

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

PLENARY MEETING

SEVENTH SESSION

Friday, 17 October 1952, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Adoption of the agenda; report of the General Committee (A/2225/Rev.1) (continued)	71
General debate (continued)	73
Speeches by Mr. Dennis (Liberia), Mr. Skrzyszewski (Poland) and Mr. Martin (Canada)	

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

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

PART I (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT: In connexion with the inclusion of item 66 in the provisional agenda, which was decided at this morning's meeting [381st], one or two representatives wish to explain their votes on this matter. Their notification to that effect had been sent in but had not reached me at the time of the adjournment. They will now explain their votes before we proceed to the next item on the agenda.

2. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (*translated from French*): In explanation of its vote, the French delegation wishes to state that the Government of the French Republic has always opposed any kind of discrimination, whether racial, religious or otherwise, but that it cannot countenance the tendency of some States to interfere systematically in the internal affairs of other States and to involve the United Nations in such interference, in violation of the explicit provisions of the Charter. It was solely on the grounds of this principle that the French delegation voted against the inclusion of item 66 in the agenda.

3. Mr. POLITIS (Greece): My delegation voted for the inclusion of item 66 in the agenda, but I wish to state that we reserve our right to speak concerning the question of competence as well as the substance of the matter.

4. The PRESIDENT: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote on this item, we shall proceed to the next matter before us.

5. We have now adopted the items enumerated in Part I of the report of the General Committee [A/2225/Rev.1], entitled "Adoption of the agenda". In the first three paragraphs of that part, however, there is an explanation of why certain items which had

been in the provisional agenda were not recommended by the General Committee for inclusion in the list of items submitted to the General Assembly. Paragraph 1 explains why item 25 of the provisional agenda [A/2158] was not sent forward; paragraph 2 explains why item 31 (a) of the provisional agenda was not recommended for inclusion; and paragraph 3 explains that item 63 of the provisional agenda, originally proposed by Iraq, was later withdrawn and was superseded by another item on the same subject, sponsored by a number of States, including Iraq. Paragraph 5 explains that the General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly the deletion of item 58 of the provisional agenda, "Draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind". This was done on the understanding that the matter would continue to be discussed by the International Law Commission.

6. If there are no comments or observations on these paragraphs, we shall proceed to deal with part II of the report of the General Committee.

PART II

7. The PRESIDENT: It will be noted that twenty-two items have been recommended for reference to plenary meetings. Is that list of items allocated to plenary meetings acceptable to the General Assembly? Although no representative now expresses a desire to speak, I had been given to understand that certain delegations did have observations to make on this matter. Perhaps those delegations are not present at the moment. It may be well, then, to go on now to the next series of items and to return later to the consideration of these twenty-two items.

8. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan): As the President has stated, there are certain delegations that would have liked to make observations on the recommendations for allocation of items to plenary meetings. However, those delegations are not now present. Hav-

ing talked to them, and having understood that they were going to raise the point, I had planned merely to express my wholehearted support of their position.

9. The observation that I now want to make is that, contrary to the normal procedure of the United Nations, an item which should be discussed in the Third Committee is being recommended for allocation to a plenary meeting. This item, dealing with "recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples", is of great importance to my delegation. As representatives are aware, the Afghan delegation attached extreme importance to this question at the last session of the General Assembly, and it still attaches the same importance to the question.

10. The only reason which has been given to me for recommending that this item should be allocated to a plenary meeting is that certain delegations think the importance of the matter to be so great that its discussion in a plenary meeting or meetings would give it the prominence it deserves. I am grateful to them for this attitude. At the last session, when my delegation introduced the draft resolution on the right of self-determination of peoples [A/C.3/L.186 and Add.1], our first task was to bring to the attention of certain delegations the importance of this matter. Today, it would appear that that aim had been achieved.

11. The consideration of this item will entail discussion of a draft, and I do not think that a detailed discussion of drafting matters should properly take place in a plenary meeting. I think that committees have been established for the purpose of carrying on such detailed discussions, with the matters being brought before a plenary meeting after decisions have been reached upon such matters in committee. We know that the procedural limitations obtaining in a plenary meeting will not afford speakers a fair chance to express their views as thoroughly as they may wish to do upon a given item, especially if it is of a drafting nature.

12. We therefore suggest that this item should be allocated to the Third Committee for discussion. This is merely a suggestion. If the general inclination of the delegations is not to follow our suggestion, we shall not press the point. However, in one respect my delegation would like to make a reservation; in the event that it is decided that this item should be discussed in plenary meeting—and I repeat that we shall not object if that is the general inclination of the Assembly—we submit that we should be given a fair chance to express our views in plenary meeting in as much detail as would be possible in the Third Committee.

13. Mrs. FIGUEROA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation is prepared to support the suggestion of the representative of Afghanistan. As we all know, the General Assembly at its sixth session, in resolution 545 (VI), decided to include in the covenant or covenants on human rights an article on the right of all peoples to self-determination. This resolution also requested the Commission on Human Rights to prepare recommendations concerning international respect for the right of self-determination and to present those recommendations to the General Assembly at its seventh session.

14. I should like to say that my delegation is very pleased to see some items allocated directly to the plenary meetings, without prior discussion by committees. I feel that this procedure will tend to expedite the work of the General Assembly and render it more efficient. But in the particular case now before us, where the matter dealt with in the recommendations is one which gave rise to considerable controversy at all the debates in previous sessions of the General Assembly, my delegation feels that this attempt to save time, to conserve our efforts and to shorten the debate by allocating the question directly to the General Assembly may actually have the opposite effect—it may result in longer debates and more waste of time. Because of the nature of the question itself, and also because the report of the Economic and Social Council [A/21/2], which is before the Assembly, indicates, particularly in its paragraphs 553 and 554, that the questions at issue warrant thorough study, my delegation feels that this item should be discussed first in the appropriate committee.

15. Mr. KYROU (Greece): Our delegation attaches particular importance to item 30. May I repeat what I already have had the honour of stating in the General Committee: our delegation would be ready to see all twenty-two of these items allocated to the plenary meetings. During the discussion in the plenary meetings, in case it should be proved that it would be better to allocate item 30 to a committee, that action could be taken.

16. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): My delegation believes that the allocation of this item to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly has no precedent with respect to any other item of a similar nature in the United Nations. The Third Committee decided that the right of people and nations to self-determination comes under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it spent three sessions discussing this item.

17. The Economic and Social Council consists of only eighteen Members of the United Nations, whereas the Third Committee, when it discussed this item, heard the opinions of about sixty nations on this very vital article with reference to human rights. Therefore we do not see any justification for its transfer to the plenary meeting on the ground that time would be saved.

18. We have met several times in small groups to discuss this question. It would be inefficient for us to meet in this Assembly and exchange views on such a vital issue. I have heard it said that, due to the fact that the Fourth Committee is interested in this item, it would save time to have it transferred to a plenary meeting instead of having it discussed in two separate committees. The Third Committee can either invite the Fourth Committee to join it and discuss the matter together in the event the Fourth Committee has any views, or the Fourth Committee can take any decision it likes and submit it to the Third Committee after having read the latter's decision on this article.

19. There cannot be any compromise on this article. I believe that thirty-seven votes were cast in favour of a definite article in the human rights covenant. Some of us are inclined to believe that this is a tampering with the decision that was taken at the sixth session of the

General Assembly.¹ To reopen the question in plenary meeting in the form suggested by the Economic and Social Council is unconstitutional in so far as the Third Committee is concerned. It is true that that is the recommendation. However, please consider that it is the recommendation of only eighteen members.

20. I propose that this item should be referred again to the Third Committee.

21. The PRESIDENT: As there are no other speakers on this matter, I shall put to the General Assembly the proposal that item 30 should be transferred from the list of items to be dealt with at plenary meetings to the list to be dealt with by the Third Committee.

The proposal was adopted by 26 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions.

The list of items recommended for allocation to plenary meetings, as amended, was adopted.

The lists of items recommended for allocation to the First Committee, the Ad Hoc Political Committee and the Second Committee, respectively, were adopted.

The list of items recommended for allocation to the Third Committee, with the addition of item 30, originally included in the list recommended for allocation to plenary meetings, was adopted.

The lists of items recommended for allocation to the Fourth Committee, the Fifth Committee and the Sixth Committee, respectively, were adopted.

PART III

The recommendations concerning the arrangements relating to the schedule of meetings and the target date for the closing of the session were adopted.

22. The PRESIDENT: Unless there is any objection, I declare that the report of the General Committee, as a whole, as amended, is approved.

It was so decided.

General debate (continued)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. DENNIS (LIBERIA), MR. SKRZESZEWSKI (POLAND) AND MR. MARTIN (CANADA)

23. Mr. DENNIS (Liberia): We have convened for the seventh annual session of the United Nations General Assembly in these new, elaborate and magnificent structures provided and dedicated for the benefit of the United Nations to serve as edifices in which, by our united efforts, the propagation of world peace, goodwill, equality and human rights among men may be realized.

24. Our appreciation is due to the Government and people of the United States, within whose territories these buildings have been constructed, to the donor of the land upon which this permanent home of the United Nations has been made possible and to all those who have contributed in any way towards this laudable effort.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 375th meeting.

25. The members of the Liberian delegation have come to assist in the common effort of creating and prolonging the era of peace. We are resolved to support measures designed to achieve and maintain international peace, freedom and liberty, not only for nations, but for individuals.

26. While it is gratifying that this great world Organization meets with Member nations not engaged in a deadly global war of arms, and while it is incontrovertible that it has been the mighty influence and effort of the United Nations since the end of the Second World War, when this institution was organized, that has served as a deterrent of another world war, speaking candidly, every one of us can truthfully admit that the attitudes of Members of the United Nations have not been and are not reasonably appropriate to the name, style, objective and purposes for which the United Nations was instituted and intended to represent.

27. Most Member States appear to be divided into two separate camps—admittedly so by ourselves—to which we give the appellation Eastern and Western blocs, and relationship between these two separate groups of nations has developed into what we call a cold war. This state of affairs has continued for almost seven years, and the tension, antagonism and estrangement among us have become so sharp and desperate that we have reached a point where even the fine art of diplomatic parlance in discussions, the rules and niceties that used to attend and relate to the exchange of divergent points of view in diplomacy between civilized States seem to be ignored and abandoned.

28. On the floor of the meetings halls of this very Organization, Member States attack each other in language most harsh; over radio broadcasts we have indulged in the selfsame practices. With the immense, amazing and tremendous advancement that man has made in science and invention, it is alarming to note that he seems to have retrogressed in culture and refinement by his conduct. The great statesmen of yesterday, of the nations represented here today, could easily, if they could speak to us, declare themselves ashamed of our conduct and behaviour.

29. The ultimate aim of the United Nations is to achieve and maintain peace and goodwill among nations and men by just and fair treatment and regard one for the other. We can never achieve peace and goodwill if we persevere with our present trend of hate, suspicion, selfishness, individual nationalism and greed. We cannot achieve peace and goodwill on earth by force, power and might; peace cannot be achieved by the United Nations or any other organization by mighty air forces, navies, armies and atomic or other weapons—I mean universal and permanent peace—but peace can be attained by love, national unselfishness and international unity.

30. There must be a halting point somewhere to the present bitter feelings and strained relationships among the nations which have subscribed to the Charter of the United Nations; we must live and practise the principles laid down in that sacred and immortal document subscribed to by us, and which was intended to be the sheet-anchor of this Organization in its struggle

to win world peace. There is need for conciliation and possibly reconciliation between East and West and West and East; and the Liberian Government, represented by its delegation to the General Assembly, appeals to and implores you, one and all, to alter fundamentally the present attitudes and make use of the many conciliation or reconciliation commissions set up by this Organization in getting at the root of the evil that keeps the Member nations of this Organization apart, and find a solution for the reunion of friends with friends so long divided.

31. The human race, the nations of the earth, men, women and children, the wealth of the world, civilization, culture, religion, the earth itself and even nature, pleads for it, as none of them can endure such a conflict as another war, with the destructive implements of war possessed by the nations, will impose. Humanity speaks to us most clearly and demands it of us. If we fail to take these factors into account, to follow the dictates of our consciences and put an end to the cold war that must inevitably lead to a universal bloody war that might destroy civilization, culture, the human race and all that we have striven to develop and preserve through the centuries, we, the leaders of the world of today in politics, in science and in culture, will be responsible for the vandalism and annihilation that such a holocaust will involve.

32. Several questions have time and again appeared on the agenda of the sessions of the General Assembly; they have been lengthily discussed and no solutions have been arrived at, simply because the laudable spirit of compromise has been distinctly conspicuous by its absence in our deliberations. As long as one State or group of States feels that its views on any subject must in all respects and at all times prevail, there can be no solution to such problems.

33. In the pursuit of peace, if the world is to be consolidated, if it is to be prepared and able to prevent or meet aggression, from whatever source it comes, the leaders of the United Nations must be bold enough to recognize without reservation the natural and inalienable rights of men and women of all races to equality, liberty and freedom. We must realize that people will not continue to strive to preserve a politico-social structure in which they themselves are denied the freedom and liberty of such a structure, yet whose preservation they are called upon to defend.

34. It is gratifying to all of us liberty-loving peoples, and especially to us in Africa, to note that, under the action of the United Nations, another independent State has come into existence under the name and style of the United Kingdom of Libya.

35. It is well known that the old theory still persists among certain States that certain peoples, for one reason or another, cannot be raised in the society of nations to the rank of independent and sovereign States. It is our ardent hope that the United Nations will preserve and continue to exert pressure on the colonial Powers to loosen their grip in the colonial orbit, where the urge for self-government and independence has assumed considerable proportions. We hope that the aspirations of these people will continue to receive the sympathetic consideration of the General Assembly in their struggle.

36. The policy of the Government of Liberia in respect of this basic, all-important question, was clearly and forcefully outlined by the President of the Republic on 7 January 1952, when he said, *inter alia*:

"With the firm belief and steadfast faith in the axiom that all men are created free and independent, and therefore entitled to the benefits and privileges of self-determination and the natural right to conduct their own political affairs, we shall seek to co-operate with all democratic and freedom-loving peoples and nations, through the aegis of the United Nations Organization, to adopt measures whereby the teeming millions of mankind inhabiting most of the under-developed areas of the world who, because of their peculiar circumstances, are considered unprepared presently to assume the responsibility of full sovereignty and independence, may be able to do so in common with us in the shortest possible period of time.

"This is the ultimate objective of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which we, in conjunction with a majority of Member States, have unreservedly adopted. The sacred fulfilment of all of the propositions of this Declaration is not only a just challenge to the United Nations, but seems to me to be the bastion of understanding and the surest pathway to enduring, universal peace and happiness."

37. This is the spirit and the principle by which the Liberian delegation will be guided in its approach to all issues affecting the destiny of the peoples which may be brought up for consideration at the present session.

38. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): When, after a bloody and heroic struggle against fascism, the nations of the world decided to maintain peace by a common endeavour and to prevent the outbreak of a new war, they established the United Nations for that purpose. Under the provisions of the Charter, the purposes of the United Nations were to achieve international co-operation, to develop friendly relations among nations, to remove threats to the peace and to suppress acts of aggression wherever they occurred. We all remember how the peoples welcomed the establishment of the United Nations seven years ago, and how they founded their hopes of a lasting peace on it after the terrible years of the last war.

39. The governments of the States that joined the United Nations affixed their signatures to the Charter, thereby undertaking formally and solemnly to observe its provisions. The United Nations Charter thus became one of the important international documents of the post-war period. It became a document which should have been respected and given effective application.

40. When we meet each year at the sessions of the General Assembly, we take stock of the period which has elapsed and express our views on the current situation. Today, more than seven years after the establishment of the United Nations, we are forced to conclude that not all Members have remained faithful to the provisions of the Charter. Only a few of the governments which represent the true will of their peoples are stubbornly following the path indicated by the Charter. Their policy is still a policy of peace. In

accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter, these governments are making every effort "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

41. I have primarily in mind the USSR and its peace policy, a policy symbolized by the peaceful construction proceeding in that country and by the proposals for the maintenance of peace and for peaceful co-operation among nations which are submitted tirelessly both in the United Nations and elsewhere. We are compelled to acknowledge that it is the Soviet Union which has respected and respects the principles of the observance of international treaties and loyalty to international commitments freely assumed. We see that the policy of the USSR accords with the principles of the Charter and is a true peace policy.

42. Other countries in the camp of progress are also defending the principles of the Charter. The People's Republic of China, another great Power and one of the founders of our Organization, having cast off the yoke of foreign exploitation and of a corrupt government, has joined the ranks of the States which are still loyal to the cause of peace. It defends the principles embodied in the decisions of the Charter. Unfortunately, and contrary to all principles and to law, the People's Republic of China is being refused its place in the United Nations by the very parties whose activities are in glaring contradiction with the purposes of our Organization.

43. Poland, too, is indomitably defending the principles of the Charter. Ours is a country which has known dreadful suffering. We are a nation which has achieved a people's democratic régime and is advancing towards a better and a happier future. When the new State of Poland was established in 1944, our country was ruined and impoverished; its situation then was far worse than it had been in 1939, when we were one of the poor and backward countries of Europe. In these last seven years, the People's Republic has restored an enormous mass of ruins, its economy is serving the interests of the people and it is carrying out a second long-range economic programme. We are building factories, and new towns and cities; we are building a new Warsaw, with fine new districts which serve as symbols of our peaceful and creative effort.

44. For Poland, 1952 has been another year of achievement in the fulfilment of our great programme of peaceful construction, our six-year plan. We have made further progress in our industrial and agricultural development, in transportation, culture, education and health protection. We are investing ever larger sums in the construction of new factories and in the expansion and modernization of existing industrial establishments. The People's Republic is giving ever greater protection to agriculture. Expenditure on the development of social insurance and schools is constantly increasing and budgetary appropriations for public health, maternity and child welfare and the construction of new hospitals, sanatoria and rest homes are growing steadily larger.

45. Systematically, and at an ever-increasing rate, we are remedying the backward state of our economy. Poland is becoming a country of high technological

achievement, with a modern industry and agriculture. Our output today is three times what it was before the war; now, in 1952, it is 310 per cent of what it was in 1938 and its *per capita* value is now four times as great.

46. In the eight years of the people's democratic régime, we have published 500 million books, 100 million more than pre-war Poland published in twenty years. Three times as many pupils are attending school as before the war, and there has been a fourfold increase in the number of vocational schools. In 1951, we built 100,000 housing units.

47. We have, once and for all, removed the scourge of unemployment, both in the towns and in the country.

48. All our attainments, our achievements in carrying out our economic plans, testify to the moral and political unity of our people. Our successes are also due to the great and unselfish assistance which the People's Republic has received and is receiving on a very large scale from the USSR. They are the fruit of a new type of economic co-operation among the countries in the peace camp, based on the principle of mutual assistance, equality and trust.

49. On the international level, we are concluding treaties and agreements which express our desire for peaceful collaboration. We are scrupulously observing our international commitments, which include economic commitments, and we are abiding strictly by the provisions of the Charter, since we have always believed, and still believe, that the United Nations can and must remain an instrument for the safeguarding of peace. That is why, speaking from this rostrum on behalf of the Polish Government, I am fully entitled to assert that Poland has done everything possible to enable the United Nations to carry out its appointed tasks.

50. Nevertheless, despite the efforts of the Soviet Union and the other States in the peace camp, the United Nations has not as yet fulfilled the hopes inspired by its establishment. Everywhere, even in the report submitted by the Secretariat to the present session, it has had to be acknowledged that the nations no longer regard the United Nations as "the sole or even the main instrument for the preservation of peace at present".²

51. The United Nations has not been able to stop the armaments race, to remove international tension and to protect mankind against the nightmare of the possible use of weapons of mass destruction; it has not as yet succeeded in bringing about the cessation of hostilities in Korea.

52. The fact remains, however, that the peoples of the world desire peace. The world-wide movement of the partisans of peace has become a powerful force uniting masses of people of differing views in a common effort to prevent a new war. The world peace movement demonstrates the possibilities of co-operation among and co-existence of nations.

53. How, then, has it come about that, despite the peoples' profound desire for peace and despite a peace policy pursued by the States in the camp of progress,

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1, chapter V, section (a), first paragraph.*

the international situation remains tense? What are the reasons for the grave danger which threatens the cause of peace?

54. The answer is to be found in the policy of certain States, and especially in that of the United States Government. Without even awaiting the end of hostilities in the Second World War, the United States was heading for a third world war, for which it is now preparing. In illustration of this, it should be recalled that consultations between British and United States military leaders to draw up the strategy of the future war were held as early as the Potsdam Conference. For confirmation, one need only refer to the memoirs of General Arnold, Chief of the United States Air Force, in his book, *Global Mission*, wherein he describes his conversations with Marshal of the Royal Air Force Portal, then Chief of the British Air Staff. They reached the conclusion that "to use our strategic air power successfully, we must have bases so located round the world that we can reach any target we may be called upon to hit". Mr. Byrnes, the then United States Secretary of State, who was present at the conference, gave General Arnold the following idea of United States foreign policy: "what we must do now is not to make the world safe for democracy, but to make the world safe for the United States".

55. That is the goal which United States policy has pursued during the past seven years. Each year has brought fresh proof of its hostility to peace. This policy is expressed in the United States attitude to the countries of Western Europe, in the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty and the remilitarization of Western Germany. In the Balkans, the United States is using the docile Belgrade régime as a basis for operations directed primarily against the immediate neighbours of Yugoslavia. The special role assigned to Yugoslavia is to provoke frontier incidents and to assist subserviently in the organization of an aggressive wing of the Atlantic bloc in the Balkans. In the Near and Middle East, the United States is endeavouring to bring the peoples under its domination by exerting political and economic pressure on them and by attempting to engineer an aggressive pact for the Near and Middle East. In the Far East, the United States is waging war in Korea, seeking to extend the war to China and to conclude a Pacific pact, remilitarizing Japan.

56. In order to justify this policy, the United States invokes the pretext of the alleged danger from the so-called Soviet bloc, and the danger of aggression which is said to be threatening the United States, and this in spite of the facts, which prove that it is precisely the States where the people have assumed power which are constructing new régimes and remain in the forefront of the struggle for peace; which have prohibited war propaganda by law; which are engaged in peaceful construction on an enormous scale; which, at the international level, respect the agreements they have concluded; which are indefatigable in their efforts to promote peace; and which entertain no feeling of enmity towards either the American people or other peoples.

57. To seek world domination and the enslavement of other peoples—that is the aim of United States policy. This policy is carried out by ceaselessly poisoning peaceful relations among States, creating centres of

aggression and provoking grounds for disputes to be submitted to the United Nations. Diversionary activity has become a favourite weapon, and a constant method. The particular symptoms and results of such a policy are as follows: transition of the capitalist countries to a war economy under the pressure of the United States, economic discrimination, the armaments race, violation of the principles of international law and of international agreements, organization of aggressive blocs, remilitarization of Germany and Japan, atomic blackmail, and, lastly, the aggression in Korea. In the light of this situation, how false and hypocritical seems the statement Mr. Acheson made yesterday [380th meeting]! The facts belie his words.

58. Today, the war preparations undertaken by the United States are swallowing up enormous wealth in both material and manpower. The United States is spending more than 74 per cent of its national budget on armaments. The effect of United States pressure is to make the countries of Western Europe totter under the burden of war expenditures which exceed their material resources. Thus, for example, the military budget of the United Kingdom exceeds £1,500 million. France is spending 1,400 thousand million francs a year on armaments. It is obvious that such a rate of expenditure on armaments must have disastrous repercussions on the economic situation of these countries as well as on that of the countries economically dependent upon them. The militarization of the economy results in a decline in the production of normal consumer goods and the unilateral development of war production. This has a catastrophic effect on the economic situation of all the economically backward countries, which are exploited as sources of raw materials and thus have to bear the shocks of the violent price fluctuations on the international markets.

59. The capitalist world is therefore faced with growing economic difficulties. Even the most optimistic experts in the United States are obliged to admit that the economic policy of that country, which is now based on the production of armaments, cannot prevent the approaching crisis. United States politicians admit that the Korean war has made the present situation possible. Analysing the present situation of the United States, which is characterized by a war economy, Mr. Leo M. Cherne, Executive Secretary of the Research Institute of America, states that economic circles now have "no more than a year in which to prepare for a recession that may be deeper and longer-lasting than any interval of difficulty since the thirties". Thus the experience of the development of the American economy after the Second World War proves, as the experience of the Hitlerite economy also proved in its time, that the growth of armaments production not only fails to banish the spectre of crisis, but that it is, on the contrary, the source of increasing difficulties and constitutes the reason why "a downturn in business activity is considered to be inevitable", as the *U.S. News & World Report* said on 10 October 1952.

60. The countries of Western Europe have already been very severely affected by the militarization of their economic life. The United States is disorganizing their economy and exploiting their enfeeblement to conquer a considerable part of the capitalist world market. The United States is destroying multilateral economic ties and substituting for them agreements

concluded by those countries with the United States to their own disadvantage. By forcing the countries of Western Europe, in spite of their vital interests, to break the economic ties with the peoples' democracies—traditional ties, without which the economy of Western Europe cannot grow—the United States is making the countries of Western Europe still more dependent on the American market. It is lowering the standard of living of their peoples and causing an increase in unemployment. The most recent quarterly bulletin of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe gives the following appraisal of the situation in Western Europe: "Industrial employment and production as a whole . . . fell . . . increases in the industries supplying defence programmes being . . . still in insufficient to offset declines in the activity of those producing . . . consumer goods both for home and export markets."⁸

61. The growing economic crisis is the cause of the ceaseless conflicts which reflect the internal contradictions in the capitalist world. The struggle between the competitors on the capitalist world market is becoming increasingly acute. Germany and Japan are pressing ever harder to dislodge the United Kingdom and France from their positions; and meanwhile the American monopolies, while seeking to secure advantageous markets to the detriment of national production, are making it increasingly difficult for those countries to obtain access to the American markets.

62. On several occasions, and particularly at the last session of the General Assembly, we have asked that steps should be taken to check the growing armaments race. The opponents of those proposals sought to justify their attitude by the alleged requirements of national defence. Every year brings further proof that the war preparations of the Atlantic bloc are not intended for defence, but, on the contrary, for aggression against the countries which are planning their future by peaceful labour. This is confirmed by the establishment of more and more United States bases in all parts of the world, in Europe, in the Near East, and in the areas of the Pacific, thousands of miles from the coasts of the United States, a circumstance which clearly indicates their aggressive nature.

63. This aggressiveness is revealed if only by the fact that the war-mongers in the United States, just like the governments which place their own territories under foreign occupation, are attempting to conceal what they are doing from their own people. In the opinion of the Pentagon, the secrecy of the agreements presents additional advantages. Indeed, according to the *Chicago Tribune* of 15 July 1952, one of the high officials of the Pentagon cynically declared that "secret agreements can be arranged more quickly and satisfactorily because secrecy permits us to use diplomacy, cajolery, or other tactics which do not work as well out in the open".

64. American armaments, which absorb an enormous proportion of the budget of the United States, include all types of weapons, even those which have been condemned by mankind and prohibited by international agreements. Obsessed with the desire to dominate the world, the United States is prepared—as the experience

of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, as well as of the Korean war, has shown—to use all the most inhuman and savage methods, without regard for what happens to the countries which are the victims of its aggression or even to its closest allies. Blackmail by threat of the atomic bomb has become one of the essential methods of United States foreign policy. All the indications are, however, that the free nations against which the threats of these gentlemen from the Pentagon are chiefly brandished, have not let themselves be intimidated. What has increased, on the contrary, are hysteria and fear in the United States itself. American war propaganda has returned like a boomerang to the mind of the American people itself.

65. The United States does not hesitate to use another weapon of mass destruction: I refer to the terrible bacterial weapon, which it has used in Korea in spite of the existing prohibitions and in spite of the indignation expressed by world public opinion. It is a fact that this weapon figures largely in the United States armaments programme. This shows still more clearly the danger of American armaments to mankind. These weapons and these armaments are intended for aggression, and neither the Press nor the American politicians can conceal that fact. Thus, for example, the *U. S. News & World Report*, in its issue of 26 September 1952, attempts to calculate accurately the possibilities of an attack against the Soviet Union launched simultaneously from two directions, that is to say, from United States bases in the North Sea and from United States bases in the Mediterranean. The article is accompanied by a map on which big black arrows indicate the development of the attack and show the towns which the United States would like to sentence to death. The purpose of the armaments is also revealed by presidential candidate General Eisenhower, who announced the co-called "liberation" by arms of the peoples of Eastern Europe and of Asia, the "liberation" of precisely the peoples who are devotedly struggling to promote peace. I cannot refrain from mentioning it, for the threat of the so-called "liberation" is to be effected with the help of napalm bombs, plague and other infamous weapons from the American arsenals.

66. Acts of gross intervention against these peoples have moreover been taking place for some time in the form of the organization of diversionary activities and sabotage, dropping of spies by parachute and the financing of foul crimes, evidence of which is provided by the trials in progress, some of them in Poland. The notorious Public Law No. 165, which was passed by the 82nd Congress of the United States and was discussed at length at the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations,⁴ constitutes a public admission of this by the United States. The events preceding the adoption of Law No. 165 by the 82nd Congress, as well as the events of 1952, have confirmed the full extent of United States responsibility for diversionary activities in Eastern European countries. These facts have fully borne out the justice of the indictment brought on the subject at the sixth session. The bombastic statement by Mr. Acheson which we heard yesterday, to the effect that the United States is faithfully observing the principles of the Charter, is

⁸ See *Economic Bulletin for Europe*, vol. 4, no. 2 (First Quarter, 1952), p. 3.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 355th and 358th meetings, and *First Committee*, 472nd to 475th meetings.

incompatible with the practice of United States policy as I have just described it.

67. The attitude of the Polish people towards both the threats and the diversionary activities of the United States Government is one of the most profound contempt and indignation. They will not disturb the calm course of our labours for increased prosperity and a better future for Polish children.

68. The Polish people are also aware that a special place has been assigned to Western Germany in the United States policy of aggression. Year after year we have drawn attention to the fact that Western Germany is in process of becoming the arsenal of the policy of war and that the United States is preparing to use it as a base from which to attack the Eastern European countries. The United States has found an ally among the renascent forces of fascism, among the routed generals and among those seeking to revive German imperialism. The past year has provided further evidence of this. A neo-nazi army is being established, whose members are to become the shock troops of the so-called European army; this neo-nazi army, according to the Bonn Secretary of State, Mr. Hallstein, is planning expansion as far as the Urals.

69. In pursuit of this policy, the United States is seeking to maintain the division of Germany and to prevent the German people as a whole from becoming a member of the family of peace-loving nations. Washington is imposing a separate treaty on Western Germany, giving orders for the creation of a Bonn army, and appointing as its leaders those who were responsible for the misfortunes and mass murders of the last war. The Western European nations are becoming increasingly aware of the danger which threatens them. More sober views are being expressed with increasing frequency in the Press of every shade. Even a publication like the *Manchester Guardian* recently wrote: "Can one feel any confidence in the belief that a Western Germany, rearmed and powerful, with the Krupp family and their financial empire intact, and half their industrial properties still in their possession, may not again become a rallying-point for unscrupulous elements in German policy and politics?"* The Krupp factories are again producing lethal weapons and the sinister shadow of the *Wehrmacht* looms darker over Europe; it looms over France, Belgium and the Netherlands and the other countries which suffered the brutalities of Nazi occupation. The "famous" Schuman plan is also aimed at these countries.

70. As the representative of Poland, I am particularly entitled to speak on the subject. The Nazi aggression against Poland marked the opening of the Second World War. Encouraged by the policy of Munich, fascism inflicted the most devastating losses upon us. This is the reason for our protest against the action of the United States Government in reviving the neo-nazi military forces. For this policy is closely bound up with an attack upon our western frontiers, upon the inviolable decisions of Yalta and Potsdam. This is how United States imperialism wishes to "liberate" the Polish people.

71. The policy of the revival of nazism and the militarization of Germany is encountering increasing resistance from the European nations and from the

German people itself. The progressive forces in Germany, the same forces which brought about the creation of the German Democratic Republic, are today seeking to bring about a peaceful and democratic Germany. The German people is demanding the unification of the country and the establishment of a democratic government—a fact of which the United States is well aware and which is the reason for the devices and manoeuvres it is employing in order to mislead German opinion. The illegal attempt to make use of the United Nations, and the creation, at the sixth session of the General Assembly [*resolution 510 (VI)*] of an illegal commission in connexion with the German elections, was an instance of such manoeuvres, as were the ill-judged replies to the constructive USSR proposals for the unification of Germany. At the same time, the United States is doing everything in its power to prevent the unification of Germany and to perpetuate the division of the country.

72. In the plans of the United States, a rôle similar to that of Western Germany is assigned in the Far East to Japan. Contrary to the interests of the Japanese people, it is on Japanese territory that a base is being established for an attack against the Chinese people, which has already shaken off the chains of oppression and exploitation. But there also conflicts are obviously inevitable. The Japanese people itself have no desire to become the instrument of United States policy and are making increasingly energetic protests against the attempts to prolong United States occupation to all eternity.

73. The peoples of Africa and Asia are also resisting attempts to enslave them and to perpetuate their dependence. The colonial and dependent peoples are striving to secure their full right to self-determination. The attitude of the Polish people is one of sympathy and understanding for the struggle of these peoples to attain their independence. Their right to an independent existence is incontrovertible; they must be given their proper place among the peoples who are fighting for peace.

74. Against the background of United States policy, the origin of present tension, of conflicts, and of the danger of war, becomes quite apparent. It is the aspirations of United States imperialism to world domination, to a new division of the world and to interference in the affairs of other nations against their will, which are the source of conflicts. And all this takes place notwithstanding the decisions of the Charter, the principle of equal sovereignty of States, the principle of the right of peoples to self-determination and the obligation to observe international agreements.

75. In contravention of these principles, an attack has been made upon the liberty of the Korean people, who have been refused the right of decide their own fate. The United Nations has been used as an instrument of the policy of aggression. Day after day, we permit thousands of human lives and the property of hundreds of thousands of peace-loving human beings, who ask only to live and work in peace, to be destroyed by barbarous attacks from the air. Korea has become the living symbol of the policy of aggression. Korea is for the world a graphic illustration of where the policy of armament and unrestricted expansion, the policy of dominating other peoples, may and does lead.

* Quotation unchecked owing to insufficient data.

76. The situation I have just described makes it clear why the basic provisions of the Charter have not yet been realized, why peace has not been secured. It shows why the international situation remains tense, why the danger of a new world war hangs over the world.

77. While the Polish delegation does not underestimate the danger, it also rejects the fatalistic view that war is inevitable. In our opinion, a series of measures is required which, taken as a whole, may contribute to the maintenance of peace and peaceful co-operation. For the international situation requires simultaneous action on a whole series of questions; it requires that we jointly consider and resolve the crucial problems of international policy.

78. The most urgent question is the cessation of hostilities in Korea, on land, at sea and in the air. This is the third session of the General Assembly since the United States launched its attack on the Korean people. The United Nations has, alas, allowed itself to be used as an instrument of the aggressive policy of the United States. Having secured the sanction of the United Nations by illegal methods, the United States has declined to permit any steps to be taken to bring the conflict to an end; it even prevented discussion of the Korean question at the sixth session of the General Assembly. Furthermore, after dragging a number of countries into direct participation in the military operations, and taking advantage of the armed forces dispatched by those countries while retaining the command of the forces for itself, the United States is persistently seeking to extend the conflict by a variety of measures and to direct it primarily against the People's Republic of China.

79. The United Nations has not only an opportunity but also a duty to deal with the question of the Korean conflict. It has a duty to secure the cessation of military operations and a peaceful and lasting settlement of the conflict, in the interests of international peace and security.

80. Yet military operations are continuing. American pilots are murdering innocent victims—women, children and the aged—by the thousand. The heavy casualties sustained by the contingents of its allies in pressing forward the aggression in Korea are of no concern to the United States Government. It has even remained unmoved by its own lengthening casualty lists, by the fact that several thousand young Americans have lost their lives in an unjust war. The United States is engineering the failure of the talks on the cease-fire problem. After it had been compelled, by the pressure of world public opinion, to accept the Soviet Union proposal, the United States at once set itself to prevent the talks from reaching a successful outcome. With that object in view, it violated the neutral zone on several occasions and spread false rumours and provocative charges against the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the object being to create a variety of pretexts for breaking off the armistice talks. After the failure of these provocative activities, the United States went on to acts of brutal destruction. The bombing of towns and villages, the annihilation of the civilian population, the devastation of a country already in ruins and, finally, the provocative air attacks on the power-stations and plants on the Yalu River—which caused so much concern to the allies of the United States—were of unprecedented violence. It was quite

obvious to the allies of the United States that these air attacks were an attempt to extend the conflict or even to start a new war.

81. While the devastation spreads from day to day, the ruins pile up and innocent men fall victim to the United States Air Force, Mr. Acheson talks of the future reconstruction of Korea. This is the United States contribution to the reconstruction of Korea announced by Mr. Acheson.

82. The problem of the prisoners of war is a particularly shameful chapter in the history of the Korean conflict and of the Panmunjom talks. The procedure for settling the problem should not, however, be in doubt. There are clear and unequivocal international agreements on the question of the treatment of prisoners of war. All that was necessary, one would have thought, would have been to apply these agreements, the signatories to which include the United States Government. Not so, however. The history of the prison camps in South Korea, where terrorism, violence, starvation and murder have become the daily lot of the Korean and Chinese volunteer prisoners, is a dark page in the history of recent years. Koje has become the scene of the martyrdom of Korean patriots and Chinese volunteers. A few weeks ago, on Cheju, fifty-two prisoners who dared to hoist their national flag on one of their national holidays were brutally murdered. Only yesterday the American Press reported that eleven prisoners in the Koje camp had been injured following alleged insubordination. And it is precisely this question of prisoners of war which the Government of the United States is using as a pretext to prevent the conclusion of an armistice, to undertake the systematic sabotage of the talks and finally to adjourn them, as it recently did in the most shameful manner, without fixing a date for their resumption. This step was obviously taken with a view to confronting the General Assembly with a *fait accompli*.

83. The United Nations cannot tolerate such a state of affairs. It must not allow appalling wars of destruction to continue. We should recall the disillusionment and indignation with which ordinary peoples throughout the world are following the discussions in the United Nations, unable to understand why it should indulge in sterile debate while thousands of innocent men are losing their lives every day. This war does not concern the Korean people alone, but has become an international problem, since its continuation constitutes a threat to the peace, particularly in Asia and the Far East. Faced with this situation, the General Assembly must recommend the immediate cessation of military operations on land, at sea and in the air, the repatriation of all prisoners in conformity with the principles of the Geneva Convention and the withdrawal, within a period of two or three months, of all foreign forces as well as of the detachments of Chinese volunteers.

84. It is the duty of the United Nations to seek a peaceful solution of the Korean problem through the unification of Korea by the Korean people themselves; it should do so with the help of a commission on which, in addition to the countries directly concerned, other States, including some which are not taking part in military operations, should be represented.

85. Korea is a glaring example of the consequences of the policy of aggression and the armaments race. That

is why a reduction of armaments is a prerequisite for any action to secure a relaxation of international tension. As long ago as 1946, the General Assembly, on the initiative of the USSR, adopted a resolution [41 (I)] affirming the need to reduce armed forces and armaments as soon as possible. Despite this resolution, no progress whatsoever has been made in the disarmament problem during the past six years. The problem has been discussed at each successive session of the General Assembly. At these sessions one of the great Powers, the Soviet Union, has put forward concrete proposals which, if adopted, would have made possible an immediate reduction of armaments and armed forces and the use of vast material resources and reserves of human energy for peaceful ends.

86. The unremitting efforts of the USSR and of the countries of the peace camp have come to naught as a result of the opposition of the United States, the Power responsible for the initiation of the present armaments race. The latest evidence of this was the rejection of the Soviet Union proposal submitted to the sixth session of the General Assembly [A/2068]. The proposal was referred to a newly established commission [resolution 502 (VI)], the Disarmament Commission, but has remained unstudied in consequence of the action of the United States delegation. Another year has thus elapsed, during which a further increase of armaments has served only to heighten international tension; for no relaxation of that tension is possible without a reduction of armaments.

87. A start must be made forthwith on a general disarmament plan, and the first step in that direction must be the proportionate reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the great Powers. No proof is needed that the armed forces of the great Powers play a predominant role and that a disarmament initiated by those States would lead to a substantial and effective relaxation of international tension. The assumption that the reduction of armaments must be initiated precisely by those States is therefore sound. The Soviet Union has already expressed its willingness to undertake a reduction of its armaments. It is now time for those Powers which have not yet done so to give concrete evidence of their readiness to co-operate in effective action to reduce armaments.

88. By taking this first step, the United Nations can make a considerable contribution towards an immediate relaxation of national tension and to the lightening of the burden which weighs on the world economy. The proposals pompously described as the three-Power (United States, United Kingdom and France) disarmament proposals, submitted to the sixth session of the General Assembly [A/C.1/667], were revealed to be a spurious plan from the start of the discussions which took place during that session, and this was even more evident during the detailed discussions in the Disarmament Commission. In the absence of any obligation to reduce armaments during the period of the armaments race, the proposed checking of armaments is not merely devoid of meaning, but would in fact amount to sanctioning the armaments race. The same applies to the so-called disarmament plans, and in particular to the plan of which Mr. Acheson spoke yesterday, since their authors did not aim at reducing armaments, but at securing or maintaining the domination of the North Atlantic bloc by pursuing their own

armament effort. The Polish delegation considers that it is the fundamental duty of the United Nations to prepare and carry into effect a genuine disarmament plan. A disarmament conference should be convened to study the disarmament of all States.

89. We also consider that the source of the present international tension lies not only in the absence of a disarmament plan jointly prepared by the great Powers, but also in the failure of those Powers, through the fault of the United States, to co-operate in other aspects of international policy. Co-operation among the great Powers is a matter of concern to all States and we all, I think, recognize the need for co-operation among those who bear the main responsibility for peace. We remain faithful to the principle of the equality of all Member States of the United Nations. At the same time, it must be recognized that certain States play a predominant role by reason of their economic and military potential and the power they represent. The role of those Powers was clearly revealed in the Second World War, and was recognized when the United Nations was brought into being. The duties and rights of the great Powers were recognized by giving them permanent seats in the Security Council and by accepting the need for unanimity among them as essential to the effective working of the Organization. Recent events have taught us that, whenever the great Powers have reached agreed decisions, the crucial problems of international politics have been properly solved. The tension has then relaxed. Today, we are faced with the absence of any such unity. The United States is stifling co-operation and precluding the settlement of many problems confronting the United Nations. The absence of unanimity has made it impossible to reach a settlement of the question of disarmament and of the prohibition of atomic weapons; it prevents the settlement of burning questions; and, lastly, it makes it impossible to admit to the United Nations fourteen States which have waited so long for admission to our debates.

90. Today, therefore, it is particularly necessary to restore that co-operation. Obviously, such co-operation neither does nor can take the form of forced decisions, of attempts to by-pass the requirements of the Charter, to weaken the role of the Security Council or to substitute various illegally established bodies for the Council. The great Powers must arrive at agreed decisions on the basis of the unanimity rule. The Polish delegation considers it the duty of the great Powers to give an assurance to all of us, as well as to their own peoples, that they will unite their efforts to maintain peace.

91. But words are not enough. If this assurance is to have any value, it must be embodied in a solemn international instrument, which is binding on the parties to it. Is there any room for doubt that this would help to ease the tension and that it would be greeted with a sigh of relief by millions of men throughout the world? We are demanding the action for which provision has been made in Article 106 of the Charter. The action we are demanding is a logical consequence of the present international situation. Already at previous sessions, one of the great Powers—the USSR—has expressed its readiness, in a series of resolutions and proposals, to enter into negotiations with a view to improving relations among the great Powers; it has also proposed

the conclusion of a five-Power peace pact, the need for which is even greater today than it was in the past.

92. While recommending that the great Powers should conclude a peace pact and appealing to all States to strengthen international co-operation, the General Assembly must at the same time condemn all attempts to draw up pacts of aggression which are in fact contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter and incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Organization. They are at variance with the principle of collective security and have nothing in common with the arrangements customarily described as regional pacts.

93. The North Atlantic Treaty, which was set up under the guise of a defence pact, is such a pact of aggression. From the very first days of its existence, the Treaty has served as a pretext to organize an army of aggression, to establish military bases and to increase armaments. This Treaty, to which certain Members of the United Nations are signatories, is directed against other Members of the Organization. As we know, the so-called European army is being organized and a unified command of land, sea and air forces is being established under this Treaty. Those in control of this war machine have recently shown themselves particularly active in organizing provocative military manoeuvres directed against Member States of the United Nations. On the basis of its aims and structure and of the activities so far undertaken within its framework, we are bound to conclude that the North Atlantic Treaty is contrary to the Charter and that participation in it is incompatible with membership in the United Nations. This is another problem to which the General Assembly must give its attention.

94. My delegation also considers that no relaxation of the international tension is possible so long as the threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction hangs over mankind. Effective measures must therefore be taken to remove this danger also. Through the fault of the United States, fruitless and sterile discussions have been in progress for over six years on the prohibition of atomic weapons and an effective system of ensuring observance of this prohibition.

95. The objective of the many versions of the famous Baruch plan, which do not in fact differ substantially one from the other, was not to secure the prohibition of atomic weapons or to establish a system for ensuring that the prohibition was really observed. Its purpose was to subordinate the economy of other countries, and first and foremost that of the Soviet Union, to the United States atomic super-trust. It is difficult to believe that the sponsors of this absurd and cynical plan did not realize that its effect would be to postpone the question of prohibiting the manufacture of atomic weapons indefinitely and frustrate all effective measures of control. The proposal for the solution of the atomic energy problem by so-called "stages" has already found a place in the, alas, not very glorious pages of our Organization's history.

96. By maintaining that there could be no question of disarmament or of prohibiting weapons of mass destruction until an atmosphere of confidence was established, the United States delegation deliberately created a vicious circle. But it is obvious to everyone that no relaxation of the tension can be achieved without a

substantial reduction of armaments, absolute prohibition of atomic weapons and the establishment of genuine international control. The People's Republic of Poland, which has constantly associated itself with the other democratic countries in the peace camp in supporting the initiative of the Soviet Union, has since the outset consistently called for the immediate prohibition of atomic weapons, the establishment of an effective international system for ensuring observance of this prohibition and research into methods of utilizing this new technical achievement for peaceful purposes, to the benefit of mankind.

97. The Soviet Union's possession of the atomic weapon has in no way affected its unremitting struggle to secure the prohibition of the use of this devastating weapon of mass destruction. We are witnesses to the fact that the USSR has always given and is giving the maximum evidence of its goodwill and has made a series of concessions which could contribute to agreement in this matter. Its proposals found expression in the new plans submitted to the sixth session of the General Assembly, in the draft resolution relating to the simultaneous introduction of prohibition and of a system of ensuring observance of the prohibition [A/2068]. The Polish Government warmly welcomed those proposals.

98. But all these efforts to reach agreement have so far encountered the ominous opposition of the United States. Compelled by the pressure of public opinion to submit counter-proposals, the United States has sought to conceal its real intention of keeping its hands free where the production of atomic bombs is concerned. The matter was ultimately referred to the recently established Disarmament Commission, but there again the United States made the attainment of any genuine agreement impossible. The United States there attempted to divert attention from the crux of the problem to questions of secondary importance, such as the disclosure and verification of armed forces and armaments. The idea of proceeding by stages again came up. Information about the atomic bomb was obviously to be divulged only at the last stage, which was not clearly defined. The firm proposals of the USSR on the question were again sabotaged and no progress was made in the matter.

99. Meanwhile, the United States has taken advantage of the present state of affairs, and of the fact that the atomic bomb is not prohibited, to stir up fear and insecurity and so maintain and increase the existing international tension. The United States Government has itself cynically described its attitude as atomic diplomacy. The purpose of this diplomacy is to create panic among nervous persons by brandishing the atomic weapon. Once again experiments are being carried out on a vast scale. Bigger and more destructive bombs are being produced and there are constant threats to use them.

100. Not long ago Senator Aiken declared before the United States Congress:

"The United States needs an air force for strategic bombing capable of launching repeated atomic attacks on objectives anywhere in the world."*

A few weeks ago, on 18 September 1952, one of the leaders of the American Legion called for the imme-

* Quotation unchecked owing to insufficient data.

diate use of the atomic bomb in Manchuria, north of the Yalu River. American politicians and military men are threatening to use the atomic bomb. Possessed by the desire to destroy, they demand increased production. General James Doolittle, a former chief of the American Air Force, speaking in Detroit on 30 August 1952, assured his listeners that it was possible now to produce a bomb which, dropped from a single aircraft, would have the explosive force of all the bombs dropped during the Second World War. The day after the opening of the present session, Mr. Pace, United States Secretary of the Army, praised certain new types and models of the murderous atomic weapon to representatives of the Press.

101. Millions of simple people throughout the world are protesting against these threats and this policy of blackmail, united in the single desire not to see the threat of awful destruction and death hang over their homes but to be allowed to live and work in peace. The peoples of the world demand that the production and use of the atomic bomb shall be prohibited. It must be realized that the threat now being made with regard to China and Korea may tomorrow turn against other nations. As for those who brandish the atomic weapon, they clearly do not reflect that that weapon can strike them too.

102. For these reasons, the Polish delegation feels that this burning question must be settled at the present session. The General Assembly faces the grave task of taking effective measures to bring about the prohibition of the production and use of atomic weapons, by establishing effective and simultaneous control.

103. There is a further problem which must be dealt with in connexion with measures to dispel international tension. Over humanity today hangs the threat not only of the use of new technical discoveries for purposes of destruction, but also the use of other means of mass extermination already known in the past. This problem was brought before the United Nations as a result of the use of bacterial weapons by the forces of the United States in Korea and China.

104. Last January, public opinion throughout the world was staggered by the news that the United States Air Force had used bacterial weapons in Korea. At the end of February came news of bacterial attacks on Chinese territory by United States aircraft. The fact that this weapon had been used was confirmed in the official communiqués of the Korean and Chinese Governments. The communiqués contained data so appalling that some people in the western countries doubted their veracity. Nevertheless, special commissions composed of authoritative and competent persons—distinguished scholars from various countries, men of differing religious and political opinions—have confirmed the facts beyond any doubt. The commissions examined an immense quantity of factual material and heard eye-witnesses of the crime.

105. If these undeniable facts are compared with the official statements of United States generals and statesmen about the need to use bacterial weapons, it becomes clear that this criminal policy is practised knowingly and that the United States does not hesitate to employ one of the most atrocious weapons of mass extermination, primarily against the defenceless civilian population. It is enough to recall the statements of

Merck, chief of the military research centre, and of Rosebury and Kabat, professors of bacteriology attached to the notorious Camp Detrick, and other statements. It should also be recalled that, on 3 April 1952, General Bullene, chief of the chemical corps of the United States Army, asked the Senate to increase the appropriations for bacteriological research and drew attention to the need for mass production of bacterial weapons. Two years ago, in November 1950, the American periodical, *Nation's Business*, deplored the fact that United States atomic scientists had been able to test their product in a dramatic demonstration whereas "our germ scientists, who had labored just as hard and maybe more effectively, were denied their demonstration". Two years later, the United States Army turned these genocidal dreams into reality in Korea and China.

106. This occurred despite existing prohibitions of the use of this weapon of mass extermination. It should be recalled that in the Hague documents of 1899 and 1907 it was declared that belligerents did not have an unlimited right to inflict losses upon their adversaries. As a result, the use of expanding projectiles containing poisonous or corrosive gases was prohibited. With the ever more rapid development of science, a new and dangerous weapon, the bacterial weapon, was added to the arsenal of potential weapons of war. In line with the steps already taken, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 confirmed the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons. It should be recalled that among the great Powers of that time, only two, Japan and the United States, have not ratified the Protocol. History has shown that Japan did not do so because it intended to use the weapon in the fulfilment of its plans of aggression, and that it did indeed use it to a certain extent. This was brought out at the trial of the war criminals at Khabarovsk. As for the United States, its representatives, well before that time, were reluctant to recognize the prohibition of the weapon of mass destruction and emphasized several times that their Government was not bound by any international agreement. To this day, the United States has not ratified the Geneva Protocol. As late as 1947, President Truman withdrew the draft ratification from the Senate.

107. In the circumstances, the United Nations, faced by the fact of the use of bacterial weapons in Korea and China, has an urgent task before it: to condemn all actions of this kind, to confirm the existing prohibition, and to recommend to all who have not already done so that they should accede to and ratify the Geneva Protocol. Humanity, determined on progress, demands this, as conferences of non-governmental organizations have already demanded it, among them the Conference of the International Red Cross, which unanimously adopted a resolution to that effect at Toronto a few months ago. It is significant that the country against which bacterial warfare has been waged—the People's Republic of China—lately acceded to the Protocol. At the same time, the Government which has used this weapon refuses to recognize and abide by the existing prohibitions. Use of the bacterial weapon is a grave crime against mankind; and the General Assembly will not be doing its duty if it does not condemn those who use the weapon and issue a warning to any who dare to use it in the future.

108. Such are the main problems confronting the General Assembly at the seventh session, and on which it must take a stand. We have raised the problems of the cessation of hostilities in Korea, of disarmament, of the conclusion of a peace treaty among the great Powers, of the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, and of the condemnation of the North Atlantic Treaty. We have raised them because we believe in the possibility of peaceful co-operation among countries with different political systems. The socialist countries have already stressed this possibility many times and have affirmed it by their actions.

109. We have raised these problems as the delegation of a country which has already been the victim of brutal aggression, a country whose people have known the atrocities of war as few peoples have known them at any time in their history. Today, as our wounds are healing and we are building a new life on the ruins of yesterday, the basis of our foreign policy has become the struggle to safeguard our independence by safeguarding the peace. The best proof that Poland is serving this great cause, and intends to serve it unflinching, lies in the provisions of our new fundamental law, the Constitution of the People's Republic of Poland, adopted by our Parliament on 22 July 1952. It lays down that the Polish nation and all the organs of authority of the working people of Poland must try, in the spirit of the Constitution of our People's Republic, "to intensify the friendship and co-operation between nations, in the alliance and brotherhood which today link the Polish nation with the peace-loving nations of the world, in their endeavours towards a common aim—the prevention of aggression and the consolidation of world peace".

110. The delegation of Poland submits for the consideration of the General Assembly the following draft resolution (A/2229), which proposes measures for the prevention of a new world war and the maintenance of peace and co-operation among the nations:

"Measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to strengthen peace and friendship among the nations"

I

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that the war in Korea has already entered its third year and has caused untold suffering and misery,

"Recommends to the parties engaged in the war in Korea:

"(a) The immediate cessation by the parties of military operations on land, at sea and in the air;

"(b) The return of all prisoners of war to their homeland, in accordance with international standards;

"(c) The withdrawal from Korea of foreign troops, including the Chinese volunteer units, within a period of from two to three months and the peaceful settlement of the Korean question on the principle of unification of Korea, this unification to be achieved by the Koreans themselves under the supervision of a commission, with the participation of the parties immediately interested and of other States, including the States which have not taken part in the war in Korea."

II

"The General Assembly,

"Desiring to avert the threat of a new world war,

"(a) Recommends to the Governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, France and China—the permanent members of the Security Council—to reduce their armed forces by one-third within one year, including their air forces, naval forces and auxiliary forces, and to submit full data on their armaments, and further recommends to the Security Council that it call as soon as possible an international conference for the carrying out by all States of the reduction of armed forces;

"(b) Calls for the adoption without delay of a decision on the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the establishment of strict international control over the observance of that decision by all States;

"(c) Calls on all States which have not acceded to or ratified the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925 on the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons to accede to or ratify that instrument."

III

"The General Assembly"

"Declares that participation in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc, which has brought about an ever growing armaments race and has aggravated international tension, is incompatible with membership in the United Nations;

"Calls upon the Governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, France and China, to conclude a peace pact designed to bring about reduction of the armaments of the great Powers and the strengthening of peace among the nations; and"

"Calls upon all other States to adhere to the peace pact."

111. Mr. MARTIN (Canada): I am sure that this Assembly will permit me to say that I am proud, as the acting head of the Canadian delegation, to find myself addressing a fellow Canadian as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The support which the President received for this high office is, if I may say so, a tribute both to Canada and to him personally. It is a recognition of his—and our—devotion to the cause of peace for which the United Nations was created and remains dedicated.

112. And now, for the first time since our countries pledged themselves to the ideals for which the United Nations stands, we meet in a new permanent home. I think it is fitting that we should pay our respects and offer our best thanks to those whose skills and talents have made possible the completion of these magnificent buildings. Although, as the Secretary-General has said in the introduction to his report, "the situation today has not changed in any fundamental way for the better",⁵ I do believe that this session of the General Assembly could be a turning point

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1A*, p. 1.

in our affairs—a turning point on the road towards establishing the United Nations and all it stands for on as solid and enduring a footing as the rock on which these permanent buildings now stand.

113. I think, however, that our past President, Mr. Padilla Nervo, did well to remind us, in his fine address on Tuesday last [376th meeting], that our situation could easily turn, not for the better but for the worse. The United Nations cannot indefinitely survive an annual increase of international tension, nor an annual repetition, if I may say so, of propaganda debates. I may say to the representative of Poland that I do not propose to follow his address, but I would say to him that what the world wants now is not another peace pact but a firm determination on the part of every nation to live up to peace pacts and obligations already solemnly undertaken. I think Mr. Padilla Nervo was right to insist on the primary role of the United Nations as being one of conciliation, and to apply that principle to Korea.

114. It is perfectly obvious that the United Nations is not in any sense a world government. The only basis on which we can operate is on the basis of consent. We cannot dictate an armistice in Korea or impose upon the world a system of general disarmament. Such great and desirable ends can only be obtained by free agreements based on a mutual desire for peace and stability.

115. These are the goals I am sure that most of us seek, and yet the sad fact is that there is no agreement. Our task is not made any easier when one group of nations directs a deliberate and sustained campaign of hate against another group, or when all efforts at compromise and conciliation are met by a stream of abuse directed particularly against the United States and, incidentally, against all who are friends of that great democracy. We had an example of that a few moments ago.

116. Well, we are friends of the United States. We are friends in spite of the fact that we are also neighbours. Canada and the United States have lived side by side now for nearly two centuries. We have had our difficulties, as neighbours do, but we know from a hundred years of experience that this great and this smaller nation can live together without fear and in mutual respect. We are proud of our friendship and proud of our example. Our only wish is that the United Nations could see established the same confidence and friendly relations among all nations. If such a basis of mutual trust and respect could be made universal, this body would be truly the United Nations.

117. By all odds, the most important, the most explosive and probably the most difficult question we face is Korea. As we shall, before long, be discussing Korea in committee, I think that the Assembly would do well to follow the example so wisely given us by Mr. Acheson yesterday [380th meeting]. I shall therefore confine my remarks on this aspect of our problem to one or two general observations.

118. Last year, the Assembly voted [resolution 507 (VI)] to defer consideration of the Korea items on its agenda until a military armistice had been achieved or until other developments made further consideration of the problem desirable. The good sense of that

proposal was realized by the overwhelming majority, who saw that a solution would not be facilitated by an angry exchange of charge and counter-charge. Now that four of the five points of disagreement outstanding have been resolved, and only one issue divides the negotiators at Panmunjom, I profoundly hope that we, at this Assembly, will not complicate the task of the United Nations negotiators. Theirs is a thankless task, and yet one for which we should render thanks to those members of the Unified Command whose patience has been so sorely tried in these past months and in which they have been ably representing the United Nations.

119. My delegation will take it as a fundamental premise that present hostilities must be limited to the Korean peninsula and that the search for an early settlement of those hostilities by negotiations at Panmunjom must be continued. The United Nations intervened in Korea for the sole purpose of resisting and defeating aggression. That was, I repeat, its sole purpose. We should regard that purpose as having been achieved through an honourable truce negotiated on the basis of the present battle lines. And, if I may say again, addressing my remarks to the last speaker: whose territory, whose security is threatened by this proposition? Why, then, can we not agree?

120. One issue alone is holding up a truce. Surely it should not be beyond the resources of human intelligence and patience on both sides to find, consistently with principles, a way to resolve this sole remaining obstacle if there is a real desire on both sides to come to an agreement. The most recent proposals of the Unified Command should have gone a long way towards convincing all who bring an impartial mind to the examination of the question that the desire for agreement is deep and genuine on our side.

121. From whatever point of view we approach this problem of achieving an armistice in Korea, we must never allow ourselves to accept the continuation of the fighting for one day longer than necessary to achieve the principles for which the United Nations went into Korea.

122. I suppose we have always been aware in the United Nations that, underneath the so-called East-West issues which have for the most part preoccupied our political discussions in the General Assembly during the past six years, there lay other difficulties of a long-range character which at some time or another would be bound to emerge here and which would continue to exist even if by some magic the East-West issues were to evaporate overnight. Some of these underlying issues are this year beginning to come to the surface as major problems before the Assembly.

123. It is our duty to give a fair hearing to every complaint and to every appeal that we have bound ourselves by the Charter to consider and discuss. Since the Second World War, it is a fact that one quarter of the world's population has achieved, by various roads, independence and direct control over its own destinies. This great surge towards self-determination is an historical trend. It is the goal not only of the aspirations of the peoples who for many years have been dependent economically upon other Powers, but it is in large measure true to say that the same goals are now recognized also, for the first time in history,

by all civilized free States, those which control dependent territories as well as those which do not. The point at issue, therefore, has become increasingly one of means rather than of ends, of timing rather than ultimate objectives.

124. Speaking for a country which grew up from colonial to independent status before the United Nations came into existence, I cannot guess how the development of Canada would have fared had those of our forefathers who pursued the family struggle for independence had such an organization as this to which they might have appealed. I think it would be very difficult to say whether, looking back on our history, any kind of international organization could, in fact, have speeded up the process. And I think it is even more difficult to say whether a speeding-up would, from our purely national point of view, have been to our long-term advantage.

125. Yesterday [381st meeting] the Foreign Minister of Iraq paid a generous tribute here to the far-sighted leadership of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, under whose auspices freedom has come to India and Pakistan, to Ceylon and to Indonesia. He also acknowledged, with a gratitude we all share, our debt to France, which has for so long stood as a living symbol of the principles of liberty. My country has confidence that the notable record of progress, of which these nations are so justly proud, will continue unabated, and that their proclaimed goal will be realized to the benefit of the peoples concerned.

126. To achieve this, two things are necessary: orderly progress not jeopardized through the reckless and destructive action of extremists, and a constant awareness by the administering Powers of the need for the maximum rate of progress in the countries under their authority. Moderation on the one side and good faith on the other side are the twin methods by which the progress of dependent peoples toward freedom will be steady and sure.

127. In the same temper of moderation and good faith, our debates here should not, certainly at this time, degenerate into an exchange of accusations and recriminations, but should seek to bring the collective good sense of this body to bear on these problems in a way that will help instead of hinder our advance towards the goal in which all civilized States believe. If the General Assembly is misused as if it were a government or a court, the result will, I fear, be that delegations which think as we do will be less inclined than they are at present to see whether Assembly discussions—of, for example, the colonial issues of which we have been speaking—can be channelled into moderate and constructive lines. For if politics is “the art of the possible”, we can see no good coming from demands which are patently impossible, no matter how many votes they may gain. We live in a troubled world, and we must all take that fact into account in what we ask and when we ask it.

128. Much will undoubtedly be said in our debates about justice. I should like to conclude this section of my remarks with a quotation from that great book of Islamic knowledge, the *Mathnawi*. I cannot pretend to my Moslem friends that I am conversant with the *Mathnawi*, but I was very much taken by what it says about justice. It says that to give water to a

tree is just, but to give water to a thorn is not. At this Assembly, we might also consider the appropriateness and the usefulness, for the purposes and principles of the United Nations, of giving our time and our place to discussions that can never bear fruit, but only thorns.

129. By no means all of our problems in this field will be political. We shall also be discussing very practical and pressing economic problems—how to feed the mounting populations of Asia, how to pick the fruits of the earth from land at present bearing only thorns. With the dissolution of most of the old political relationships by the sometimes over-hasty action of that powerful solvent, nationalism, new ways of meeting the perennial problems of economic development must be found. The United Nations has an important place in working out and applying experimental solutions for these new relationships between countries which happen to be more developed, not so much in natural resources as in “know-how”, and those which are in need of development and as yet lack the resources both of capital and skill to develop themselves unaided at the pace demanded by their peoples.

130. And so, in this effort to aid in raising the standards of undeveloped nations, my country has played and will continue to play its part. We sympathize most earnestly with the picture that has been painted by several speakers of the poverty and distress that afflict so much of the world. We have made our contribution to the generous and promising schemes of assistance that have already been inaugurated. We are interested above all in the programmes of technical assistance with which we are already associated, and we are profoundly aware that much of the poverty in other regions springs, not from a lack of resources, but from a lack of the technical knowledge and ability that would enable the peoples of those countries to develop their own resources for their own benefit. We believe that it is through the sharing of the technical knowledge which has brought such striking advances to the Western world that other regions of the earth can themselves develop along the same path and towards the same goal. We recognize that where local resources are inadequate, a measure of financial assistance may still be necessary while this process is being brought into play. But in the interests of the under-developed countries themselves, and particularly of their independence, economic as well as political, we believe that the most effective form of help is the self-help which an advance in technical knowledge will bring about.

131. The under-developed countries need what President Roosevelt used to refer to, when speaking of another emergency, as “priming the pump”, and as the Prime Minister of Canada said recently, when speaking of the Colombo plan, that we hope “not only to raise the living standards of the people benefiting from it but that it will also build up enough confidence in their countries to prime such a flow of foreign and domestic investments that prosperity will come to the entire southern part of Asia”. And think not only of Asia but of all countries whose peoples desperately need help, impartially and unconditionally given.

132. One group of Members of the United Nations which consider themselves developed do nothing at

all about these problems except, one regrets to say, exploit them for propaganda. They are not even willing to belong to the various specialized agencies of the United Nations.

133. And we, who do want to tackle the needs of the under-developed areas practically, want you who speak for those peoples at this Assembly to understand some of our difficulties. It is not that we are unwilling to lay upon ourselves as heavy burdens of taxation as others, but that a large part of my Government's budget has to be spent for the unprofitable, unproductive but wholly necessary purpose of providing our people, at this time in the history of the world, with a minimum of security—a minimum insurance premium that we consider it prudent to devote to the upkeep of our freedom and to the prevention of a third world war. To quote my Prime Minister again, we hope and believe "that once the measures for our own safety, and the safety of all freedom-loving peoples with which our own is bound up, have been reasonably secured from the formidable threat that still shows no signs of diminishing, Canadians will want to participate to a greater degree than they can today in helping their less fortunate fellow human beings to improve their lot in life". And yet we are convinced that the measure of the contribution which we are making at the present time is not without its significance.

134. I have linked the extension of our programmes of economic development and technical assistance with the question of disarmament and collective security. In the simplest terms, most of the water must come out of the same well for one or for the other, and we are inevitably faced with the problem of priorities. The balance is not easy to find, but we must, according to our lights, do our best to keep it. And I am not ashamed of the contribution which my country, in that particular, is making.

135. In this opening statement I have tried to develop a concept of the United Nations and to use it as a guide to the policy which my delegation will follow in threading its way through all the subtle and often

conflicting legal interpretations to which the Charter of the United Nations is likely to be subjected. Perhaps we might make more use of the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice to guide us. There is, however, one issue on which I hope and believe there will be general agreement, although this may not be enough for a solution, that is the question of the admission of new Members.

136. I have no doubt whatever that the United Nations was intended by the great majority, and probably all, of the "founding fathers" at San Francisco to be, in due course, a universal organization. True, there were restrictive provisions concerning ex-enemy States, but these were not intended to debar them forever. This is not the place for a detailed argument as to the reasons, but let me simply state my belief that neither the right of veto nor Article 4 of the Charter was ever intended to keep out of the Organization any independent State worthy of the name. I am not speaking in favour of a "deal", but, as the Secretary-General has expressed it in the introduction to his annual report, of "real universality". As he has said, surely, despite the deadlock on other issues, we should be able to make some progress on this issue at this session, although the General Assembly alone cannot, of course, resolve the deadlock among the great Powers.

137. All I have said may be summed up in one phrase, one definition. I left my text, so to speak, to the end, because I think it can usefully be applied to almost everything I have said. It is a definition of a nation taken from St. Augustine's *City of God*: "A nation is an association of reasonable beings united in a peaceful sharing of the things they cherish." It is hard for us individually or collectively to live up to it, but if we come here prepared to act as reasonable beings and to try in some measure to be united, as many of us as possible, we shall have served our countries and the United Nations well at this critical time in the history of the world.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.