

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



380th PLENARY MEETING

Thursday, 16 October 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	33
Speeches by Mr. Webb (New Zealand), Mr. Muñoz (Argentina) and Mr. Acheson (United States of America)	
Adoption of the agenda: report of the General Committee (A/2225/Rev.1) ..	45

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

General Debate (*Continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. WEBB (NEW ZEALAND), MR. MUÑOZ (ARGENTINA) AND MR. ACHESON (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

1. Mr. WEBB (New Zealand): I feel that I should announce that although my name is Clifton Webb, I am not the screen star. By all accounts, he is "Sitting Pretty" down in Hollywood, and foreign ministers, I find, are "Cheaper by the Dozen" around here. I am also pleased to see from the map above the head of the President that New Zealand is on top of the world. We, of course, know that that is a fact, but we are pleased to see that it is recognized by others.

2. Amidst the large and growing number of topics with which the Assembly is invariably called upon to deal, there may be a tendency to forget that the maintenance of international peace and security still remains the paramount purpose of the Charter. How have we fared in this respect since this Assembly last met?

3. It would be too much—far too much—to claim that the clouds which have been darkening the horizon have rolled back, for they still hover threateningly over certain areas. But, nevertheless, I feel that the situation—perhaps I am an optimist—shows signs of becoming a little easier. The sky is not quite so overcast. In a period of acute international tension, this is much to be thankful for. It would, nevertheless, be idle to deny that this is due, not to a change of heart on the part of those who have been disturbing world peace, but to increased determination, backed by actual preparation, on the part of those peace-loving States which, while threatening no one with aggression, are determined to resist it from whatever quarter it may come.

4. At San Francisco, when this Organization was launched, we had hoped that its Members would be so united and so powerful and willing to resist aggression that all regional arrangements of the kind some of us have felt it wise—and indeed, imperative—to

make would be unnecessary. But, to the world's great loss, this has proved not to be the case.

5. It is a sorry commentary on our so-called enlightened twentieth-century civilization that, in the present temper of nations, military preparedness seems to be the only condition on which we can hope to avert a third world war—a war which might well change the face of civilization.

6. But let us not rest content with this negative approach to the problem of maintaining world peace. As our retiring President, Mr. Padilla Nervo, in what I thought was a comprehensive and thoughtful speech at our opening meeting, said, perhaps not in so many words but in effect, defence against aggression is not enough. Something more is expected of us. We must strive all the time to devise some way of ridding the world of the scourge of war and of the threat of war. The expenditure on military preparation, not to mention war itself, has reached staggering and appalling figures. What a tragedy that these vast sums cannot be devoted to the constructive purposes of peace instead of the destructive purposes of war! Peoples all over the world are yearning for a brighter future. But, alas, until the time comes, if it ever does come, when the edifice of peace rests upon the common determination of all nations to support it, until the time comes, if it ever does come, when nations, or at any rate all great nations, are prepared to have their international disputes settled by arbitration instead of by war, the only hope seems to be to buttress the structure of peace with appropriate regional arrangements wherever it is threatened.

7. I now naturally turn to the Collective Measures Committee, about which the Secretary-General circularized all Members last year [A/2215]¹. He invited us to submit observations on subjects which the Committee might consider during this year. The response to his appeal has been disappointing.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 17, annex C.*

8. New Zealand, as one of the very few Member States which replied to the Secretary-General's invitation, suggested that the Committee might usefully devote some time to a study of the problem as to how the military, financial and other assistance to be furnished to the United Nations in the case of collective action might be more equitably shared. We made this suggestion because it relates to what we regard—and, indeed, what obviously must be regarded—as one of the essential elements in the development of an effective system of collective action, namely, the necessity for the widest possible participation and support by Member States.

9. That there is a need for the United Nations to build up such a system is endorsed by the great majority in this Assembly, and we are all concerned to support its development. But mere verbal or voting support is not enough. We should like to see a clear recognition of the principle—and, what is more important, some practical evidence of that recognition—that the military and economic burdens of collective action must be borne by the majority of States supporting the action, rather than by a willing minority.

10. As my Government has already pointed out to the Committee, it is in our view entirely inequitable—though it seems to be taken for granted by the great majority of States—that all the economic burdens incidental to collective military action should be borne exclusively by those Members of the United Nations which have themselves provided military elements. In such an action it is incumbent upon all Members to assist the United Nations primarily by the provision of military elements or, if that is impossible, at least by the contribution of some other forms of assistance. I do not deny that this problem of sharing is a difficult and, perhaps, delicate one; but I repeat my conviction that the United Nations has to face up to it if it seriously desires to found an effective collective measures system.

11. I wish to make it quite clear that the observations which my Government submitted for consideration by the Collective Measures Committee, and the remarks I have just made, were not directed specifically at any particular case of collective action; we intend them as applying to the general development of the collective measures system, and to all cases which may have to be dealt with under that system. I cannot deny, however, that our own experience as a participant in the Korean action was very much in mind when we made these observations. It cannot be contested that the contributions of Member States in that case fall far below the full requirements for collective action as indicated in the Committee's report last year [A/1891]. I do not propose to dwell on this point; it was fully dealt with by the leader of the New Zealand delegation in the general debate at the sixth session of the Assembly [337th meeting]. I would only add that in the year that has passed since then there has, in our view, been very little improvement in this aspect of the case, and that substantially the whole military and economic burden of the action continues to be borne by the same small minority of Member States.

12. Gilbert Murray, who laboured hard for world peace, if any man ever did, once said: "The problem is to make sure that all Members, or at least those Members upon whom the issue depends, will, when the

time comes, do their duty and take united action to resist the aggressor." It must be admitted that before the Korean action this unfortunately was still a problem.

13. I regard the Korean action as a turning point in the history of this Organization. It is the first time that anything approaching an international police force has been seen in operation. Some people seem to regard our action in Korea as a failure. My own view is that it has been anything but that. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that we intervened in Korea solely to halt aggression, and in that we have succeeded. We seek no territorial expansion or other material gain in Korea, but if we are to measure up to our responsibilities under the Charter, then no nation and no group of people must be allowed to take the law into its own hands. That is why we intervened in Korea. We felt that, whatever grievance the North Koreans may have had, they were not justified in attempting to redress it by the arbitrament of the sword.

14. Though the response to this clear call to duty has not been as great as it ought to have been, nevertheless it is reassuring that some Members—and I am proud to think that New Zealand is one of them—have demonstrated that they are prepared to fulfil the obligations into which they have solemnly entered and that they are determined to see, and to let others see, that a breach of world peace cannot be committed with impunity. And so I repeat that the United Nations action in Korea has not been a failure. No one, of course, would deny that we have not as yet accomplished all that needs to be done. Our task is not yet finished, and we intend to stay in Korea until our objective has been achieved. That objective, I emphasize, is to bring about a cessation of hostilities and to establish something approaching a settled order in the country—nothing less, nothing more.

15. The first step now towards this end is the conclusion of an armistice, and in this connexion we are profoundly disappointed that the truce talks, in which agreement has been reached on all controversial points of substance except one, should have been seriously interrupted.

16. It is the duty of all States, both Members and non-members of the United Nations, to bend all their efforts towards the conclusion of an armistice. And if, as we are given to understand, the only outstanding problem is the question of the forcible return of the prisoners of war, surely some mutually acceptable formula can be agreed upon.

17. I should like to make an appeal to the Soviet Union, through its representatives here to assist wherever it can towards this end. Theoretically, ostensibly, the Soviet Union is not a party to the Korean war, but we know that it has been doing a little more than prompting from behind the scenes.

18. It may be said by way of rejoinder that we could have had an armistice long ago if we had only chosen to send unwilling prisoners back to the North Korean lines; but would any reasonable person, any unbiased person, say that we should force men to return against their will—when they say they fear for their lives if they are sent back? By all accounts, the genuineness of their fears has been doubted; so also, apparently, has the reliability of our calculations, and perhaps even

our veracity. I suppose that in the present tense atmosphere, when suspicions are so easily aroused, these doubts are understandable, though in fact they are quite unfounded.

19. But surely adequate means for putting the prisoners and ourselves to a reliable test have been devised. How can it be suggested that no impartial screening tribunal can be found? People who make this suggestion lay themselves open to the charge that those who are not prepared to put their trust in anyone else are judging the ethical standards of all other people by the same low level as their own, or, alternatively, that they are afraid to have the other fellow subjected to an impartial test because they know that he will be proved right and they will lose their grievance.

20. I hope, therefore, that even at this late stage, the Soviet Union will be able and willing to persuade the North Koreans and Chinese to accept the reasonable terms—the very reasonable terms—that the United Nations negotiators have offered, and thus bring about an armistice. This in turn should pave the way for a settlement that will rid this unfortunate country, Korea, of the internal dissension and strife by which it has been torn asunder.

21. In the meantime, the United Nations, as a whole, may draw courage and inspiration from the fact that the first part of its duty with regard to Korea—the defeat of aggression—has been fulfilled.

22. Passing now to other matters, I am glad to record that New Zealand has continued to co-operate to the best of its ability with the Trusteeship Council and other United Nations organs concerned with advancing the welfare of dependent peoples. We feel that the Trusteeship Council has now settled down, and has developed healthy procedures by which it can effectively carry out its task. There is no doubt that it has made noticeable progress and has worked hard. Many of its achievements may have escaped notice, but they are none the less real. Too often the headlines are reserved for quarrels which beset many of the organs of the United Nations, and probably the reason why the Council's deliberations are not well publicized, therefore, is that it is working harmoniously and reasonably well.

23. The International Trusteeship System has now been in operation for six years, and, if I may be permitted, I should like to indulge in a very brief stock-taking. In 1946—before the Council was established—the New Zealand delegation stressed in the General Assembly that the Trusteeship System was not devised in the interests of either the Administering Authorities or the other Members of the United Nations; much less was it devised as a flail with which to flog the Administering Authorities or other Members of the United Nations or as a forum for propaganda. The main objective of the Charter was, and is, the promotion of the welfare of the inhabitants of the territories concerned.

24. It is regrettable that in the years which have elapsed since then a tendency to ignore this vital point has on too many occasions seemed evident, and that there have even been attempts to misuse the Trusteeship System in the struggle for world power. Such a course cannot serve the real interests of the inhabitants of either the Trust Territories or the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

25. The New Zealand delegation is, however, convinced that the great majority of the members of the General Assembly do not want the Fourth Committee to become, as it has regrettably shown signs of becoming, another political committee. Extraneous political issues should not find a place in the Fourth Committee, since discussion of them can only lead to neglect of the interests of the peoples of these territories. We feel that all members of the Fourth Committee should strive to develop a sense of responsibility and to put aside all thought of gaining momentary, and often illusory, political advantage from actions which have nothing to do with the welfare of the dependent peoples.

26. What we need is a better spirit of give and take—a renewed effort at co-operation and conciliation in the interests of the Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories. On the part of the non-administering Powers, this calls for a better understanding of the magnitude of the task which confronts the administering Powers, a recognition of the great progress that has been made, and the exercise of patience in reviewing what must often seem to them the painfully slow emergence of the dependent peoples towards self-government or independence.

27. So far as the New Zealand Government is concerned, we shall always be ready to pay heed to all honest and constructive criticism. We think that we have in the past shown our willingness to co-operate to the fullest extent with the United Nations in guiding the people of Western Samoa towards self-government. We are grateful to the Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly for the help which they have given us in this respect.

28. I should like to emphasize that New Zealand has nothing whatever to gain out of Western Samoa, except the satisfaction of promoting the welfare and advancement of its people and of helping them along the road that leads to the goal of their ambitions—self-government—and that satisfaction, I may add, will be ample reward to us for the obligations which the trusteeship entails. In my capacity as Minister of Island Territories of the New Zealand Government, I visited Western Samoa at the beginning of this year, and I can assure the General Assembly that both Samoa and New Zealand will continue to co-operate with the United Nations and to pay the greatest attention to any constructive suggestions and recommendations the United Nations may put forward. In this connexion I may mention that one of the last Bills I introduced in our Parliament before leaving for this Assembly was one which provides for the setting up of a Samoan executive council which will include several members of the Western Samoan Legislative Assembly. This new body is designed to give members of that assembly a voice in the shaping of the legislative programme, and not merely the right, as at present, to discuss such measures as may be brought before it.

29. When, in the United Nations, a delegation makes an appeal for patience, whether with respect to dependent territories or to other questions which come before us, it is liable to be suspected of secretly wishing to make the United Nations a barrier against all change. It is therefore salutary to remind ourselves of the very great political developments which have already taken place through, or with the assistance of, the United

Nations in the comparatively brief space of its seven years. No fewer than four States—Indonesia, Libya, Israel and the Republic of Korea—have taken their places in the family of sovereign nations, though for well-known reasons two of the four still knock vainly at our door for admission. But in any event the United Nations has played a significant part in their attainment of international status. Besides Libya, the constitutional position of former Italian Somaliland and Eritrea has also been settled through the decisions of the United Nations General Assembly [resolution 289 A (IV)], and it is worth recalling that in spite of the gloomy prophecies that the British war-time Administration of the former Italian colonies would continue to remain indefinitely in possession, it has, in fact, now vacated all three. These examples alone are enough to prove that important changes do take place through the instrumentality of the United Nations.

30. The United Nations cannot fairly be accused of going too slow in all matters; it might sometimes, perhaps, be accused of trying to go too fast. I have in mind particularly those cases affecting the jurisdiction of the United Nations General Assembly in which its decisions might have matured better if more use had been made of advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. The Assembly itself has recorded its desire to follow this path.

31. On the present agenda there are a number of items in respect of which problems that concern on the one hand the competence of this Organization and on the other hand, the domestic jurisdiction of Member States, have arisen. The existence of such problems is familiar to all, but there must be few who are able to discern with confidence and clarity the principles which should predominate in the solution of any one of them. This situation of uncertainty is the more distressing if we consider that as the United Nations advances, so will problems of this nature continue to be presented to it, perhaps in increasing number and variety.

32. The New Zealand delegation is, of course, not alone in regretting the lack of guidance and legal precedent from which, notwithstanding the number of cases that have come before us, the general membership of the United Nations still suffers in these matters. We think that the situation would have been different if, in dealing with these cases, the General Assembly had availed itself of the advisory function of the International Court of Justice. We ourselves have not failed on several occasions in the past to urge that it was the duty of the Assembly to follow this course. In some quarters this seems to be regarded as a device for shelving a question, but I do not regard it in that light at all.

33. No one would suggest that this Assembly should shirk its responsibility for political decisions by casting it on the Court, or that the Court should be burdened with questions on which the Charter provisions are perfectly clear. But there are cases, such as the one concerning domestic jurisdiction, which turn on questions of interpretation, where it is difficult to reconcile articles that are in conflict or apparent conflict. Sub-paragraph 7 of Article 2, for example, lays down that this Organization has no right to intervene in matters of domestic jurisdiction. Where does domestic jurisdiction end and our jurisdiction begin? In every case, of course, the final decision must be that of the United

Nations, but if we referred the question to the International Court of Justice, we should have the benefit of trained minds. They could sift the chaff from the oats, lay bare the fundamental issues, state the arguments for and against and perhaps establish a set of guiding principles that would help us in making up our own minds. Two qualities are, of course, essential to its success—competency and impartiality. Both are indispensable, but given these qualities the Court can greatly enhance the value of our work. I feel, therefore, that we should afford it every opportunity to prove its worth and thus gain the confidence of the nations.

34. My Government has noted with extreme disappointment the results of the Security Council's recent consideration of the outstanding applications for membership of the United Nations. Speaking quite frankly—and I address these remarks to the members of the Security Council, and in particular to the permanent Members—we believe that after all these years the Assembly is entitled to something better than the same empty report of no progress whatever. The position is highly unsatisfactory. The number of outstanding applications is now over twenty, and some of these date back more than six years, to the very beginning of the United Nations activities. My delegation would be the first to agree with the advisory opinion of the Court² that each application must be considered individually on its own merits, in the light of Article 4 of the Charter. It is essential to the life of the United Nations that its membership should grow, and the present situation, in which it is quite impossible to secure the admission of any one of twenty applicants—even one—is plainly intolerable. In my view this present situation, more than almost any other, carries with it the possibility that the United Nations will be brought into disrepute. The fate of an application for membership should not be dependent upon a horse-trading deal.

35. Finally, I should like to draw attention to Article 109, which provides that if a general conference for reviewing the Charter has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly, a "proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided . . . by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council". Though there is nothing in the Charter as to the date on which this conference is to be held, I understand it was the expectation at San Francisco that it should be held in conjunction with, or soon after, the tenth annual session. Such a conference would need considerable preparation, and it seems to me that it would not be too soon for the Assembly, at its next ordinary session, to take the matter in hand and perhaps appoint a preparatory committee to receive and analyse suggestions.

36. No one would claim that the United Nations Charter or the Organization itself is perfect; in fact, experience has shown that there are serious defects. But those defects are due more to the frailties and perversities of human nature than to the form of the Charter itself. We are a long way from that happy state when the wolf and the lamb shall lie down

² See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Article 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948, p. 57*

together and a little child shall lead them. But despite the imperfections and shortcomings of the Charter, it offers to the world a far more promising basis for an effective international organization than has hitherto been devised. One writer who had quite a considerable hand in the drafting of the Charter has recently said that what is surprising is not that the United Nations has been able to achieve so little, but that it has been able to achieve as much as it has in spite of all its difficulties.

37. Let us hope that as this Organization grows to maturity, it will gradually acquire the strength to keep the peace and promote good will and understanding among all people that on earth do dwell.

38. Mr. MUNOZ (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): The Argentine delegation is attending the present session of the Assembly fully conscious of the gravity of the present world situation and of the resultant problems, which have long faced the United Nations.

39. The practical application of the Charter has brought a number of fundamental defects to light. We would not presume to attribute to these defects all the difficulties besetting international relations in these historic times. It is, however, obvious that by perfecting the instrument governing relations among peoples, we should do much to promote the understanding for which mankind is yearning, and to allay the anxiety caused by the prospect of a grim future, fraught with problems and dangers.

40. The rule of unanimity of the five great Powers, a variant of the rule of absolute unanimity formerly obtaining in the League of Nations, was instituted at the Conference of San Francisco with a view to facilitating United Nations action, but it has not yielded the results which were anticipated in 1945. To our way of thinking, it could not have been otherwise. As we have already pointed out on a number of occasions, it is doubtful whether any organization of States whose members do not all enjoy genuine equality of rights can function effectively. Any rule which establishes exceptions to this principle is not only a violation of the unalterable concept of sovereignty, it is also an attack on the harmony essential to the success of any international action. This is not the moment to elaborate upon the possibility of reforms which, to judge by the failure of the various proposals submitted at previous sessions of the Assembly, would be unlikely to meet with a favourable response, perhaps because of the pressure of certain political interests, which prevent an impartial view of the problem. We would merely recall that we shall in a relatively short time have an opportunity of implementing Article 109, paragraph 3, of the Charter, which provides for the convening of a general conference of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the Charter. In this connexion, I was glad to note that the representative of New Zealand, who spoke before me, holds somewhat similar views. We shall, of course, concern ourselves not only with the desirability and scope of reforms affecting vital issues, such as the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council and, especially, the reform required in respect of the obstacle imposed by Article 108 of the Charter to any amendment of that instrument, an obstacle which is unacceptable to my delegation, but also with many other amendments to

the Charter which experience has shown to be necessary and some of which, it appears, could be introduced without the same difficulty.

41. With regard to the functioning of the United Nations, I feel bound again to emphasize the deadlock which has been reached in regard to the admission of new Members. I must make the stand which the Republic of Argentina has taken since the outset quite clear and definite. On the one hand, I would again point out that we adhere to the principle of the universality of the United Nations, which means that the Organization should include all peace-loving peoples, and, on the other hand, I would stress the need, which is daily becoming more apparent, for the General Assembly, in order to defend its powers, as the sovereign body in the matter, to take whatever decisions it sees fit in regard to each applicant.

42. We consider that, as early as possible in the current session, the General Assembly should press the Security Council to submit its recommendations for the admission of all or the largest possible number of the States which have applied for admission so that the Assembly can decide each case as it thinks best. We are unable to understand why this solution, which would result in the admission of the largest possible number of States, while securing compliance with the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter in every case, has not been accepted by the majority. We believe that the failure is mainly due to political considerations, which prevent a completely objective view of the matter. Although the results which have been achieved so far have been manifestly unfavourable, we still cherish the hope that a solution of the problem will be reached at the present session of the Assembly. My delegation wishes to make it clear that it intends to continue to press for the immediate admission, as full Members, of States such as Italy, which should long since have been Members of this Organization.

43. As at the two previous sessions, the work of the Assembly at the present session is unfolding against a background of events culminating in the hostilities in progress in the Korean peninsula. While endeavouring to bring those hostilities to an end, the Assembly has sought to set in motion machinery for collective measures to repel any possible future aggression. As the Argentine delegation has said before, it considers that it is obvious from the present world situation that, while the elaboration of such machinery may, theoretically, be of value, its effectiveness depends on the determination displayed by States in repelling aggression and on the possession of the necessary means for that purpose. By reason both of the facts and of the provisions of the Charter, the prime responsibility rests with the great Powers. For that reason we again wish to call attention to the danger of losing ourselves in technical complications and the advisability of concentrating on the root causes of the difficulties encountered in international relations in order to find a remedy. We whole-heartedly support the view that, in order to secure lasting peace in international relations, we must establish conditions conducive to economic and social stability, without which it will be impossible to dispel the dangers threatening international harmony.

44. The need for this stability is generally recognized, but we have made little progress towards its attainment. We consider that in this exceptionally important ques-

tion the medium and smaller Powers can exert their influence with a view to achieving a sound solution. One of the most important factors in assuring the peace and well-being of the nations is the proper regulation of commercial and economic relations. It is for that reason that the securing of co-operation in the solution of international economic and social problems is one of the basic objectives laid down in the Charter. This objective is intimately related with the other objectives, and together they constitute an organic whole which provides a basis for the activities to be undertaken by the Organization. Its attainment is thus a prerequisite for the accomplishment of the basic objective—the maintenance of peace and international security. In line with this provision, the Organization has made great efforts to secure a solution of economic problems. Its action has been developed through the Economic and Social Council, the many organs of that Council, and the specialized agencies, which have undertaken valuable studies and activities. We believe, however, that international co-operation is not on a scale commensurate with the urgent economic and social problems of the times.

45. Since the end of the Second World War, we have seen the highly industrialized States proclaim the desirability of reorganizing world trade on an equitable basis, while at the same time seeking to safeguard the situation which existed before the war, with many of its inequalities. This paradox has persisted throughout the post-war period, and goes to show that the great declarations of principles, sound though they were, were smoke-screens for activities definitely designed to maintain a state of affairs which is certainly not conducive to the desired spirit of co-operation and understanding. Later, in order to bring some solution to the serious problem of poverty in vast regions of the world, the great Powers announced their intention of carrying out vast programmes designed to achieve better economic development in these regions and thus to eliminate the existing differences, which constitute a serious threat to the peace and security of mankind. In substance, these programmes are designed to counteract the shortcomings of private enterprise, which is generally hesitant and cautious in its approach and does not lead to a satisfactory distribution of world savings in line with the interests of the peoples, who have been impoverished for generations by the effects of a capitalism practised without full awareness of contemporary social realities. The social function of capital can be fulfilled only if private enterprise takes the initiative in a process of self-education, weighing the material consideration of profit against the interests and the prosperity of the working masses, who form the actual backbone of production and the basis of a just and progressive society. In our view, therefore, it is essential that private enterprise should clearly understand its mission in the world of today; otherwise its very existence will be threatened by the gains which other ideologies will amass at its expense. The lack of vision in private enterprise has been manifest of late in certain cases which have in fact developed into international problems which the community of nations is now trying to solve. Private enterprise has not made sufficient response to the calls of the world of today and it is because of this failing that we have to adopt the programmes to which I referred. Nevertheless, in spite of all these good and sincere proposals, utter

poverty still prevails as an unfortunate reality in vast regions of the world. We are in fact witnessing a process whereby a large proportion of the world's savings is being devoted to the production of war materials, to the great detriment of the programmes for economic development.

46. The most important factor for the nations known as the under-developed countries, or those which are going through the process of industrialization and are developing towards economic independence, is the question of the price of raw materials as compared to that of the manufactured goods which these countries have to acquire for their subsistence and development. It is absolutely essential to establish fair relations in trade if these countries are to be able to build up the capital formation within their frontiers which they need for progress and economic expansion. The deterioration in the balance of trade is the result of a historic process and it will in the long run be fatal if the highly industrialized countries fail to take adequate steps to correct this trend.

47. Action in this field was taken, as regards certain specific products, through what is known as the International Materials Conference, which was set up precisely in order to control the price of raw materials, either directly or indirectly, thus preventing trade in the products within its scope from reaching the level required to promote the development of the under-developed countries. The declared purpose of the Conference was to regulate the world distribution of certain products, giving priority to defence requirements and subordinating economic development to war mobilization plans. It should be added that the establishment and activities of the Conference bore no relation to the known and recognized rules of international law. Nor is it enough to call attention to the Conference's shaky constitutional position: its activities have proved unfavourable to the countries which produce raw materials and, politically, they have been discriminatory, in that they have favoured the highly industrialized Powers. Now that these results have been achieved, the International Materials Conference is in process of dissolution, and the committees dealing with products which are now in plentiful supply or whose prices are beginning to drop have been abolished. This is the case, *inter alia*, for wool, a textile of paramount importance in the foreign trade of many countries.

48. Prompted in the first place by a sincere desire to collaborate in such matters, Argentina accepted the invitation to take part in the work of the Conference's Wool Committee. But whatever slight efforts we made to persuade the Committee to take some account of the position of the countries producing raw materials were blocked by the large wool-importing countries. It was simply a question of an amendment to a resolution on military purchases to the effect that countries making emergency purchases for military purposes should not suddenly withdraw from the market and thus create serious disturbances. We were led to submit this amendment by the memory of what had happened in connexion with Korea, when the announcements of large purchases for purposes of strategic stockpiling led to a wave of speculation and a marked increase in prices, an increase which was quickly checked by sudden withdrawals from the market and other similar measures. As is well known, this led to the tremendous drop in

the price of wool, beginning in March 1951, to a level even lower than that prevailing before the outbreak of the Korean conflict. The same happened in the case of tin, copper, etc., although the Conference had no jurisdiction over some of these products.

49. The Argentine motion was rejected and the Argentine Republic was then obliged to enter a special reservation regarding its desire to make its position known to the public and to explain the reasons for its attitude as well as the circumstances leading to the rejection of its amendment. It was compelled to do this because the Committee's proceedings are not open to the public and are even kept secret from the other member countries which are not represented on it. This in itself is highly significant and it is for this reason that we are using this all-important international forum to inform Member States and world public opinion of the activities of this supra-national organization which has no real justification for its existence and has done serious damage to the countries producing raw materials. We believe, in all good faith, that it is necessary to situate this state of affairs within the general picture of the problem of the economic development of the under-developed countries. This Assembly will deal with the problem of financing such development and the methods of achieving greater productivity in the world. Both these problems can be solved only if the question of the balance of trade is also taken into account and settled justly and fairly so that the countries producing raw materials will be able to proceed with their economic development.

50. The present unfair situation which has developed out of a continuing process through long periods of history, and the resulting lack of capital equipment in these countries, will completely offset any programme which does not take such realities into account. This problem should therefore be thoroughly studied so that, as it becomes better known, practices such as those we have described will be abandoned. At the same time, it is essential from the outset to place economic development high on the list of questions requiring a solution in the present world economic and political situation, for otherwise we shall simply go on in the same vicious circle. The peace and security of mankind depends basically on the satisfactory solution of this problem. Whenever this question has come up, we have proclaimed the principle that the peace and prosperity of the world are indivisible and it is by virtue of this principle that we are asking Member States to collaborate in finding a solution for the critical position of the majority of the world's inhabitants. We shall express our point of view concretely by submitting a draft resolution at the appropriate time to the appropriate committee, so that we may help to find a satisfactory solution which will show a way of adjusting the present situation and lead us on to progress.

51. Just and equitable prices will also enable us to achieve the social justice which is demanded by world public opinion, not only through increased investments and the growth of economic activity, but also through a fairer system of remuneration for labour. The main purpose will always be to raise the general standard of living by providing the conditions and services called for by the modern concept of social justice, through a system of fair distribution in the interests of the community. Our Government's whole policy is based on

this social approach to the rights and duties of the individual in an organized community, an approach which is essential for peace in the world.

52. We have mentioned these facts in order to contribute towards the solution of economic and social problems. This Assembly could shape future events if it became the starting point for a new era of international harmony and understanding. With this end in view, we shall work earnestly to bring about an understanding of these problems and to facilitate their solution for the benefit of a suffering section of mankind which, by its very existence, as we have already pointed out, constitutes a threat to world peace.

53. Mr. LOUDDIN (Afghanistan): I consider it a great honour and privilege to share with you the opportunities and responsibilities of the United Nations on this momentous occasion. This world Organization embodies the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world for peace, prosperity and prospects of a better and more fruitful life. It is our task to reaffirm and to help realize the aims and purposes which are expressed in the Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations with a degree of eloquence that only the urgent desire of a generation which had suffered the scourges of two world wars could formulate. It is for us, the representatives of Members of the United Nations, never to become oblivious to the sufferings and experiences which created the urgent desire to pursue the aims and the purposes of the United Nations. We must solemnly rededicate ourselves every day in discharging our functions. We must pledge ourselves to serve humanity. We must persist in our efforts in searching for ways and means of preserving peace. We must promote and safeguard the freedom of individuals and nations and relieve the stark poverty and conditions of starvation which unhappily is the lot of a great segment of the human race.

54. In order to accomplish these ends, we must push forward the cultural, economic and social development of the under-developed areas of the world through the aid and assistance of the United Nations in all its phases. In the realization of these aims and objectives, happily the moral duties of the peoples of the United Nations, for which their collective conscience acts as their guide, coincides with their collective practical self-interest.

55. Peace with freedom is the prime requisite and the essential and critical condition for nations as well as for individuals in order that they may fully develop their mental, moral and physical potentialities and resources for producing good and desirable results. Only in a world political atmosphere which is free from suspicion, tension and fear of international conflicts and struggles can the fullest development of human and material resources of any nation, and especially of the lesser developed nations, be achieved. It is the solemn duty of the Member nations and their representatives here to search and find ways and means of allaying suspicion and fear among nations and to restore confidence in the ability of this Organization to preserve peace and promote freedom—the necessary conditions for the alleviation of misery, poverty, ignorance and disease in this world.

56. Peace and security must be established on the firm foundations of equality and justice. No self-serving

formula of established interests should obscure the issue of the aspirations of the peoples for individual freedom and national independence. In our search for peace, no differences in ideologies or political and economic doctrines, no differences in faiths and professed beliefs should be allowed to stand in the way. The dangers are so great that no failure can be admitted. The very survival of the human race is at stake. The survival of the human race must have precedence over any narrow national aspirations or ideological issues. We must persist in our hope and work during the session of the General Assembly for the adoption of effective measures to reduce suspicions and fears among nations. We must promote the realization of the aspiration for personal freedom and national independence of the peoples who are still deprived of those basic elementary human rights. We must formulate and adopt effective measures to preserve peace. We must provide favourable conditions for the fullest utilization of technical assistance and find the funds so necessary for development in the under-developed areas of the world.

57. I am sure that our collective dedicated efforts will move aside the apparent mountains of obstacles which seem to lie in the way. I am sure that with our collective dedicated efforts, even in this seventh session of the General Assembly we may be able to take important steps towards the realization of our noble and useful goals.

58. Mr. ACHESON (United States of America): This is our first meeting in the new home of the United Nations. We join in our congratulations and gratitude to all of those who have had a part in the completion of this work. The result of their efforts is an enduring symbol of accomplishment and of aspiration.

59. We meet here to take up our labours to bring together and to harmonize the hopes and desires of the peoples of the United Nations. This is a never-ending task for each Assembly in its turn.

60. This year marks the seventh anniversary of the ratification of the Charter. These seven years have demonstrated that the role of the United Nations in the community of nations is an essential one, and one that will continue to increase in influence and importance in the years ahead.

61. The importance and influence of the United Nations is reflected in the problems that come before it. They indicate the powerful currents which make our period in history one of turbulence and change. Many of these problems will be with us for years to come. We cannot shy away from them even if we wished to do so. Our task is to face them squarely and realistically, with good faith and good sense, in the light of our joint and several responsibilities under the Charter.

62. Moreover, there is an interdependence between these problems. Each is made more difficult of solution by the existence of the others. We cannot solve them all at once. But we can solve some; we can chip away at others; and we can use all the resources of the United Nations to prepare the way for more effective co-operation between nations.

63. One of the most important of these resources is the General Assembly. There is no more representative or more influential international institution than the one in which we are now participating. The

Charter entrusts the Assembly with a wide variety of tasks and with an equal variety of methods which it can employ.

64. Three groups of problems lie before us: first, those that concern security, secondly, those that relate to the fulfilment of national and individual aspirations and, thirdly, those that have to do with the economic progress of both individuals and communities.

65. The chief lesson of our experience in the field of collective security is that the solidarity of the nations which support the Charter is absolutely essential. The alternative to this solidarity is the disintegration of the United Nations and the triumph of lawlessness in the world. The programme which started in 1950 with the "Uniting for Peace" resolution [377 (V)] constitutes General Assembly recognition that Members of the United Nations must, by virtue of that membership, stand together and act together for the maintenance of peace. To make this work, wholehearted co-operation is essential. The institution of the United Nations can be no stronger than its Members. It is the governments and the peoples of all Member nations who have the responsibility to be physically prepared and to be morally resolute to concert their strength for the cause of peace.

66. This responsibility to co-operate must be reflected not only in readiness to participate in action undertaken by the United Nations itself, but also in other ways recognized and sanctioned by the Charter. Regional and collective self-defence arrangements, entered into and developed in accordance with the Charter, are an integral part of a universal collective security system. When individual strength and collective strength are all dedicated to the cause of peace and the purposes of the Charter, the structure of security becomes a reality.

67. The Secretary-General put this matter forcefully in his report to this Assembly. "The final test of effective collective security", he said, "will always be that a sufficient number of Member Governments are firmly committed in their policies to join in resisting armed aggression wherever it occurs and that they have at their disposal military power strong enough to strike back with punishing effect against any aggressor nation".^a

68. This is the lesson of the past seven years. It would be folly for us to lose sight of it.

69. It is in Korea that our whole structure of collective security is meeting its supreme test. It will stand or fall upon what we do there. The United Nations fight in Korea is the fight of every nation and every individual who values freedom. Had our nerve failed at the time of this ruthless act of aggression, these new buildings in which we meet today might already be the empty husks of our defeated hopes for this Organization. Had Korea been allowed to fall to the aggressor, the words of John Donne would have applied to each one of us:

"Never send to know for whom the bell tolls;
"It tolls for thee. . . ."

Had the Republic of Korea been allowed to fall to the aggressor, the representatives to these assemblies

^a See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1A*, p. 4.

would now be looking to their left and to their right and asking which would be the next victim on the aggressor's list.

70. Korea is a test, not only of our courage at the initial moment of decision, but even more of the firmness of our will, the endurance of our courage. The aggressor, having defied the United Nations and lost, having found himself pushed back behind his initial line of attack, now counts for victory upon those of faint heart who would grow weary of the struggle.

71. There are moments in history when determined will through dark hours has brought victory. My country's trials came at the very outset of its history. The darkest moment for the United Nations in Korea came at Pusan. We met and overcame that trial and now face the test of staying power. Ours must be the determination and the will to sustain this crucial test. I will not pretend that the burden is light. My countrymen, like those of many of you, regard with anxiety and grief its human cost. But to the question: How long shall this be? We must answer: We shall fight on as long as is necessary to stop the aggression and to restore peace and security to Korea. We shall stop fighting when an armistice on just terms has been achieved. And we shall not allow faintheartedness or recklessness to defeat our cause, which is to defend peace.

72. We must convince the aggressor that continued fighting in Korea will cost him more than he can gain. This means the training and commitment of troops; it means food, clothing, material, money. I urge every Member of the United Nations to look to its responsibility to support the common action in Korea, and to participate in the reconstruction of that unhappy land.

73. The United Nations went into Korea to repel aggression and to restore peace and security. Aggression has been stopped. But despite patient and sincere efforts of United Nations negotiators, the Communists have so far rejected reasonable terms for an armistice. This Assembly will have the opportunity to review the record of the armistice negotiations, which have been proceeding over the past fifteen months. The record shows that the United Nations representatives have been patient, flexible and resourceful, always defending the principles of the Charter. We shall have an opportunity, by action at this Assembly, to demonstrate to the aggressor that we are united in purpose and firm in resolve; that we are as one in desire for a just peace and in determination to achieve it.

74. No consideration of security can overlook the importance of the work which has been done since our last Assembly in the field of disarmament. For, even though we are no closer to a universal agreement, the Disarmament Commission set up last year [*resolution 502 (VI)*] has shown that the obstacle to disarmament is not technical, but is a matter of will. Practical methods are at hand by which the possibility of aggressive warfare can be reduced and ultimately erased.

75. Those practical methods are not based on the fallacious idea that our safety will be assured by piecemeal pledges not to use this weapon or that weapon. All Members of the United Nations have

made a solemn commitment to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations". This commitment is a pledge against any aggression, in any form or with any weapon, against the use of armed force "save in the common interest". On behalf of my Government, I reaffirm this pledge.

76. We can make that pledge absolutely specific. We will not commit aggression with rifles or machine-guns or tanks. We will not commit aggression with atomic bombs or any other kind of bombs. We will not commit aggression with chemical weapons or bacterial weapons, which we have been falsely and slanderously accused of using. We will not commit aggression with any weapons or by any means. We reaffirm for all the world to hear that, pursuant to our solemn commitment under the Charter, we pledge not just that we will avoid the use of one weapon or another but that we will not permit the use of any form of force contrary to the Charter. We reaffirm our Charter obligations to settle "international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered".

77. Nations committed under the Charter not to use force to impose their will on other nations should not have to maintain huge armaments to protect themselves from one another. The maintenance of huge armaments itself constitutes a danger to peace. But disarmament cannot be achieved unilaterally. It cannot be achieved by denunciation in a battle of epithets. It can be achieved only by international agreements under effective safeguards which will protect law-abiding States from the hazards of violations and evasions. Until all States with substantial armaments are willing to co-operate in effective, guaranteed disarmament, the free, law-abiding nations of the world must arm and remain armed in self-defence. But we will continue to work to achieve the fourth of the four freedoms of President Roosevelt—freedom from fear.

78. The United States, with other members of the Disarmament Commission, has sought to outline a comprehensive disarmament programme with a view to reducing the possibility and the fear of war [*DC/10, DC/12, DC/15*]. The programme seeks not only the elimination of all major weapons of mass destruction, including atomic and bacterial weapons, but the elimination of large mass armies. The programme calls for a reduction of well over 50 per cent in the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union and for comparable limitation on the armed forces of all other States. The programme provides for the effective control of atomic energy to ensure its use for peaceful purposes only. It provides effective safeguards to ensure an open world with no secret armies and no secret weapons.

79. In submitting this programme, we gave outlines, not details. We did not insist that ours were the only proposals that could carry out the General Assembly resolution. We submitted them for discussion and genuine negotiation. Out of negotiation, conducted in good faith, the purposes of the General Assembly resolution could be achieved and the maximum reduc-

tion of all armed forces and armaments consistent with the avoidance of any imbalance of power dangerous to international peace in any part of the world can be made. The United States is ready to carry out such a programme. We shall continue earnestly and in good faith to induce others to join us towards that end. We shall apply all the ingenuity and resourcefulness we can muster. If other States do the same, we can succeed.

80. The second group of issues which lies before us comprises those which grow out of the legitimate aspirations of dependent peoples for a determining voice in their own affairs.

81. It is important to note at the outset that these matters are not issues in the sense that anyone disputes the right of a dependent people to ultimate self-government. That right is enshrined in the Charter, and the obligation to help fulfil that right rests with each of us, including each of the administering States. These States recognize that the peoples under their control must some day determine their own destinies. These States are working towards that end, just as the dependent peoples are preparing themselves for the responsibilities of self-government.

82. This is, I think, illustrated by the following facts. Of the 800 million people in the free world who were in the dependent category ten years ago, some 600 million have already attained full independence. In this period a dozen new nations have emerged, and most of them are now playing an important role in the United Nations. Furthermore, rapid progress has been made towards self-government for the 200 million others who still remain in varying stages of dependency. What these facts suggest is that the differences confronting us are not differences of purpose; they are differences of method and of timing and they can be solved through wise statesmanship.

83. Over 175 years ago, the American people asserted and established their right to their own national life. Surely we can and do understand the similar aspirations of other peoples. Indeed, our record establishes this far more conclusively than any assertion that I could make. Our own experience and responsibilities have also taught us the necessity for wisdom and understanding between administering Powers and dependent peoples. For it requires understanding on both sides to solve the complicated problems which arise in preparing a people for a stable and viable self-government in the complex world of today. The result of this kind of understanding is reflected in the presence among us in this great Assembly of our colleagues from the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma and Indonesia. And there is a place in this Assembly for others.

84. But, in the nature of things, it is not enough that the States comprising the United Nations should agree on the abstract principle of self-determination and the desirability of the evolution of dependent peoples towards self-government. For we are concerned with specific situations involving the aspirations of present and future generations. In examining these situations, it will inevitably appear to some that the process of fulfilling those aspirations is too long, too tortuous. By the same token, it will seem to others that the transfer of powers is going forward at too rapid a rate—that people are being called upon to

govern themselves before they have attained adequate political experience, and before there exists a sound economic, social and educational basis for lasting self-government.

85. If the sole question were whether it was going too fast or too slowly, the answer undoubtedly in most cases would be to try to find some accommodation between these two sides. This would not, of course, wholly satisfy either one. But this is the way things have to be done in reconciling conflicting views. But in many situations this is not the only point. There is another point, which is very often lost sight of in the assertions of absolutes in regard to the right to self-rule. The fact we are apt to overlook is the deep economic interdependence between the parties. It would be utterly destructive to the interests of both if the solution were made on the basis of theoretical absolutes. If people can harmonize their views and then work either a little faster or a little more slowly together, then their mutual dependence becomes a factor which helps to bring the matter to solution.

86. This fact is reflected in the evolution of formerly non-self-governing peoples. While some have chosen to move towards complete independence, many others have chosen an independent position within a commonwealth or union, and still others have chosen to identify themselves in some other form of association with another State or group of States.

87. What is the proper role of the United Nations in these matters? When specific disagreements arise as to the adequacy of the progress being made by a dependent people towards self-government, the responsibility for settling such matters lies in the first instance with those immediately concerned. This is not to say that the United Nations is without responsibility to assist in the achievement of peaceful solutions. On the contrary, the United Nations would be derelict in its duty if it failed to be concerned with the rate of progress towards the Charter goals being made by those States—including the United States—which hold in trust the futures of dependent peoples.

88. But it follows from what I have said before that the role to be played by the General Assembly should, in most situations of this kind, be one of accommodation. These are not cases in which it is the function of the General Assembly to impose settlements upon the parties involved. Here it is rather the primary function of the United Nations to create an atmosphere favourable to settlements which accord with Charter principles but which should be worked out by the parties directly concerned.

89. Various articles of the Charter employ different terms to indicate the type of action which the General Assembly may take—it may “discuss”, it may “consider”, it may “recommend”, or it may “decide”. As we review our seven years of experience, it sometimes seems that we have felt that we are bound to “recommend” whenever we “consider” or “discuss”. But the Charter does not assume this, nor should we do so. We must always seek solutions, but not necessarily resolutions. Calm and dispassionate consideration and discussion may in such matters as these be the General Assembly's most useful contribution towards a solution.

90. The United Nations has a twofold interest in encouraging and assisting peaceful and orderly tran-

sition towards self-government. First, it serves to assure that the aspirations of the people involved will find constructive and genuine fulfilment. Secondly, it represents the general interest of the rest of the world in peaceful settlements and orderly progress—all, that is, except those who are more interested in the exploitation of differences than in genuine solutions.

91. The unfortunate fact is that we cannot approach this problem, or indeed any other problem before this General Assembly, without being mindful of the events that are taking place in another part of the world. There, whole nations have been swallowed up and submerged by a new colonialism. Others have been reduced to a state of servile dependence. The tragic events behind this dark boundary not only are in stark contrast with the evolutionary process towards self-government which we have been discussing, but they are so fraught with danger to all of us that we can never afford to forget them.

92. I have touched briefly upon the role of the United Nations with respect to the conflicts which arise in the evolution of dependent peoples towards full self-government. But much of what I have said is equally applicable, in my judgment, to other problems of great moment and great delicacy with which the General Assembly is currently confronted.

93. I refer particularly to the role to be played by the United Nations—and especially the General Assembly—in the promotion of those individual human rights recognized by the Charter.

94. Our starting point is the Charter obligation assumed by all of us, as individual States and as participants in the work of the United Nations, to promote the fundamental rights of those within our jurisdictions.

95. To carry out this obligation faithfully means several things. It means, first of all, that we must look facts in the face. It means that we must examine our own conduct and that of other States with candour and that we cannot condone deeds which do not square with the articles of democratic faith embodied in our Charter. I venture to suggest that in the field of human rights no State represented here is wholly without fault; in our closets each of us can find the skeletons of racial, religious and class discrimination. If this is so, it neither justifies being sanctimonious about our neighbours' faults nor being tolerant of violations of Charter obligations. We must approach these problems soberly and without hypocrisy, mindful of our human weaknesses, but unremitting in our determination to fulfil our promises.

96. If our first job is to be honest about the facts, our second job is to be honest about the remedies available to us. The teachings of Confucius and Mohammed, of Moses, of Buddha and of Christ, will not gain instant and universal acceptance merely because they are echoed in our official pronouncements.

97. But the fact that we are limited in what we can accomplish does not mean that we can abdicate the field. On the contrary, we would betray the basic tenets of human decency if we came to regard the human rights provisions of the Charter as pious hopes which feed the eye but starve the spirit. To give reality to the Charter provisions, we must concentrate upon doing

those things which are in the realm of practical statesmanship.

98. Our aim in this most delicate of fields must be the aim provided in the Charter itself. By Chapter IX, all Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the United Nations to promote, among other things, universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. Our actions must be responsive to that pledge. We must work with patience and with honesty towards the achievement of the Charter goals.

99. Finally, I turn to a third group of problems before this session of the General Assembly, problems that have to do with the improvement of living conditions. In looking back over the record of the past seven years, it is in this field of economic co-operation that we find the most hopeful and promising aspect of the work of the United Nations.

100. The beginnings that have been made in this work of economic and social co-operation through the United Nations are greatly encouraging to all who have participated in it. This is a new force in international relations. It expresses a growing sense of international responsibility for the needs and hopes of individual human beings. Behind this work lies a growing awareness that, in the twentieth century, international co-operation must mean not only treaties and conferences, but people of many nations working alongside each other to grow more food, to wipe out illiteracy and disease, to increase production and trade.

101. The key to economic progress, to the expanding world economy for which we are all striving, is found in co-operative action to enable the world to increase its output of agricultural and industrial products. This is the heart of the matter. We are only beginning to appreciate the tremendous possibilities of the less developed areas for this kind of expansion—only beginning to realize them as we create the basic economic facilities, particularly power and transport.

102. As the technical assistance programmes of the United Nations and its agencies continue to work their transformations in the economic and social fields, I am confident that we shall see an acceleration of private investment, both domestic and foreign. This is a process that may take many years of work, but in no other field of action, I believe, shall we find that our efforts have so multiple an effect as in the field of technical assistance.

103. There is no greater challenge to our ingenuity than that which is to be found in the stark contrast between present levels of production of food and industrial products, and the knowledge available to us by which that production could be multiplied many times over.

104. The tragedy is that, in spite of tremendous progress in agricultural science, over half the world's people still suffer from malnutrition and many live on the verge of starvation. Despite progress in food production in many parts of the world, the fact is that the world food output is increasing at a slower rate than is the world population, and the world today has less food per person than it had before the Second World War.

105. There are several active programmes in this field that are deserving of more widespread attention and

support. A good beginning has been made by the members of the Food and Agriculture Organization, who have pledged themselves to increase agricultural production in their countries over the next five years, so that there will be an increase of food production over population growth amounting to 1 or 2 per cent each year.

106. At this session of the General Assembly, we shall have an opportunity to review some of the promising work that has been done by Member Governments and the agencies of the United Nations in the vital field of land reform. This is, in my opinion, central to the whole problem of increasing food supply.

107. Two years ago, before this body, I expressed the conviction that common efforts to apply existing knowledge to the use and ownership of land could have a tremendous effect in relieving the misery and suffering of millions of people. I spoke of the "vast opportunity" that "awaits us to bring, by such means as the United Nations has been developing, new hope to millions whose most urgent needs are for food, for land and for human dignity".⁴ Since that time, much progress has been made in dealing with this problem, this opportunity. Programmes of land reform have been launched in a number of countries in Asia and the Near East—programmes which are already bringing new hope to the people of these lands. Universities and governments have co-operated in regional seminars for the exchange of information on land use and tenure. We shall, I believe, find great encouragement in hearing the reports of this progress.

108. This Assembly will also have an opportunity to consider the steps that have been taken to stimulate increased productivity in other fields. It is clear from the report submitted by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council [E/2265] that methods are available by which marked increases in productivity could be achieved immediately. These methods would differ greatly from country to country according to local conditions, but the essential fact is that considerable increases can be achieved by the countries themselves through technical assistance and better utilization of existing tools and equipment.

109. Increases in productivity by such methods can result—and indeed in many places they have resulted—in direct and immediate improvements in standards of living. And, as I have remarked before, the best guarantee of increased investment, both public and private, is such increased productivity. It is imperative, of course, that such increased output be fairly distributed in the form of better incomes for workers and lower prices to consumers.

110. These activities demonstrate the vitality and inventiveness with which many nations are working together to improve living standards, even now, in the midst of world tensions.

111. It is tragic that forces should exist in the world whose concept of their own interests requires them to hinder and obstruct international action by all the rest of the world towards better conditions of living.

112. There are some schools of thought which doubt the capacity of free nations to meet the problems of a

changing world without falling into economic catastrophe. To them I would say that such expectations are based upon an analysis which events have shown to be faulty—and, at best, out of date. The free nations reject any notion that man is incapable of influencing events; that he is a helpless puppet in the face of determining forces; that crisis is inevitable.

113. The record, I think, will bear me out when I say that the economies of the free nations have shown great capacity for growth and adaptation. It will show that despite the burdens we have inherited from the First and Second World Wars, despite the burdens we are now assuming to avert a third such catastrophe, the free nations have not been inhibited by doctrine or dogma from adaptability and ingenuity in meeting their economic problems. As a result, and despite the dire prophecies to the contrary, there has been a long-term rise in living standards among the industrially advanced nations. And this rise has been accompanied by an ever broader distribution of income. In the United States, for example, the real income in terms of purchasing power of the average citizen has risen at least 40 per cent since 1929. And this improvement, reflected in higher living standards, has been greatest among people in the middle and lower parts of the income scale.

114. The record will also show that the free nations have learned a great deal since the depression of the 1930's, and that this learning has been applied in a whole series of measures which offer protection against a recurrence of that experience. We have built into our economies a series of stabilizers to protect our living standards and to encourage the productivity which makes them possible. Our social security programmes, price supports against severe declines in farm incomes, bank deposit insurance, modernized flexible banking and credit policies, as well as the tremendous accumulated demand for housing and public works—all of these are but a few of the stabilizers which would operate to counterbalance any substantial changes in economic conditions.

115. So much for the ability of the free economies to handle their domestic problems with skill and flexibility. But what of their ability to work together in coping with forces that threaten economic stability? Here too, I think, the post-war record will show that the free nations are able to get together to create machinery to solve mutual economic problems. Consider the instruments that have been developed just in recent years to meet problems of international co-operation—such instruments as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the regional economic commissions for Europe, Asia and Latin America, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, the Schuman Plan, and many others.

116. These instruments, together with many other works, have been put together in the face of the tremendous burdens we have inherited from previous wars, and also in the face of the burdens we now bear to prevent future wars. We look forward with confidence to the opportunities for further growth and expansion which will open to us and to all free nations whenever the threat to our freedom and independence subsides and we can safely release our great creative energies from the burden of armaments. We all have a transcending common interest—in this interdependent world—in expanding freedom and increased well-being.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 279th meeting, para. 81.

We all have much to gain by co-operating together to advance this common interest in "better standards of life, in larger freedom".

117. Our differing ways of life may impel us to pursue our objectives in various ways. But if we have confidence in our own particular ways, we should be willing to submit them to the test of experience. We should be willing to be judged by the results of our works rather than by the prowess of our arms.

118. Let us, then, work together to banish force and the threat of force as an instrument of national or ideological policy. Let us, in this interdependent world, share freedom with all men and all nations. Let us vie with one another, not in the arts of war, but in the ways of peace, in the ways of building a world of expanding freedom and increased well-being for all mankind.

119. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this afternoon upon my list. Before proceeding to the next item of business, I would ask representatives who wish to speak tomorrow or Saturday to send in their names this evening, if possible, to the Secretariat.

Adoption of the agenda: report of the General Committee (A/2225/Rev.1) [Agenda item 7]

PART I

120. The PRESIDENT: I invite the attention of the General Assembly to this report of the General Committee [A/2225/Rev.1]. I propose to deal with the subjects contained therein in the following order.

121. First, I shall ask the General Assembly to decide on those items to be included in the agenda, using the report of the General Committee which is before the Assembly as a basis for this purpose. After the Assembly has decided upon each of the items proposed, the total agenda will be put forward for adoption.

122. Secondly, I shall ask the General Assembly to decide upon the allocation of items to committees, as proposed by the General Committee in the document to which I have referred, and I shall place these proposed allocations, committee by committee, before the Assembly.

123. Finally, I shall place before the General Assembly the recommendations of the General Committee on the organization of the session; that is to say, on the schedule of our meetings and on the target date for the closing of this session. There is no objection to this procedure, which is the one normally followed in these matters.

124. I invite the attention of the General Assembly first to the adoption of the items for the agenda. The items proposed by the General Committee for inclusion are contained in part I of the report of that Committee, which is before you, under the heading "Agenda of the seventh regular session of the General Assembly".

125. I should like to remind those representatives who desire to speak on the inclusion of any item that the General Assembly is now considering only the question of inclusion or exclusion with respect to the agenda, and that the substance of the items proposed is not open to debate at this stage. Any reference to substance,

except in so far as it bears directly on the question of inclusion or exclusion, will, of course, be out of order.

126. I should also like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to rule 23 of the rules of procedure, which limits the debate on agenda questions on items recommended for inclusion by the General Committee or questions arising out of that to three speakers only in favour and three speakers against the inclusion of any particular item.

127. We shall now begin the consideration of the items. I hope that the procedure which was adopted by the General Committee, which was found to be satisfactory and saved a good deal of time, may be agreeable to the General Assembly. According to this procedure, I shall put certain groups of related questions, when this can be done, to the General Assembly. If any representative wishes to speak in respect of any item in that group he will, of course, have the right to do so. However, if no representative objects to or wishes to speak on any item in that group, the items in that group will be included in the agenda.

It was so decided.

128. The PRESIDENT: The first group of items before the General Assembly consists of items 1 to 15 inclusive. I think it is a non-controversial list. Are there any objections to the inclusion of items 1 to 15 inclusive?

Items 1 to 15 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

129. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to items 16 to 24 inclusive. Does any representative wish to speak on any item in that group?

130. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): Again this year, as in the past, I ask this General Assembly not to include item 22, "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa", in the agenda. As has been pointed out in the past, and as was repeated again by me in the General Committee, this item deals with a matter which falls exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of my country, and the General Assembly consequently is precluded by the explicit terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter from concerning itself with the matter and from including it in its agenda.

131. When I protested in the General Committee against the inclusion of the item, the representative of India argued that the item had to be included because of last year's resolution [511 (VI)] of the General Assembly. It will be recalled that in that resolution it was stated that the matter should be placed on the agenda of this present session. Perhaps I should remind the representative of India and the General Assembly that the mere fact that the inclusion of the item must be approved by the present General Assembly is proof enough of the Assembly's competence to exclude it, if it so desires. This General Assembly is the master of its own procedure and is bound only by the provisions of the Charter which, as I have stated, denies it the right to deal with the matter.

132. A point which seems to be ignored by the General Assembly is the fact that my Government has repeatedly stated that it continues to be prepared to discuss the matter with the Governments of India and

Pakistan on the basis of the formula which was agreed upon among the three Governments in Cape Town in 1950.

133. Pakistan, as the General Assembly may recall, was prepared to participate in the discussions; but India, despite its original agreement, now refuses to do so, insisting that the matter be settled under the Charter. Article 2, paragraph 7, not only denies the United Nations the right of intervention in the domestic affairs of Member States, but it also provides that nothing contained in the Charter shall require Members to submit such matters to settlement under the Charter, and my Government has indicated that it is not prepared to submit the matter for settlement under the Charter, a right which, as I have pointed out, we derive from the Charter.

134. Yet India, despite its original agreement to participate in discussions on the formula of 1950, now continues to demand a settlement under the Charter. It is India, therefore, I submit, which must be held responsible that no conference has taken place among the three Governments, and I think it has given ample proof that it would persist in its present attitude as long as the United Nations continues to claim competence with regard to the matter. In the circumstances, I ask the General Assembly not to ignore once again the valid request of my Government and to exclude the matter from the provisional agenda.

135. Mr. PATHAK (India): It seems to my delegation that yesterday, although a statement was made before the General Committee, no objection was raised to the effect that the item should not be included. Representatives will remember that last year a resolution was adopted by the General Assembly providing that this item should be put on the agenda of the General Assembly at its seventh session. No reason has been shown why this item should not be included in the agenda of the session, except the question of the competence of the General Assembly to deal with the matter. This question was raised for the first time in 1946, when this item came on the agenda of the General Assembly. In spite of this objection, the item was included. Ever since, this objection has been repeatedly made, but the item continues to be included in the agenda of the General Assembly, and the General Assembly has held that it possesses the competence to deal with this matter.

136. It is too late now to raise the objection that, as the General Assembly is not competent to deal with the matter, the item should be excluded from the provisional agenda. It is against the practice of the General Assembly to delete items from the provisional agenda on the ground that it involves a question of jurisdiction. The very fact that the question is raised makes it necessary that it should be discussed, and that can be done only by putting the item on the agenda. The item cannot be excluded without a discussion of the question which is adduced as a ground for exclusion.

137. The question of jurisdiction is inseparable from the facts. When the facts are presented, it will be clear that the policy of *apartheid* is nothing but racial discrimination, and racial discrimination being a violation of the Charter, the General Assembly is competent to consider this question. When the facts are presented before the General Assembly, the question of jurisdiction will answer itself.

138. It should also be borne in mind that the General Assembly has already passed a resolution to the effect that the policy of *apartheid* is based on racial discrimination.

139. For these reasons, I would submit, on behalf of my delegation, that this item should remain on the agenda of the General Assembly. What is the difference between today and the earlier years when this item was put on the agenda?

140. The PRESIDENT: A formal proposal has been made for the exclusion of item 22 from the provisional agenda. If no other representative wishes to speak in respect of item 22, I shall put the proposal for exclusion to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 46 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

Items 16 to 24 inclusive were placed on the agenda.

141. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed with items 25 to 30 inclusive, which are concerned with economic and social questions.

Items 25 to 30 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

142. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider items 31 to 38 inclusive, dealing with trusteeship questions.

Items 31 to 38 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

143. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider items 39 to 49 inclusive, which are concerned with budgetary, financial and administrative questions.

Items 39 to 49 inclusive were placed on the agenda without discussion.

144. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider items 50 to 59 inclusive, which are concerned with legal questions. I recognize the representative of the Ukrainian SSR who wishes to speak on item 56.

145. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers it illegal to include in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly the item concerning revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

146. The procedure for the revision of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide is laid down in article 16 of that Convention, according to which a request for revision of the Convention may be submitted only by the States parties to it.

147. As we know, the request for the revision of the Chinese text of the Convention has now been submitted, not by the legitimate government of the People's Republic of China, which alone is entitled to make such a request, but by the representative of the Kuomintang group, which has been expelled by the Chinese people and occupies a place in the United Nations illegally. Obviously the inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly of a request by this private person, who does not represent the Chinese people, is absolutely inadmissible.

148. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore protests categorically against the inclusion in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the item concerning revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and appeals to delegations of the States represented at this session to support our objection.

149. Mr. TSIANG (China): My delegation requested the inclusion of item 56 in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly. This item was on the agenda of the sixth session. However, because committee action on this question was incomplete, we requested that the item should be put on the agenda of the seventh session.

150. The Ukrainian representative did not object to the inclusion of this item on any ground which could be justifiable. He did not say that the item was inappropriate, or that it was improper, or that the inclusion of the item would be contrary to the Charter, or that its inclusion would be contrary to the rules of procedure. He claimed that my delegation did not have the right to request that this item be included.

151. I submit that this kind of argument is not based on the rules of procedure or on ordinary and well-accepted notions of democracy. That might be a form of what they are trying to introduce in this world—the so-called people's democracy. It is something which the General Assembly must certainly repudiate. Certainly the right of my delegation to request the inclusion of an item in the agenda is not second to that of any other delegation in the Assembly.

152. The PRESIDENT: The exclusion of item 56 from the provisional agenda has been formally moved by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR. I shall now put the proposal for exclusion to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 37 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

153. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Czechoslovakia wishes to speak on item 59.

154. Mr. VAVRICKA (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): The Czechoslovak delegation proposes that item 59 of the provisional agenda, entitled "Use of the citation 'Died for the United Nations' in respect to persons who, in certain circumstances, are killed in the service of the United Nations" should not be placed on the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly. This item, proposed for inclusion in the agenda by the delegation of France, is similar in substance to the proposal concerning the so-called Korean decorations submitted by the Philippine delegation at the fifth session of the General Assembly [A/1421].

155. Like the Philippine proposal two years ago, the present proposal of the French delegation is intimately bound up with the United States aggression in Korea. The Czechoslovak delegation voted against the Philippine proposal two years ago and voted against the draft resolution on that subject submitted by the Sixth Committee to the General Assembly at its fifth session [320th meeting]. The reasons which the Czechoslovak delegation gave at that time for voting against the proposal apply with equal force today, and explain my delegation's position with respect to the French pro-

posal which appears as item 59 of the provisional agenda submitted by the General Committee. This proposal is yet another attempt to use the United Nations flag to cover the imperialistic and aggressive policy of the United States in the Far East, especially in Korea. We are facing yet another attempt to misuse the name of the United Nations, an attempt that stems directly from the illegal resolutions adopted by the Security Council in 1950.

156. Accordingly, the Czechoslovak delegation is unable to support the inclusion of item 59 in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly and proposes its deletion.

157. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (*translated from French*): I should like briefly to repeat before the Assembly the points I made yesterday in the General Committee [79th meeting] in reply to the USSR representative, who was the first to express the views which the representative of Czechoslovakia has now expressed here.

158. Contrary to what Mr. Gromyko supposed and what our Czechoslovak colleague has just repeated, the French proposal is not prompted by any shady political motives. It is not an attempt to justify what our colleague calls "American aggression" by means which would be odious, in that they would be tantamount to exploiting the memory of the fallen; it is simply intended to honour that memory, to pay a solemn tribute to all those who have died or who may die under the United Nations flag in some action undertaken to halt aggression, wherever it may occur, or to prevent hostilities.

159. There is a similar provision in French legislation, and undoubtedly in that of other countries. In the case of soldiers killed during the two world wars, and of all Frenchmen who fell fighting during the Resistance, the citation "Died for France" appears after their names in their death certificates and on their graves. It is a way of paying a tribute to their sacrifice by recalling the great cause for which they made it.

160. The French Government felt that those who died for a cause that was not directly that of their own country should receive a similar tribute, and that they deserved that the tribute should be paid by the United Nations itself in supreme recognition of their sacrifice. This is the only purpose of the proposal submitted by the Government of the French Republic. I do not doubt that it will be understood and appreciated by a big majority of delegations.

161. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): The applause which has just resounded in the hall reflects the attitude of this Assembly towards the French proposal for including this item in the agenda.

162. In our view, the French proposal provides for the recognition of the valiant men who gave their lives in mankind's greatest cause, the cause of peace, which the United Nations represents. Tribute would be paid to those who fall in United Nations action against aggression. My Government believes that such a special tribute would express, so far as words can, the appreciation of the people of the world, who yearn for peace and put their hopes in the United Nations to defend that peace.

163. In Korea, as the principal instance, many young men have died for the cause of peace. They have died

in defence of their own homes and countries as surely as if the crime of aggression had been committed upon their own doorsteps. The flag of their allegiance was their national flag, but their sacrifice is of additional significance, for these men have served the security of their own countries by serving also in defence of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. Many Members of this Assembly have responded to the call to go to the defence of the principles of the United Nations in Korea. Most Members will be grateful that the French delegation has offered this opportunity for expressing the humble gratitude of all free people to the young men who have died for us in Korea.

164. For these reasons, my Government strongly supports the inclusion of this item in our agenda.

165. The PRESIDENT: I put the proposal for the deletion of item 59 to the vote.

The proposal was rejected by 48 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Items 50 to 59 inclusive were placed on the agenda.

166. The PRESIDENT: We now come to two items closely related, item 60, on the Tunisian question and item 65, on the question of Morocco.

167. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): When the provisional agenda of this session was discussed yesterday in the General Committee [79th meeting], the USSR delegation had an opportunity of giving its views on item 63 of the provisional agenda. It stated that it objected categorically to the inclusion of that item in the agenda. It explained the reasons for its objection to the inclusion of that question in the agenda. The delegation of the Soviet Union deems it necessary, at this meeting of the General Assembly too, to point out to representatives that the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly would constitute an illegal action. I consider it necessary to restate the reasons why the USSR delegation objects to inclusion of this item in the agenda.

168. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers it necessary to draw attention to Article 107 of the United Nations Charter. I shall not quote that article, since its contents are well known to everyone. Article 107 of the Charter gives the United Nations no right and no reason to consider the Austrian question in the General Assembly. The Austrian question, concerning the conclusion of a State treaty with Austria, is the kind of question which must be settled by the Powers concerned—those which concluded the relevant international agreements after and in consequence of the Second World War.

169. It is common knowledge that a declaration on Austria was adopted in 1943 at the Moscow Conference. We know that the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—joined later by France—stated in the declaration on Austria which was adopted at that conference of their Foreign Ministers that they desired the restoration of a free and independent Austria.

170. Subsequently, at the Potsdam Conference, in 1945, the principles of the common policy of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom with regard to Austria were defined, to be later

acknowledged by France, which associated itself with the decisions taken at Potsdam.

171. In accordance with those decisions of the four Powers, a decision was taken at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France held in December 1946, in New York, to prepare a State treaty with Austria; and later, at the Paris Conference of Foreign Ministers of the four Powers, in June 1949, some important provisions were adopted in concert on a number of political and economic questions relating to Austria.

172. On the basis of these decisions, the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France reached agreement, except for certain particular articles, on a draft State treaty with Austria, to which a considerable amount of time and energy and a considerable number of meetings were devoted.

173. The Government of the Soviet Union has repeatedly proposed the consideration of those articles of the draft State with Austria on which agreement has not yet been reached. It has frequently made such proposals. Unfortunately, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France have for some reason deemed it inexpedient to take steps for the final drafting and conclusion of a State treaty with Austria.

174. During the discussion of the draft State treaty with Austria, the Government of the Soviet Union on several occasions drew the attention of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France to the fact that the Powers which had assumed the responsibility for implementing the policy which had previously been established with regard to Austria, should, in connexion with the preparation of a State treaty with that country, see whether the decisions which had already been adopted—that is to say, the Moscow declaration on Austria and the Potsdam Agreements, which defined the policy towards Austria—were being carried out.

175. The Government of the Soviet Union has also pointed out to the Governments of the three Powers that the Austrian question, the question of concluding a State treaty with Austria, cannot be considered separately from certain other agreements among the four Powers, especially the decision concerning Trieste. The Government of the Soviet Union has stated that, since Trieste has illegally been turned into an Anglo-American military base and the international obligations undertaken by the Governments of the three Powers with regard to Trieste have remained unfulfilled for a number of years, there can be no guarantee that the treaty with Austria will not meet the same fate.

176. Instead of taking steps to accelerate the conclusion of the State treaty with Austria, the Governments of the United States, France and the United Kingdom have submitted a proposal for the conclusion of an "abridged treaty" with Austria. The question of concluding this shorter treaty with Austria was submitted to the Government of the Soviet Union by the Governments of the three other Powers for consideration in March 1952, but its text bears no relation to the principles and policy laid down with regard to Austria in the Potsdam Agreement and in the declaration adopted at the Moscow Conference of Foreign

Ministers, to which I have referred. This shorter treaty absolutely ignores the previously established principles of the policy towards Austria, both with regard to turning Austria into an independent, sovereign and democratic State, and with regard to its demilitarization.

177. In its reply to the note from the Governments of the three Powers to which I have referred, the Government of the Soviet Union indicated the necessity of taking steps for the speedy conclusion of a State treaty with Austria; it pointed out that the proposed abridged version of the State treaty with Austria was contrary to the decisions previously taken on Austria by the three Powers; it also asked the Governments of the three Powers whether they would be prepared to withdraw the proposals they had submitted on the conclusion of the so-called abridged treaty with Austria.

178. In their next note, the Governments of the three Powers made it clear that they maintained their position with regard to the abridged treaty with Austria, and absolutely ignored the draft treaty with Austria, on which a considerable measure of agreement had been reached by the representatives of the four Powers at meetings of the deputy Foreign Ministers.

179. As for the question asked by the Government of the Soviet Union, namely, whether the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France were prepared to withdraw their proposal for the conclusion of a so-called abridged treaty, no answer whatsoever was received. Instead of answering, the Governments of the three Powers took steps to place the question of the Austrian treaty before the General Assembly. This could be expected, given the conduct of the Governments of the three Powers two or three weeks before the opening of this session of the General Assembly, when they refused to continue to work on completing the drafting of a State treaty with Austria. When the provisional agenda was discussed yesterday in the General Committee [79th meeting], the United States representative welcomed the Brazilian proposal, the initiative of Brazil, as he put it, which had submitted the question to the General Assembly.

180. We had no doubt whatever concerning the position which would be taken by the United States Government on this Brazilian proposal. Leaving aside the question of whose the initiative really is, the Soviet Union delegation nevertheless considers it necessary today, at this meeting, to draw the General Assembly's attention to the fact that the consideration of this question in the General Assembly can in no way facilitate the drafting and conclusion of a State treaty with Austria, or the establishment of an independent, sovereign, democratic and peace-loving Austrian State. On the contrary, it is obvious from the previous actions of the authors of this proposal and from their statements at yesterday's meeting of the General Committee, that their purpose is to render the drafting and conclusion of a State treaty with Austria more difficult. It is self-evident that the USSR delegation cannot be a party to acts of that kind.

181. I have tried briefly to explain why the delegation of the Soviet Union once more, at this plenary meeting, objects categorically to the inclusion of this question in the agenda and to its consideration in the General Assembly. The question of the State treaty with Aus-

tria should be settled by the Powers concerned, which undertook obligations under the Moscow declaration and under the Four-Power Potsdam Agreement.

182. The PRESIDENT: I had thought to put the two items on North Africa, items 60 and 65, to the Assembly. Mr. Gromyko has anticipated me and crossed the Mediterranean to Austria. I am sorry I did not make myself clear to him.

183. I suggest we now continue consideration of the item which he has been dealing with and whose deletion he has moved, namely, item 63, "Question of an appeal to the Powers signatories to the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943, for an early fulfilment of their pledges towards Austria". The discussion will be on that item now.

184. Mr. MUNIZ (Brazil): Since objections have arisen to the inclusion of this item, proposed by the Brazilian Government, I feel bound to stress the following points.

185. There has never been any doubt in our minds as to the fact that the primary responsibility for the matter still rests on the shoulders of the great Powers. Our proposal is based on this assumption, and the explanatory memorandum we have submitted [A/2166/Add.1] makes this point perfectly clear. This is all the more true since what we contemplate is precisely an appeal—and I stress the word "appeal"—"to the Powers signatories to the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943, for an early fulfilment of their pledges towards Austria". I do not see how the primary responsibility of the four Powers could be asserted in a more explicit and peremptory manner. What we shall point out is that the situation arising from the inconclusive state of the negotiations among the four Powers on the conclusion of an Austrian treaty, has led to a serious state of affairs which can no longer be ignored by the United Nations.

186. The development of "friendly relations among nations, based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples", is one of the corner-stones of the United Nations and one of the proclaimed Purposes and Principles of the Charter. The United Nations was founded as "a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations" in the attainment of common objectives and in the establishment of conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties or other sources of international law could be maintained. It was in this spirit that the General Assembly, at its third session, adopted resolution 190 (III) of 3 November 1948, in which an appeal was made to the great Powers to renew their efforts to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace.

187. The Brazilian delegation did not move to bring the Austrian question to the consideration of the seventh session of the General Assembly, as Mr. Gromyko has implied. The Brazilian delegation is requesting the Assembly to consider the advisability of addressing an appeal to the great Powers for the early fulfilment of their pledges towards Austria. This is entirely in keeping with the United Nations Charter and in accordance with the purposes of the Organization.

188. A reference has been made by the representative of the Soviet Union to the provisions contained in

Article 107 of the Charter, namely, that nothing in the Charter "shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any State which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the... Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the governments having responsibility for such action".

189. It is rather astonishing to me, to say the least, to hear such a theory advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, and as a matter of recorded history, the Soviet Union stated formally in the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943 that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, "shall be liberated from German domination". Furthermore, in the same document, the Soviet Union considered itself in no way bound by the changes effected in Austria since the *Anschluss*, which it repudiated together with the other signatories of the Moscow Declaration and declared null and void. It would therefore be very hard to reconcile such formal promises and such solemn pledges with the statement which we have just heard, to the effect that Austria, after all, is still a former enemy State.

190. The Brazilian delegation does not intend to place the responsibility for the present state of affairs on the shoulders of any individual State. The only interest of the Government of Brazil is to see the matter considered and discussed by the General Assembly, as the most representative body of the United Nations, which has a direct responsibility for the maintenance of conditions likely to be conducive to the establishment of friendly relations among free and independent nations.

191. In insisting upon the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly, the Brazilian delegation is fully confident that a debate on the matter will serve the interests of international peace and security and will represent a powerful contribution to the solution of the outstanding problems arising from the Second World War.

192. The representative of the USSR showed surprise because this item had been proposed by the Brazilian Government. It seems that he entertains a very narrow conception of international relations and of the United Nations. According to that conception, only the great Powers are entitled to take the initiative of bringing matters to the consideration of the General Assembly which go beyond their own immediate interest. Is the representative of the Soviet Union trying to forget that peace is indivisible and that any situation affecting peace interests all Members of the United Nations and is the responsibility of every Member State? Does the representative of the Soviet Union reject the participation of every Member State which is not a great Power in the work of creating and consolidating world peace? Is the USSR Government trying to revert to the old concept of a directorate to direct the affairs of the world?

193. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation has already made clear, at the meeting of the General Committee, its attitude concerning the request of the Brazilian delegation that the item "Question of an appeal to the Powers signatories to the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943 for an early fulfilment of their pledges towards Austria" should be included in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly.

194. In view of the fact that this is a question of very great importance for Czechoslovakia and for a peaceful settlement in Central Europe, the Czechoslovak delegation appeals to the General Assembly to give consideration to the serious reasons of Czechoslovakia and to exclude this item from its provisional agenda.

195. It is the opinion of the Czechoslovakia delegation that, under Article 107 of the Charter, this is not a question which falls within the competence of the United Nations. Certain delegations are attempting to pervert an indisputable principle which is clearly inherent in the Charter with the contention that Austria is not an enemy State within the meaning of that article, as if the Czechoslovak delegation considered Austria as an enemy State.

196. The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943 must be considered as a complete entity. The Moscow Declaration, on which the Czechoslovak delegation bases itself in its arguments, states quite clearly that annexation was imposed upon Austria. Czechoslovakia is equally desirous of seeing a free and independent Austria. Czechoslovakia does not consider Austria as an enemy State, but sees in Austria a victim of nazi aggression. In its proposal for the exclusion of this item from the provisional agenda, the Czechoslovak Government is guided by the historic experiences of the Czechoslovak people. In this it differs from the Brazilian delegation. It cannot ignore the participation of Austria in the Second World War.

197. We learned to know the brutalities of the Austrian SS men on our skins. That is why Czechoslovakia, basing itself on the Moscow Declaration, stresses that Austria cannot evade its responsibility for having participated in the war on the side of Hitlerite Germany; and that is also why the provisions of Article 107 of the Charter are fully applicable to Austria. The inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly is not merely a question of the interpretation of the Charter and of the Moscow Declaration. From this point of view, the question is absolutely clear; there is no doubt that it should not be included in the agenda of the General Assembly.

198. The conclusion of a State treaty with Austria is, however, a question of vital importance for a peaceful settlement in Central Europe, and a question also which touches upon an entire complex of problems, such, for example, as that of Trieste. Czechoslovakia is a direct and immediate neighbour of Austria, and primarily interested in the conclusion of a State treaty with a free, democratic and peace-loving Austria, in order that the people of Czechoslovakia and the people of Austria may further develop their traditional relations.

199. The conclusion of a State treaty with Austria is a question to be settled by the four great Powers, which have already attained certain results in the drafting of such treaty. Any interference which is contrary to this procedure, which has been agreed upon beforehand and is applied in practice, is aimed at rendering impossible the actual conclusion of a State treaty with Austria and is thus in direct contradiction to the vital aims of the Austrian people. Any outside interference in this local procedure and, therefore, the inclusion of the question of Austria in the General Assembly agenda, is aimed at the setting up of artificial

barriers between the nations of the world and the maintenance of insecurity and unrest in Europe.

200. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation, invoking the clear provisions of the Moscow Declaration and of the Charter, and having in view the conclusion of a treaty with Austria at the earliest possible moment, in agreement with the wishes of the Czechoslovak people, is opposed to the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly and calls upon the Member States to exclude it therefrom.

201. The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to speak on item 63, I shall put to the vote the proposal for its exclusion from the agenda.

The proposal was rejected by 48 votes to 5.

Item 63 was placed on the agenda.

202. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the inclusion of items 60 and 65, which deal with the North African questions.

Items 60 and 65 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

203. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider item 61, "Draft convention on political rights of women", and item 62, "Question of the adoption by the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions of Spanish as a working language".

Items 61 and 62 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

204. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider item 64, "Application of Japan for membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization".

Item 64 was placed on the agenda without discussion.

205. The PRESIDENT: I shall return in a moment to the question of item 66, as I believe there will be a lengthy discussion on that subject, but it is my opinion that the Assembly might conclude at this meeting the consideration of items 67 and 68.

Items 67 and 68 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

206. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider items 69, 70 and 71.

Items 69, 70 and 71 were placed on the agenda without discussion.

207. The PRESIDENT: That means that all the items on the provisional agenda, with the exception of item 66, have been dealt with. I understand that the representative of the Union of South Africa will have a somewhat lengthy statement to make with regard to that item and I believe, therefore, that consideration of this matter might be postponed until tomorrow, when it will be the first item of business before the General Assembly. After consideration of the agenda has been concluded at the morning meeting, the general debate will be resumed, if that procedure is agreeable to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.