

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



384th

PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 20 October 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| General debate ( <i>continued</i> ) .....  | 103  |
| Speeches by Mr. Belaúnde (Peru), Mr. Casey (Australia), Mr. Siles Zuazo (Bolivia) and Mr. Charlone (Uruguay) |      |

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

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. BELAÚNDE (PERU), MR. CASEY (AUSTRALIA), MR. SILES ZUAZO (BOLIVIA) AND MR. CHARLONE (URUGUAY)

1. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): The sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations refrained from discussing the subject of Korea, in order that a political debate should not interfere with the course of the armistice negotiations, which were to be based solely on humanitarian principles. The lack of agreement among the representatives of the United Command in the armistice negotiations has proved that other factors have influenced the situation, which we have been watching so anxiously, like all the peoples whose only concern and aim is peace. I do not wish to attempt to analyse those factors, because it is not my delegation's purpose to aggravate the difficulties or introduce a note of discouragement and disappointment into this debate. What matters now is to make one more effort towards success in the armistice negotiations or, if that is not possible, to provide a true picture of the facts of the situation, without any ambiguity or any attempt at misleading propaganda. It seemed that final agreement had been reached, the only question outstanding being that of the prisoners. The serious problem which arose was that a considerable number of these did not wish to return to the side from which they had come, and this revealed a new and exceptional situation, to which it would have been wrong to apply the ordinary principles, for that would have imposed upon free human beings a fate which they rejected, for reasons or motives of which they alone could be the judges. The fundamental principle in this matter must be respect for the human person and his right to free choice in the matter of his own destiny.

2. One great American country, Mexico, inspired by these ideas and anxious to offer a practical solution, has approached the Unified Command, stating that prisoners are not a collective mass to be disposed of arbitrarily, and that countries which are prepared to do so should be given the opportunity to receive prisoners who do not wish to return to their countries of origin. It is

true that very serious difficulties may arise for many countries—perhaps even for the majority—in adopting the generous attitude which the Mexican proposal invites us to take. In any case the principle of respect for the prisoners' wishes has been eloquently formulated by a Power which represents the feelings of the small and medium-sized countries, whose role is to be the spokesmen of impartial opinion throughout the world. In this spirit, may it not be our duty to use our imagination to find plans which might improve the Mexican proposal or replace it if it is found impracticable? The fate of the prisoners, by virtue of their supreme value as human beings, concerns not only the military authorities and the parties concerned but all mankind.

3. The United Nations, though it is not a world State, represents and personifies not only a high moral authority for the world but also a high legal and political authority. Exercising this moral authority, the United Nations could declare that prisoners of war who did not wish to be repatriated were under its protection and safeguard. As a logical consequence of such a declaration, an international commission could be appointed which would include the parties, States which had the confidence of the Assembly and, as a guarantee of greater impartiality, neutral States, not Members of the United Nations, which, by virtue of their culture and their services to peace and humanitarian causes, would by their presence and co-operation lend weight to our noble undertaking.

4. Without making a formal and definite proposal, I leave this point for the Assembly to ponder and act upon in due course. Such a commission, in its wisdom, might perhaps be able to find means of establishing these prisoners in an appropriate zone under the safeguard of rules based on the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and incorporating all the relevant provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

5. We invite the representatives of the Soviet Union to consider this or any other suggestions which may be put forward with open-mindedness, and thus give real proof of their peaceful intentions.

6. The Peruvian delegation, interpreting a general desire, presented to the sixth session of the General Assembly a draft resolution which was adopted [*resolu-*

Resolution 506 (VI)] by the considerable majority of 43 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions, recommending that the Security Council should consider the applications for membership of the Organization individually, taking into account only the principles of Article 4 of the Charter and the evidence of their peace-loving nature and fulfilment of international obligations. The Assembly, exercising its legitimate prerogative, reminded the Security Council that the admission of new Members was a very important function. It adopted the interpretation of the Charter given by the International Court of Justice,<sup>1</sup> according to which a Member of the United Nations cannot lawfully make its assent to the admission of new Members dependent upon conditions not expressly set forth in Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter. It is clear that since the General Assembly adopted the resolution [296 (IV)] founded in law on the advisory opinion to which I have referred, Members of the United Nations may not adduce political reasons of a strictly internal character and purely subjective reasons which contradict opinions they have themselves emitted concerning the conditions governing the admission of new Members to the United Nations.

7. We have never denied the Soviet Union its right to analyse the objective qualities and study the international behaviour of each candidate, and to base its vote upon the security which the candidate country can offer for the fulfilment of its obligations under the Charter. Objections by the USSR related to these objective standards would have to be respected. But that does not apply to candidates such as Italy, Portugal, Ireland and certain other countries, for the Soviet Union has recognized them as peace-loving States and has not contested their capacity or fitness for fulfilling the obligations of the Charter. This attitude of the Soviet Union therefore confronts us with a serious legal and philosophical problem, and I ask the Assembly to give its attention to this difficult but most important matter.

8. In legal logic, any decision by a judge, a member of a parliament or any other authority postulates a judgment, and the decision—an act of the will—should follow the judgment—an act of the intellect—as shadow follows substance, as effect follows cause, or as matter follows form. Once the judgment, the intellectual process, has been completed, the ensuing decision must conform to it entirely. To admit that the decision, that is to say, the will, may be separate from the judgment is to grant to the will an extra-legal value, an absolute quality—to assume that the will is entitled to operate above and beyond the law.

9. We have a Charter and therefore a standard. Within the spirit of the Charter and by the application of this standard, the Soviet Union has recognized that certain countries possess the qualifications for admission to the United Nations; but then, at the time of voting, it invokes an arbitrary power, a power above and beyond the Charter, and says: I have the power to annul by the veto the very rights which I have recognized. We cannot accept this philosophical monstrosity, which combines a flagrant violation of the Charter, disregard of the advisory opinion of the Court, and a refusal to accept the interpretation of the Charter given by an overwhelming majority of the Assembly. Our question

is this: can the veto have an extra-legal and an anti-legal nature? Was that the veto we approved at San Francisco? I maintain that the unanimity rule which we accepted at San Francisco, as a compulsory concession to save the Charter, did not invest the veto with this privilege, this absolute and inconceivable right, to violate or paralyse the Charter. The speeches made at San Francisco by those who opposed the veto in the general—the very general—discussions, turned the proposed *liberum veto* into the obligation to seek unanimity, to find agreed solutions whereby the antagonisms resulting from opposing points of view would be overcome. If solutions were not found after they had been sought in complete good faith, the proper course was to take note of the conflict between equally lawful alternatives. I draw the Assembly's attention to this essential point. The disagreements made manifest by the rule of unanimity of the great Powers, and which might rightfully paralyse a decision, must take the form of legitimate alternatives, none of which involved a violation of the Charter. Otherwise the Charter signed at San Francisco would have been an illogical and monstrous document, because it would have given a single Power not only the right to paralyse the will of the majority, but also the more serious right completely to nullify the provisions of the Charter and turn it into a scrap of paper.

10. It will be said that this conception of the lawfulness of the veto is incompatible with the very idea of the veto. To be sure, it is incompatible with the idea of the veto as developed by the USSR and with the use that Power wishes to make of the veto; but it is incompatible neither with the letter of the Charter nor, above all, with the background of the discussion on this important matter, nor, I might add—and I shall prove this when the occasion arises—with the precedent established by the Assembly in approving the resolution [377 (V)] entitled "Uniting for peace", which for all practical purposes precludes or annuls a veto intended to paralyse the supreme function of the United Nations, that of chastising aggression. A veto intended to paralyse the Assembly's essential function of admitting new Members may be set aside and annulled in the same way.

11. I am well aware that the Charter can be modified only in accordance with the principles which the Charter itself has laid down. What is now needed is to prevent an unduly broad and wrongful interpretation of the veto. We merely ask whether a use of the veto in flagrant violation of the Charter is admissible. That is the question which the Assembly has to decide. We have given the Security Council a final opportunity to apply strictly the principles of the Charter within the official interpretation given by the Assembly on the basis of the authorized opinion of the Court. In view of the rebellion of the USSR against this lawful interpretation given by the Assembly, that body has a perfect right to judge, appraise and examine the voting in the Security Council, and to consider whether or not there has been the majority required for the function which that organ has to fulfil in respect of the admission of new Members.

12. It will be objected that the Assembly has no power to interpret the Charter. I should like to ask this question: if the Assembly has no power to interpret the Charter, what other method of interpretation do we

<sup>1</sup> See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Article 4)*, *Advisory Opinion: I. C. J. Reports 1948*, p. 64.

possess? The Security Council is an organ intended to perform specific tasks entrusted to it by the signatories to the Charter. Are not all the signatories to the Charter represented in the Assembly, together with the countries which have subsequently acceded to it? The dilemma with which we are confronted is a very clear one: either we forego any interpretation in the face of the present difficulties, and announce that in certain cases the Charter cannot be applied, that the Charter is useless, that the Charter is inoperative, thus paralysing international life in one of its most interesting aspects, namely, the achievement of the ideal of universality; or we agree that there is a body which is able, after consulting the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, to interpret the Charter, and that this body is the Assembly. The Assembly's renunciation of any right to interpret the Charter would constitute the *capitis diminutio maxima* of this institution, decreed by itself; it would be an inconceivable abdication, a case of spontaneous amputation contrary to nature, an admission of legal impotence contravening the letter and the spirit of the Charter and the dictates of the conscience of mankind. The Peruvian delegation reserves the right to present in due course a proposal to enable the Assembly to resolve this grave problem which is compromising our effectiveness and our prestige throughout the world.

13. By way of compensation for the tragedy of suffering and blood brought about by the war in Asia, we have had an eloquent proof of deep human solidarity. Not only through the shortening of distances by technical means but also, and much more, through the intensity and universality of human feeling, the distant war in Korea has had profound repercussions, not only in Asia but also in the western countries and here in America. There has been a general realization that we live in a single world in which good and evil are not to be found in one area or in one form alone, but are shared by the whole of humanity. This is a psychological and moral factor of incalculable moment. It was in that spirit that the United Nations voted unanimously—for one cannot take into account the exception represented by the satellites of the Soviet Union—for the condemnation of aggression, and have repeatedly expressed their desire for a cessation of hostilities and peace. This unity has constituted an element whose importance it will be possible to assess only in better historical perspective. But as life goes on, and when events are complicated, such unity is relaxed and jeopardized. It is not for me to investigate here the circumstances conspiring against unity; I must point out, however, that the effectiveness of the United Nations in dealing with the problems before it and its prestige depend on the careful maintenance of this unity. The Western Powers, the American peoples, the nations of Asia, Africa and Oceania must march together in agreement, because this agreement is the basis of our existence, indeed, of our salvation. I do not believe that there are abysmal divergences or insoluble difficulties between the Western Powers and the peoples who have passed from colonial status to freedom with the help, approval and support of those very Powers.

14. We Latin-American nations are in a peculiar situation. We are united with the Western Powers by the same conception of life, the same conception of justice and the same unflinching attachment to liberty.

We are united with the peoples of other continents by the fraternity which springs from the fact that we had preceded them on the path of independence, and by the economic situation, which calls for our further development and for the achievement of our independence and full individuality in this field. We are thus in a good position to act as a sort of living link between the old Europe, which is once more reviving and asserting itself, uniting and becoming an integral whole amid our applause and our hopes, and the peoples who, like ourselves, are anxious to see the full accomplishment of their destiny. We are confident that a united Europe will pursue its defensive policy as part of a wide and generous international co-operation; and we say to our brothers in Asia, Africa and Oceania who have followed us on the road to freedom that in the United Nations and in a broad co-operation with us they have full scope for achieving their aspirations and for making possible a common understanding with the European countries; and that any other policy would divert them from what is clearly their destiny and would launch them upon courses that would endanger not only their economic resources but also their own political independence.

15. Various delegations have eloquently presented here the staggering figures, arrived at by authorized technical commissions, depicting for us the poverty in which the majority of the inhabitants of this planet live. This accurate and impressive picture makes us think of the immense riches expended or destroyed in the two world wars and of those that have to be employed in avoiding a third war. The calculations of eminent economists have shown that the capital consumed in the last wars would have been sufficient to transform the economic face of the world. Today we are further than ever from the economic interpretation of history, which attributes the tragedy of war to mere economic or commercial interests. Peace furthers not only the moral interests of humanity but also its actual profit, its actual material well-being. War has always had psychological causes. Man's greatness lies in culture, and his supreme misfortune is the will to power, the overmastering usurpation described in immortal terms by St. Augustine in *The City of God*. This spirit of overmastering usurpation has exploited the infinite capacity of the masses for absorbing myths and for suffering oppression.

16. Peoples who are both the victims of illusion and oppressed, have inevitable pursued the disastrous course of endeavouring to impose their illusions and their oppression to other peoples. That is the sad lesson of history. The efforts of the creators of science, who have not only enabled us to control nature but have also taught us the immense value of truth as against myth and illusion, have been of no avail. The noble doctrines of the founders of religions, all of whom have preached the brotherhood of man, have been powerless. These two bright aspects of human history have been overshadowed, as by an ever-present menace, deepening and spreading day by day, by the will to power. The philosophy of culture leads us to a pessimistic conclusion, and yet we ask: can we not hope that truth which is modest, verifiable, progressive and relative, which seeks and comprehends the views of others and desires their co-operation, will overcome the fitful, hallucinatory, infectious gleam of myth and utopia? Can we not hope that the sense of human brotherhood which must have



been stimulated by the sorrows, anxieties and anguish that are suffered today by all the peoples of the earth alike, will prevail and restrain or quench the thirst for domination and the invincible passion for power of the rulers of certain States? But I do not wish to conclude these sincere remarks upon a note of philosophic pessimism.

17. I know that the students of Marxist philosophy have discovered that its essence lies in the ideal or dream of the complete disappearance of the State in an earthly paradise, that this goal can be reached only by passing through an arduous stage in which all the powers of the present State, which covers every aspect of human life, are strengthened, and that only after the destruction of the so-called exploiting class in the country concerned and in other countries will it be possible to attain to the ideal of a free mankind with the complete elimination of the State. That conception leads logically to universal war, through universal revolution.

18. Today, however, contrary to the conclusions of students of Marxist philosophy, the most highly placed persons of the USSR have affirmed at the Moscow Congress the possibility of the coexistence of capitalism and communism, and here, from this very rostrum, the eminent representative of the Soviet Union has, with his customary eloquence, referred to and endorsed [383rd meeting] this idea of possible coexistence, supporting it with quotations from his masters, Stalin and Lenin. Let us hope that these declarations will prevail over the pessimistic conclusions of the students of Marxist philosophy to which I have just referred. In all impartiality, let us bear in mind the favourable factors that exist: the realism—which I recognize and have always recognized—demonstrated by the leaders of the Soviet Union on more than one occasion and their full appreciation of all the factors in determining their course of action. The leaders of the Soviet Union today realize that the West is able, alert and determined to defend itself and that a war would not be a triumphal march, but the beginning of universal destruction.

19. There is another factor which we must also bear in mind: the Russian people have behind them more than a thousand years of Christian tradition which cannot be obliterated by any régime, however great its political influence; and we cherish the hope that this ideal of understanding, peace and brotherhood may inspire broad sections of the Russian people, coinciding with the realistic policy which their leaders must now pursue. In any case, we shall not close our ears or our hearts to any sincere initiative for peace or any opportunity for agreement.

20. Mr. CASEY (Australia): Before speaking on some other matters, I should like to add my tribute and that of my country to the devoted labour that has gone into the completion of this United Nations Headquarters building. The Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, has praised the work of others [376th meeting]. But it is in no small measure due to his tenacity and devotion that we Member nations now find ourselves established in these very well organized permanent Headquarters.

21. Secondly, I should like to congratulate the President of the General Assembly on his election. Australia welcomes his election both as a person and as a Canadian. Under his impartial and competent guidance, we

are confident that discussion of the vital issues before us will be conducted with fairness and dispatch.

22. Of the many important items on our agenda, war-torn and unhappy Korea transcends all others. I think that is the one point on which the majority in this Assembly will agree with what was said in the remarkable tirade we heard from the leader of the Soviet Union delegation in this chamber on 18 October [383rd meeting].

23. Men are fighting and dying while this Assembly is in session. We have had a draft resolution from the Polish delegation [A/2229]. We have heard thousands of words from Mr. Vyshinsky. But where do they take us? Neither dealt with the vital issue which is preventing a cease-fire: the forcible or non-forcible repatriation of prisoners of war. Korea is not a problem which the General Assembly can deal with—and forget—by the adoption of a resolution. Let us endeavour to strip the verbiage and get down to the hard facts of the Korean situation. The machinery to stop the fighting in Korea has been in existence at Panmunjom for fifteen long months. If the Communists sincerely wish peace—as the world understands the word “peace”—the door is open.

24. It may be suggested by some that we should take the armistice negotiations out of the hands of the present United Nations negotiators and deal with them here, or in some other way. Australia is not prepared to do this. Australia has complete confidence in the negotiators acting on behalf of the United Nations at the cease-fire talks in Korea. We stand firmly by them. The United States Secretary of State said in this chamber on 17 October [380th meeting], only a few days ago:

“Korea is a test, not only of our courage at the initial moment of decision, but even more of the firmness of our will, the endurance of our courage. The aggressor . . . now counts for victory upon those of faint heart who would grow weary of the struggle.”

25. Australia is as shocked as any nation by the needless death and destruction in Korea. Our fighting men—of the Navy, Army and Air—were amongst the first in action against the aggressor in Korea. Australia has the proud record of having been in both world wars against aggression from start to finish, and we shall see this situation in Korea through to the end.

26. United Nations efforts to achieve an armistice have been constant, and our negotiators have gone to the limit in an effort to reach agreement. On paper we have had an armistice agreement since last April—and agreement on every point at issue except that of the repatriation of prisoners of war. On this issue we stand firm. We are not prepared to compel prisoners by force to return when they have a reasonable fear of danger to life or liberty. Will anyone deny the decency or the humanitarianism of this stand?

27. Soviet Union armies in the past have gone much further than the principle that I have just enunciated. In an ultimatum to the Commander of the German troops at Stalingrad on 8 January 1943, the USSR guaranteed, to all who surrendered, “return after the war to Germany or to any country where the prisoner of war desires to go”. A similar offer was made to German troops later in the Budapest area. An official Soviet Union publication, referring to this latter

instance, described it as "expressing the highest act of humanitarianism".

28. And it must be remembered that we have not adopted this principle out of any particular love or regard for these communist prisoners. After all, they fought ferociously against us. The simple fact is that we are striving to uphold a principle as vital as freedom itself. I have heard no convincing reason given by the Communists for the rejection of the principle that I have stated regarding prisoners of war, but I have read a series of blunt and abusive refusals.

29. The women and children of Korea—both North and South—are paying as much as anyone for this failure to reach agreement. If it could be agreed that fighting should stop, the United Nations stands ready to furnish rehabilitation and reconstruction services for civilians not only in South Korea, but also in North Korea. They are all Koreans. But I have not heard of any similar offer of rehabilitation and reconstruction on the part of the Soviet Union or communist China.

30. It may be asked—I have no doubt it has been asked and will be asked—"What are we fighting for?" I think the best and shortest answer is that which Mr. Churchill gave in reply to a similar question during the 1939-1945 war, when he said: "If we stopped, you would find out." In Korea, we have repelled aggression, and the very fact that we intervened has been a warning to aggressors that they cannot ravage and outrage other countries with impunity. Our resistance to aggression in Korea may well deter aggression elsewhere, maybe on an even more formidable scale.

31. We are still hopeful of an armistice. I assure the General Assembly that my delegation will examine the question of Korea with the greatest of care in the First Committee, while preserving the principle to which I have referred.

32. I should like to make a brief reference to the United Nations, not to its successes or failures, but to its composition. I feel strongly that some way should be found of breaking the deadlock which is preventing a number of countries from joining the United Nations for reasons not related to the Charter. A great majority of Members have believed that a number which have applied for admission since 1946 are fully qualified under Article 4 of the Charter. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has endeavoured to secure the admission of some others which, again in the opinion of the majority, are not so qualified. The exclusion of so many countries from this international forum is a disability reducing the exchange of views and curtailing our activities and usefulness. By admitting more Members, we wish to give the Organization the widest possible representation.

33. But we must remember the Charter on which it rests. I remember the wise words of the President, on 14 October [377th meeting], when he said: "The United Nations, we should not forget, is not a super-government." The Charter permits discussion of a wide range of subjects. But at San Francisco, it was agreed to impose limitations without which our deliberations might be so wide as to prove endless and fruitless. To my mind, the Charter must be regarded and considered as a whole. At San Francisco, the document would not have been acceptable to many of us had not its various provisions been interrelated. In this connexion, I refer

to Article 2, paragraph 7, which prohibits the discussion of matters of domestic jurisdiction.

34. By stating broad humanitarian principles in the Charter, I do not think that the nations at San Francisco had in mind that the Organization would thereby be permitted to discuss or to intervene in questions of domestic economic or social legislation. The objective of international welfare which has its expression in the Charter is an objective of international co-operation towards an ideal, and not an authorization for the Organization to attack individual States on matters which are the subject of its own legislation. I say this without regard to the merits of any particular situation.

35. I cannot emphasize too strongly the view of my Government as to the need to keep the whole of the Charter in perspective in this way. The suggestion that the United Nations has the right to discuss anything within the scope of the Charter notwithstanding Article 2, paragraph 7, even though it may not have the competence to make recommendations thereon, is in our view not in the best interests of the United Nations as a co-operative instrument in international affairs.

36. In the opinion of many of us, there have been not only discussions, but positive recommendations, particularly in the past two or three years, on matters not contemplated by the Charter. This has been particularly apparent in the work of the Fourth Committee of the Assembly. Frequently, the Committee has sought to impose its will in contravention of the Charter. There has been an underlying innuendo that countries responsible for dependent peoples and Trust Territories are bent upon maintaining the *status quo* for some selfish ends of their own. The fact is that the responsible Powers have been loyally carrying out their duties under the Charter in accordance with principles accepted not only by those Powers but also by all Members of the United Nations by the act of signing the Charter. Indeed, better conditions exist in certain colonies or dependent territories than exist in the countries of some of the critics.

37. The world has become accustomed to attacks on what is called colonialism. They spring from the concern of all Members for the rights of dependent peoples. But there is much of which one can be proud in the record of the so-called colonial Powers. In the past decade, as Mr. Acheson very rightly pointed out, 624 million people have attained full nationhood and independence. Others are moving towards self-government in accordance with principles that have long existed and which have been restated in the Charter of the United Nations. Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Israel, Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Indonesia, Libya and Eritrea—all new nations—are surely proof of the good faith of the colonial Powers.

38. Communist propaganda holds that nations responsible for the peoples who are not yet self-governing are interested solely in their exploitation. This specious plea is designed to help identify communism with nationalist aspirations. But for these people, communism offers only the kiss of death, the mortgaging of freedom, before freedom itself is attained.

39. Fortunately, the leaders of nationalist movements have been forewarned of this. They have seen the proud independence of countries like Czechoslovakia,

Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and the Baltic States become a tragic—but, we hope, only a temporary—memory. While colonial Powers have, since the war, brought to nationhood an impressive number of countries, many of them represented here today, the Soviet Union has destroyed the independence of no less than seven nations. There could be no greater fallacy than to believe that communism is the path to greater freedom or welfare.

40. My own country, Australia, was a collection of colonies only fifty-odd years ago. Along with many other colonial countries, Great Britain protected us and assisted us with men, money and markets until progressively we achieved complete representative self-government in all aspects of our domestic and international affairs.

41. There are dangers in the premature granting of self-government. A people must be ready to take effective measures of defence and must learn to direct their economic affairs before self-government can be exercised. Leaders prepared for their responsibilities must emerge. Otherwise, autonomy can lead to chaos and poverty, the breeding ground of communism.

42. We are sometimes criticized by certain countries for not providing social services in our Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories on a scale far beyond that which exists in the countries of some of our critics. Our critics might be reminded of the biblical injunction:

“Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged . . . And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?”

I shall say no more than this, although there is a very great deal more that could be said.

43. The simple fact is that, so far as Australia is concerned, we recognize fully the obligations that we have accepted towards the indigenous peoples of Papua and of the Territory of New Guinea. We propose to carry out these obligations in the letter and in the spirit, as we have done in the past. If anyone imagines that we are exercising these responsibilities for selfish gain, let me say that since Australia accepted the Trusteeship Agreement for New Guinea, our dependent territories have cost metropolitan Australia a net amount of £14,900,000. Each year we have made grants to our territories several times the value of the revenues of those territories.

44. Those who have had experience of primitive peoples in many countries know very well that the too rapid impact of what we are pleased to call civilization can utterly corrupt and destroy them. There are many essential things that can and should be done, but there is much else that can be done only gradually and with understanding if the people are to survive.

45. We should recognize the problems and difficulties facing the administrations of the many new nations that have come into existence with complete autonomy within the last ten years. Many are evolving governments best suited to their own conditions. Levels of industrial development and standards of living vary immensely from country to country. If some nations can be of assistance in helping the newer nations to raise their standards of living, they should do so with no strings

attached. If assistance is not wanted, that is the affair of the country concerned. No one will attempt to impose it on them. But modern techniques of production, both industrial and agricultural, can do much for them.

46. It is a common form of communist propaganda that technical assistance is another form of colonialism. This, of course, is not the fact. It is action for the common good. Economic development not only benefits the people directly concerned, but also those of other nations. Food and want are global problems, not merely regional or national.

47. The USSR has never offered technical assistance to the rest of the world except recently, for obviously self-interested political purposes in limited areas. The Soviet Union belongs to none of the economic and humanitarian agencies of the United Nations. The Soviet Union has made no contributions to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund or the International Refugee Organization. These are facts that need to be said and said again. In the days when they still had some measure of independence, the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Poland made such contributions, but in the last three years not a penny has come from Eastern Europe for these programmes. The Soviet Union is a country of 200 million people, or thereabouts; my own country, Australia, is a country of eight and a half million people. Under United Nations and other programmes of relief and assistance, Australia has contributed or pledged no less than \$180 million. The USSR has not contributed a penny. This is a record of which we are proud, and it is a record which stands in stark contrast to that of the Soviet Union.

48. I now wish to say a word on the food problem. The world is short of food, and the situation is worsening. Food production has lagged behind population increase. According to a United Nations survey, there is 5 per cent less food available *per capita* today than there was in 1939. Next to maintaining peace, mankind's most urgent task is to increase the world's food supply. Twenty years ago, the League of Nations reported that half the world was suffering from malnutrition. The population of the world is currently increasing by about 30 million people a year, and yet exportable food surpluses are declining. The remedy must be applied in terms of individual countries and regions, and technical assistance and other means of increasing agricultural production should be given the highest priority.

49. The major food-exporting areas of the world are North America, Argentina, Australia and New Zealand. However, the food-exporting potentialities of these areas, taken as a whole, have declined over the past fifteen years. Adverse seasons in one or another of these areas could create a desperate situation.

50. In Australia, we are making every effort to stimulate and encourage increased food production. I need not go into detail. We are hampered by a shortage of capital—the best fertilizer in the world. With adequate capital, we could in the long run make substantial increases in food production. Great things could be done in Australia if we could link the provision of additional capital with immigration, irrigation and food production. Similarly, faster development would be possible if the present heavy burden of rearmament forced on us by the threat of communist aggression were to be



lifted. But we are short of capital for the basic irrigation products and to meet the cost of additional land settlement on which greatly increased Australian production largely depends. However, apart from our domestic Australian situation, Australia has, in common with other British countries—the United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand—concerned itself with the foodstuffs situation in the countries on the Asian mainland to our north. Through the Colombo plan, we and others are doing all we can to help in a variety of directions, particularly with respect to food projects. The United States has taken splendidly helpful action. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is supporting developmental projects designed largely to increase food supply on the Asian mainland.

51. Mr. Vyshinsky seemed to find some grim satisfaction in the fact that there is a world shortage of food. Yet the Soviet Union has done nothing to help. We, the democracies, have made every effort to help. The simple fact is that the Soviet Union, practically alone of all the Powers which could help the food situation, particularly in southern and Southeast Asia, has done nothing and shows no sign of wanting to do anything.

52. Does it not all add up to a rather simple answer? We, the democratic countries, recognize the existence of the food problem, and we are assisting the governments of the countries concerned with freely given aid to the limit of our abilities. The USSR, on the other hand, apparently hopes to produce doubts and fears by stressing these problems—but does nothing about them. One can only assume that the Soviet Union is not interested in solving these problems but is interested only in fomenting discontent arising out of them. In other words, the Soviet Union has a vested interest in discontent.

53. I should like to speak briefly about the Soviet hate campaign. We are all familiar with its charges of germ warfare, imperialism, racial prejudice and all the rest. Clearly it is the aim of the Soviet Union to attempt to drive a wedge between the United Kingdom and the United States. If this is so, there are a great many of us who have an interest in this matter. British-American co-operation is an anvil that has worn out many hammers. I have no doubt that it will stand up to a sickle as well.

54. On Saturday morning, I listened attentively to the leader of the Soviet Union delegation. His speech contained nothing new. I think that that is generally agreed. Most of it reiterated the false and blatant propaganda that the USSR had been trying to sell for a great many years. By the use of quotations, largely taken out of their context, he sought to show that all the United States wanted was war, that its whole system was geared to war, and that it was arranging a series of aggressive actions to encircle the Soviet Union. He even went so far as to suggest that the ANZUS arrangements recently contracted between the United States, Australia and New Zealand, fitted into this pattern of aggressive alliance. But if Mr. Vyshinsky thinks—and I do not believe that he does—that our Pacific security arrangements are threatening the Soviet Union and are designed for anything other than our self-defence, he need have no fear.

55. The democracies certainly have, in recent years, banded together in various parts of the world in their

own defence. The United Nations Charter provides for this and sanctions it. The reason why we have done this is that we believe it is essential to make provision against the aggressive tactics of the USSR. Despite that country's talk of disarmament, there are no features connected with Soviet Union armed might which have yet given us any particular cause for confidence. Our confidence stems from our growing strength. We are under threat—and we are taking adequate measures to protect ourselves.

56. I shall now speak on peace and disarmament. How many words have we heard from the USSR about these two ideals of all humanity! For the reason why we hear so much about this, I refer the General Assembly to the *History of Diplomacy*, an official publication of the Government of the Soviet Union issued in 1945. It gives, with disarming frankness, the motive behind these campaigns. The following quotation that I am going to read—a short quotation—shows the callous Soviet regard for the effectiveness of certain kinds of dishonest propaganda:

“To the same groups of examples of the concealment of predatory ends behind noble principles also belong the instances of the exploitation of the idea of disarmament and pacifist propaganda in the broad sense of the word for one's own purposes.

“From time immemorial, the idea of disarmament has been one of the most favoured forms of diplomatic dissimulation of the true motives and plans of those governments which have been seized by such a sudden ‘love of peace’.”

57. I do not think that one could have a more cynical and frank statement of the Soviet Union attitude towards the world or expression of propaganda in recent years. On Saturday, Mr. Vyshinsky, in particular bitterness towards the United States, made his protestations about the desirability and possibility of peaceful coexistence in this world, I believe, a mockery.

58. Contrast his charges with the claim published in the Soviet *New Times* on 13 August 1952, which told its foreign readers:

“The Soviet Union fosters in its citizens a spirit of respect for, and peaceful co-operation with, other nations. The Soviet way of life does not tolerate the propaganda of animosity, let alone of hatred, towards the peoples of other countries.”

I hope that no USSR representative will be kept from sleeping by laughing at this unfortunate contradiction on the part of the Soviet Press.

59. Let me now say a word about the fantastic charges about germ warfare in Korea. The charges have, of course, been specifically denied time and time again. Impartial investigation was proposed by the United States when the charges were first made, and, as we all know, it was refused.

60. For myself, I consulted our leading Australian authority on virus and communicable diseases, Sir Macfarlane Burnet, a man whose reputation and experience is not without repute in scientific circles throughout the world. Sir Macfarlane Burnet has allowed me to quote him regarding allegations that germ warfare has been carried on in Korea. He said the following:

"The whole question of spreading disease by such methods has been extensively and openly discussed in literature on the subject. It is the general opinion of bacteriologists that any attempt to initiate epidemics which would then spread widely amongst enemy personnel is bound to be fruitless.

"No intelligent bacteriologist could ever believe that the dropping of plague-infested fleas or typhus-infected lice could have more than a minor psychological or nuisance value. The spread of any epidemic is determined almost wholly by the condition of the population concerned.

"In areas where plague or typhus are already present, as in North Korea and Manchuria, the occurrence of outbreaks will be determined by local conditions such as the degree of overcrowding, the presence of rats and the immunity of the population.

"The deliberate liberation, by any means, of the responsible germs could have no more than a trivial effect on the incidence of diseases. No significant military effect could be expected. It is unthinkable that any responsible officer would have ordered such action."

I have a longer and very much detailed statement from Sir Macfarlane Burnet on this subject which I shall make available at a more appropriate time, when this matter is discussed—as I have no doubt it will be—in the relevant committee.

61. Obviously it is no use appealing to the Soviet Union to desist from the campaign in which it is engaged. The General Assembly has already passed resolutions against war-mongering, war propaganda, and false and distorted reports, all of which are ignored by the country which initiated them. We can and shall answer the allegations of the Soviet Union Government, and in strong terms, but it will not go unnoticed that we do not engage, as regards the peoples of the USSR, and the peoples of other countries in the hands of the USSR, in the sort of vilification practised by that Government.

62. The peoples of the world have to try to understand each other. The Charter enjoins us to do just that. Its purposes, which have been callously ignored by some, even Members of the United Nations, include the following: "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples . . ." and "To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations . . .". What a mockery has been made of those purposes by some of our colleagues in this Organization! What a travesty they have also made of resolutions, largely instigated by themselves, dealing with questions like war propaganda! If anything is going to produce a war in this world, it is sowing the seeds of hatred among peoples.

63. There is an old tale among some of the peoples who live on the foothills of the Himalayas. It goes like this: "One day as I was walking on the mountain-side, I saw at a distance what I thought to be a beast. As I came closer, I saw that it was a man. As I came closer still, I found it was my brother." It is a far stretch from the Himalayan foothills to this modern chamber. But the councils of the nations could well heed the moral of that simple folk tale if we are to live in peace and understanding in the world.

64. Mr. SILES ZUAZO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): I must begin by expressing the emotion and anxiety I feel as I address this Assembly, which is opening another session in full awareness of the fact that it is struggling for its existence as the supreme international body vested with the task of building a constructive peace for all peoples. Because "power cannot be exercised with impunity", to quote the Bolivian Minister, Franz Tamayo, it is disquieting to consider the tremendous power and correspondingly great responsibility of the great Powers which, constrained as they are to proceed in accordance with a rigid pattern in keeping with their domestic policies, have been unable to lay the foundation for a stable peace which would enable their peoples and the peoples everywhere to live in the hope of a better world.

65. Our emotion becomes anxiety when, as the representatives of small nations, we realize that we can contribute very little, indeed almost nothing, to the elimination of the conflicts among the great Powers. Yet, at the same time, we understand that it is our duty to co-operate constructively in the work of the United Nations, which seeks to build good-neighbourly relations at a time when profound changes are being made in economic, political and social structures and when no State, however small, can remain indifferent to the problems confronting a world which is moving towards unity. The United Nations is in itself the most satisfactory international institution history has known for studying and planning better economic and social conditions for the undeveloped countries. Its painstaking and methodical investigations, and its sustained interest in the solution of the vital problems of the undeveloped countries, represent a collective effort without precedent and the combined labour of outstanding abilities placed at the service of mankind. If to this is added the ever-growing conviction that the world will be a better place to live in if it is prepared to achieve unity, so that the economies of the different regions of the earth may be complementary to each other, all respect being given both to economic sovereignty and the principle of self-determination of peoples, it will be realized that the under-developed countries are the most vitally interested in the effective solution of the conflict among the great Powers, and, thus, in the real strengthening of the United Nations.

66. It is the study groups of the United Nations which, in their search for the soundest bases for a lasting peace, have pointed out the fundamental need to promote the development of the under-developed countries. This view has gained such acceptance in the United Nations that no discussion and no important resolution fails to take into account the danger inherent in the continued existence of economically exploited and politically dependent peoples. Now, in Bolivia, the opportunity has arisen to give effect to the purposes and recommendations of the United Nations regarding the economic development of the under-developed countries, without risk of conflict. That opportunity and that development will be followed with the greatest interest by other countries in a similar position.

67. In the frank and intelligent statement he made a few days ago [379th meeting], the retiring President of the Economic and Social Council, who is the head of the Chilean delegation, mentioned the alarming figures for mortality, health and nutrition in the under-devel-



oped countries and their trade deficits, and referred to the report submitted to the President of the United States by the Materials Policy Commission. He cited statistics on the reserves of tin, copper, manganese, aluminium, oil and zinc, and the probable consumption in the next twenty-five years, which show how "the world, and especially the industrial countries, will depend to a growing extent upon the raw materials emanating from the under-developed countries". These ores and others, in addition to vegetable raw materials, exist in abundance in my country. Up to the present time, only tin has been intensively exploited, and Bolivia is the second largest producer of tin in the world.

68. The arrival of the *conquistadores* in the territory now occupied by Bolivia disrupted the agrarian economy of the Incas and transformed it into a mining economy, while the feudal system was imposed in the rural areas. That is how, during the colonial period, the legend of the wealth of Potosí spread far and wide in America and Europe. But, paradoxically, that very wealth contributed to the poverty of the producing nation. This apparent contradiction was due to the fact that the silver shamelessly extracted at the cost of the lives of millions of Indian serfs helped to finance imperial Spain's plans for domination.

69. In the twentieth century, tin being essential to the development of the industrialized countries, an economic empire based on tin mining was built up in Bolivia. After firmly establishing its political power in my country, the rulers of this empire went abroad and assumed foreign citizenship in order to strengthen their political domination through diplomatic influence. The tin magnates found minor allies in the large landowners and local politicians living on the labour of the Indian peasants; thus a feudal mining system was established and for half a century appointed puppets as presidents, members of parliament, judges and diplomats, all of them employed in the semi-colonial exploitation of the people of my country. Thus the bitter paradox of the colonial period of a country tremendously rich in natural resources and at the same time incredibly poor, continued to exist, although there was now the fiction of political independence.

70. The following statistics from official United Nations documents clearly illustrate the real situation in Bolivia. The birth rate is 45 per thousand; the general death rate is 35 per thousand; the death rate of infants is as high as 500 per thousand. As regards nutrition, the Bolivian's consumption of calories is 1,612 daily. The annual *per capita* income is \$73 (U.S.). As regards literacy, 80 per cent of the population is illiterate. Average daily wages are about 50 cents (U.S.).

71. At the other extreme, it is interesting to note that the personal fortune of the tin magnate, Simón I. Patiño, was estimated a few years ago to amount to over \$500 million, and that in 1951 the Patiño family as a whole paid a total of 53,217.08 bolivianos, or approximately \$250, in surtax (tax on presumed profits). Another "tin baron", Mauricio Hochschild, paid no surtax at all. Lastly, Mr. Carlos Víctor Aramayo, owner of the daily newspaper *La Razón*, which alone is worth roughly \$250,000, paid 186,971 bolivianos, or about \$900 in surtax in 1951.

72. Such an abnormal and inhuman system of economic privilege, based on the exploitation of three mil-

lion human beings, by an insignificant minority, was maintained for half a century by the irrational exercise of political power and was one of the main obstacles to the normal development of Bolivia. Indeed, this anomalous situation could not have lasted as long as it did had it not been encouraged and supported by interests outside the country. As a reaction to that state of affairs, and in defence of freedom and progress in Bolivia, a movement of liberation, formed by the middle and working classes and the peasants, came into existence in Bolivia fifteen years ago. It came to power without the consent of the "tin barons", by the vote of the people, ratified by arms. It was not merely another political party, ready to wait its turn to serve the feudal super-State of the mining industry, or to seize the opportunity of the traditional military coup to enrich its leaders with the crumbs from the tables of the owners of the means of production; it was a movement of national liberation which had come into being spontaneously and naturally as a result of the situation in Bolivia and Latin America. The agents of the feudal régime imposed by the mining industry immediately understood that the organized arrival of the people on the Bolivian political scene constituted a danger to their own existence and resorted to every possible means to thwart their access to power. Those means included non-recognition. That is why, particularly during the last six years, the rights of that people were pitilessly destroyed. Thousands of working-class, peasant and middle-class families were held down under the yoke of poverty as a result of labour black-lists. They suffered the violence of a police State and were the victims of mass murders. The most elementary human rights were denied and violated; at the same time, the people were subjected to a campaign of political slander. The will of the people, as expressed through elections despite chicanery and coercion, was frustrated.

73. But the march of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples towards progress and freedom cannot be halted, because to halt it would mean the perpetuation of war and poverty in the world. In Bolivia, the path of peaceful evolution was closed and the people, wresting the weapons from the hands of its enemies, overthrew the feudal mining régime after a bloody and heroic struggle. The triumph was marked by the greatest humanity; after the battle, and while it was still giving Christian burial to its thousands of dead, the stout-hearted and generous people of my country forgave its erstwhile opponents. Not a single person was shot; there were no reprisals or destruction of property. In Bolivia a revolution without hatred is in progress.

74. Under the technical assistance programme launched by the United Nations to promote the progress of the under-developed countries, the agreement of 1 October 1951 between the United Nations and Bolivia was an experiment with far-reaching implications. Thanks to this agreement, which went beyond the strict definition of technical assistance, my country was given administrative assistance designed to re-establish order in its public and fiscal administration. In view of the chaos to which the public administration had been reduced by the feudal mining system at that time, it was logical that the United Nations should desire to offer technical assistance in the sphere of administration, although it was certainly not realized that the disorder had been created as a method of concealing the frauds

committed by the mining industry and the government officials in its service. In Bolivia, this step was looked upon with some suspicion. It was pointed out that it involved a tacit renunciation of the principle of sovereignty and independence. Outward appearances were, of course, maintained, and the administrative trusteeship over Bolivia was veiled by regulations drawn up to guide the advisers in their work. But the Bolivian people understood instinctively that this intervention, although materially of advantage to the country, was in conflict with its traditional principles. Today my Government, interpreting that collective feeling, is preparing its observations on the agreement and will propose amendments which it considers to be in keeping with its national dignity. These reservations will not in any way constitute a repudiation of the agreement reached with regard to technical assistance, for, today, more than ever, as it begins a new era in its history, Bolivia hopes to secure all the advantages which technology can offer to a country whose potential wealth must not be underestimated in plans for increased world production or in programmes for the settlement of large numbers of migrants who could find homes in its rich and extensive territory. Negative factors in the economic and social structure of Bolivia have weakened its strength and retarded its development—its geographical position, its small population and its isolation from the world's great trade routes. But the underlying reasons for its internal disorder are closely related to the forms in which its wealth has been exploited, which have been typical of the semi-colonial nations, and these, in turn, can survive only under the control of international cartels.

75. I should like to comment on the basic criterion which, in contrast to the analysis I have given, the competent organs of the United Nations applied in dealing with the problem of technical assistance to Bolivia. The report on which the agreements between Bolivia and the United Nations were based could not include all the information which circumstances required, because the sources providing the information were interested in maintaining and consolidating the conditions in which the mining industry and the Bolivian workers were being exploited. As mining was not only the main but also the only positive activity of the national economy, radical remedies were necessary, and not mere palliative measures which would in the long run only intensify administrative disorder and governmental instability. There were two main gaps in the report: the absence of data on methods of establishing smelting-works for tin and other minerals in Bolivia and, secondly, the lack of any critical analysis of the conditions under which the mining industry operated. It was impossible to make an objective study of the Bolivian economy without considering these two matters. Unfortunately, they were not taken into account, and the result was a gap which is now becoming apparent in the United Nations plans for technical assistance to Bolivia. It would be unfair, however, to blame the technical mission for these gaps. It began its inquiries at a time when the political situation of the country was such that there was particular official interest in concealing the truth and in misleading the experts, who had in the end to follow the lines laid down by the great mine-owners through a government that was completely subservient to them.

76. In view of what I have said, the Bolivian people wish to enjoy the assistance of the United Nations. The United Nations and its specialized agencies can do much, not only for the direct benefit of my country, but also—and this is the most important aspect—for the benefit of mankind, which is impatiently seeking means of balancing population growth with expansion of the means of production to eliminate hunger and poverty.

77. From its liberators, Bolivia received as a heritage an extensive and rich territory which is at the service of mankind. I do not feel that I am exaggerating the scope of these problems, which are closely related to technical assistance, when I say that the problem of my country's economic development is not a strictly national question but a matter which affects the community of nations. The Bolivian problem deserves special understanding for one reason in particular, that it is the result of a conflict initiated by external factors. Now that vigorous domestic forces are seeking to reorganize its economic structure, Bolivia requires, and requests through this great assembly of nations, the support which is needed to solve its basic problems, so that the sacrifices of its people, who are striving with unparalleled vigour to overcome the obstacles created by its unfavourable geographical position and against powerful international interests which seek to perpetuate its semi-colonial status, may not once more be vain.

78. Under the Constitution and mining laws of Bolivia, the State's right to expropriate concessions, which have given rise to a power openly opposed to the national interests is indisputable. Under our law, the expropriation and withdrawal of such concessions are called for by two constitutional principles: the social function of property and the public interest. The principle of political independence is fully recognized in the constitutions of Member States. However, side by side with this legal and democratic provision, without which an international organization could not exist, there are economic forces which believe simply that might is right. The relations between small producers and large buyers are becoming increasingly difficult. Although there have been and still are producers' associations, it is equally true that there are buyers' monopolies. Faced by such forces, a country without reserves can easily be upset. Apart from these factors, countries whose economy depends on one or two basic commodities are subject to a policy of extortion, whose purpose I fail to understand. Under this policy, low prices are fixed for certain commodities when they are in short supply and there is a demand for them, and they are thrown on the free market when the supply increases. This policy has been followed in the case of certain essential commodities and is an undisguised threat to the security of the under-developed countries. This restrictive and extortionist policy destroys the reciprocity and solidarity which should mark the economic relations of the small, medium-sized and large countries. International disputes and national liberation movements emerge, like inexorable historical corrective phenomena, as a result of such unjust relations.

79. The Bolivian liberation movement has taken the irrevocable decision to nationalize the large mines in accordance with the law as a first step towards bringing the national economy under the control of the

State. Mining profits will be used to raise the present level of productivity, to carry out a land reform which will enable the rural population to participate fully in the national life, to establish new industries which will make it possible to take advantage of other minerals, other sources of power and other natural resources, to improve living conditions and to make the benefits of culture and civilization available to the whole population. When political independence is thus coupled with economic sovereignty, there will be social peace and progress in Bolivia; this will contribute directly to the harmonious development of the other peoples of America and of the world, and will help to achieve one of the objectives of the United Nations with regard to countries in a similar position to mine. The degree of success of this vital process will be reflected in the United Nations and in the under-developed countries in their common struggle for progress and freedom. I therefore appeal to the understanding of the tin-purchasing countries; I am certain of the solidarity of the countries which have problems similar to ours. My delegation reserves the right to speak again in this general debate if an international situation arises which affects my country during the period of nationalization of the mines. And now, in conclusion, I must turn to a problem of general concern.

80. The system of collective security is undoubtedly the most remarkable historical experiment undertaken by the human race in its endeavour to ensure world peace. During the first half of the twentieth century, men have striven to perfect this system, which is the most effective means of warding off the scourge of war and eliminating aggression. The real obstacles to peaceful development are the disturbances affecting the relations among the great Powers whose destinies involve the fate of the entire world. The small and medium-sized nations have placed their hope in moral principles, the *sine qua non* of that spirit of peace which is necessary to create a situation in which peace among men is possible. My people earnestly desire the establishment of a lasting and enduring peace under the auspices of the United Nations and consider that moral and spiritual factors offer the best guarantee for the progress of man towards his goal.

81. Mr. CHARLONE (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): As I take the floor here, towards the close of the first stage in the general debate which the peoples of the Member States, through their delegations, initiate each year in the General Assembly, I desire once again to reaffirm the faith and hope of Uruguay in the United Nations. Both within and without the United Nations there are tensions and conflicts as strong as those of previous years, and new problems of undeniable gravity have arisen, such as the upsurge of nationalism and claims by the under-developed countries for greater equality of rights, freedoms and economic opportunities. Nevertheless, my delegation agrees with the Secretary-General that the United Nations, today more than ever, offers to all peoples the only road to the conquest of peace and the protection of civilization.

82. It is precisely because we belong to an unfortunate generation which twice in twenty-five years has witnessed the outbreak of a major war, that we see in the United Nations the only hope for peace and co-operation. That is particularly true in the present

phase of world history, when the earth is growing smaller through scientific progress and the genius of man is discovering new sources of power which, according to whether the great Powers which possess its secret succeed or fail in achieving harmony, may raise the human race to the pinnacle of happiness or hurl it into the tragic abyss of destruction and death.

83. When the actions of the United Nations are evaluated and judged, let it not be forgotten that the Organization came into the world in the most dramatic circumstances, after an orgy of violence without precedent in history, in which the freedoms of the peoples had been trampled underfoot, their sources of production destroyed, the wealth accumulated by creative labour submitted to systematic pillage, and the dignity of the human person insulted and mocked by the worst forms of outrage and humiliation. For the same reason, the United Nations must be allowed sufficient time to attempt its great mission when it is called upon to solve problems rooted deep in history, impossible of solution in the past owing to the absence of that spirit of tolerance, understanding, confidence and faith in the advantages of co-operation upon which the philosophy of the United Nations Charter is based.

84. The destiny of man cannot be raised up out of chaos and violence and brought to order and happiness without a necessary period of transition—the stage through which we are now passing—when the work of the United Nations must be judged rather by what it succeeds in avoiding than by what it is able to achieve. Creative action requires an atmosphere of tolerance, of peaceful relations, and of co-operation. These, we firmly believe, can be achieved by the efforts of the peoples and their governments if, while we cultivate these noble sentiments, the United Nations uproots, wherever they may appear, all seeds of aggressive ideologies, lust for power and the spirit of conquest, the tragic legacy of that totalitarianism so recently defeated on the field of battle.

85. It seems obvious that many of the present tensions and conflicts have arisen from the delay in signing the peace treaties and from the manner in which those treaties which have been signed were drafted. It was always a matter of dispute whether the United Nations should begin its new chapter in world history before or after the peace treaties had established the concrete foundation of order in the relations among States. The League of Nations, which came into being at the same time as the peace treaties which put an end to the First World War, began under apparently happier auspices; but it failed to safeguard peace and collective security because it lacked the decision and strength to punish aggression and the manifestations of international delinquency when they claimed their first victim. The guiding principle at San Francisco was the idea that the United Nations should come into being before peace was finally negotiated, because there was a hope that the great Powers would agree on foundations for that peace in line with the purposes and principles of the Charter. That hope has not as yet been borne out by experience, but the Organization cannot be denied the right to weigh and judge the conduct of the great Powers in this matter, as we are about to do once more in the concrete case of Austria.

86. It is here, in the Assembly, that the battle is waged to ensure that the principles of the Charter shall



gradually permeate the organs which express the common will of the United Nations, and also the conduct of the great Powers, whose acts and decisions are of such vital importance to peace. The annual debates of the Assembly reveal a continuous and tenacious effort to inspire the life of the United Nations ever more fully with the ideal of democracy and the spirit of law. In this task we are supported by those spiritual reserves of humanity, respect for law and international morality. These are most precious reserves, which in the last war upheld all over the world, even in the darkest hours, humanity's faith in the final triumph of the democracies. The support of these moral forces here in this Assembly has enabled the United Nations to overcome its structural defects, such as the veto, by invoking the concurrent jurisdiction of the Assembly when the Security Council, for the reasons and in the circumstances known to all, failed in its essential task as the guardian of peace.

87. In our opinion, which I should like to express with some emphasis, the great achievement of the United Nations has been to overcome its organic defects. Evidence of this is the resolution [377(V)] entitled "Uniting for peace," of which Uruguay was a co-sponsor at the 1950 session of the Assembly and which is in itself the most convincing proof that the United Nations has succeeded in abolishing the privilege of immunity which, in practice, is conferred by the veto. At this point it cannot be argued here, as it was on 29 October 1946, in the second part of the General Assembly's first session,<sup>2</sup> that the principle of the veto is the corner-stone of the United Nations and that its removal would cause the whole structure to collapse. Today, on the contrary, there may be a hope that in the near future the veto will become a thing of the past, with the spinning-wheel and the bronze hatchet, and will be no more to the peoples than the sign and symbol of a vanished world based on inequality among States, the privileges of power and the denial of the rule of law and morality.

88. The United Nations requires an atmosphere of confidence, of understanding and of collaboration, and it is in that spirit that we consider and judge the upsurge of nationalism in vast areas of the world whence the cry goes up for more substantial rights, for wider freedoms, for better economic opportunities—aspirations which are all implicit in the ideal of the self-determination of peoples expressly formulated in the Charter. No one can fail to be aware that nationalism, that mystical expression of the right to self-determination of peoples in all fields in which they can develop their personality under the aegis of liberty and progress, is one of the great forces of history, deeply rooted in the most powerful emotions of the human race—love of family, home and country. Inspired by a spirit of solidarity, the peoples of the world have embodied these aspirations in the United Nations Charter, with the noble purpose of opening up to the peoples a way towards all forms and possibilities of freedom and progress—political, economic, social, cultural and humanitarian.

89. After the United Nations had been set up, we saw the birth of the State of Israel. India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma have achieved full independence. Indonesia, an independent member of the Netherlands-Indonesian

Union, has become a Member of the United Nations, with equal status and sovereign rights. The associated States of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia have achieved their independence within the French Union and have applied for membership of the United Nations. If we remember also the work of the United Nations in Libya and Eritrea, we shall have to admit that the world has seldom witnessed a peaceful revolution, on such an enormous scale and of such profound significance, in such a short time.

90. Unfortunately, heavy burdens have been laid on the sincerely peace-loving peoples by the need to repel aggression and organize their lawful and collective self-defence under regional arrangements—certainly a more onerous method than the creation of a common international force, which has been rendered impossible by certain intransigent attitudes. These burdens have diverted valuable resources from the economic development of the under-developed countries. Undeniably this is the long-range problem of the greatest importance for the destiny of the world; and we wish to define our attitude towards it and to explain in advance the position which we shall take up, repeating from this platform the statements which we have frequently made on the subject in the Economic and Social Council. In order to arrive at the satisfactory and effective solutions which we are seeking, it is necessary, in our opinion, to make use of all the resources available and of the new methods which have been evolved—although, inevitably, they are inadequate in the face of a problem so vast and of such long standing—taking into account the obvious inequalities which exist and which are the result of differences in strength of economic structures and of the national *per capita* income which, in some countries, enables people to amass private fortunes while, in others, it is not even enough to enable them to meet their most elementary requirements. There are countries which are in process of economic development, where progress has been and still is possible although the pace at which it proceeds is often far from satisfying the wishes of the population. Side by side with these countries are the economically under-developed countries, where the chances of improvement are greatly hindered, if not wholly blocked, by meagre resources and low standards of living.

91. In the first case, that of the countries which are already in process of economic development—a category which we feel includes Uruguay and other countries with the same or similar characteristics—where the level of the national income makes it possible to save and to accumulate private fortunes, the requirements of economic development can be met with the aid of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. If we take it that the Bank makes loans only to governments, or to private undertakings which can be guaranteed by governments—the latter requirement being difficult to satisfy for obvious reasons of internal policy with regard to the need to respect the independence and freedom of private enterprise—it would appear that the action taken to promote economic development could be greatly expanded if private capital could be mobilized and directed towards those investments which really furthered such development, thus helping to implement programmes sponsored by private initiative in each country, that is, by free enterprise. An institution operating in that way, maintaining close contact with and establishing standard

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Part of First Session, Plenary Meetings*, 42nd meeting.

operating procedures in agreement with the Bank, would, in our opinion, enable us to overcome the present lack of confidence which is discouraging this kind of investment.

92. As regards the second category—the under-developed countries whose people live in economic and social penury—the best service we can render their unfortunate inhabitants is to refrain from reminding them of the misfortunes they suffer and to offer them the means of removing or alleviating their suffering. Here the measures already mentioned must necessarily be supplemented by other types of assistance, such as interest-free loans and even subsidies. My delegation wishes to state that it will welcome most warmly the provision of new funds for this purpose.

93. This year the General Assembly has on its agenda, as at its last session, two items typical of that atmosphere of distrust and hypersensitivity which so often leads to distortion and misinterpretation of efforts to achieve understanding and co-operation. These items relate to the war in Korea and the future of that country, and to policy regarding armaments. With regard to the first of these matters, the deadlock which has existed since the aggression was repelled, has not yet been broken. When the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, in his recent speech [383rd meeting], reproached the Secretary of State of the United States because, after speaking of an honourable peace, the Secretary of State had then referred to a just peace, our only reaction was that justice and honour are two inseparable elements in any plan for terminating hostilities and restoring peace.

94. We here state in all frankness that the proposals presented to the General Assembly by the representative of Poland [4/2229] do not, in our opinion, meet that requirement. Moreover, they add nothing new or constructive to the debate. In regard, in particular, to the repatriation of prisoners to their countries of origin, it is neither just nor honourable that, as the price for breaking the present deadlock, the United Nations should renounce its own principles and agree to deny to more than 30,000 human beings their right to choose freely the place where they are to rebuild their happiness in the peace of their homes.

95. The delegation of Mexico has proposed a solution of this problem which safeguards the freedom of the individual. My delegation warmly supports this proposal, without relinquishing our opinion that an equally honourable and just solution would be for the United Nations, through its competent bodies to which the Charter entrusts the protection of human rights, to assume responsibility for those prisoners who refuse to return to their countries of origin. It would be neither logical nor reasonable that the United Nations, because of its status as a belligerent, should be prevented from fulfilling the tasks entrusted to it by the Charter and assuming the care of these prisoners. The military action undertaken by the United Nations is *sui generis*. It is a police action by a collective body whose essential purpose is to prevent breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. Consequently the rules regarding prisoners which have been made for belligerent States are hardly applicable to it. Moreover, although all are Members of the collective body which is taking action, a distinction can admittedly be drawn between those States which have taken up arms and those which have

merely supported the action by their votes or are passively bound by it.

96. With regard to policy concerning armaments and armed forces—a problem fundamental to the peace and progress of the world—we are again at an impasse. And it must be conceded that no substantial progress can be made in the matter so long as the effective control of disarmament and the duty to see that atomic energy is not used for purposes of war are still in the hands of the Security Council, that is, subject to the privilege of impunity constituted by the veto.

97. Finally, my delegation would like to comment on the remarks made by Mr. Vyshinsky in his speech to the Assembly on Saturday [383rd meeting], when he declared that in the opinion of the Soviet Union there was nothing to prevent the peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism. That opinion coincides with the general feeling expressed many times in other quarters. The Charter was certainly not established to impose systems or ideas upon men or nations. It was established to safeguard the right of peoples to the respect of their freedom and the right of each individual to the respect of his person. But the world is too varied and complex for the destiny of each of its peoples to be bounded solely by the dilemma of capitalism or communism. Nor can it be reduced to the dilemma of free enterprise and a socialized or State-controlled economy, for private capital everywhere is subjected to greater or lesser restrictions, which subordinate it to the general welfare in accordance with the dictates of justice, and which sometimes even replace it by State-controlled enterprise for the better organization of the necessary public services. Indeed, it may happen, as in Uruguay, that the process has been a long one, dating from the opening of the century, and carried out with full respect for the law and the property of others. My country has nationalized or placed under State control sources of production and of wealth upon which a people's independence is based.

98. The differences which may arise between nations and systems in the world today correspond to different and opposing concepts of the individual before the law and in his relations to the State. As applied to peaceful relations among peoples, these ideas are an expression, certainly, of differing concepts of life.

99. Is man the chief end of the law, the State the servant of man, and he the sole sovereign? In that case, the human person is as much under international as under national law. Or is man subject only to national law, receiving his liberties from the State and remaining the servant of the collective systems which express the will of the State? This is the first difference of concept. Is man a product of history, subject to the inexorable laws of determinism? Or is he the master and architect of his own destiny and, as such, able to influence history, to build it, to live it, like the men of good will who, in the United Nations, are endeavouring to show the peoples of the world the bright and blessed paths of peace, tolerance, friendship and brotherly co-operation, thus correcting the effects of the blind forces of history? There is no doubt that these two concepts can coexist in peace. But it must be agreed that such coexistence requires of all nations a sincere respect for the purposes and objectives of the Charter, which, by reflecting the ideal, represent what is eternal, and the necessary spirit of tolerance in working to

achieve these ends through the constitutional bodies created to serve and further them.

100. For example, the success or failure of our work for the freedom and dignity of man will depend upon the use or abuse of the privilege of national sovereignty. The liberation of man as a member of a nation is a sad illusion when as an individual he lives subject to the omnipotence of the State. What is to become of this great ideal called human rights, which we honour and venerate in all the organs of the United Nations, if in the end we make of it the first of the stateless refugees, closing the doors of home and country against it precisely on grounds of attachment to national sovereignty?

101. Although the Charter refers often to domestic jurisdiction, we should remember that Article 2, paragraph 7, makes that reservation only in regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State. In our opinion there can be no doubt that all matters which are part of the substance of an international covenant such as the United Nations Charter have by that very fact ceased to be essentially matters within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

102. Freedom of information is part of the precious heritage of the great human freedoms. Let us all be agreed that if systems founded upon different concepts of human life are to coexist in harmony, freedom of information is the best school in which a man may in-

struct his spirit and choose in freedom the way of life he deems best suited to his ideas, his ideals and his experience. If this peaceful coexistence of peoples separated by fundamental ideological differences is to result in lasting peace and security, it becomes daily more essential that a spirit of mutual confidence should banish for ever from the life of the United Nations the concept of absolute and inviolable sovereignty, at least in the crucial field of control of effective disarmament and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Nothing practical or effective can be done to that end if the great Powers, which are recreating in our time the legend of Prometheus by their possession of the sacred fire which can bring progress or death, invoke the principle of sovereignty in order to resist international control.

103. The voice of grieving humanity, whose destiny is still shackled by the bonds of insecurity, fear, misery and destitution—wretched legacy of the hideous war which we have just experienced—makes known in these halls its hope that the great Powers will understand their grave responsibilities and recognize their obligations. Today, more than ever, this rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly seems to be the appropriate place from which to recall the words of the distinguished sociologist: "The choice is not between Utopia and the world of our fathers, but between Utopia and hell."

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*