to conclude an international convention on the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for purposes of war directly contradicts the finest aspirations and the conscience of the peoples of the world. That is why we all have the right to hope that a unanimous opinion will eventually be reached among governments on an international convention prohibiting the use of atomic energy for purposes of war.

III

Necessity for Control and Inspection

THE problem of a general reduction of armaments places before us the task of establishing control over the carrying out of the decisions which will be made on this question. Inasmuch as a decision will be made on the prohibition of the use of atomic

energy for purposes of war, effective control over the implementation of this decision is also necessary.

When we speak of control over the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons, we must bear in mind the importance of this task. Of course, this question must be elaborated in detail. We cannot exclude the possibility that disputes will arise on separate aspects of this problem. Nevertheless, we should acknowledge that, inasmuch as we are dealing with the establishment of control in such a serious matter as atomic energy, we should all agree with the correctness of a recent statement of the head of the Soviet Government, J. V. Stalin, that in this case "strong international control is needed." If we agree in principle with the necessity for strict international control, we should also be able to reach an agreement on the concrete matters relating to control over the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for purposes of war and over the implementation of the decision which will be made on the general reduction of armaments.

The Soviet Delegation accordingly submits a supplement to the proposal on the general reduction of armaments which I brought before the General Assembly on October 29. This is the supplementary proposal:

"To ensure the adoption of measures for the reduction of armaments and prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes, there shall be established within the framework of the Security Council, which bears the main responsibility for international peace and security, international control operating on the basis of a special provision which should provide for the establishment of special organs of inspection, for which purpose there shall be formed:

"(a) A Commission for the control of the execution of the decision regarding the reduction of armaments;

"(b) A Commission for the control of the execution of the decision regarding the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes."

The Soviet Delegation thinks that this proposal provides a basis for the solution of the problem of control and inspection. The adoption of such a decision would further assist such a solution.

In conclusion, I think it necessary to recall the history of the disarmament question.

You know that the League of Nations, too, dealt with problems of the reduction of armaments. More than one special conference

was convened for the examination of this problem. The failure of these conferences is remembered by everyone, and should serve as a lesson to us all.

The problem of the general reduction of armaments is again before us. The peoples of the whole world will follow with great attention what the United Nations Organization does in this connection. It is up to all of us to determine the fate of this question.

We must now concern ourselves with the task of achieving a general reduction of armaments, sweeping aside all obstacles in our path. The Security Council, which bears the main responsibility for ensuring universal peace, should begin the examination of this problem in the near future. For its own part, the Soviet Government will take an active part in any measures to promote a rapid and practical solution of the problem of a general reduction of armaments.

Speech of December 4

In Committee I

I

Aims of the Soviet Union

Mr. Chairman, Delegates:

A CONSIDERABLE number of delegates have spoken here on the question of reduction of armaments. The Soviet Delegation notes with satisfaction that the majority of speakers have given this proposal a positive evaluation. Consequently we may consider that there is a prevailing opinion among the United Nations on the necessity of starting reduction of armaments.

Referring to some of the speeches, I must first of all dwell on the declarations of the British delegate, Sir Hartley Shawcross. His stand is somewhat contradictory. On the one hand Sir Hartley Shawcross might be understood in the sense that he, just as others, is in favor of adopting a decision on general reduction of armaments. Yet on the other hand, there is apparent in his speeches an expression of strong disapproval of the fact that this question has been raised for the General Assembly to consider.

Only thus can one explain the flood of doubts and suspicions which pours forth when he speaks and gives warning about possible fraud, traps and propaganda, to which subject he has devoted so much of his gift of eloquence. Let us hope, however, that he will give us a clear answer, when the issue is decided as to who is in favor and who is against a general reduction of armaments, who is in favor and who is against prohibiting the atomic weapon.

Various questions arise when one hears speeches of that kind. Perhaps the Soviet Government was wrong in posing the question of general reduction of armaments? But no one here has frankly said so. Or perhaps this question has been raised at the General Assembly at the wrong time? No one has definitely said this either.

Some people hint that collective security should be first ensured, and only then should disarmament be launched. The incorrectness of such an argument can be easily observed. Anyone can under-

stand that general reduction of armaments under the leadership of UNO will undoubtedly fortify international security. Consequently those who care for international peace and security should strive for the realization of general reduction of armaments. Otherwise reference to the necessity of consolidating security would only serve as camouflage for those who actually refuse to recognize the necessity of a general reduction of armaments.

What did the Soviet Government have in view when it raised the question of general reduction of armaments for the General Assembly to consider? Our aim was very plain. It was that the General Assembly should make the first step toward solution of this important problem. We believed, and continue to believe, that it is perfectly sufficient for the General Assembly now to express its opinion on the following three questions:

First, the General Assembly would perform a great deed if it said in a firm voice that the time has come to start general reduction of armaments.

Second, the General Assembly is confronted with the task of expressing an opinion on the question of prohibiting the atomic weapon, since it is known that the threat of the atomic weapon sows deep anxiety among the nations.

Third, the General Assembly ought to recognize the necessity of establishing reliable international control over the execution of the decision on general reduction of armaments and prohibition of the atomic weapon, so that this international control should have at its disposal an inspection to check the situation in all countries.

By adopting these three decisions the General Assembly would indeed make an important step toward general reduction of armaments. After such decisions the Security Council should begin working out concrete measures. Such is the essence of the Soviet Government's proposal.

If we all agree to this necessity, the General Assembly will adopt a decision on the reduction of armaments which will have historic importance.

The American Draft and Our Amendments

SINCE submitting the Soviet draft, we have also studied a number of other drafts on the question of reduction of armaments. One should mention first of all the proposals of the Australian and Canadian Delegations. Then a few days ago we were presented with the draft of the United States of America, about which Senator Connally gave his explanations on December 2.

To a certain extent the Soviet Union's initiative receives support in all these drafts. We believe that the American draft merits particular attention in this respect.

Frankly, the American draft as submitted cannot satisfy us. We believe it to be insufficiently clear and somewhat one-sided. We shall submit amendments to that draft which will express our wishes.

With a view to securing unanimity in the General Assembly's decision on general reduction of armaments, we are prepared not to insist on the draft that we submitted and we express our willingness to accept the American draft as a basis for further discussion. We hope that this step of the Soviet Delegation will offer an opportunity to secure unanimity, so that the General Assembly in session in New York will make the first step in this important matter.

Now I would like to dwell on the amendments which the Soviet Delegation would want to introduce into the American draft. There are only three such amendments.

I shall begin with an amendment concerning the first point. This point refers on the one hand to the Security Council, which should proceed to the elaboration of practical measures for reduction of armaments. On the other hand, the same point speaks of international treaties and agreements on reduction of armaments. The question arises as to how the decision on reduction of armaments will be adopted: will it be adopted as pertaining to international conventions, or as a decision of the Security Council?

If we take the view that reduction of armaments will be executed as pertaining to international agreements, this would furnish no few pretexts for delays of every sort. Therefore, the Soviet Delegation maintains that the decision on reduction of armaments should be adopted as one to be taken up by the Security Council. It is very important for the General Assembly to uphold such a

viewpoint, and the cause of reduction of armaments will be considerably expedited. The formulation of the first point should be altered accordingly.

As regards the second point of the American draft, the Soviet Delegation would suggest its adoption as follows:

"In order to make a substantial step toward the urgent aim of eliminating from national armaments the atomic weapon and all other basic types of armaments suitable for mass destruction, the General Assembly insistently recommends that the Atomic Energy Commission speedily fulfill its tasks as formulated in Section 5 of the resolution of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946. Accordingly, in order to secure conditions in which the general prohibition, regulation and reduction of armaments will concern the basic types of weapons of modern warfare and not only secondary types of weapons, the General Assembly recommends that the Security Council expedite consideration of the report which the Atomic Energy Commission will submit to the Security Council by December 31, and thereby facilitate the successful progress of the work of that Commission, and also that the Security Council should expedite consideration of a draft convention on prohibition of the atomic weapon."

With your permission I will now give certain explanations to this proposal.

After acquainting yourselves with the submitted text, you will see that the first sentence in this draft, replacing the respective sentence in the second point in the American draft, is taken in full from the second point of the Australian draft. The value of this sentence lies in the fact that it recalls the resolution of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946, on establishing a committee for control over atomic energy, and that in accordance with the above resolution this committee should regard as an urgent aim the elimination from national armaments of the atomic weapon and all other basic types of armament suitable for mass destruction. We believe this proposal should meet with no objections here.

In the second sentence of this point of the American draft, apart from the slight modification of the text, there have been added at the end the words: "and also that the Security Council should expedite consideration of a draft convention on prohibition of the atomic weapon." This addendum obviates the one-sidedness in the wording of Point 2 of the American proposal, serving as

a reminder that the draft convention on the prohibition of atomic weapons must also be considered.

I have to say that the Soviet Delegation would consider necessary a more specific statement on the prohibition of atomic weapons, such as is made in Point 2 of the Soviet proposal. However, the Soviet Delegation is prepared not to insist on its original proposal, if the text of Point 2 of the American proposal is adopted with the modification I have just suggested.

The text of Point 3 of the American proposal can, we believe, be accepted. We think, however, that at the end of this point there should be added the provision made in Point 3 of the Soviet proposal, which, as you know, speaks of forming two control committees: one to control fulfillment of the decisions on armaments reduction, and the other to control fulfillment of the decisions prohibiting the use of atomic energy for military ends. As far as could be judged by the discussion, such a proposal would not meet with any objection here.

Point 4 of the American proposal can be accepted, and calls for no amendments. There is no need to go into the other minor amendments now.

III

Control and the "Right of Veto"

INOW pass on to the question of the "veto" or, to be more precise, the practice of the principle of Great Power unanimity. On this point it is necessary to dispel a patent misunderstanding which has developed in the course of the discussion.

As you already know, the Soviet Government is in favor of having the Security Council adopt a decision for general armaments reduction and the prohibition of atomic weapons. Adoption of such a decision entails considerable difficulties. Different views may be voiced in the Security Council on particular aspects of the problem. Only the achievement of unanimity in the Security Council, and first of all among the five permanent members, can ensure adoption of the decision on armaments reduction. There can be no doubt that the achievement of such unanimity is in the interests not of some one power, but of the Security Council as a whole, including all the Five Powers who are permanent members. Accordingly, when the decision on armaments reduction is worked out in the Security Council, the "right

of veto" may be exercised by any of the Great Powers until such time as unanimity is reached among all the Great Powers and the Security Council takes this decision in accordance with the Charter provision.

The rule concerning unanimity of the Five Great Powers must also be adhered to in regard to the Security Council decisions on the institution of committees for control over armaments reduction and for control of the prohibition of atomic weapons. But once the decision on the formation of the control committees has been taken, and they start working, they will naturally work according to the regulations the Security Council works out for them.

It should be perfectly clear that the question of the unanimity principle, which we all know and which operates in the Security Council, has nothing to do with the work of the control committees themselves. Accordingly, it is quite wrong to represent the matter as if any state commanding the "right of veto" would be in a position to prevent the exercise of control and inspection. The control committees are not the Security Council. And so there are no grounds for saying that any state will, by availing itself of the "right of veto," be in a position to prevent control from being carried out. Any attempt to prevent the exercise of control or inspection in accordance with the decisions adopted by the Security Council will be nothing but a violation of the Security Council's decisions.

That is why talk about the "veto" in connection with control and inspection is devoid of foundation. Such talk can only be understood as an attempt to replace one question by another, to evade giving a direct reply to the question at issue—that of the general reduction of armaments.

And so we have an important decision to take. The General Assembly must take the first step in solving the problem of general armaments reduction. We must prepare this decision, allowing no further procrastination in this matter.

The Soviet Delegation hopes that the American draft and the Soviet Delegation's amendments will form a good basis for the General Assembly's decision.

Speech of December 13

In Plenary Session of General Assembly

Mr. President, Delegates:

I HAVE already spoken from this rostrum regarding the point of view of the Soviet Government on general disarmament. All of us have heard with great interest the points of view of other governments on this question, both in the committee which discussed this question and in the General Assembly.

The present international situation is much different from that which existed after the First World War.

All of us remember these differences, and we know that Germany after the Second World War is not the same as the Germany which existed after the First World War. If we add to this the fact that Japan after the Second World War is not at all what Japan was after the First World War, if we remember that Germany and Japan are the two main aggressive powers, the one in the West and the other in the East, which led the aggressive forces before the Second World War and unleashed the war, that they involved all countries, great and small, in this war, then the fact that there are fundamental changes in the position of Germany and Japan has a very important meaning for the understanding of the international situation.

It goes without saying, therefore, that in our policy regarding the former aggressor states, we are carrying out to completion a policy and an aim which will answer the interests of universal peace. We should have as a goal the demilitarization of ex-enemy states and their real disarmament, and firm control over them so that they cannot again be transformed into aggressive forces. We must bring to completion the struggle against fascism, the fight for the democratization of these states, as was recognized during the war by the Allies. Thus, with regard to the forces of aggression, we have conditions now which are favorable for acting in accordance with the task of preventing new aggression.

An important circumstance is the fact that now, after the Second World War, there are no countries which are able to stand

aside from the tasks of the newly created international organization—strengthening peace and security. In this respect the situation is quite different from that which existed after the First World War. Now all countries, great and small, which deserve to be called democratic states, have, with a few exceptions, entered the United Nations Organization. And this creates quite a significant basis for solving the problem about which we are speaking today—the problem of general disarmament.

It is necessary to realize that much now depends on us, on our combined efforts and on our desire for cooperation with one another in the interests of general peace, on not setting one country against another, on not creating a bloc of one group of states against other peace-loving states and, at the same time, on not being lured by a policy tending to subordinate other states to the predominant influence of any great power. It is only by working in the spirit of those principles and aims which are the foundation of the United Nations Organization that we can and should strive for the guaranteeing of general peace and the security of the peoples.

Now let us pass directly to the resolution which was proposed to us for consideration.

Two ideas were made the basis for the Soviet Delegation's draft on general reduction of armaments when it was brought up for consideration by the General Assembly.

First, we believe it important that the United Nations Organization take a firm position on the necessity for general disarmament.

Second, we believe it necessary that the United Nations Organization speak in favor of the necessity of prohibiting the production and use of atomic energy for military purposes. The draft of the resolution under consideration includes both of these ideas. I shall not conceal the fact that the Soviet Delegation would like the basic proposals which it set forth for the consideration of the General Assembly to be expressed in more definite form. However, the resolution presented contains in different forms basic ideas which reflect both the idea of general reduction of armaments and the idea of prohibiting the production of atomic energy for military purposes. Therefore, the Soviet Delegation is satisfied with the results of the work of the Committee and with the resolution which was presented to the General Assembly for acceptance.

Much has been said here today regarding the use of atomic

energy for military purposes. And it is quite understandable, for this kind of weapon merits special attention at the present time. It is for this reason that it was pointed out in the Soviet draft that the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes was a task of primary importance. The draft resolution correctly points out the necessity of speeding both the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the working out of a convention prohibiting the use of atomic energy for military purposes. The latter is of particular importance. It is understood by everyone that the atomic bomb is not a weapon of defense. Therefore, when we are told about the necessity for the defense and protection of a state, we should, of course, keep in mind that this is not a task which can be decided with the help of the atomic bomb. Atomic bombs, as is known, are intended for foreign territories, but not for the defense of home territory.

The resolution on this question which was proposed for our consideration and which, we are sure, will be the decision of the General Assembly today, will be the first step toward carrying out a program of general disarmament. After this decision by the General Assembly, it will be necessary to take other steps; further measures will have to be worked out by the Security Council. That is a very necessary and a very important task for the Security Council. And we should wish success to the Security Council in working out and carrying out these further measures. Today the Soviet Delegation expresses satisfaction with the first results of the work on the question of general reduction of armaments and with the cooperation which we have achieved here in the preparation of the question.

- We still hear today that the question of general reduction of armaments arouses certain fears among the representatives of certain states. From time to time someone speaks for the reduction of armaments, but in an uncertain voice. It goes without saying that this question is so important and complex that no one would advise haste. However, we must take a positive position with regard to this problem, because it has become a serious and pressing task which must now be taken up by all of us. We must not think that the more troops we have on the territories of other states, the more military, air and naval bases we have scattered far and near on territories outside our frontiers, the better will be the guarantee of peace and security.

Certain information has already been cited here on a question about which there has been much discussion—that of troops in foreign territories. Of course, this information could not be presented in full form in such a session as this, it could not be comprehensive.

The Soviet Delegation wishes that the proposal which was under consideration as a special question—namely, the question of troops in foreign territories—had not been postponed, but that it had been solved. Had this been the case, all of us would know exactly what troops are outside the frontiers of their countries and where, what bases members of the United Nations have, and where. At this time, in connection with the decision about general reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes, this information would be beneficial.

Acceptance of the decision regarding general reduction of armaments will be reflected also in the economic sphere, particularly in the budgets of states. And, as a matter of fact, it is no secret that now the budgets of certain states are quite inflated. The people would welcome a decision regarding general reduction of armaments and of military budgets because, among other things, it would bring them real relief from taxation and would prevent rises in the prices of goods. All this is linked with the vital material interests of every working man.

Therefore, one can hope that one of the first practical conclusions of our decision today will be the reduction of mounting military budgets, thus bringing about more normal budgetary conditions, and therefore, the reduction of the burden of military budgets for the people. It will be welcomed with great approval in all countries.

I would like to call to your attention that, in accepting the decision on general reduction of armaments, we should not forget that in certain instances even now, more than a year after the end of the Second World War, furious propaganda for a new war is being disseminated. It should be clear to us that the encouragement of such propaganda does not correspond to the interests of the cause of general reduction of armaments. When we are told, in this case, about the freedom of the press and other fine things, we wish to ask in this connection: Why must the freedom of the press be used primarily by the propagandists of a new war? Why cannot we, the adversaries of this harmful propaganda, take advan-

tage of the freedom of the press and in unison oppose this type of propagandist, this type of public opinion maker?

The present session of the General Assembly has already adopted and will adopt a number of decisions. These decisions will vary: some will have greater importance and others will have less importance. It seems to me that none of us has any doubt that the decision on the general reduction of armaments will be among the most important decisions of the General Assembly.

This decision was unanimously adopted by the Committee, which represents all our countries. It bears repeating that this decision has been adopted by us opportunely. A decision on such an important and complex question as general reduction of armaments could be accepted unanimously only because all of us recognize it as opportune and essential. More than that, this decision answered the fundamental needs of all peoples, both large and small. We are adopting this decision unanimously, understanding that it is in the interests of our peoples, whom we are serving, and in the interests of general peace.

That is why the Soviet Delegation expresses the assurance that the unanimity which we have reached in the preparation of this decision will be shown also in adopting this decision in the General Assembly on general reduction of armaments.

