

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

339th
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 12 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| General debate (<i>continued</i>) | 53 |
| Speeches by Mr. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), Mr. Eden (United Kingdom), Mr. Belaúnde (Peru) and Mr. Pearson (Canada). | |

President : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. COSTA DU RELS (BOLIVIA), MR. EDEN (UNITED KINGDOM), MR. BELAÚNDE (PERU) AND MR. PEARSON (CANADA)

last war. You all know that these discussions were sabotaged by the USSR representative, by his time-wasting speeches and, subsequently, by his systematic absence. And what was the conclusion ? It was painful, it was disappointing. The armed forces of the United Nations were not to be larger than those of any one of the great Powers.

7. Thus the secular arm, once demanded so warmly, so movingly by Aristide Briand, to whose memory I must pay a tribute of respect, would become in the hands of the strong a method of bringing the weak and the small to heel.

8. How far we have come from the juridical and philosophic digressions of Dumbarton Oaks ! How far from the idylls of Yalta and Potsdam ! The tragic ambiguity of the morrow of victory is obvious to all and bids fair to change the present and future of the United Nations from top to bottom !

9. But errors come home to roost ! It was a juridical error to base the whole system set up by the Charter on a politically impracticable compromise. It was a psychological error to make such a compromise between nations with fundamentally different cultures, interests and ideologies. It was a psychological error to take the comradeship of war and victory and the momentary coincidence of interests for a permanent guarantee of friendship and mutual confidence.

10. The ancients recommended mortals pursuing happiness to mark each day with a white stone. We see, alas as we glance backwards, that the whole road since 1945 is paved with black stones.

11. Hardly a week ago the USSR representative in this very Assembly replied to the Western Powers' proposals for disarmament, which might obviously have been a useful basis for discussion, with sarcastic remarks in doubtful taste. But, as he knows that even the crudest irony is not really a political position, he put forward certain counter-proposals. I will deal only with one of them : that for a disarmament conference of Member and non-member States of the United Nations to be held in June 1952 [A/1944].

12. What does this mean ? Does the Soviet Union no longer regard the United Nations as a valid organization ? Does it think that all negotiations to ensure peace should be concluded outside the Organization ? After weakening

this Organization by an attitude which is the negation of international collaboration, after exhausting its advantages and propaganda resources, the Soviet Union considers the United Nations no longer suited to its interests and designs and intends to do without it.

13. A few of us still here—I see them in this hall—attended the 1932 Disarmament Conference at Geneva. That conference, called by the League of Nations, comprised Member and non-member States, just like the conference Mr. Vyshinsky is proposing now. I do not want to annoy the augurs, but you all know what became of that Disarmament Conference. When it was of no further use to Hitler in obtaining acceptance of his views, the famous *Gleichberechtigung*, Germany left the Disarmament Conference and the League of Nations. Seven years later, the same Germany and the Soviet Union, champion of peace, signed the agreements of August 1939 and together plunged the world into a hell from which it has not yet entirely emerged, into which, there is every reason to believe, an effort is being made to plunge it again.

14. So, I ask you and I ask myself whether it was for that that mankind endured such untold agonies for so many years? Was it for that that women shed torrents of tears? Was it for that that we gave the lives of our children, lives which we had worked upon as upon a masterpiece so that they could be finer and more useful than our own? Shall all who died have to repeat that terrible sentence which Rudyard Kipling wrote on the tomb of a soldier of the previous war: "Passer-by, go tell the living that they lied to us"? Lies, then, the words spoken by the false shepherds to lull the good faith of defenceless people! Lies, the human rights, to state which alone does honour to the spirit of man, but which the totalitarian Moloch daily devours as they take on a certain consistency and assume some form! A lie, too, this right to life, sacrificed daily to the criminal exercise of state sovereignty!

15. So we have come to a wall. We must choose: either we have retreat, the Charter torn to shreds by admitted violence and aggression or by Machiavellian sapping of the principles which are the basis of our liberties, our dignity and our moral health; or we have reasoned collaboration, withdrawal of pride, partial waiving of that sovereignty which is of disservice to many causes, the patient search for a peace that shall not be the peace of one or of the other, but just peace.

16. But, alas, to judge by what we hear, it seems that peace is the exclusive prerogative of certain States, as each boasts that it alone has its secret. Yet, by a tragic irony, this secret is not the secret of peace, but that of war. To defend peace you must have a firm grasp on death.

17. Are we the playthings of some strange spell or are we all men who have gone mad? Can we not lay aside our grievances, our pride, our secret interests? Can we not do without our sarcastic remarks? Can we go on living in a world in perpetual mourning, in a world in which great words, the heritage of our forebears, words such as honour, love, pity, gratitude, kindness, have lost their meaning?

18. And though the voice of a small country like mine may be too weak to be heard, allow me none the less to repeat over and over again: Let us love one another! Let us understand one another! Let us help one another!

19. The great Powers' duty is not only to defend peace by arms, but to defend it also by setting up such living standards as will promote order and justice. Thus, while the world resounds with the noise of arms being forged and

bombs being tested, my Government has asked the United Nations to send a mission of inquiry to make a general survey of all its material and intellectual resources.

20. The Keenleyside mission, to which I cannot pay enough of a tribute, has completed its investigation and an agreement between Bolivia and the United Nations has just been signed on the basis of its report. Under this agreement a team of international experts in various branches and of various nationalities will completely recast our much too obsolete administrative services in accordance with a pre-established plan. They are to discover means to set our currency on a sound basis and to plan the exploration, exploitation and distribution of our resources within the limits set by our Constitution and laws.

21. I should like to draw the Assembly's attention and sympathy to this heartening aspect of international collaboration, to this over-all experiment in planned technical assistance. It is the first large-scale activity undertaken by the United Nations in the complex and varied life of a country desperately trying to work out its destiny.

22. Labour must be accompanied by bodily, mental and social health. The worker must find happiness not only in a fair wage but in healthy living conditions and in an atmosphere of relaxed confidence, in which he and his employer can live side by side and work for the common weal.

23. All in all, it is a great honour and a great satisfaction to present to you today the example of a small country, economically weak but potentially wealthy, asking the strong to make it in the future what they are today. The example of the United States of America in the past shows that this is possible.

24. Unfortunately, there is a shadow over this profession of faith which I cannot conceal. Bolivia which, in no mercenary spirit, placed all its resources of strategic materials at the disposal of the allied countries fighting for freedom, is today facing a very serious problem, both economic and moral. I must bring it to the Assembly's attention.

25. The price of tin, the basis of the Bolivian economy, has for some months been subjected to the unilateral criterion of a purchaser against whom my country is defenceless. An attempt is being made to force upon it, by the methods used by the strong against the weak, a price which bears no relation to equity or to the spirit of co-operation. Whereas the manufactured goods sold to us, and the other non-ferrous metals, have risen in price by from 40 to 60 per cent, the price offered to us for tin is, within a few cents, that of 1945. If a fair and reasonable solution is not found by direct negotiation, there is a danger of a far-reaching economic and social crisis. Not only the Bolivian Government and employers, but also the whole Bolivian working class, are calling the Assembly's attention, through me, to the serious problem caused by the artificial lowering of the price of a primary strategic raw material and by the unfair price imposed for it. At present purchases and sales have come to an end. I hope, however, that I shall be able in the near future to inform the Assembly that a reasonable solution has been found in the spirit of friendly co-operation which is laid upon countries of goodwill by the Charter, and to which my Government remains deeply attached.

26. In conclusion, may I be permitted to express my satisfaction at the fact that the Assembly is holding its sixth session in Paris. It seems that I am in some small degree responsible for this. Some delegations have praised me

for it, others have blamed me, yet others still hold it against me. That is really too much honour for a mere representative of a small South American country. I must, however, remind you that in ratifying by a two-thirds majority at its fifth session in New York the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Bolivia, Colombia and Peru [A/1593],¹ the Assembly set aside budgetary considerations and based itself on political and moral grounds alone.

27. Europe is the sick continent. Marshal Tito's recent appeal is confirmation enough of that. It was therefore timely and wise for the United Nations to come and sit beside its sick-bed. In these critical days when civilization is being washed by a tidal wave, and the Mediterranean culture to which my friend the Brazilian representative swore eternal faith—and I join with him—is threatened, the gathering of the United Nations in France seems symbolic.

28. Joseph de Maistre, who lived in a period almost as topsy-turvy as our own, wrote in 1814: "France has been granted an undisputed mission to raise man to his highest function". France is still fulfilling that mission. It is gratifying that we are here to bear witness to that. A country which has poured out the fruits of its genius, which has convinced, persuaded, and, even better, charmed; a country whose ideas have formed distant nations still in the stage of France's own turbulent youth; a country whose capital is not a city, but a sun; a country which has made the Champs Elysées the meeting place of the world; a country which at will manipulates masculine thought as easily as feminine styles of hair and dress; where the Louvre is Beauty, the Etoile Grandeur and Chaillot Peace and Fraternity—that country has taken upon itself a secular and redoubtable responsibility. That responsibility France is fulfilling still in offering us its wonderful and abounding hospitality. And then there is Paris, the only city in the world which one can take to one's heart without it bursting.

29. Mr. EDEN (United Kingdom): All civilization is under a debt to France. For centuries those who have visited this brave nation and its capital city have been inspired by its graceful culture and enlightened by its intellectual clarity. It is therefore appropriate that today, in the year when Paris celebrates her two thousandth birthday, the United Nations should be meeting in her midst. We are all grateful for her greeting.

30. It is six years since I had the privilege to address the founder Members of this great Assembly. Unhappily, we can none of us pretend that in the interval the world has made any notable progress towards unity, toleration and enduring peace. In 1945 at San Francisco the great Powers were united in a joint endeavour. In good faith, as we sincerely hoped, this Organization was set up.

31. How different is the scene today. The abrupt division of the nations into two confronting camps, their failure to resolve the many problems which face them, the use of force by aggressors in an attempt to compel the solutions which they seek, all these are clear enough evidence of a change for the worse. And to this I now find added, here in the United Nations, another experience which is new to me: the bitter vehemence of the polemics exchanged at international gatherings. It is small wonder if in such conditions some should ask, can we breathe life into an international order and build the peace and security for which the whole world yearns?

32. As many of you know, the greater part of my public life has been concerned with the international scene. I can only tell you, in reply to these doubts, that I am more than ever convinced that, if we are to succeed in this task, the nations of the world must submit to the rule of law and abide by it. Confidence can only be created and maintained on a basis of respect for international engagements. It is therefore the duty of all nations, as indeed it is their interest, to respect international authority and to uphold it.

33. It was this conviction which led me, as Foreign Secretary, to put forward in 1943 the United Kingdom plan for a new world organization. Much of this plan was eventually embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. It was this conviction which, even before the war with Germany had ended, led me, on behalf of my country, to give the fullest support to the initiative of the United States which resulted in the conference at San Francisco. When I spoke at the opening of that conference, in April 1945, I outlined the reasons which made some kind of international organization even more necessary then than it had been before. I would like to quote to you these few words:

[Our proposals], I said, "impose obligations equally on all of us, on every Power here represented. But I am conscious that a special responsibility lies on great Powers in these days when industrial potential is so decisive a factor in military struggle... Great Powers can make a two-fold contribution. They can make it by their support of this organization. They can make it also by setting themselves certain standards in international conduct and by observing those standards scrupulously in all their dealings with other countries... The greater the power any State commands, the heavier its responsibility to wield its power with consideration for others and with restraint upon its own selfish impulses."²

34. These words, I suggest, are as true today as when they were spoken. With them in my mind I take this opportunity to declare that my own faith in the principles and purposes of our Charter is unshaken. That faith is not daunted, either by the disappointments of the past or by the critical challenge of the present. It is only too true that we are today confronted with difficulties enough and to spare. They loom and vex us in every continent. Yet, if the nations have the will to solve them, here, in this Organization, is machinery which by itself alone can work that miracle. Here we have an instrument to hand. We must use it, as the Charter says, as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations. And by that I mean the actions of all nations, for in my judgment it would indeed be a tragedy if this Organization lost for any reason its universality, its appeal and its widely representative character for men of all creeds and convictions.

35. But the instrument cannot produce harmony in an atmosphere of discord and abuse. For example, on Wednesday last three of the Powers represented here at this Assembly, the United States, France and ourselves, put before you certain proposals for disarmament [A/1943]. One might surely have expected, remembering the hopes placed in the United Nations in the early days, that these proposals would have been welcomed, or at least considered on their merits. Yet, within a few hours, they were denounced by the representative of the Soviet Union in a speech which certainly did not err on the side of moderation. Mr. Vyshinsky's cataract of abuse did not anger me, but it saddened me, as I think it must have saddened and discouraged the millions throughout the world who read or heard of it. In my view the peoples of our countries do not expect

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, Fascicule on place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly.*

² See *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, Vol. I, document 15, P/3, 1st plenary session.*

their leaders to shout abuse at one another, but rather to make contacts and to try to reach understandings for peace.

36. The most fantastic of all the charges levelled against us last Thursday was that we are war-mongers. Let me assure this audience—need I really do this?—that everyone in Britain “the people, Parliament, the Government” deeply desire peace. And is not that natural enough? We have suffered too much, as individuals and as a nation. We had six years of war. For more than a year of that war the countries of the Commonwealth and Empire stood alone—alone—in the fight against Hitler’s aggression, whilst those who are now calling us war-mongers had a pact with Hitler. Since the war I have travelled widely throughout the British Commonwealth and in the United States of America. Everywhere, everywhere, as in my own homeland, I had first-hand evidence of how deeply the people, and the Governments which they freely elect, are devoted to peace.

37. In all our actions we seek peace; yet our proposals are laughed to scorn. I must admit that I do not understand or accept such methods. I do not believe, or ask you to believe, that in any dispute one party is one hundred per cent a black villain, and the other party one hundred per cent snow-white. That is against the law of averages. All men are fallible, and peace can only rest on mutual forbearance and restraint.

38. Should we not, then—fellow representatives, I make this appeal—should we not, then, do much better to proclaim a truce to name-calling and angry words? Could we not, instead, apply our minds dispassionately to serious problems? I am sure that we should. Shall we try from now onwards? That will be my task.

39. Before I deal with positive tasks for this Assembly there are two general points which I desire to make.

40. We are told that membership of the North Atlantic Treaty is incompatible with membership of the United Nations. This assertion is based on the charge that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is an aggressive bloc, which it certainly is not, and never has been. Article 51 of the Charter expressly recognizes the rights of collective self-defence and the North Atlantic Treaty is firmly based on that Article. Its sole purpose is defence. Why, then, you may ask, was the North Atlantic Treaty necessary? I was not a member of the Government that signed it, but I and my colleagues wholly and fully support it. The answer to that question is that the disparity between the forces of East and West had become a grave danger to peace. The world has surely learned by painful experience the danger of such inequality. We disarmed in good faith but our example was not followed. In like good faith we now seek to restore the balance, still in pursuit of peace. For we know that to win that peace we must negotiate as equals.

41. The second condition is respect for the sanctity of treaties. This is an obligation which binds all States—may I say all States both small as well as great? I commend to your attention the wise words spoken on this subject by the New Zealand [337th meeting] and Brazilian [335th meeting] representatives. Those who benefit from collective security must also accept its obligations. Unless this is admitted, the United Nations will never work, and there will be international anarchy. How, then, can we apply the principles that I have just set before you to the work of this Assembly which is meeting now?

42. First, let me make it clear that France, the United States and ourselves intend to persevere with our disarm-

ament proposals. We do not insist upon them, as the representative of the USSR maintains, but we invite this Assembly to examine them with sincerity and goodwill. We ask our critics to study them. We suspect they may have been so busy laughing at them that they have not really had time to read them. To us, it seems that our proposals are serious and sensible and that they lay the foundations for a practical plan to be accomplished by stages. Let me draw your attention to certain important new features of the proposals.

43. In the first place, we now put forward a progressive system of disclosure and verification of armed forces and armaments. We suggest—we only suggest; we do not dictate—that this should begin with the less important categories of armed forces and armaments, and then move on to those that are more difficult to handle. This, I admit, is something new. Its purpose is not delay. The sooner we can agree on the simpler categories, the sooner we shall have the confidence to tackle the more complex tasks.

44. Secondly, we propose that agreement should be reached on certain definite criteria, criteria for the limitation of armaments of which Mr. Acheson the other day [335th meeting] gave us examples.

45. Thirdly, and most significant of all, we now propose that atomic weapons should be included in the same system of disclosure and verification as conventional armaments.

46. All this, I submit, is a new departure in three important respects. Yet we are told that we have made no advance upon what we have proposed before. The USSR delegation has often complained in the past that we were artificially separating conventional and atomic armaments, and I understand that argument. Well, now we have linked them together. Is that an advance or is it not? If our disarmament proposals contain nothing else, I submit in all seriousness to my fellow representatives that for these reasons alone they are worthy of study by this Assembly.

47. Now the criticism is made that we, in these proposals, link the reduction of armaments with the settlement of outstanding political issues. Of course we do. That is perfectly true; but that does not suggest that we are looking for reasons for delay, nor, still less, does it prove the insincerity of our efforts. But is it not obvious to anyone who seriously thinks about these matters, particularly those of us who sat through those long disarmament discussions at Geneva so many years ago, that genuine disarmament can only be achieved step by step with the reduction of tension and the settlement of urgent political disputes? If we had come before you with grandiose proposals for immediate disarmament, isolated from any attack upon the real fundamental causes of tension, then you might have accused us, and accused us justly, of insincerity. We have not done this. We have been, I submit, realistic and practical.

48. I now turn to other ways, tasks for this Assembly, in which we can show that we are able to work constructively for peace. And let me add that—and I say this as one who has watched your work for so many years from without—one positive achievement by this Assembly or by the great Powers whose differences are so notorious, would do more to help the peace of the world than all the eloquence that everybody’s oratory in this Assembly can command. Now what are those tasks?

49. In the first place, Korea. The United Nations, which took up the challenge of aggression, is ready and waiting to make another great effort and help to bring about the pacification and unification of this unfortunate country.

once an armistice has been concluded. Thereafter, the United Nations will be called upon to play its part in the great task of restoring the shattered economy and the devastated homelands of these long-suffering victims of aggression. Let us resolve here and now that this great work will be undertaken irrespective of ideological considerations.

50. In the second place, Germany. Can we not accept the German Federal Chancellor's request? What are we asked to do? We are asked to agree to a commission to determine whether conditions in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Berlin and in the Soviet Zone of Germany make it possible to hold genuinely free elections by secret ballot throughout these areas. That has formed the subject of the joint note [A/1938] which we have addressed to the Secretary-General. Would not this proposal do something to reduce the tension which exists in Europe today? Would it not help to bring back unity and confidence to the heart of Europe? Would we not thus bring nearer the day when a free Germany can play her part in peaceful association with a free Europe?

51. Then there is the issue of Austria which has waited for so long. Can we not sign that treaty? Can we not bring to that small country evidence that the great Powers can agree on this one issue, and relieve it of the burden of occupation? Cannot the Austrians be allowed at last to live and let live?

52. And why cannot Italy be brought into full membership of our Organization "why not"? This nation, with its freely elected government and its ancient and glorious traditions, should be represented here. Why does the veto have to be used to prevent that? Why does it frighten anybody? Surely this is a matter on which we should be able to agree without damage to anyone's interests. And there are other similar examples, in particular Ceylon.

53. It is not political weapons alone that we have to forge and use to work for peace. You have well understood this in your Organization, where a wide variety of agencies and commissions are at work in many spheres touching on the economic well-being, the health and the social advancement of mankind.

54. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Stikker, and my Australian and New Zealand colleagues have all referred with truth and force to our urgent and immediate economic problems. The Colombo Plan is one of the means by which we in the Commonwealth family seek to meet this challenge. It is an immensely formidable challenge, especially at a time when the unwelcome necessity to rearm adds fresh burdens to our already laden shoulders, but it must be faced.

55. My message, therefore, to you is this: on both fronts, I suggest, on both fronts together, political and economic, let us grasp definite and limited problems, and work for their practical solution. That is the real road to peace. That is the way to make a fresh start. If we can once do that, we shall have created a situation, and, if you like, a climate, in which the kind of moving appeal which Mr. Auriol made to us can meet its full response. Preparation, confidence, and agreement: that should be the order of our endeavour, starting from small issues and working to the great, a steady pursuit, with a fixed determination and with real goodwill.

56. For my part, I repeat: we threaten no one. We will attack no one. We rearm for one purpose only: not for a world war but to negotiate peace from strength. But if we are to succeed in all this, then each one of us has a contribution to make. The Government and the people whom I represent here are second to none in the loyalty which we

give to the United Nations, and we have another loyalty which we prize no less, our loyalty to the cause of freedom itself. There is no conflict here. How could there be, when the United Nations itself was born of a struggle to protect freedom against tyranny?

57. We in Britain are part of a Commonwealth family. That partnership is our life and faith. For most of us there would be no meaning in political endeavour without it, yet this same partnership is constantly evolving. It takes new forms and shapes; it welcomes national aspirations as well as the wider loyalties that bind us all; it is an instinctive comradeship which has its message for the world. It tells us that no nation is so strong or so rich in natural resources that it can achieve as much by itself alone as in association with others—partnership, comradeship, brotherhood, the sense of commonwealth, call it what you will.

58. Here is a spirit which is stronger than race or creed and which can move men and multitudes to a common purpose. Today, we are trying to find a new relationship, not only within the Commonwealth and Empire, but with all nations and peoples with whom we come in contact. We want it to be based on consent and goodwill, and I believe that we have the experience and the understanding to give form and reality to this faith, and surely it is a task for us all.

59. In this scientific age, what can anyone hope to achieve by violence except the destruction of life itself? By toleration, patience and restraint, we can build a world worthy of those in all our lands whom we remembered yesterday. In loyalty to them, and to those who follow after, we must not, and we will not fail.

60. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): This meeting of our Assembly is faced with an inescapable fact: the grave tension and the anxiety bordering on despair which were a feature of the time when we condemned the attitude adopted by communist China have gradually decreased and have given place to a measure of calm and a ray of optimism.

61. What are the causes of this change? For a full appraisal of its functions, the Assembly must realize the moral factors at its command. Let me indicate quite dispassionately the various reasons for this change for the better in public opinion, although I am not unduly optimistic, since there has been no change in the points of view expressed nor, unfortunately, has the acrimonious tone of the debates lessened in any degree.

62. We must take account of one decisive factor: the steadfast and heroic resistance which United Nations forces have offered to aggression. We still lack the necessary historical perspective which would enable us to appreciate in its full and admirable significance the resistance of the United Nations to aggression in Korea. That resistance has proved decisively that the United Nations is a living force. We have succeeded in meeting an unexpected attack by steadfast opposition in the cause of justice and law, and this resistance has prevented war from spreading to other areas included in the plan of aggression, has strengthened the hopes of all nations and, finally, has consolidated the life of our Organization. An interesting feature of this resistance, however, is its nature, moderation and limited character. Resistance was confined to precise objectives. Disregarding schemes and illusions of intensified action, we restricted ourselves to the defence of Korea and withstood the other aggression which followed later, when our task seemed to have come to an end. Such moderation, such

limitation of our objectives had the great advantage of winning for us the moral approval of the world and of giving the Asian world proof of the uprightness of our intentions and of the just scope of our purposes.

63. There is another factor which must be borne in mind. The problem of Korea awakened in all nations the conviction, which hitherto perhaps had only been present in latent form, that peace is indivisible and that all the world's economic, military and moral forces must be mobilized to halt aggression. Giving expression to this universal belief, the United Nations decided to overcome the obstacle of the veto and approved the resolution [377 A (V)] establishing in effect the general mobilization of all nations to combat aggression. This conviction clearly constitutes a highly important moral factor in the interests of peace since, whatever may be said and despite all rhetorical utterances, the indisputable fact remains that mankind is aware today that universal co-operation is essential in order to prevent aggression.

64. In this perhaps rather weighty study which some might think technical rather than diplomatic, I must refer to progress in the technical sphere which has also proved a factor favourable to peace. From what I have been able to note the public has the impression that technical progress affords an opportunity of creating a proper balance between the forces working for peace at less cost, through superiority in the quality of certain weapons rather than through superiority in numbers. This idea leads to another concept of equal value since, instead of an armaments race, which would defeat the very purpose it is intended to achieve, it points to a possibility of reducing armaments to the level required for the defence of each country and the maintenance of internal order.

65. Nuclear energy seems to have passed from the catastrophic to the defensive stage, and we hope it will soon reach its definitive stage, when it will be employed industrially. In any case, the proposal has been made here either for control of atomic energy or for its prohibition. However, inspection is essential to secure either object. In the absence of inspection fully and completely guaranteed, control or prohibition would be a meaningless term.

66. Finally, there is a moral factor: the cold war, the subversive war, the threat of the use of destructive weapons, and a sort of war or pre-war psychosis attended by actual war in various parts of the world. Economic aimlessness and disorganization throughout the world have produced a great weariness, a distressing situation. Among all men, and everywhere there is a yearning for peace and a desire for some course of action which would restore economic and spiritual health to an exhausted, bewildered and irresolute Europe.

67. We are well aware that this peace cannot be achieved by purely verbal or rhetorical efforts. No one believes in the peace offensive which is only aimed at weakening resistance, at impairing the spirit of self-preservation and at hampering the will for justice. There is, however, in all nations—and I might even say also in the Soviet mind, in the common or average man of that vast country—the desire for a real peace based on the readjustment of economic, political and military interests and inspired by the most cordial and human understanding.

68. President Auriol has given expression here [333rd meeting], with that eloquence and distinction which are characteristic of the French language, to that peace which is desired by all peoples of the world and particularly the peoples of Spanish America, with their deep attachment to peace and international justice.

69. We possess here, in spite of the acrimonious and harsh note of our discussions, these moral assets and these moral factors. What must we do? The weight of these moral factors imposes a clear policy upon the United Nations Assembly: in the first place, to combine and focus this longing of all peoples and to make of this rostrum the great instrument, not of the selfish propaganda of any one country but of the desire for peace of the whole world. May this spirit preside also over our discussions in committee and may we renounce strident and contradictory monologues and engage more happily in constructive, harmonious and fruitful conversations.

70. We have affirmed that peace is indivisible and that aggression can only be restrained by universal co-operation. However, we still have to implement these declarations of principle. The Assembly must lay down that its first task is to give effect and practical meaning to the resolution [377 (V)] "Uniting for Peace"; each country, according to its economic and political situation, its military strength and military traditions and its geographical position, must assume the obligations incumbent upon it.

71. There is another point which is also of great importance; I refer to regional agreements. It is gratifying that the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, speaking with the authority of that great nation, has set forth in this hall the doctrine of these regional agreements; the North Atlantic Treaty is entirely in keeping with the spirit and the letter of the Charter.

72. The Peruvian delegation recalls with satisfaction that it was the first, in that memorable meeting of 13 April 1943,^a to defend the rightfulness, the legality and the constitutional meaning of the North Atlantic Treaty. We peoples of Latin America cannot but see with profound satisfaction the reconstitution of Europe. I venture to say from this rostrum that a united America would greet with enthusiasm a united Europe, since in the last analysis Europe, which is the spiritual mother of America, has always been spiritually united. There may have been wars and conflicts; nevertheless, certain general principles of civilization have been upheld.

73. Let me recall now that symbolic tripod referred to in the famous conversation between Renan and Mommsen, in which Germanic, Anglo-Saxon and Latin culture are integrated. The tragedy of the world is precisely due to the fact that this moral and cultural unity of Europe was not accompanied by a unity based on economic co-operation and international harmony. We feel very deeply that the tragedy of the present time is the result of the disruption of the European soul, and consequently that the revival of Europe, the affirmation of Europe, the assertion of its need to live and to play again the part it formerly played in human destinies will furnish the key and, more effectively perhaps than any other factor, provide a solution to the problem.

74. Thus, in the enthusiasm of this profound conviction, I pay homage to the eminent figures of Winston Churchill, who was the first to advocate European unity when the symptoms of this crisis first appeared, and of Robert Schuman, who submitted practical measures to achieve such unity. Germany and Austria must be called upon to play a part in this movement, in the spirit of Leibnitz, Goethe and Kant: of Leibnitz, who proposed to Bossuet—to our Bossuet I hope my French friends will permit me to say—the religious unification of Europe as a basis for a new

^a See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part II, Plenary Meetings, 192nd meeting.*

legal order; of Goethe, whose Germanic vitalism and romanticism bring to us the breath of the latinized and catholic Rhine; and of Kant, who represented the last endeavour to reconcile philosophy with the Christian sentiment of life and who bears the stamp of Christian philosophy in contrast with the dissolvent philosophies that followed, Hegel's belief in the absolute power of the State and the materialism of Marx.

75. What has the USSR to fear from this unity of Europe, established solely for defence, united solely by moral, intellectual and esthetic factors which always work for peace? If such a glorious and harmonious result were achieved no one would think of denying the Soviet Union a place in that comity of nations. Remember that it was the western countries that discovered the admirable art of Russia and its no less admirable literature. Are we not aware and is it not our duty to proclaim here that, in spite of many difficulties and many conflicts, centuries of Christian culture must continue to influence the Russian mind?

76. I now turn to a point which is not strictly of a moral and political nature, but rather of a legal character, which I submit to the serious attention of my colleagues. We cannot deny that our Charter suffers from very serious faults. We know only too well that the revision of the Charter is impossible in the light of the Article of which we are all aware. However, even if that is so, the obscure parts of the Charter may be interpreted and, where it is defective, it may be supplemented. Teachers of law know that law is essentially dynamic and that a static and dead concept of law cannot be maintained in view of world events.

77. Our Charter must be interpreted or supplemented in the same way as pretorian law interpreted and supplemented the old Roman Law. We must remedy the defects of the Charter by employing the methods that led to the evolution of Roman Law. The principal fault of the Charter has resided in the veto. That is a fact which must be stated categorically, since an absurd and unacceptable interpretation has been given to the rule of unanimity which we approved in San Francisco. It has been interpreted as giving all the great Powers the privilege of evading the issue or of avoiding the search for a joint solution by taking up at the outset an unyielding attitude or by violating the principles of the Charter. This absolute veto frequently results not in a choice between two legitimate lines of action under the Charter, but in a country adopting a course at variance with the spirit and the letter of that instrument. That is a position we cannot accept. The veto in itself is open to criticism, but the veto interpreted as a method to which a Power may arbitrarily have recourse in order to violate the Charter while actually invoking the Charter itself, is a monstrous thing which must be rejected by all the legal minds of the world.

78. The application of this principle has been clearly demonstrated in the question of the admission of new Members. Three States are awaiting a resolution by the United Nations. Clearly, that resolution has been delayed for reasons that are mainly political, and the political criterion applied to the admission of new Members is bound to call forth a protest from those who, in San Francisco, believed that they had established, not an alliance or a league of countries on the old model, but a universal organization. I ask my colleagues who were present at San Francisco and I even ask those colleagues who represent the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics what it was that we established in San Francisco. Was it a political league in which membership depends on the sympathy or the arbitrary acquies-

cence of existing members in regard to application for membership? Or did we found an international order?

79. I am sure that no one who was present at San Francisco could rise in this Assembly and say that we established there a league and not an organization. We established a universal juridical order to which every State should belong by natural law, in the same way as every human being belongs to the civil order by that same natural law.

80. Consequently, States have the right to enter the Organization once they have fulfilled the objective conditions laid down in the Charter of being peace-loving and of accepting their international obligations. The Organization passes a judgment, and does not give an opinion, on these objective conditions; and since the days of Greece and Aristotle's logic, we know that there is a difference between opinion, which is arbitrary in nature, and judgment, which must be based on definite grounds. We must pass a judgment based on these conditions which are laid down in the Charter.

81. Consequently we cannot recognize any discretionary power, since if we did so we would become a league. On that point the International Court of Justice has endorsed the views of those who upheld the universal character of the Organization. The International Court of Justice has stated⁴ that the power of the Assembly and of the Council is not a discretionary power, that it is unrelated to *raison d'État*, and that it is not a matter of private judgment for which no reason or explanation need be given. It is in fact a regulated power which is exercised in the manner stipulated in the Charter. If that is the case, then, we need to establish a new jurisprudence. We must establish, for the admission of new Members, a new procedure in conformity with the spirit as well as the letter of the Charter. I am not referring to any country in particular, for I look at the Organization from a universal point of view. I refer to the three States that favour the western nations and to those that may favour the Soviet bloc. They must all have the right to backing in their request for admission. Nay, more, they must be invited by the General Assembly to adhere to the peace pacts that have been concluded, and to subscribe to conventions on outstanding international matters, as evidence of their compliance with the provisions of the Charter.

82. Then the General Assembly, being in possession of such documents and in the exercise of its functions under Article 10, would recommend to the Council, in accordance with its duty, the juridical study of the documents submitted. The Council would then have to distinguish between votes cast in accordance with the objective provisions of the Charter and those based on international grounds outside the scope of the Charter.

83. Who then could maintain that a single subjective, personal and arbitrary vote could prevail against the opinion of the majority—the overwhelming majority—based on documentation submitted in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Charter? To admit that such a vote could prevail would be tantamount to enabling a country to exercise a function which, even though exercised by all, would still be null and void, because it would run counter to the spirit and letter of the Charter.

84. How could we call ourselves a universal institution if we exclude Italy, the heir of Rome, which was the supreme master of juridical universality? How could we call

⁴ See *Competence of Assembly regarding admission to the United Nations, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 4.

ourselves a universal institution if we excluded the Iberian peoples who, heroically and after fantastic voyages, discovered new worlds and founded new countries which are now represented here? How could we call ourselves a universal institution if we excluded Ireland, whose sons are scattered in all parts of the world and who are a source of strength in the field of labour and culture in the United States of America, Canada, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand? Ideals, moral aspirations, and even noble enthusiasm, are here in harmony with the principles of justice.

85. The Peruvian delegation puts forward its proposal boldly and with conviction, and affirms that other attitudes are contrary to the spirit of the San Francisco Conference and to the universal conception of the organization set up at that historical moment.

86. There are other problems which it is not for me to raise here but I say, with a certain anxiety, that the problems with which this Assembly will have to deal, or at least some of them, are difficult in the extreme. I am not afraid of a problem when the conflict is between a principle and a particular interest. The problems that are truly tragic for any thoughtful mind and upright spirit are those in which there is a conflict between two equally valid and worthy principles that, nevertheless, paradoxically find opposing expression in practice.

87. Respect for the sovereignty of States and for self-determination is incontestable; but it is also unquestionable that one of the bases of the United Nations is collective security and that such security is not only a good thing for all, but frequently for the countries that might be particularly affected.

88. I recall an idea expressed by the eminent American statesman, Elihu Root, who said that for every problem, however difficult it be, there is always an underlying solution, not at first apparent, but which has to be found by laborious and patient effort. And when in good faith that solution is found there is neither victor nor vanquished, but only a triumph of truth, justice and equity. Following the thought of so matter-of-fact and practical a man as Root, I would go somewhat further in an ethical sense: nothing is invincible for this magical association of the uprightness which leads us to God and the goodwill and charity which it is our duty to show to all nations and to all men.

89. I am encouraged by the thought that this Assembly is being held in the cultural atmosphere of France. The praises of the French people have been sung here. I shall modestly confine myself to saying that when we feel the difficulties are insuperable, we should turn our minds to the spirit of immortal France, seek its characteristic qualities that have been forged out of its scholastic and Cartesian experiences, and find in them the light and inspiration for the solution of our problems. Thus under God's protection, under the protection of the mark of humanity and keeping pace with the noble inspirations of the French people, let us work with daring and with faith for a peace based on justice and love.

90. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): May I begin, as so many others have begun, by expressing the pleasure of my delegation at being once again in this lovely city of Paris, and in this great and hospitable country of France. I confess that our delegation did not support the move to transfer the sixth session of the General Assembly from New York to Paris, but our motives for not doing so will not, I am sure,

be misunderstood by our French friends. They were certainly no reflection on the affection which we have in Canada for France, a mother country of the Canadian nation, but were dictated by considerations of that prudent economy which I understand is itself a notable French characteristic.

91. This general discussion provides the opportunity for an annual stocktaking of our world Organization. This year, not much comfort or hope results from that process. One should not, of course, jump to the hasty conclusion that we are bankrupt, because we are not, but we are certainly losing some credit. The reply of Mr. Vyshinsky on Thursday afternoon to the statement of Mr. Acheson that morning showed in a dramatic way how far this wastage of assets has gone.

92. The United Nations remains our last best hope for peace but the emphasis, it seems to me, is shifting from best to last. We will have to stop that shift if our world Organization is to survive as an effective instrument to maintain peace and promote security.

93. On the credit side, much valuable though often unspectacular work in the social, economic and humanitarian field has been accomplished. The struggle against hunger and privation goes on and the United Nations is playing a gallant part in it. In our disappointment over some other aspects of the United Nations work, we should not forget that fact. But even this social and humanitarian work is impeded and, indeed, often frustrated by political factors though it should be far above such considerations.

94. It is also held back by the fact that one great group of Powers, which never ceases to boast of its peaceful, humanitarian ideals or its technical advances and social development, is making practically no contribution to that work. Indeed the leader of that group of Powers, the USSR, has refused to participate in the work of a single one of the technical and specialized agencies created by the United Nations for social, economic and humanitarian purposes. That fact itself disposes, among other things, of much of the Soviet Union's familiar glorification of its desire to share its progress with others. How, for instance, can any State boast of its belief in peaceful coexistence and friendly international co-operation when it refuses to take any part whatever in the work of such useful, progressive bodies as the World Health Organization or the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization?

95. On the political side of our United Nations work there have been great achievements. The United Nations has shown in Korea what collective action under strong leadership can do to halt aggression. This demonstration of our collective will and our collective strength has inspired and strengthened the United Nations. Those who broke the peace have been held and driven back, and the lesson of their failure is there for all others to read who may be thinking of aggression. That, of course, is the reason why those others rail against the effectiveness of the United Nations action in Korea, and try to prove it is action by American war-mongers and aggressors. If you can believe that, you can believe anything, but no one believes it except those whose opinions are prefabricated in Moscow.

96. For what has been accomplished in Korea by the United Nations, we should pay a special tribute to the United States, which has carried so much of the burden and which for that reason has been the target for so much of the abuse. No country is closer to the United States geographically, or in any other way, than Canada. Our

relations with the most powerful nation in the world are based on friendship, confidence and mutual respect; they are not, as in some parts of the world, the relations of master and servant. We in Canada occasionally do criticize frankly, but I hope always responsibly, the policies and attitudes of our friends to the south. This I think only reinforces the value of the support which, of our own free will, we give to the United States as, with the United Kingdom and France, she gives leadership to those countries which are trying to preserve the peace, uphold the principles and fulfil the purposes of the United Nations Charter. That is what we are doing today in Korea and thousands of Canadians, fighting there as soldiers of the United Nations, are proud to share in that high endeavour.

97. The action of the United Nations in Korea had to be hastily improvised. It has not even yet a broad enough basis of participation. It has demonstrated weaknesses as well as strength in our Organization. Above all, it has underlined the lesson that responsibilities must be accepted if privileges and powers are to be shared. For this reason, the report of the Collective Measures Committee,² which was created at the last session [*resolution 377 (V)*] to study how collective action could most effectively be organized in future against an aggressor, will constitute one of the most important subjects for consideration at this session. The result of that consideration may go far to show whether our Assembly, which now has the authority, will be able to use that authority more effectively against threats to the peace than the Security Council has recently been able to do.

98. If a powerful group in the Assembly opposes this development or if others stand aloof, then the United Nations may become little more than a forum for the expression of world opinion, and an instrument for the conciliation and negotiation of disputes, if any, which do not involve any major Power. Those are important functions, but if they are the only things we can do the whole character of our world organization is changed from the concept proclaimed at San Francisco, and collective security on a universal basis becomes a distant dream. As it disappears, we would be forced to rely more and more as a second best on limited and regional arrangements to protect the peace. Such a possibility must certainly be faced. There is no point in deceiving ourselves. The United Nations has great achievements to its credit and will have more, but the vision which once inspired such world-wide and such fervent hope has been dimmed by the dark clouds of political conflict between the great Powers.

99. International relations are now, in a very real and dangerous sense, centred on the conflict between two great blocs, facing each other in suspicion and animosity and fear, with the chasm between them growing wider, and the efforts to bridge that chasm apparently becoming less effective. Indeed, if we took this statement of the USSR representative on Thursday last at face value, it would show that the USSR Government has now decided to abandon the effort completely and to use the United Nations not for the removal of differences, but merely to vilify, to sneer at and to attack those with whom it disagrees. That, in turn, naturally produces a hardening on the other side until diplomatic negotiations of any kind become practically impossible. That is the real tragedy and the real danger of the present position.

100. Between those two blocs other States hover uneasily, form their own small groupings and pursue their own aims inside and outside the United Nations. Some of these aims are peaceful and legitimate but others have little to do with the principles of our Charter. Many of the States between the two blocs are what we now describe as "under-developed areas". They are receiving a measure, indeed an increasing measure, of technical assistance from the United Nations and technical and economic aid from the various agencies in the free world, including that provided by the Colombo Plan which was set up through the initiative of the Commonwealth of Nations, membership in which my country is proud to play a part.

101. If only the burden of the defence programmes could be reduced a much larger measure of such technical assistance and aid for capital development could and would flow in a far greater stream into under-developed countries and territories. Unhappily the necessity forced on free States to protect themselves against the imperialism of the Soviet Union, using as its spear-head the weapon of international communism, has now become the mainspring of national policy. It has forced us into this cold war which now unfortunately colours every subject appearing in the United Nations agenda, whether the election of the chairman of a sub-committee or a resolution on disarmament. As a result, the United Nations instead of devoting its energy to removing the causes of war and promoting economic and social well-being is now used all too much as an agency for gaining strength in the conflict which now rages and in preparing for the far worse one which may come.

102. In our debates and discussions some representatives, notably the Cominform representatives, adopt the strategy and even vocabulary of conflict and others feel it necessary to defend themselves against these tactics. Ideas and words are distorted as in war propaganda and lose their meaning. Peace is used merely as a slogan to divide and disarm the enemy. The victims of aggression, as in Korea, are denounced as aggressors. Dangerous courses are advocated in the name of nationalism, freedom, international law, order or of progress. In such an atmosphere how can our United Nations grow stronger? How, in fact, can it survive?

103. There was a depressing example last Thursday of the depths to which the debates of the United Nations General Assembly can now descend. The United States Secretary of State, on behalf of the three Powers, made a serious, constructive and helpful proposal for the regulation, limitation and the balanced reduction of all forces and armaments together with the prohibition of atomic weapons. The first essential step in this process was to set up an international agency to go into every country, including the United States and the USSR, and secure complete information about every form of armed force and armament, including atom bombs.

104. What was Mr. Vyshinsky's reply to this three-Power disarmament proposal? He could hardly sleep, he said, it made him laugh so much. It was so funny. It makes one wonder whether this pathetic merriment does not conceal an uneasy conscience. When he stopped laughing, Mr. Vyshinsky produced a really serious proposal of his own. I should like to read the first paragraph of that proposal which is as follows [*A/1944*]:

"The General Assembly declares participation in the aggressive Atlantic Bloc and the creation by certain States, and primarily by the United States of America, of military, naval and air bases in foreign territory incompatible with membership of the United Nations."

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 16*.

105. It is quite obvious that the USSR delegation does not expect to get much support for that. Even as propaganda it is not very impressive stuff. The whole world knows that the Atlantic Pact is a purely defensive arrangement, in strict accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. It will never become anything else. Mr. Eden, in that great and moving speech which we listened to a few minutes ago, once again re-emphasized that fact, speaking as a representative of a country which did as much as any country to win the last war and is doing as much as any to prevent the next one.

106. The USSR proposal also calls for a general disarmament conference beginning not later than 1 June 1952. Why wait until June? What is this Assembly? It is itself a disarmament conference with a concrete proposal now before it; one which causes Mr. Vyshinsky only merriment.

107. Then, finally, the USSR representative again produces his five-Power peace pact. As Mr. Acheson said the other day, in the United Nations Charter we have a sixty-Power peace pact. Why does the USSR representative think that a new and more exclusive pact would do what the Charter does not do? Of the five Governments which he suggests for this pact he damns three as aggressors, war-mongers, imperialist cliques and capitalist exploiters; but he would have us believe that a pact, a piece of paper, would change all that, restore confidence, produce co-operation and friendship. This kind of argument is an insult to our intelligence; but, of course, it is not meant for us. Once again the United Nations Assembly is used merely as an instrument for political warfare and debased for propaganda purposes.

108. I stress these depressing reflections which the USSR statement of last Thursday provokes, because none of us can escape the responsibility of assessing the attitudes and motivations of the Government of the USSR as realistically as possible, however grim the conclusions resulting from that assessment may be.

109. Our policies must be based on a sober weighing of facts, however unpalatable. But I for one am not prepared to abandon hope of negotiations within the United Nations to ease the present tension. The three Powers have made a serious proposal that we should begin discussions here and now for the reduction of armaments. We, in our delegation, support this proposal, but we know that one determining factor must be the attitude of the USSR. So I hope that this attitude, as stated by the representative of the USSR last Thursday, will be reconsidered, so that when we sit down in the First Committee to examine this question, the USSR delegation may be able to help us realize, rather than to laugh at, the deepest hopes of mankind.

110. That would involve, amongst other things, a readiness by the delegation of the USSR and by every other delegation, to discuss facts rather than to pursue the tactics of propaganda. But nothing, I am afraid, that we have heard so far from the Soviet delegation gives us very much reason for hope on this score. For example, Mr. Acheson reminded us the other day of brutal violations of human rights and human dignity from which thousands in Hungary and other Cominform countries have suffered in recent months. Mr. Vyshinsky could do no better than to retaliate with a report of two negroes shot in Florida. If that report is accurate, a shocking crime has been committed. However, the important fact is that 99.9 per cent of the people of the United States will feel that way about it. Thousands will protest about it and will try to do something about it. But when 10,000 innocent Hungarians are dragged from their

homes and driven like animals to the horrors of a concentration camp, does anybody in Budapest dare to protest? If he so much as murmured in his sleep, he would soon join the ten thousand, indeed, he got that far. Of course Mr. Vyshinsky says that such reports are slanderous fabrications, but we are not able to believe that because we know the facts. And facts, to use the USSR representative's own words, are stubborn things.

111. Similarly, when Mr. Vyshinsky says "everyone knows that the Soviet Union... has no intention of... attacking... any... country", and therefore we need no armed defence against a non-existent danger, our reply is again that we are not able to believe that because facts are against it. And again, when he says that Soviet Russia abhors power-politics and stands for "close international co-operation based on mutual respect... and... sovereign equality of States", we simply point to the Soviet attitude towards Yugoslavia or recall the fate of those Polish or Czech or Bulgarian communists who dared to show a trace of national loyalty or patriotism. Because the facts, those stubborn things, are there for all to see, we have in my country a dread of the aggressive designs of Moscow, and less hope now than before that negotiation inside the United Nations will result in action which will remove that dread. Other free peoples have come to the same conclusion. Even in the USSR itself, because of the misrepresentation and falsification of events in other countries by a Government which has absolute control over what its own people see and hear, that fear of war has now been driven deep into the minds of the people there who want war as little as we do. And so the vicious circle of fear is now complete.

112. As one means of escape from this dread anxiety, my country is now forced to increase its armed strength, though there lies ahead of it, as a young country, a tremendous task of peaceful national development to which it desires to direct all its energy, all its resources and all its wealth. But instead, for the protection of our very existence, we are now forced, by the unfriendly, aggressive policies of the Cominform States, to devote today about 45 per cent of our budget to defence. History shows that arms alone have never been able to ensure peace. But what alternative is there in present circumstances to acquiring that strength from which alone the free world can negotiate, with any chance of success, with those who recognize no other test but power? No words of the kind which Mr. Vyshinsky has uttered in this debate will deflect my own country from this course, because nothing he has said, and indeed his Government has done, has lessened the burden of our fear.

113. Without military strength then, we feel that we would be lost. But now that our strength is increasing, and this is giving greater confidence to our people, it should also—and I hope we shall never forget this—give us renewed determination to use that strength solely for defensive purposes and without provocation; to use it as a basis for the negotiation and settlement of differences, whenever possible, within the United Nations.

114. It is essential that when a genuine move towards peace and the easing of international tension is made by Members of the United Nations we should meet it half way, or indeed more than half way, but glib words about peaceful coexistence are not enough. Hitler promised that to those he wished to conquer, if they would only wear brown shirts and become his slaves. It is always easy to secure peace and a kind of security on the other man's terms, but we know where that can lead: to the humiliation of a Chamberlain and the death of a Masaryk.

115. The only peaceful coexistence which we can accept, and for which we must never cease to search, is in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. If only we could reach that objective the tragic split between the great Powers which now weakens and endangers our world Organization could be healed, and the United Nations could grow in strength and prestige to a point where many of the items on the agenda of this General Assembly would be unthinkable. If, however, that split persists and becomes deeper and more dangerous the United Nations, as we know it now, as we formed it at San Francisco, may disappear, and with that disappearance, should it ever take place, the risk of a war in which everything worth having would also disappear would become immeasurably greater.

116. To the prevention of that final catastrophe my delegation hopes that this Assembly will be able to make an effective contribution. To that end we pledge our own best efforts.

117. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to remind representatives who wish to speak in the general debate that the list of speakers will be closed at six o'clock this evening, and I would therefore ask those who wish to be included in the list to submit their names to the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.