



C O N T E N T S

Page

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)..... 121

Speeches by Mr. Sunario (Indonesia), Mr. Vyshinsky
 (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr.
 Stephanopoulos (Greece)

President: Mr. Eelco N. VAN KLEFFENS
 (Netherlands).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. SUNARIO (INDONESIA), MR.
 VYSHINSKY (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUB-
 LICS) AND MR. STEPHANOPOULOS (GREECE)

1. Mr. SUNARIO (Indonesia): I should like to begin my statement by extending to the President and to his delegation my congratulations on his election to the Presidency of this session of the General Assembly. I am sure the United Nations will benefit from his guidance.

2. I wish also to pay tribute to Mrs. Pandit, who presided so ably and so gracefully over the eighth session of the General Assembly. My country is also most appreciative of the honour done us by Mrs. Pandit by her recent visit to Indonesia in her capacity as President of the General Assembly. My people will long remember her visit as a great pleasure and privilege.

3. As we, the representatives of sixty Member nations, meet again at this ninth session of the General Assembly, I wish to reaffirm, on behalf of the people and the Government of Indonesia, our continuing belief and faith in the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. There are, indeed, evidences of very wide gaps which must be bridged if we are to reconcile the many different approaches towards carrying out the aims of this Organization in the preservation of international peace and in the promotion of greater international co-operation for the continued economic and social progress of mankind.

4. But these divergent national interests and attitudes, which arise in part from the varying historical development of our respective nations—in their economic and social aspects no less than in their systems of political organization—have been envisaged in the Charter, which provides that this Organization shall be “a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations”, and enjoins upon all Members “to practise tolerance” in their relations with all other nations. It is our hope, therefore,

that this session of the General Assembly may approach the many problems with which we are faced in this spirit of forbearance and mutual respect as we jointly endeavour to find new means of harmonizing these divergent elements for the common interest of all mankind.

5. Many of the items on our agenda have been previously considered in this General Assembly and indicate recurrent problems, although several new sources of international friction have also developed. Casting a shadow over all our deliberations, however, is the continuing atmosphere of the cold war, originally arising out of the ideological conflict between the greater nations.

6. We have cause for satisfaction in the outcome of the Geneva Conference with the success of the negotiations for the cessation of hostilities in Indo-China; and the recognition of the right of national independence for a people long subjected to colonial domination. These negotiations have provided renewed hope for the relaxation of international tension and have demonstrated once again the universal desire for peace which underlies the purpose of the United Nations. But much still remains to be accomplished in the political settlement with regard to Viet-Nam, which can only be successful if all parties continue to exercise tolerance, understanding and recognition of the desires of the Viet-Nameese people.

7. However, although there has been some evidence of the relaxation of tension in Indo-China as a result of continuing efforts of Member nations to reach agreement through negotiation, no course of further action has been agreed upon in Korea, which still remains a delicate problem for peace in Asia. The hope for unity in Korea when the armistice agreement was signed in July of last year has been clouded by the subsequent failure to reach a political settlement at the Geneva Conference.

8. An imminent danger to the cause of world peace and to the very existence of mankind itself is the continuous threat of an atomic world war. Therefore, Indonesia is strongly in favour of the international control of atomic energy, even the complete abolition of atomic and other ultra-modern weapons of mass destruction, and the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. All efforts to this end should be welcomed and encouraged. We therefore heard with the greatest interest the proposal made by President Eisenhower in his speech in December of last year [470th meeting], and put forward again some days ago by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, in his speech to this Assembly [475th meeting].

9. At the Colombo Conference between the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, India, Pakistan and Indonesia, held in May of this year, these five Prime Ministers, in a joint communique issued on 2 May,

made the following statement, which I trust all of us may heartily endorse:

"The Prime Ministers viewed with grave concern developments in regard to the hydrogen bomb and other weapons of mass destruction. They welcomed the current efforts of the United Nations Disarmaments Commission to bring about the elimination and prohibition of such weapons and they hoped that the Commission would be able to reach an agreed solution to this problem urgently."

10. As we meet in this Assembly there are also conferences being held on a more restricted level, among the nations directly involved, such as the Colombo Plan Conference in Ottawa, in which Indonesia is participating, with regard to problems of major political and economic concern, the solutions of which will directly or indirectly affect the entire world. It is true that the primary responsibility for the solution of these problems remains technically outside the domain of the United Nations. At the same time, however, we have to bear in mind that we should always work in accordance with the principles and aims of the United Nations, since success or failure in reconciling these issues will seriously affect the pervading atmosphere in this Assembly and the tenor of our discussions on the issues which come before us.

11. There still exists the tendency toward the alignment of nations between the two major blocs through military alliances and regional groupings. While respecting the right of each nation to decide what it deems to be in its own interest, my Government, in accordance with its actively independent policy and with world peace as the final goal, has on many occasions emphasized the dangers involved in the trend toward the polarization of nations. The growing reliance upon relative military strength and military alliances by the opposing forces in the so-called cold war has resulted in a precarious equilibrium which, in many instances, tends to obscure the fundamental principles of peace upon which this Organization was founded. The mobilization and threat of opposing military forces can lead only to increased anxiety and fear, which will in turn lead to the suppression of the exchange of ideas which alone can stimulate those dynamic forces required for world peace. And we are all only too keenly aware of the devastating consequence—material and psychological—of armed conflict with conventional weapons, not to speak of the grave risks to world civilization inherent in the destructive forces wrought by present technological development.

12. For all these reasons, Indonesia has decided to remain outside any such military alliances. At the same time, as a responsible member of the family of nations, it continues and furthers, through peaceful means, an active, positive policy aimed at making world peace more attainable.

13. Indonesia, with its positive good-neighbour policy inside and outside the United Nations—and, as regards all its neighbours, with its equally positive Afro-Asian policy—strengthened by the conclusion of several treaties of friendship, and by its participation in the Colombo Plan, is trying constantly and most conscientiously to contribute its share to progress and peace in Asia, especially in South-East Asia and the Pacific area in which we live.

14. Since, however, we must recognize that the outcome of all negotiations for the settlement of regional problems has an impact upon the broader scope of international relationships, Indonesia, in order to make our efforts more complete and effective, does not forget to strive ever more earnestly in this Assembly and other organs of the United Nations to carry out that common task dictated by our common responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples.

15. Thus, by maintaining an actively independent—not merely neutral—foreign policy and by taking no sides in the cold war, we believe that we are able to develop and complete our independence and sovereignty more effectively, and that we are able also to discharge our responsibilities in terms of the basic principles of the United Nations, according equal rights to all nations, large and small. In so doing, we are convinced that Indonesia also may play an active role in co-operating with all nations, without exception, in a harmonious and friendly relationship for the promotion of economic and social progress throughout the world.

16. Such true international co-operation can be promoted only in a world at peace, which requires the peaceful coexistence of all nations and peoples. As stated by the President of Indonesia in his speech to Parliament on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of our national independence:

"Every nation must live, and it has the right to live according to its particular convictions. It is entitled to a life according to its own conscience, and to act, work and trade in conformity with its convictions, so long as such actions do not harm other people or nations."

17. In this sense, "coexistence" is not a negative term implying passive acquiescence to the policies practised by others. It means, rather, a positive effort to recognize the terms or values under which other peoples determine their own way of life, so long as this does not impinge upon the rights of others.

18. In this respect, I should like to quote point 9 of the Colombo Conference communiqué. It reads as follows:

"[The Prime Ministers] were convinced that such interference"—interference in the affairs of their countries—"threatened the sovereignty, security and independence of their respective states and the right of each country to develop and progress in accordance with the conceptions and desires of its own people."

This is why we profoundly believe that, in the present period of strongly conflicting political ideologies among nations, it is only by the acceptance of such a positive concept of national independence and peaceful coexistence that the world can continue to make any significant economic or social progress through negotiations. But peaceful coexistence and negotiations also require mutual respect and reciprocal treatment on a basis of equality. This belief is in full agreement with Indonesia's philosophy of life as embodied in our State ideology, the *Pantja Sila* or Five Principles; namely, first, belief in God; second, humanity; third, nationalism; fourth, democracy; and fifth, social justice.

19. We know, of course, that a nation's real strength rests on its own ability to utilize its potential resources for the improvement of the economic and social well-

fare of its people. It is, therefore, our hope that the benefits of modern technology may be utilized for the much-needed economic development and expansion of all nations, as they strive to raise their standards of living. The general interdependence of political and economic problems has long been recognized by all concerned with the development of stable international relations. This is a problem of primary concern to the many so-called under-developed countries of Asia and Africa, whose economic welfare, as a result of their recent history as colonial or semi-colonial peoples, has depended on the production of a few major commodities, mostly agrarian and for the greater part consisting of raw materials destined for the world market. But, at the same time, all of us must recognize and bear in mind that the industrial development of these countries, also, is a primary requisite for maintaining a stable world economy.

20. Although the United Nations technical assistance programme has been of inestimable value in the field of technical development, international economic programmes of a much broader scope are urgently required in order to increase production, investment and employment in the so-called under-developed areas. These problems have been under study and review by the General Assembly, as well as by the Economic and Social Council, for the past several years. In this connexion, it is of great significance that, although there was improvement in general world economic conditions during the past year, this improvement was shared only to a minor extent by the under-developed countries. The primary reason for this is the dependence of the countries in these areas on the export of a few primary commodities, which fluctuate widely in volume and price. The future development of the political as well as the economic stability of the world obviously cannot rest on a solid basis when so many areas of the world are unable to make more rapid progress in their economic and social life. Nations which have no sound economic base are vulnerable, both politically and militarily, if they are not able to satisfy their peoples' basic needs and aspirations for the future.

21. My Government, therefore, considers the problem of economic development to be of the utmost importance. We strongly support the proposals which have now been made for accelerated economic development through international investment funds and the stabilization of international commodity prices as measures urgently required to promote greater economic stability.

22. In this connexion, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to an important means of stabilizing markets and prices. I have in mind the liberalization of trade, the abolition of trade barriers. Trade barriers may be caused by economic necessity, in which case they have to be overcome by economic means. Unfortunately, there are also trade barriers which originate in non-economic causes, political tensions or even in political conflict. I shall refrain from commenting on these political causes, which all of us deplore. I would only draw attention to the economic consequences of these barriers, which narrow the markets.

23. Western European countries have repeatedly insisted on the abolition or at least the mitigation of barriers of this kind in their traffic with the Eastern European countries. This appears to create a favourable climate for such efforts, especially if the motives for

establishing these barriers are political, rather than economic.

24. If the highly-developed countries of Western Europe find their economic development hampered by trade barriers, it is clear that under-developed countries are still more affected by shrinking markets for their products. Their economies depend to a great extent on these exports, and the larger their markets, the greater the stability of their exports and, hence, of their economic situation generally.

25. Under-developed countries have been hampered in their effort to extend their markets by the embargo imposed by the United Nations—faithfully adhered to by my country—at a time when we and others urgently required an expansion of our trade. I am fully aware of the deplorable reasons which gave birth to this embargo. But since this Organization initiated this measure, it would do well to realize the economic consequences thereof for the so-called under-developed countries.

26. Political tension has led to restriction of economic activity and of trade expansion. This restriction has, in turn, created other political tensions in the so-called under-developed areas, where the raising of the standard of living is hindered, and where poverty remains too long a source of economic instability and, therefore, of social and political instability. These are the grave consequences of the measures taken a few years ago. I would, therefore, recommend to this Assembly that it explore ways and means to promote world trade in the widest sense of the word—especially now that the political climate is improving and thus favouring such an endeavour—as I am confident that, in a spirit of international economic co-operation, a method can be found to prevent, or at least to alleviate, the consequences of artificial restrictions on world trade.

27. The world is an economic unity; for commerce, no less than peace, is indivisible. Economic barriers can serve only to rend asunder the seamless web of economic relations which is strongest when it encompasses the widest possible interchange in the markets of the world.

28. We are confronted with another grave danger to international peace in the continued existence of colonialism in many parts of the world, including Indonesia. A major precept of the Indonesian Constitution, as stated in the Preamble, is this:

“Since independence is the birthright of every nation and any form of colonialism in the world is contrary to humanity and justice, all colonialism must be eradicated.”

This is a principle to which my Government firmly adheres, not only because of our own recent experiences but also because of universal moral concepts of human dignity and social justice. Wherever colonialism exists there is a denial of those basic human rights which are necessary for economic and social fulfilment, and without which only growing social discontent can prosper.

29. We have, therefore, again, as in the past two years, joined with other nations in proposing the questions of Tunisia and Morocco for the consideration of this Assembly. The situation in Tunisia has not changed substantially since this item was last discussed by this Assembly, although there are some faint hopes for negotiations with the true representatives of the Tunisian people towards the realization of sovereignty and independence. We shall certainly watch any such develop-

ments closely until concrete results have been achieved. The situation in Morocco has, unfortunately, deteriorated considerably. It is for this reason that Indonesia hopes that this session of the General Assembly will take positive steps on the Tunisian and Moroccan questions, so that they may finally be settled in the interest of the people of Tunisia and Morocco, as well as in the interest of the world at large.

30. An important step towards the solution of world problems—including the questions of Indo-China, the threat of hydrogen bombs and other weapons of mass destruction, the representation of the People's Republic of China, and the Tunisian, Moroccan and other colonial questions—was made at the recent five-Power Colombo Conference. The effect of this Conference for the future of Asia at least is considerable and should not be underestimated.

31. The Powers participating in the Colombo Conference have felt the urgent need, particularly in these crucial times, for close co-operation in the political, economic and cultural fields. And it is in the way pointed out by the Colombo Conference decisions on colonialism, as well as by the anti-colonial resolution adopted at the Inter-American Conference at Bogotá in 1948 and in Caracas in 1954, that the colonial danger in the world should properly be met by common action and with mutual understanding. In particular, a significant outcome of this Conference was the initiation of preparations to hold, in the near future, a wider conference of African and Asian nations in order to discuss further world problems still pending, especially those which directly affect these countries.

32. It is with regret that my Government has found it necessary to bring to the attention of this Assembly an unsolved problem remaining as a legacy of our struggle for independence, achieved in 1945. In spite of the agreements reached with the Netherlands in 1949 concerning further negotiations to determine the political status of West Irian, and despite repeated efforts on the part of Indonesia to enter into such negotiations—the most recent effort having been made at the The Hague Conference where the unworkable Union between Indonesia and the Netherlands was dissolved—this integral part of Indonesia, West Irian, still remains in dispute. Since the transfer of sovereignty at the end of 1949, this issue has become ever more serious and explosive, as a result both of the continuous refusal of the Netherlands to resume the negotiations broken off in 1952 and of the increase in Dutch occupation forces in West Irian. My Government will continue, as in the past, to exert all its efforts for a peaceful settlement of this question. But we also feel that it is necessary to bring this problem—representing both another instance of colonialism and a territorial dispute between two sovereign countries—to the attention of this Assembly as a matter of vital concern threatening the peace and security of South-East Asia. We were, therefore, heartened by the Assembly's decision to place this item on the agenda, and highly appreciative of the unstinting support given to us by so many delegations.

33. The Indonesian delegation was, however, taken aback by the tone of the remarks made to this Assembly on the question of West Irian by the representative of Australia, the more so in view of the moderate tone employed by the representative of the Netherlands. Our amazement stems, in the first place, from the fact that

we have no dispute with the Australian Government or people on this issue. We face a tense situation with regard to West Irian, but our disagreement is with the Netherlands, and not with Australia. We cannot understand why the Australian delegation is so concerned, even violent, over this matter. We recognize that, as the Administering Authority of East Irian, Australia has a natural and understandable interest in what happens in a contiguous territory, but the intensity of the Australian representative's reaction on this question seemed to us disproportionately great.

34. My Government has never made any claim and has no claim to East Irian. We are concerned solely with the territory of the former Netherlands East Indies: the area which constitutes our national boundaries and the area we struggle to set free. In raising this matter before the United Nations, we are attempting to complete the deliverance of our countrymen from colonial rule; we are attempting to resolve the last issue of this nature arising out of our fight for independence. We have no expansionist intentions or any design on territory beyond our national boundaries. Our only desire is to live in peace as good neighbours with Australia and with the other States near-by in a friendly community of nations. Surely this must be clear to the Government of Australia.

35. We were still more surprised to hear the representative of Australia raise before this Assembly the rather worn argument that West Irian cannot rightfully constitute a part of the Republic of Indonesia because of an alleged difference in ethnic and racial origins between the Irianese and the rest of the Indonesian people. As I stand here before the representatives of 59 other Member nations, I cannot help wondering which, if any, delegation—including the Netherlands and Australia delegation—represents a nation whose citizenry is solely and exclusively descended from a single racial or ethnic group. In this connexion, the publications of UNESCO on the question of race are most instructive. But, as we all know, the criteria by which to determine the political affiliations of the people of a given territory are not based on an examination of racial origins or anthropological characteristics, unless we wish to fall into the obsolete and fatal *Blut und Boden* (blood and soil) theory.

36. And I must confess that we are even more surprised to hear this issue of racial origin raised in this connexion after this myth was so thoroughly destroyed in the course of the Indonesian revolution. Throughout the discussion of the Indonesian case from 1947 to 1950, we heard dire warnings from several delegations about the supposed lack of a common tie between the people of Indonesia, about the absence of a genuine unity or true national feeling. Yet, the genuine character of Indonesian nationalist feeling was proved beyond any possible doubt through the willingness of its people, whatever their ethnic origins or racial characteristics, to shed its blood in a common effort to achieve the national unity and independence it desired. And I might recall that the fact that the people of Indonesia trace their origins from a variety of ethnic groups and have a series of local tongues, in addition to their national language, did not prevent the Australian Government from being one of our earliest and warmest supporters in our struggle for independence—an independence which extended to West Irian as well as to the rest of Indonesia.

37. It is strange that the representative of Australia claimed before this Assembly [479th meeting] that there was and is no genuine movement for Indonesian independence in West Irian since it was Australian troops which, as the first Allied forces to enter that area in 1945, were greeted by strong demonstrations from the Irianese people proclaiming their adherence to the newly-established Republic of Indonesia.

38. Mr. Casey apparently shares with the representative of the Netherlands the fear that an airing of the question of West Irian will provoke tension in South-East Asia. This, too, is an argument which the experience of the United Nations with the Indonesian conflict—let alone with numerous other issues—has disproved. Refusing to bring an issue out into the open, refusing to face the facts where disagreement exists and has persisted for five years, is hardly the way to achieve stability or to ease tensions. The Indonesian Government is not creating an issue by bringing this matter before the General Assembly; rather we are presenting to this body for peaceful deliberation a situation which might become explosive, so that we feel constrained to seek the quickest and best possible means of easing it. Trying to stifle this issue, trying to pretend that no problems exist, will merely exacerbate an already unsettling state of affairs.

39. Mr. Casey stressed the importance, in his view, of continuity of administration. My delegation must be forgiven if we seem somewhat sceptical about the advantages of continuity of administration, the more so when the administration referred to is a colonial one. My people, after all, are quite well versed in the relative benefits to be acquired by uninterrupted colonial rule, and our verdict on this point has been clearly stated in the history of the past ten years. The representative of Australia apparently fears that my Government would not be able to meet the needs of the people of West Irian. Casting modesty aside for the moment, I must say that the record of the Indonesian Government in coping with the tremendous problems of illiteracy, basic and higher education, communications, improved health conditions and numerous other aspects of social progress—all these problems a legacy of continuous Dutch colonial administration—is really noteworthy for its enormous accomplishments in the brief period of time since the formal transfer of sovereignty in December 1949. The vast strides forward that my people have taken along the path toward literacy, education and a higher standard of living are in the most striking contrast to the conditions which prevailed under colonial rule when the accrued benefits of 350 years of colonial rule had culminated in a literacy rate of 7 per cent of the population. It is only natural, then, that, far from approving the continuation of an administration that has left the vast majority of the people of West Irian in such a primitive state, we feel confident that the record of my Government in these matters gives much greater assurance of serving the interests of the Irianese.

40. The continued intransigence of the Netherlands on the West Irian issue is the more distressing to my people because we have before us the example of the United States which, in granting freedom to the Philippines, did not attempt to withhold independence from any area on the ground of difference in levels of development, or on any other ground. Nor did the United Kingdom lessen the statesmanship it displayed in re-

linquishing authority over India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon by attempting to withhold freedom from a section of that vast area.

41. Turning to other problems before this session of the Assembly, the Burmese question still awaits a final solution. We hope that one may be found at this ninth session before this tragic problem becomes another one of those items which perennially finds itself inscribed in our agenda. Certainly the incursions visited upon the Government of Burma by foreign forces are of immediate and continuing concern to all its neighbour countries, which not only deeply sympathize with its unfortunate plight, but also desperately desire—in fact need—a restoration of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

42. Similarly, the question of the Arab refugees, which has been before this body now for many years, is one which should be of the gravest concern to all Member nations. The elimination of this problem, of this human misery, is not only a matter to be dealt with by the countries most directly concerned, but a matter of the greatest urgency to this Assembly as a whole, and one requiring our common efforts.

43. Finally, we are also painfully aware of the continuing danger presented by the racial policies of the Union of South Africa. It is a sad fact that this problem should reappear year after year on our agenda. Certainly, it is not beyond the wit and the capacity of this Assembly to find the ways and means to ease the social tensions in the Union of South Africa, both in the interests of the people there and in the interests of human relations in general.

44. As we consider these and many other problems affecting the welfare of all nations and peoples, we share a heavy responsibility and an obligation to all mankind. But such responsibility also implies a privilege of contributing to an enlightened world order based on mutual assistance and conciliation. It seems regrettable to my Government, therefore, that we have made no progress toward achieving universal membership in the United Nations, which concerns so many pending applicant States with which Indonesia has the best relations, and that we are thus deprived of the benefit of wider representative viewpoints. It is an unrealistic and anomalous situation, created by the seemingly irreconcilable attitudes of the major Powers to exclude governments representing hundreds of millions of peoples from an organization established on the principles of equal rights and international justice.

45. It is also our firm conviction that each nation should be represented by that government which has established actual and effective control within its national boundaries. We therefore continue to support the representation of the People's Republic of China as the established Government of that nation. In the present period of instability in Asia, as a result of the emergence of new and independent nations with all their problems of political, economic and social adjustment, the representation of this major Power in the United Nations will certainly promote stability in Asia, and assist in the solution of problems affecting the entire world.

46. In the few years since the birth of this Organization, there has been a steady growth in international activities, both voluntary and governmental, which have enlightened the people of the world. For our part, we wish to express our deep appreciation for the

tremendous work done in Indonesia by the various agencies of the United Nations, such as the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Technical Assistance Mission to Indonesia (UNTAMI), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and others. This constantly widening horizon, extending far beyond the boundaries of each nation, has, I am sure, acted as a catalytic agent in the growth of international understanding and co-operation. In spite of the serious conflict in political ideologies, which has had at times a disproportionate effect upon our deliberations, there has developed a very large reservoir of goodwill and sympathetic understanding of the varying concepts which shape the life of individuals and nations throughout the world. As we preserve this diversity of concepts as a stimulating force toward progress, let us also search, in a spirit of understanding and co-operation, for ever new means of preserving peace and promoting the welfare of all mankind.

47. In this respect, an important phenomenon is the repeatedly expressed desire to re-establish the United Nations on a firmer basis through a revision of the United Nations Charter. Indeed, some of the defects of the Charter and its interpretations are strongly felt by many of us, including Indonesia, particularly with regard to the solution of colonial problems and the representation of Asian nations in the various organs of the United Nations. In today's world of transition, in which the re-emergence of the people of Asia and Africa is perhaps the most significant event, the United Nations has to be flexible in order to function properly, and perhaps even in order to survive. This means, for example, that the countries of Asia should be better represented in the Security Council. Equally, we urge the Members of the United Nations to consider earnestly the need for a better representation of Asian countries in the Economic and Social Council, as well as in the other organs of the United Nations. It is the sincere wish of Indonesia that these suggestions may be taken into consideration, so that the United Nations may more firmly and surely meet the exigencies of a rapidly changing world.

48. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In accordance with its practice, the General Assembly has begun its work with a general debate, which enables delegations to give their views on the questions they consider most important and most deserving of the Assembly's attention. Several delegations have already availed themselves of this opportunity, and some have naturally attempted to analyse the current international situation, to appraise the role played by the United Nations in recent events, and to determine what history holds in store for the United Nations and the world.

49. Several representatives have noted that the agenda of the ninth session includes a number of questions already considered at previous sessions which, borrowing a term from botany, they called "the hardy perennials". But they either made no attempt to explain this phenomenon, or if they did, in our opinion they were not successful.

50. We can hardly term successful an analysis of world events in which the course of history is portrayed as a meaningless jumble of facts brought into being by the

malignant will of certain people who, as some speakers claimed, are intent upon upsetting the world order and whose troublesome behaviour presumably compels representatives of other States to engage in such pursuits as the armaments race, the stockpiling of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the formation of new blocs, the installation of new military bases in foreign territories and the preparation of plans for a new world war. We need hardly say that in our opinion such a conception of the course of world events shows no real grasp of the process of prehistorical development of human society. Those who reason in this way truly cannot see the forest for the trees. They fail to realize that there are laws which govern the process of historical development. Yet only by adopting this guiding principle is it possible to gauge correctly the significance of world events—such as the widespread movement of national liberation in Asian countries—and to determine the position and the tactics of the United Nations which, in turn, should serve as a basis for its programme of action in relation to these events.

51. I feel I must also note that some representatives made an attempt to glorify the past activities of the United Nations. Their assertions are refuted by all the facts, which show that the United Nations, an international organization dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security, cut a sorry figure on many occasions and failed in its duty, under the Charter, to act in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, thereby prejudicing its international authority. Faithful observance of its principles and of the Charter is a prime requisite for the successful work of the United Nations.

52. In his statement of 23 September [475th meeting], Mr. Dulles said that the American people sincerely believe in the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. I do not doubt that the American people sincerely believe in the purposes and principles of the United Nations, but the American people have little to do with these matters, while those Americans who deal directly with United Nations affairs frequently disregard the principles of the United Nations. They flout the principles of the Charter, such as the injunction in Article 1, "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" and "to achieve international co-operation". The yearly recurrence at the past few sessions of the whole sorry business of inviting the People's Republic of China to take its rightful seat in the United Nations is surely nothing but an infraction of these important principles which are the very basis of the work of the United Nations.

53. The stubborn opposition of some delegations which support the attitude taken in the matter by the United States—an attitude contrary to the principles of the Charter and of international law—proves that these delegations are unfortunately not inclined to fulfil their obligations by adhering to the principles of the United Nations. The Soviet Union, for its part, is deeply convinced that the just demand that the People's Republic of China should not be prevented from taking its rightful seat in the United Nations must be complied with and that the participation in our work of the representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China will be of the greatest assistance to countries which endeavour, through the United Nations, to work for peace and to achieve inter-

national co-operation in solving the world's economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems. We shall not weary of drawing attention to this abnormal state of affairs, this denial of a most important demand made by peace-loving States.

54. Some of the problems facing the United Nations are of the utmost importance, and their solution would avert the threat of a new world war and strengthen universal peace. These are not empty words. This is reality itself, knocking at the door of the United Nations. Among the measures which must be taken to achieve that end are several of outstanding importance, such as the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction and their elimination from the armaments of States, a substantial reduction of armaments and the establishment of control over the application of these decisions, to name but a few of these measures. There can be no doubt that the adoption by the General Assembly of agreed decisions on these important questions would have the welcome effect of further easing international tension and improving international relations.

55. The Soviet Union is profoundly convinced that there is every possibility of reaching an agreement on all these unresolved questions which would strengthen international peace and security, on condition that we respect the principles of sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the affairs of other States, mutual respect for the rights and interests of States, and fulfilment of international commitments. Under such conditions there would be a very real prospect of settling outstanding international problems, however important or acute they might be. We are convinced of this. We are convinced that the possibility is a real one, mainly because we feel confident that all peoples are anxious for peace, international co-operation, and the development of peaceful international relations. Our confidence is based on Lenin's doctrine of the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of States in spite of differences in their social structure, and it is further confirmed by almost forty years of experience, during which the Soviet Union has maintained good-neighbour relations with many countries whatever their social structure.

56. Attempts are often made to disparage the principle of peaceful coexistence by intimating that it is being used either for propaganda or as a temporary, fortuitous or tactical measure, designed to provide a breathing space. It is said, quite unjustifiably, as Mr. Dulles did in his speech at Williamsburg on 15 May of this year, that (I am quoting from a newspaper) "coexistence is not part of a Soviet Communist creed or practice except in the sense that non-Communists are allowed, in a physical sense to exist." The Chilean representative in his turn, speaking at the 475th plenary meeting, called the principle of coexistence a mere slogan, launched, as he said, by the propaganda machine of the aggressor. Neither remark has any foundation in fact.

57. I could site numerous facts in support of my words, but it should suffice to recall that as early as 1922, more than thirty years ago, Lenin, the great builder of the Soviet State, speaking of the possibility of a *rapprochement* on the basis of economic interests between the Russian Republic and capitalist countries, in particular the United Kingdom, said when interviewed by a correspondent of the *Observer* and the *Manchester Guardian*: "We feel that perfectly friendly relations with both Powers"—the reference is to Great Britain and France—"are entirely possible and

constitute our objective . . . We feel that the interests of England and France, if they are properly understood, will also operate in this direction."

58. The question as put at that time was: Is it conceivable that a Socialist republic could survive in a capitalist environment? Lenin's reply was: "This seemed inconceivable both, politically and militarily. That it is nevertheless possible, both politically and militarily, has already been proved; it is a fact. But what about commerce?" he continued. "What about trade relations? What about communications, assistance, an exchange of services between backward and ruined agricultural Russia and the industrially advanced and rich group of capitalist Powers—are these possible? Have we not been threatened that we would be surrounded by barbed wire and that therefore there would be no trade relations?"

59. Certainly such threats were uttered, and attempts were made to take corresponding action. But even then experience clearly showed that trying to ignore the importance of diplomatic and trade relations between the Soviet Republic and other States of the Western world brought no positive results. The Western countries were forced to recognize that the coexistence of States with different social structures was possible.

60. The Soviet Union has consistently maintained that position. The entire subsequent development of the Soviet Union's relations with capitalist countries has confirmed that the principle of coexistence is important, realistic and necessary. Nowadays only arch-reactionaries in Western countries continue to oppose the recognition of this important principle with its great practical significance, a principle which has always played and must continue to play an important part in the development of normal international relations and which is, indeed, essential to that development.

61. The Soviet Union Government, while bending all its efforts to further a mighty development of peaceful economic construction within its country, is at the same time taking all possible steps to ensure normal relations with other States, in other words, to bring international relations back to normality. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malenkov, said at a meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR: "We are consistently pursuing a policy of peace and of strengthening international co-operation." Such are the basis and the purpose of the Soviet Union Government's entire foreign policy. No matter what is said to distort and twist the truth, this purpose and this basis of the Soviet State's genuinely peaceful foreign policy tell the entire world that this is how the Soviet State conceives and carries on its relations with other States.

62. The objective of the Soviet Union's domestic policy is steadily to raise the level of its economy and the material and cultural level of Soviet citizens and of the entire Soviet society. The great bulk of State funds is used to promote the growth of industrial production, agriculture, trade, and all forms of transport. Vast sums, amounting to many thousands of millions of roubles, are expended on such social and cultural activities as universal education, vocational training, the development of science and the arts, social security, pensions, and aid to mothers of large families and destitute mothers. In the Soviet Union's budget for the current year, the allocations for social and cultural needs are 40 per cent higher than the allocations for

defence. Furthermore, this year the allocations for defence amount to only 17.8 per cent of the total, or 2.6 per cent less than last year. Such a policy naturally precludes any preponderance of allocations for war purposes in the Soviet Union's budget, while anything having to do with the armaments race, the installation of military bases in foreign territories or the formation of military blocs is altogether out of the question.

63. The Soviet Union rejects any such policy both in practice and as a matter of principle. That is why it constantly endeavours to bring about the prohibition of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the prohibition of war propaganda and a substantial reduction in armaments and armed forces.

64. The Soviet Union is convinced that only a policy based on the aforementioned principles can lead to a strengthening of mutual trust and international co-operation and can prevent the countries of the world from being divided into hostile camps. In this connexion, I cannot but recall what Mr. Molotov said in his statement on the results of the Berlin Conference:

"It is our earnest desire that neither Europe nor the entire globe should be divided into two camps on the question of the defence of peace. We appeal to all European States to renounce the formation of military alignments directed against each other; for the formation of such alignments cannot but result in war. Instead, we propose the union in a single camp of all the European States which are anxious to preserve their security and to achieve lasting peace in Europe."

This appeal applies not only to European States, but to all the countries in the world.

65. On the basis of its conviction that if peace is to be preserved the world must form a single camp, the Soviet Union Government has objected and continues to object to the organization of separate and exclusive alliances of certain States—such as the European Defence Community (EDC)—which are directed against other States and are nothing more or less than military blocs for clearly aggressive purposes. Such a situation is contrary to the basic principles of international law and international relations on which the Soviet Union's foreign policy is based. Only where these principles are observed do we find peaceful and friendly co-operation among nations, which in turn serves to strengthen international confidence and mutual respect, to consolidate general peace and international security.

66. In this connexion I must recall the five principles which, on the conclusion of the negotiations held at New Delhi and Rangoon in July of this year, India, the People's Republic of China and Burma proclaimed to be the essential basis for their mutual relations. These principles are: (a) mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty; (b) non-aggression; (c) non-intervention in each other's internal affairs; (d) equality and mutual advantage; (e) peaceful coexistence. We wholeheartedly support these principles.

67. The present session of the General Assembly has opened at a time when international tension has somewhat eased as a result of the termination of the war in Korea and the restoration of peace to Indo-China. There can be no doubt that the year 1954 has been marked by a relaxation of international tension. This, we believe, was partly due to the Berlin Conference of

the four Foreign Ministers, but even more due to the Geneva Conference of the Foreign Ministers of five Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China—with the participation of representatives of other States. Although little was accomplished at the Berlin Conference, that little was of great international importance inasmuch as the Conference overcame the obstacles to meetings between representatives of the four Powers, and paved the way for the Geneva Conference. The Berlin Conference also served the useful purpose of demonstrating more clearly than before the essential link between the solution of problems such as that of Germany and that of ensuring European security.

68. These questions are of course of great international moment, and it is therefore particularly important to form a clear and correct conception of the methods by which they can be solved. In his statement of 23 September [475 meeting] the United States Secretary of State did not outline any such methods, although he devoted a few passing remarks to these questions, which were, however, by way of review. To do him justice, his remarks seemed to be impromptu and not in entire accordance with the facts—and that should be borne in mind in discussing the ways and means of settling the questions raised in that statement.

69. In referring to the German question, Mr. Dulles said, for example, that "the division of Germany cannot be perpetuated without grave risks". One cannot but agree with that statement. But what, in fact, are these risks? It would be useful to have further information on this point. What are the risks involved in the division of Germany? I venture to suggest that these risks are that, instead of re-establishing a united, peace-loving, democratic and independent Germany, headed by an all-German Government—which is what the Soviet Union has been proposing—attempts will be made to re-establish Germany as a militarist State headed by men like Field Marshal Kesselring and his ilk who are eager for revenge. Such a settlement of the German question indeed involves grave risks—the risk of giving free rein to the militarist and aggressive forces which survived in Western Germany after the end of the Second World War, and the risk that these forces may pave the way for a new war, which would, of course, be contrary to the interests of the European nations and of the German people themselves.

70. It is here that the real danger lies not only for Europe, but for the whole world, the real risk inherent in certain policies towards Germany. In his brief reference to the German question, Mr. Dulles tried to give the impression that the Soviet Union proposals would serve to aggravate the dangerous division of Germany. Such a conclusion is utterly unfounded. It is, on the contrary, the proposals of the Western Powers which are incapable of promoting the unification of Germany as a peace-loving, democratic and independent State, and which can only serve to perpetuate the division of that country. This is surely borne out by many facts in West Germany today. It is not evident that there are forces which are struggling for, and have in some measure already achieved, the remilitarization of Germany and the restoration of Germany as a militarist State, an objective which East Germany can never accept because it is against the interests of the German people as a whole? Hence, the remilitarization of Western Germany makes the perpetuation of the division of

Germany more likely and indeed more inevitable than ever.

71. That is why the Soviet Union is so persistently and forcefully warning against the danger threatening Europe and the whole world from the lair of the fascist beast, which is waiting for the hour of a new war to strike, for the trumpet call of the Prusso-German militarists headed by the monopolists of the Rhine and the Ruhr, athirst for money and for blood. We, or for that matter, anyone truly anxious to preserve peace and to remove the threat of a new war, cannot permit this to happen. We cannot permit history, whose pages are stained with the blood of two world wars, to repeat itself. We cannot allow our children and grandchildren to suffer the bloody tragedy of a third.

72. Mr. Dulles said that "the problem of peace in Europe has become further complicated because of the recent setback to the consummation of the European Defence Community." It would be difficult to agree with such a statement, which seems to me to be without foundation, since it is precisely the attempt to force Europe to accept the EDC—which, as the European countries fully appreciate, is a threat to their own security and to the security and interests of all peace-loving nations—that is complicating the problem of maintaining peace in Europe. The European Defence Community is usually represented as an organic unity merging the armed forces of a number of Western European States. It was so described by Mr. Dulles, who further claimed that the fact that the EDC would merge the armed forces of such countries as France and Germany was proof of its non-aggressive character. Yet the facts say otherwise. The facts show that the militarists of Western Germany are at present exerting every effort to revive their war industry and their military strength. To begin by including 12 West German divisions in the armed forces of the EDC, subsequently to increase their number to 60 and to raise the total strength of the Western European army to 800,000 within two to three years—which is being planned in the West, as Mr. Theodor Blank, the *de facto* Minister of War of the Bonn Government has openly stated—to do this is to embark on the course of rearming a future *Deutschland über alles* which, as soon as it feels sure of its military strength, will undoubtedly again show its true nature and will fall upon its neighbours and the rest of Europe with fire and the sword. This is the logical course of events.

73. This is where the danger to European security lies. This is the risk. It is here that the lightning is already heralding the thunderstorm of war. Those who fail to see it must be politically blind or must be political opportunists interested in the kindling of a new world war. As the history of Europe has shown, the restoration of Germany's military might unquestionably constitutes a threat to the security of Europe and of the whole world. This fact is appreciated by all thoughtful and clear-minded persons, including even some big businessmen in the United States. For example, in his book *Germany, Key to Peace*, published in 1953, James P. Warburg, the well-known United States banker, wrote as follows on the subject of the plans for the restoration of German militarism:

"... we have created or helped to create a new, truncated German nation of 48 million restless inhabitants—an unnatural state which threatens the future of the German people no less than it jeopardizes the peace of Europe and, ultimately, the security

of the United States. . . . This new Germany has been shaped exclusively by the West under our leadership. It is not the 'new', peaceful, democratic Germany which we talked about creating years ago. It is the old Germany—not the Germany of Hitler—but the Germany which produced Hitler—the Germany of industrial magnates and political bureaucrats who somehow survive all political change . . ."

74. Sir James Headlam-Morley, the well-known British historian and one-time adviser to Downing Street, made the following statement as long ago as 1930 in his book *Studies in Diplomatic History*:

"If Germany fully recovers her military power, the German army will as in the past be a sword constantly pointed at France and Belgium."

And this is true. I should merely add that German militarism constitutes a threat not only to the well-being of France and Belgium, but to other European countries, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union—in fact to the rest of Europe.

75. There is talk of guarantees against the threat that a revived German militarism constitutes to the nations of Europe and there is also talk of special agreements similar to the Treaty of Locarno. In its day, the Treaty of Locarno was hailed as the beginning of a new era in Europe and in the world as a whole, and it was followed by hasty attempts to bring Germany into the League of Nations. Actually, the Treaty of Locarno, as Stalin rightly said at the time, was a plan for "the development of forces for a new war, rather than for peace". "Locarno", he said, "held the seeds of a new war". Even Clemenceau described the Treaty as a scrap of paper which Germany would tear up when necessary.

76. That is exactly what happened, as we are all well aware. These facts cannot be expunged from history. Ten years after the Locarno Conference, Nazi Germany unilaterally broke the Treaty, thus taking a decisive step towards the preparation of a new world war which broke out in 1939. Even now, attempts are being made to justify the piratical war of the German fascists against the democracies and especially against the Soviet Union, by describing Germany's attack on the Soviet Union in 1941 as a defensive war partly necessitated by Germany's future demographic position as compared with that of her enemies. Various so-called scholars in a number of Western countries including and in particular in the United States such as Spikien, Possony, Strausz-Hupé, who have been flooding the book market with their pseudo-scientific scribblings, do not hesitate to justify military adventures and to glorify aggressive wars by claiming that they were fought in self-defence. These gentlemen have gone so far as to assert that demography was a military weapon in the Second World War and that war is the supreme arbiter which decides the fate of nations, force being the factor governing its decision. Thanks to the encouragement of influential militarists and aggressive circles, these widely circulated scribblings I have just mentioned have become best sellers in the United States.

77. The imperialist monopolists do not consider it a virtue to abide by treaties. Western Germany, which has revived the traditions of previous, and in the main, Hitlerite diplomacy, is no exception in this respect. Western Germany is controlled by United States and West German monopolies, particularly those of the Rhine and the Ruhr, who are the true exponents of

the Kaiser's policy of aggression, which has been inherited by the foreign policy of Hitler and Adenauer. Under the cloak of conversations about "defence", the militarization of Western Germany is proceeding apace, and special efforts to restore Western Germany's military power are being made by the American monopolists, who have long been bound by ties of open or concealed collaboration with the West German monopolists in the matter of preparing war, such preparation being an important factor in the realization of the American plans of world hegemony.

78. This situation is still more sharply emphasized by the aggressively military nature of the so-called European Defence Community. The backbone of this Community is to be the armed forces of Western Germany, whose ruling circles nurture plans of revenge. That the intention is actually to unleash a new war and in that war to gain revenge for the lost Second World War is surely proved by the following typically revengeful resolution of the *Bundestag* at Bonn: "The Government is instructed to inform the countries participating in the European Army treaty that the present frontiers of Germany, both in the East and in the West, are in no way acceptable to the Federal Republic." The position could hardly be stated more clearly.

79. It is not surprising, remembering the lessons of the last two world wars, that broad popular movements in all countries, particularly the countries of Europe, including France, are firmly resisting ratification of this EDC treaty, which is so dangerous, not only to the French people but to all the States neighbouring on Western Germany, and to all peace-loving peoples. The collapse of this treaty in France was a great victory for peace. At the same time, it was a heavy blow to the policy of operating from a position of strength. In our view, it was a serious warning to the inciters of war and to those engaged in propaganda for war and the organization of it.

80. The supporters of the European Defence Community, of course, lament the failure of the treaty as a great misfortune. At the same time they are continuing their attempts to find fresh means of ensuring the success of their plans, which are similar to the plans that were designed to establish the European Defence Community.

81. How different, when we consider the matter, are the interests of the countries in the camp of peace from those of the leaders of the countries in the opposite camp. The rejection of the EDC treaty by the French National Assembly is convincing evidence of the extent to which the policy of establishing mutually opposed groups of States in Europe is contrary to the interests of the peace-loving nations. The French Parliament's decision was of course received with satisfaction by all those who, not in word but in deed, stand for the real security of the nations of Europe and the strengthening of universal peace. The peace-loving peoples regard that action as beneficial to the cause of peace. Others tend to regard it as a misfortune for the cause of peace. Those are two different attitudes, and each speaks for itself.

82. The problem of European security is of course inseparable from the German problem. There are two fundamentally different lines of policy on both questions. One line of policy favours a united, peaceful and democratic Germany and the establishment of a provisional all-German government for the attainment of

that objective, the unification of Germany being brought about by means of genuinely free and democratic all-German elections to an all-German constituent assembly. The other line of policy is embodied in the plan of the three Western Powers, the main feature of which is the attempt to bind the future all-German government to fulfil, for a period of 50 years, what the plan describes as the international rights and obligations of the Bonn Government. It should be obvious to everyone that such a provision would deprive Germany, during those 50 years, of any opportunity or justification for acting in accordance with its own interests, of acting freely or as a sovereign State in the true sense of those terms. Furthermore, this plan, which would bind the future united Germany not to deviate, for a period of 50 years, from the so-called international obligations assumed by the Bonn Government unilaterally and, of course, entirely without the consent of the other half of Germany, contains no measures capable of preventing or arresting the continued growth of militarist aspirations and the desire for revenge.

83. It should be pointed out that the all-European agreement proposed by the Soviet Union was, on the other hand, based on the principle of the collective defence of the States which were parties to the agreement against an armed attack in Europe on one or more of such States. The all-European collective security agreement proposed in the Soviet Union's plan would include all the European nations, and not some small and specially selected group of States. States parties to this agreement would pledge themselves not to enter into any coalitions or alliances or to conclude any agreements, the purposes of which were incompatible with the preservation of collective security in Europe. In our view, such a European system would provide a sound basis for the security of that continent. It would mark a substantial step forward in that vital matter and would also create conditions more propitious to a settlement of the German problem through the establishment of a united, independent, democratic and peaceful Germany. Experience shows us that no settlement of the German problem is possible without a settlement of the question of European security. It should be emphasized, too, that a settlement of the German problem would undoubtedly also facilitate a settlement of the Austrian problem, as the two problems are interconnected.

84. In his statement in the General Assembly [475th meeting], Mr. Dulles also touched on the Australian question and made an attempt, which I presume to describe as unsuccessful, to give the impression that at the precise moment when the Austrian treaty was completely ready and appeared to be on the point of signature, the Soviet Union suddenly put forward new conditions. This is not in accordance with the facts. As early as 1949, the four Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union—agreed on the main lines of the treaty with Austria. Agreement was then reached on all its most important sections with the exception of a few points which were not considered to be sufficiently important to preclude its signature. It was the Western Powers themselves, who, instead of standing by the treaty for Austria, in regard to which agreement had been reached on almost all points, put forward new proposals in the guise of the so-called abbreviated treaty, which differed substantially from the treaty previously agreed on in 1949. The nature of this abridged treaty was so un-

acceptable to all the parties concerned that it was repudiated two years later by the United States, the United Kingdom and France themselves. After wasting two years and thereby delaying the settlement of the Austrian question, they repudiated the abbreviated treaty they had attempted to put through instead of the treaty in regard to which agreement had been reached on all points of principle as early as 1949.

85. Since that time, say during the past two or three years, events have occurred which must be taken into account in settling matters relating to the Austrian treaty today. Those events make it essential to include in that treaty—this is a matter of the highest importance—a provision prohibiting the forcing upon Austria of plans for a new *Anschluss* with Germany, for a new military and aggressive alliance between Germany and Austria (there has been such a tendency during the past few years), and also to ensure that Austria has the possibility of democratic and peaceful development. But this is precisely what the United States is opposing, a fact which testifies to the objectivity of the statement on the position regarding the Austrian treaty made by the United States representative from this rostrum on 23 September.

86. As we know, a satisfactory settlement of the Korean question was not achieved at the Geneva Conference. But a settlement of the Korean question is urgently needed both in the interests of the unification of Korea and of the maintenance of world peace. It is, in our opinion, particularly necessary in view of the fact that systematic attempts are, as we know, still being made to break the armistice in Korea and to unleash a further war against the Korean people. It is a matter of common knowledge that special efforts are being made by Syngman Rhee and his clique to bring this about.

87. We are convinced that there is literally not a moment to be lost in reaching a settlement of the Korean question. The General Assembly must therefore exert every effort to bring about a solution. At the Geneva Conference, the delegations of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea put forward constructive proposals for a peaceful settlement. During the discussion of the Korean question at that Conference, there was a *rapprochement* in the views of a number of delegations, for example, in those of the Soviet Union and United Kingdom delegations, both of which considered it important to establish the basic principles for the attainment of agreement on the Korean question. If this could have been done, progress would have been made in paving the way for the restoration of the national unity of Korea. But the representatives of a number of other delegations did not share that view, the Belgian representative even going so far as to assert that the Soviet Union delegation's proposals would have, as he put it, appalling consequences for the United Nations.

88. Despite the fact that no progress was made with the discussion of the Korean problem at the Geneva Conference, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea put forward concrete proposals for the settlement of this question, which were supplemented by the following draft declaration proposed by the Soviet Union:

"The States taking part in the Geneva Conference have agreed that pending the final settlement of the Korean question on the basis of the establishment of

a united, independent and democratic Korean State, no action of any kind shall be taken which might constitute a threat to the maintenance of peace in Korea.

"The participants in the Conference express their confidence that both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea will act in accordance with the present declaration in the interests of peace."

This Declaration holds out the best prospects for the urgently needed settlement of the Korean question.

89. A serious obstacle to the settlement of that question is undoubtedly the so-called Mutual Defence Treaty between the United States and South Korea, which is being used, and which certain parties are planning to use, to convert South Korea into a base for military operations in the Far East. We consider it essential for the States concerned to pursue their efforts to reach agreement on a peaceful settlement of the Korean question through the creation of a united, independent and democratic State. A satisfactory solution of the Korean question must be found without delay.

90. The fiasco of the European Defence Community in Europe and the failure of the plans of reactionary circles to prevent the cessation of military operations in Indo-China—the fact that such attempts were made is well-known—has not deterred these circles from further attempts to prevent a relaxation of the international tension which favours preparations for a new world war. One such attempt was unquestionably the Manila Conference at which a number of States under the leadership of the United States agreed on the organization of a new bloc serving the same purposes as the North Atlantic bloc, as was openly stated. United States propaganda is attempting to represent the Manila Treaty as a victory for the cause of the collective defence of South-East Asia. But the very fact that the majority of Asian countries, including countries such as India and Indonesia with populations totalling almost 450 millions, declined to associate themselves either with the Manila Conference or the Manila Treaty, and that these aggressive plans are opposed by the Chinese People's Republic with its population of 600 million effectively disproves assertions that the purpose of the Manila Conference and the Treaty signed in Manila by its participants is the defence of the South-East Asian countries and that it corresponds to the interests of the Asian people. The real intention underlying the plan for the so-called defence of South-East Asia is to undertake armed intervention in Asia with the help of some Asian countries, intervention on a "collective basis", to use the term coined by some of the leading proponents of the plan. The plan is similar to the plan for the Korean war, involving the organization of foreign intervention with the participation of a few unimportant Asian countries in order to conceal the special interest of the colonists in dominating and in continuing to dominate the area; it is a plan to suppress the national-liberation movement in the South-East Asian countries by means of a perfidious scheme to set one group of Asian peoples against another.

91. Having decided to camouflage these objectives by references to the need to guarantee the so-called freedom and independence of the Asian peoples, the sponsors of such plans do not, however, conceal the fact that the concept of independence does not interest them in the slightest. All that matters is to state that

it does, in order to facilitate the recruitment of troops for the armies of the puppet régimes and thus more readily to conceal their own participation in this military adventure, their own interest in this war. With that end in view, they are again planning to make use of the title and flag of the United Nations, which, according to a State Department representative, must give its moral sanction to this military undertaking allegedly organized for the defence of "important interests at stake". But what are these "important interests" which are at stake in southern Asia?

92. An idea of the nature of the "important interests" in southern Asia, with which the United States is so concerned, can readily be obtained from a perusal of the official record of the meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on 13 January 1954. According to this record, Mr. Dulles made the following statement in the Committee:

"The interest of the United States in that part of the area is, from a strategic standpoint, very closely tied in to what is commonly called the offshore island chain. The offshore island chain has, in essence, two land bases: At the north, the Korean mainland, and in the south, we would hope in Indo-China. Then in between are the islands themselves, Japan, the Ryukyus, embracing Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. The United States has a security tie, of one sort or another, with each of these areas, not formalized in some cases, in the form of a treaty, but nevertheless very real and very actual."

93. Some time later, on 29 March, Mr. Dulles made a further statement on the same question—namely, Indo-China and South-East Asia. He described the former as a "rice bowl", "an area that is rich in many raw materials, such as tin, rubber, oil, iron ore." He said later that the loss of the Chinese continent was a great disaster for the United States, a disaster which would be heightened if to it were added the loss of the millions of people, the vast economic resources and strategic positions of South-East Asia and the Pacific islands.

94. All these admissions leave no room for doubt that the Manila bloc was organized to enable the imperialist monopolies to continue, unimpeded, their exploitation of the natural wealth of the Asian countries and of the peoples of these countries themselves. This is a matter of special concern to the United States monopolies, which lay claim to world leadership, but are being frustrated by the success of the national liberation movement in the East and Asia.

95. The strength of these interests, which the United States discovers in all parts of the world, is well known. Equally well known are the methods by which the United States has invariably and persistently defended these interests since the time of President McKinley.

96. These admissions make it clear that objectives and schemes such as those activating the authors of the Manila Treaty have nothing in common with the interests of peace. Revealing as they do the military designs of their organizers and participants, such agreements give the lie to declarations of peaceful intentions and to assertions that their purpose is to ensure the protection and security of the peoples of areas which have attracted the special attention of the monopolies.

97. Long ago though it was, the eminent United States jurist, J. Reuben Clark, was right when he

stated in a memorandum written 50 years ago: No single country had so often used its armed forces for the temporary occupation of parts of the territory of foreign States as the United States. Such intervention, he went on to say, had developed into actual intervention in the political affairs of foreign States. This respected legal adviser to the State Department maintained in his memorandum that many pretexts had been given for such action. It had usually been justified by reference to humanitarianism, the defence of the citizens of the country concerned, and so on and so forth. Although this was written 50 years ago, it is just as apposite today.

98. An attempt was also made at Manila to camouflage this new act of aggression by references to the objectives of protection and security, although such references could mislead no one.

99. Simultaneously with the organization of the Manila bloc the work of staff officers and other experts is proceeding on the drafting of plans for a new world war. In this connexion, attempts are being made to base the whole system of military measures on a plan for so-called massive retaliatory action. The plan for so-called massive retaliatory action is in reality nothing more or less than a plan for a preventive war. The qualification "retaliatory" is patently false and is intended to mislead public opinion, to give the impression that the military operations in preparation are merely a counter-attack although the myth of a pending attack on the United States has long been exploded.

100. The policy of massive retaliation clearly stems from the desire to unleash a preventive war: to strike the first blow, for that is what preventive war means. Those who are organizing the preparations for massive retaliation—which is not, cannot be and is not intended to be a matter of retaliation—proceed from the premise that if they are not to lose the war against the presumptive enemy, the American generals will be well advised to start it themselves. Such plans are a repetition of Hitler's crazy *blitzkrieg* schemes, or of those of the Japanese militarists who attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor.

101. In a speech he made earlier this year, Mr. Dulles, advertising this massive retaliation policy, said that the United States must be ready to strike a blow in any part of the world. He said where: in the Arctic or the tropics, in Asia, the Near East or Europe, at sea, on land or in the air, and with conventional or new weapons. There is retaliation for you.

102. Surely these threats of open attack in every quarter of the globe reveal the truly aggressive intention of what is called retaliation. Defined in those terms, the policy would in fact inevitably be one not of retaliating blows but of striking the first blow. The talk of retaliation is intended to divert attention from the preparations being carried on to start a war.

103. The true intention of this policy has been even more clearly revealed by Mr. Gordon Dean, a highly responsible person and former Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Recently, in one of the most striking numbers of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* Mr. Dean made a direct appeal for a preventive atomic war against the Soviet Union.

104. The present Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Rear Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, took the same line in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, when he said that in the opinion of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, full advantage should be taken of the superiority in thermo-nuclear weapons in order to maintain United States pre-eminence.

105. In line with this decision to make extensive use of atomic and hydrogen weapons—which are essentially offensive weapons—measures are being taken for the maximum possible equipment of the armed forces with atomic weapons, artillery rockets with atomic warheads of the “Honest John”, “Corporal” and “Regulus” types, and so forth.

106. The inveterate militarists are inflaming warlike passions by disseminating propaganda about the might of the American atomic artillery, which, they say quite frankly, could open huge breaches in the enemy’s lines, through which the attacking units would rush to complete the victory. So much for this so-called retaliatory blow. That is preventive war. The object of this policy is that one should be in a position to strike the first blow if there should suddenly appear on the political or international horizon the spectre of an impending attack—whether real or imagined matters little. Once such an imaginary danger appears in any quarter (and even if it fails to appear it can always be invented—as Mr. Clark, the former State Department lawyer whose words I have already quoted said, there need be no lack of pretexts) then this massive retaliation will take place.

107. From what I have said it is obvious that to the authors of this theory everything is plain sailing. Enormous breaches will be opened; the attackers will pour through—and victory will fall into their laps. Everything will go smoothly according to plan. But in my country we have a saying for the boasting of such blusterers: “The road looks nice and smooth on paper, but you’ve forgotten the holes, and you’ve got to get over them first.” True indeed, they must not be forgotten.

108. The fact that stockpiling of atomic weapons is the primary consideration in United States policy may be seen from the recently published semi-annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission (*Major Activities in the Atomic Energy Programme, January-June 1954*). Some interesting things can be read in this report; for instance:

“The nation’s atomic weapons stockpile, growing rapidly in total numbers, reflects a trend of increased variety and versatility of weapons.”

The same report goes on to say:

“Development of a ‘family of weapons’”—“family” indeed!—“has extended the military usefulness of available fissionable material. Paralleling fission weapon development since 1950 there has been in progress a concerted development effort on thermo-nuclear weapons. . . . A national policy decision was made to take every advantage of such progress to assure that the United States maintains its superiority. The President directed the Commission to continue to produce atomic weapons during 1954 consistent with this decision.”

Am I justified in saying that United States policy gives first place to the production of atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons? I think I am.

109. It is well known that the life of a State is most faithfully reflected in its budget. While I do not wish to go into details here, I cannot but observe that the budgets of the Western Powers clearly reflect a policy of militarism. That is particularly true of the budget of the United States.

110. If you compare the military expenditure of the United States during the current financial year with its expenditure on social insurance, health, education and housing, you will see that for all these latter items the budget allocates only 4.2 per cent of total expenditure, whereas 66 per cent of the total goes directly to military purposes. This comparison clearly reveals the character of the budget, the character of national policy; for, I repeat, the budget is the most faithful mirror of State policy. These figures, which typify the current United States budget, eloquently illustrate what is really meant by the so-called policy of negotiation from strength; they show how heavy a burden it lays upon the taxpayers, and what serious deficiencies they suffer, as a result, in education, health and other social and cultural spheres.

111. On the other hand, fabulous profits are being made in the production of atomic weapons by the great monopolies, in whose hands all military contracts are concentrated. The production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is of no great interest to them, nor even perhaps to the political leaders of the United States. No wonder that according to reliable sources it will be three or four years before an atomic reactor for the production of electric power, that is to say for a peaceful purpose, will be put into production in the United States; whereas the Soviet Union has already constructed a power station using atomic energy. The inauguration of this power station in the USSR marked the outset of a veritable industrial and technical revolution. This fact alone has strengthened faith in the great future of atomic energy in the service of the peaceful needs of mankind; at the same time, however, it has caused great disquiet in the camp of the militarists, who, as we know, are not interested in the development of the production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

112. Many facts go to show that progress in this direction is of little importance to these people, whose entire attention and energy is directed to the maximum development of atomic weapons production. They continue to count on their presumed superiority in this field; and they are not beyond attempting to aggravate international tension still further, for such tension is the source of vast military programmes which the monopolies are only too happy to carry out. And this policy also meets the wishes of influential military groups, headed by military leaders such as Admiral Radford and General Gruenther, who are at present busy on the preparation of what is called long-range strategy, again based on preventive war with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

113. In the Western countries, and in particular in the United States, the past year has been one of intensified rearmament. In the United States this has been expressed primarily in the stockpiling of atomic and hydrogen weapons, reflected in turn in increased expenditure for the Atomic Energy Commission—according to statements by reliable persons, the appropriations for these purposes have reached a figure higher than in any previous year. Thus the frantic race to turn atomic energy into an instrument of death instead of a source of wealth—to use Mr. Dulles’ own words—has continued.

114. As early as last year, the Soviet Union Government, at the time of the proposal of 8 December, stressed the great significance of the practical possibility of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and ex-

pressed its readiness to take part in negotiations on this subject. On 30 January and 2 February 1954 the Government of the Soviet Union conveyed to the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France the text of a draft declaration for the unconditional abandonment of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The preamble to that declaration expressed the resolve to free mankind from the threat of a destructive war with the use of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction. It also stressed the desire to encourage, by every means possible, the application of scientific discoveries in the field of atomic energy solely to peaceful uses for the benefit of the peoples and the improvement of their standards of living.

115. In taking this position the Soviet Union Government was acting in line with its view that atomic materials should be used wholly, not merely in part, for peaceful ends alone; that the achievements of scientists in this field should serve not the purposes of war and mass annihilation but the purpose of promoting economic progress and the prosperity of mankind. The Soviet Union Government was convinced that this would open up unprecedented possibilities for the expansion of industry, agriculture and transport, for the application of atomic science to medicine, for technical advance and the further progress of science. The Soviet Union Government believes that the United States proposal of 8 December [470th meeting] will do nothing to remove the threat of an atomic war, which is causing growing anxiety in many countries, particularly in view of the emergence of new and increasingly destructive types of atomic and hydrogen weapons. That is the Soviet Union's position.

116. Now we have a new item on the agenda for this session: international co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy [item 67]. Unfortunately this proposal has not as yet been crystallized in the form of some sort of programme or plan, and we shall therefore clearly have to revert to the question later, after we have received more concrete proposals and corresponding documents.

117. The correspondence between the USSR and the United States on this question [A/2738] has just been published. Anyone who reads it can familiarize himself fully with the Soviet Union's position on the question of measures for the peaceful use of atomic energy. In this connexion I cannot but express my surprise at the fact that Mr. Dulles, in his speech to the General Assembly [475th meeting], and Mr. Lodge, in the General Committee [94th meeting], declared that the Soviet Union Government had rejected the proposal for negotiations on measures for the peaceful use of atomic energy. The baselessness of these assertions may be seen if one refers, for instance, to that passage of the Soviet Union Government's *aide-mémoire* of 27 April to the United States Government which says:

"Inasmuch as it is the constant aspiration of the Government of the USSR to assist in strengthening peace among nations and under present conditions, in particular, to assist in the elimination of the threat of an atomic war, the Soviet Government has expressed readiness to take part in the appropriate negotiations."

118. In the *aide-mémoire* of 22 September—the contents of which were undoubtedly known to Mr. Dulles

before he made his statement on 23 September, and certainly to Mr. Lodge before he spoke on 24 September—it is clearly stated:

"The Soviet Government declares its willingness to continue these negotiations for the examination of the proposals of the Soviet Government as well as the proposals of the Government of the United States of America."

How can it be said in these circumstances that the Soviet Government has refused to take part in such negotiations? How can anyone say that? For whose ears is such a statement intended?

119. Equally groundless are attempts to depict the USSR's position with regard to participation in measures for the peaceful use of atomic energy as one hedged about with certain prior conditions.

120. Nor can we overlook the fact that the proposal of 8 December passes in silence over the question of prohibiting the use of atomic weapons, and ignores the persistent demands of the peoples for the outlawing of atomic weapons and their exclusion from national armaments.

121. But such a position on this matter is not calculated to promote the maintenance of international peace and security. The Soviet Union considers it essential that an international agreement should be reached ensuring the prohibition of the use of atomic energy for purposes of war and making possible the use of atomic energy solely for the peaceful needs of mankind. The possibilities of agreement with a view to international co-operation for the peaceful use of atomic energy are far from being exhausted. Of that we are profoundly convinced.

122. As for our proposal that States should pledge themselves not to use atomic or hydrogen weapons, the need for such an agreement has certainly not passed. On the contrary, various facts which I have just cited and which there is no need for me to repeat, show that it is more urgent than ever, for no one can deny the reality of the danger of the atomic armaments race and of the use of atomic weapons, the danger even of the preparations being made for the use of such weapons; in other words, the danger of the launching of an atomic war, and primarily for preventive purposes. It is all the more important, therefore, that the United Nations should take steps to ensure that no country dares to use this weapon. Nor should anyone be allowed to produce this weapon, which should be outlawed. Such a danger undoubtedly exists.

123. In this connexion, I would like to refer to the opinion expressed by the famous scholar Mr. Bernard Baruch, a co-author of the well-known Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan for the control of atomic energy, in his book *A Philosophy For Our Time*, with which I recently became acquainted. In this book, which is available in any bookshop in New York, Mr. Baruch acknowledges that there is a danger of the atomic weapon being used, notwithstanding the creation of atomic pools and other schemes aimed, and rightly so, at ensuring the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and deserving of general support. In his book Mr. Baruch states:

"Whatever is allotted this international pool, different nations would still hold back the larger part of available fissionable materials for developing atomic and other nuclear weapons."

Mr. Baruch adds:

"The dangers of atomic attack would not be lessened."

"The atomic-arms race would not slacken."

124. If we take the past year, we find that throughout the period since the proposal for an atomic pool was made, the United States has not reduced but has increased the tempo of the armaments race, the rate of stockpiling, nuclear weapons and the development of other military and aggressive measures. This is particularly true where nuclear weapons are concerned.

125. Numerous events during that year indicate that in its foreign policy the United States is still relying on the policy of "negotiating from strength". This policy, under which various national measures of a military character are planned, accordingly revolves around the atomic weapon, which has officially been declared the basis for the practical implementation of United States foreign policy. It engenders a national war psychosis, arouses enmity and hatred of other peoples, encourages propaganda for a new world war, which in turn inevitably leads to an armaments race, the establishment of an ever-increasing number of military bases in foreign territories, and the formation of an ever-increasing number of military blocs justified by misleading references to defence against some non-existent threat from the Communist countries.

126. The success of the Geneva Conference, which thwarted the aggressive designs of the advocates of the policy of negotiation from strength, the failures sustained by United States foreign policy in efforts to secure the ratification of the so-called European Defence Community Treaty, and the failure of attempts to prevent a cease-fire in Indo-China, have driven the reactionary circles of some countries, including the United States and its Western allies, into further endeavours to prevent the relaxation of international tension and the normalization of international relations. We do not doubt that these endeavours are doomed to failure, as the nations' will for peace is growing ever stronger, while the forces of war are steadily weakening. This is an important development which is deeply gratifying to all supporters of peace.

127. The policy of negotiation from strength also provides the United States monopolies with an important pretext for maintaining a military economy at the highest possible level with a view to preventing the intensification of the depression cycle which the country has already entered, and to reaping further profits from military deliveries.

128. The symptoms of a crisis in the United States are having harmful repercussions on the economy of the other Western countries as well as of agrarian and colonial countries. The economic policy of the United States, with its high tariffs, legislation regarding the preferential purchase of American goods, and so forth, is hampering exports from Western Europe to the United States and is resulting in the "dollar famine". The latter is being aggravated by United States measures restricting trade, the embargo on trade with the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and other similar measures, which have also done serious harm to the countries of Western Europe. Western Europe could easily overcome the "dollar famine" if the restrictions imposed on its trade with the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the people's democracies were lifted. The

resumption of imports from Eastern Europe, the USSR, the People's Republic of China, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, at the level prevailing before the passage of the Battle Act and other restrictive measures, would, according to experts, enable the countries of Western Europe to save about \$600 million on commodities such as wheat, maize and barley, raw tobacco, lumber, crude oil and oil products alone.

129. There is clearly an urgent need to eliminate artificial barriers to the normalization of trade and of economic relations in general. This is required by the fundamental and vital interest of all peoples. It is required by the interest of the under-developed countries for which the lifting of the embargo and similar trade restrictions is particularly urgent. It also corresponds to the interests of peace and international security, in the maintenance of which trade plays an important part by bringing individuals closer together, eliminating mutual distrust and providing an opportunity for genuinely peaceful co-operation.

130. It is quite natural that there should be a wide spread movement throughout the world in favour of the normalization of international economic relations and in particular trade relations. It should be noted that a recent report of the United States Foreign Operations Administration—I should also like to mention some favourable aspects of the activities of institutions in other countries, including the United States—contains a statement to the effect that there is a growing belief in Western Europe that great possibilities exist for trade between East and West, and that for the Western countries this trade could be a source of real prosperity, capable of remedying unemployment, poverty and exchange difficulties and of laying the foundation for a lasting and secure peace. This is not propaganda on my part; I am basing myself on one of the recent reports of the United States Foreign Operations Administration.

131. As the experience of the past year has shown, the overwhelming majority of business circles throughout the world are anxious to expand trade and economic relations with the USSR, the People's Republic of China and the peoples' democracies, realizing that such relations would open the door wide to economic, cultural and political prosperity.

132. Only the other day, the British periodical *The Economist* (I happened to come across this item) published a statement by the deputy president of the Associated British Chambers of Commerce. In that article the deputy president stated that "the biggest short-term hope for an expansion of overseas markets lay in an increase in East-West trading."

133. What then is the difficulty? What is holding matters up? Matters are held up by obstacles such as the Battle Act, by various restrictions which must be removed, if the hopes of the world are to be fulfilled. This is precisely the aim of the policy of the Soviet Union, which is expanding and developing its relations with all countries prepared to reciprocate. With every year the Soviet Union is expanding its foreign trade relations and the volume of its foreign trade has more than doubled since 1948. The course of events itself is eliminating the obstacles which attempts are being made to place in the way of the development of economic relations between the Soviet Union and Western countries. The external links between the USSR and the Western countries are constantly increasing and

are injecting a spirit of confidence and respect for mutual interests and advantages into the international political atmosphere.

134. Soviet foreign trade policy, aimed at strengthening the free and extensive development of international economic relations, is an integral part of Soviet foreign policy which reflects the firm desire of the Soviet nation to live in peace and harmony with all peoples and to strengthen peace and international security.

135. Over thirty years ago the great founder of the Soviet State, Lenin, pointed out with reference to the Genoa Conference that co-operation between the Soviet Republic and capitalist countries was possible and even inevitable. The most pressing, vital and practical need of all capitalist States, as had become crystal clear during the past few years, was, he said, the development, regulation and expansion of trade with Russia. Disputes and quarrels might develop; various groups might break away—it was even extremely probable that they would do so—but in the final analysis, he continued, this interest, this basic economic need would triumph. It could be asserted with some degree of confidence that the expansion of normal trade relations between the Soviet Republic and all the other capitalist countries of the world would inevitably continue.

136. The Soviet Union resolutely and consistently follows a policy of peace, emphasizing the need for sound and radical measures capable of removing the threat of a new world war, and thus preventing incalculable further suffering and the death of countless million human beings.

137. At every session, the Soviet Union has devoted its efforts, and will do so at the present session also, to securing a successful solution of this important task, indeed this task of paramount importance. The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the General Assembly can solve it. It must solve it, and thus fulfil the desire of the peoples clamouring for peace and security.

138. The Soviet Union delegation accordingly submits the following draft resolution [*A/2742 and Corr.1*] to the present session of the General Assembly; it is entitled "Conclusion of an international convention (treaty) on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction".

"I. The General Assembly instructs the United Nations Disarmament Commission to prepare and submit for confirmation by the Security Council a draft international convention (treaty) designed to strengthen peace and increase international security and providing for the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction and their elimination from the armaments of States, a substantial reduction in armaments and the establishment of international control over the implementation of these decisions on the basis of the French and United Kingdom proposals of 11 June 1954.

"Accordingly, the convention (treaty) should contain the following basic provisions:

"1. The following measures shall be taken simultaneously:

"(a) In the course of six months (or one year), States shall reduce their armaments, armed forces and budgetary appropriations for military requirements to the extent of 50 per cent of the agreed levels.

Armaments and armed forces shall be reduced from the strength of armaments and armed forces existing on 31 December 1953, and appropriations shall be reduced from the amount of actual expenditure on military requirements during the year ending 31 December 1953.

"(b) For the purposes of supervising the fulfilment by States of the obligations in connexion with the reduction of armaments and armed forces provided for in sub-paragraph (a), a temporary international control commission shall be established under the Security Council with the right to require States to provide the necessary information on the measures taken by them to reduce armaments and armed forces. The commission shall take the necessary steps to supervise the fulfilment by States of the obligations assumed by them in connexion with the reduction of armaments, armed forces and appropriations for military requirements. States shall periodically supply the commission at established intervals with information concerning the implementation of the measures provided for in the convention.

"2. On completion of the measures referred to in paragraph 1, the following measures shall be taken simultaneously:

"(a) In the course of six months (or one year), States shall reduce their armaments, armed forces and budgetary appropriations for military requirements by the remaining 50 per cent of the agreed levels from the strength of armaments and armed forces existing on 31 December 1953, and shall reduce their appropriations from the amount of actual expenditure on military requirements during the year ending 31 December 1953.

"(b) A complete prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction shall be carried into effect, the production of such weapons shall be discontinued and they shall be entirely eliminated from the armaments of States; all existing atomic materials shall be used only for peaceful purposes.

"The carrying out of these measures must be completed not later than the carrying out of the measures taken for the reduction of armament and armed forces referred to in paragraph 2 (a), and the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons shall cease immediately, as soon as a start is made with the reduction of armaments, armed forces and appropriations for military requirements in respect of the remaining 50 per cent of the agreed standards.

"(c) States shall institute a standing international organ for the supervision of the implementation of the convention (treaty) on the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, the discontinuance of the production of these weapons and their elimination from the armaments of States and the reduction of armaments, armed forces and appropriations for military requirements.

"This international organ shall have full powers of supervision, including the power of inspection on a continuing basis to the extent necessary to ensure implementation of the convention by all States.

"II. In connexion with the proposal concerning the prohibition of the 'use of nuclear weapons except in defence against aggression' in the Franco-British memorandum of 11 June 1954, the General Assembly

instructs the United Nations Disarmament Commission to study and clarify this question and submit its recommendations."

139. In submitting these proposals, the Soviet Union is fully confident that they will receive very careful consideration and that they represent a cause which will help the United Nations to fulfil its duty of combating the danger of the use of atomic weapons, halting the armaments race, and averting the threat of a new world war, in the interests of the peace and security of all peoples.

140. Mr. STEPHANOPOULOS (Greece) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, I wish first of all to congratulate you on your election. The Greek delegation is glad to see that the conduct of the proceedings of the ninth session of the General Assembly has been entrusted to a person who represents the European spirit in its most universal form. My delegation wishes you, in the performance of your duties, all the success which you deserve.

141. During the general debate with which each regular session of the General Assembly opens, it is customary for most of the speakers on this rostrum to draw up what might be called the balance-sheet of peace. This balance-sheet usually consists of an appraisal of the past and of an expression of hope for the future. It is not always easy to judge events in which we ourselves are caught up, and it is even harder to isolate in these events the objective truths which may be helpful in guiding the development of the international situation steadily in the right direction.

142. Every individual, acting in accordance with his own views, interests and beliefs, forms his own opinion of events, but this opinion is not always shared by everybody else. This means that facts, which each of us sees in his own way and on his own terms, rarely offer a common ground for understanding and action.

143. That is why, after noting the facts as they occurred and the various opinions of all who express serious judgments on them, we must look for some other factor which could serve as a common denominator and a better guide in our efforts to establish peace. This factor can be none other than international law and respect for the principles on which that law is founded.

144. For my part, although not wishing to interpret recent developments in the international situation one way or another, I feel bound to admit that the steady decline in the number of armed conflicts creates, at first sight, a favourable impression. Less blood is now being shed. That may be considered as a noteworthy achievement of peace on the march.

145. That by itself should not, however, be a reason for premature optimism for we should not forget that in many parts of the globe we are still faced with disturbing and tense situations which are potentially so explosive and menacing that all who bear the heavy burden of international responsibilities must be ever vigilant.

146. Apart from the great cardinal points which determine the general course of international relations, we should also take note of the efforts to strengthen peace which are made at the regional level. While failures have occurred in some regions, particularly gratifying results have been obtained in others. For example, viewing recent developments in South-East

Europe in this light, I take great satisfaction in drawing the General Assembly's attention to the constructive contributions made to the building of peace by the tripartite Treaty of Alliance signed at Bled on 9 August 1954. It should be emphasized that this treaty, which is purely defensive in its terms and nature, makes the present close and friendly co-operation between Greece, Yugoslavia and Turkey in security matters even more effective. The Governments of these three countries were at pains, furthermore, to bring this treaty into line with the structure of the United Nations in such a way that it is intimately, I might even say organically, related to the relevant Articles of the Charter. The defensive language of the Treaty of Bled and of the corresponding provisions of the Charter testify as to the devotion of the signatory States to the United Nations.

147. While speaking of matters of special interest to Greece, I should mention the improvement in our relations with Bulgaria. To the extent that the Bulgarian Government manifests its intention of continuing to act in accordance with the rules of international law, we may hope for progressively normal relations between Greece and Bulgaria.

148. Earlier in my remarks I emphasized that only respect for the fundamental principles—legal and moral—which govern international life can offer a yardstick of the progress made towards peace. The proper aim of our efforts should be the application of these principles. We shall be assisted in our endeavour by the fact that these principles are laid down and consecrated in the United Nations Charter. The road to peace lies through the Charter. This is the road of justice and freedom, of law overcoming arbitrary power, of international co-operation fostered by respect for the fundamental freedoms of all of the general interest prevailing over special interests, of the equal rights of peoples, of respect for the human rights which now have been recognized by the international conscience as the "raw material" of the international community. Without respect for these fundamental principles of freedom and justice it is impossible to establish relations of trust and understanding. Without these principles the United Nations will never be able to fulfil its beneficent mission. Its authority will soon be undermined if the Organization itself does not respect the principles inscribed in its Charter, or if it fails to secure universal respect for them.

149. In the introduction to his annual report [A/2663] on the work of the United Nations, the Secretary-General raises the problem of the use of the Organization by Members whenever current international problems call for pacific settlement. I must say that in this report, which is particularly noteworthy for its generous spirit and moderation, the Secretary-General offers us extremely useful guidance. When the issue is how to further the cause of peace, one should not exclude in advance any method or procedure likely to lead to this goal. It would however, be helpful if the Member States, realizing the great possibilities and the effective safeguards offered by the United Nations, were always to consider the Organization as the normal and regular channel through which to approach the settlement of international problems and disputes.

150. Even in cases where, for particular reasons, it seems necessary to avoid the normal procedure of

recourse to the United Nations and instead to seek peaceful solutions by other means, it would be most desirable to ensure some co-ordination between the United Nations and action undertaken outside the Organization, if only for the sole purpose of keeping the Organization officially informed of all important developments in international life. Accordingly, in the Secretary-General's view, the United Nations should not be merely a "tool" in the hands of the international community for working out constructive and peaceful solutions, but, more than that, a virtual mental reflex, a reminder to all persons at all times that the world has now set out on the road to organized co-operation and that this new development in international relations cannot be ignored. The United Nations is tracing the path which international affairs should follow in the future and so far as possible we should not deviate from this path. It is in that spirit that the Greek Government, holding that the fundamental principles of the Charter constitute definite international obligations and pertinent rules of conduct for all, has always placed its trust in the United Nations, the supreme authority and inner conscience of which are represented by the General Assembly.

151. The General Assembly has a particularly important function to perform in giving effect to the peaceful purposes of the United Nations. Irrespective of the nature of its functions and structure, the General Assembly is the principal United Nations body responsible for the organization of peace. Whether it is regarded as a permanent diplomatic conference or as a political assembly, harbinger, as it were, of the democratic organization of the future, in any case the General Assembly is assuredly the main centre for the development of the international community, one might say the mould of the world of the future; and, unless plunged into suicidal war by blind passion, that world will be built on the rule of law. National communities passed through similar phases before they succeeded in imposing a legal order commanding universal respect on their social groups.

152. There are, in the General Assembly, positive elements capable of furthering the progressive development of law and respect for certain rules to be followed in the conduct of international affairs. I do not intend to inquire into this question more searchingly, though in so far as it affects the very future of the United Nations, it should be weighed and studied by us. Nevertheless, I should like to mention, as an example, the principle of the equality of all Member States for voting purposes which is not only an emanation of the democratic spirit underlying our Organization, but also a positive element of law. In this connexion we should appreciate the valuable contribution made by the great Powers towards the building of peace when they accepted the principle of equality for voting purposes, for this principle is the motive power in the General Assembly's proceedings. I need hardly recall that law and the legal order serve the interests of the weak rather than of the strong. It is especially comforting to note that the great Powers are firmly committed to the rule of law; they realize that might is something relative, that the one who is supreme in strength today may fall from his eminence tomorrow, that sometimes the strong prove to be weak, and the weak strong, and that in any case none is more powerful than all the others together. In this way,

the rule of law is, in the final analysis, the best safeguard both for the weak and for the strong.

153. It would, I think, be to the advantage of all Member States, if they wish to strengthen the rule of law within the United Nations, to be guided by certain general considerations, of which I should like to mention two as specially significant. First, the widest possible application of the fundamental principles of the Charter should be sought and guaranteed by all, regardless of any current political or other considerations. We all know the pressure exerted on governmental decisions in all countries by circumstances, necessity and special interests. The principles of the Charter, however, express the common interest, and that interest should never be sacrificed to selfish inclinations or compromise arrangements.

154. The second consideration is respect for General Assembly resolutions and for the Organization itself on the part of all Member States. In this connexion I cannot help pointing out to you that certain delegations have stated even from this rostrum, that their Governments intended to disregard any action and any resolution adopted by the General Assembly which did not meet their own views or suit their own interests. It is particularly regrettable, and absolutely inadmissible from the point of view of the essential interests of the United Nations, that representatives should come here to show us the "waste-paper basket" to which certain Governments propose to consign the resolutions and recommendations of the General Assembly.

155. These disturbing demonstrations which deal a serious blow to the prestige and usefulness of the United Nations cannot be overlooked. Presumably all Member States, independently of the legally binding force of this or that resolution, admit that the United Nations has a certain authority which they have undertaken to respect. The United Nations would be threatened with mortal danger should the time come when each Member State recognized as valid only those of the Assembly's decisions which coincided with the views of its own Government. All Member States, more especially the democratic countries whose Governments are responsible to the people, should weigh the grave responsibility they assume in undermining the authority and prestige of the United Nations.

156. Viewed in this light this problem calls for the General Assembly's most earnest attention, and should, in my opinion, be made the subject of an appropriate study with a view to arriving at constructive and generally acceptable solutions. My delegation reserves the right to consult with other delegations in order that the question may be dealt with at a suitable moment in accordance with the interests of the United Nations.

157. Before concluding I wish to refer to the plan for the reorganization of the Secretariat proposed by the Secretary-General in the final part of the introduction of his report to the General Assembly [A/2663, pp. xiv-xv]. The Secretary-General's efforts towards better organization, improved output and the implementation of programmes are of considerable importance. Our delegation will sustain and support the Secretary-General in his efforts whenever he needs our backing. The Greek representatives on the Committees which will consider, directly or indirectly, every question connected with the problem, have received instructions to this effect.

158. Lastly, I wish to emphasize particularly that the Greek delegation supports the co-ordination of work and action which should first and foremost be directed towards helping the under-developed countries. In this respect, the Secretary-General has been guided by the primary and predominant interests of

the international community, as repeatedly expressed and specified in the relevant General Assembly resolutions. I am convinced that the Secretary-General will find the General Assembly ready to support him fully in his most laudable initiative.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.