



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>).....	185
Speeches by Mr. David (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Shukairi (Syria) and Mr. Popovic (Yugoslavia)	

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

AGENDA ITEM 9
General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. DAVID (CZECHOSLOVAKIA), MR. SHUKAIRI (SYRIA) AND MR. POPOVIC (YUGOSLAVIA)

1. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to take this opportunity to extend greetings to the General Assembly at its ninth session and to wish it every success in its important and responsible work. The ninth session of the General Assembly is faced with great problems. The peoples rightly count on the Assembly to make greater efforts than heretofore to solve these problems in the interests of peace and international security.

2. The developments that have taken place in the international situation since the end of the war in Korea have shown that the conditions necessary for a further relaxation of international tension exist. A clear illustration of this was the Berlin Conference, at which the great Powers worked together again after an interval of five years. The mere fact of the convening of the Conference and the resumption of direct contact between the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of four great Powers was welcomed by the people of all countries. The Berlin Conference helped to clarify views on a number of most important international questions, and, in particular, it led to the agreement to convene a conference of the five great Powers at Geneva, with the participation of other countries. And the Geneva Conference succeeded, despite resistance from ruling circles in the United States, in bringing about the cessation of the eight-year Indo-Chinese war and the restoration of peace in that country, thereby extinguishing the flames of war at another Far Eastern danger-point and strengthening the cause of peace.

3. The experience of the Berlin and Geneva Conferences proves how useful international negotiations can be, and shows that other outstanding international questions which are a source of international tension and prevent good relations among peoples could be settled by the same means. Our primary objectives must be to remove the threat of a new world war and to bring

about a substantial reduction of armaments, the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, the liquidation of military bases in foreign territories, the cessation of war propaganda and the abandonment of the policy of creating aggressive military blocs.

4. At the Geneva Conference, the Governments of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea pursued a policy based on the highest motives, and made great efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. Despite those efforts, however, no agreement was reached on this question, owing to resistance from ruling circles in the United States, who are stubbornly opposed to the restoration of peace in Korea. But the peoples of the world are demanding with growing insistence the peaceful unification of Korea at the earliest possible date, in accordance with the principle of respect for the national rights of the Korean people.

5. The suggestion which Mr. Lloyd made in his speech that the Korean question is not urgent is inconsistent not only with the vital interests of the Korean people, who underwent grievous suffering during an unjust war, but also with the cause of peace in Asia.

6. The rulers of the United States ignore the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Asian peoples and their desire for freedom and independence. These peoples have struck out along the road of independent development, and no attempt to halt them has the slightest chance of success. The Asian peoples are more and more showing themselves to be important factors in international life; they wish to be masters of their own fate, no longer subject to foreign oppression and exploitation. This vast process of the renaissance of the Asian peoples is one of the most important phenomena of our epoch.

7. Like the Chinese and the Korean peoples, the other peace-loving Asian peoples will reject any outside attempt to interfere in their domestic affairs and dictate to them. This is an important factor in the present international situation, and should be recognized by all those who are standing in the path of the Asian peoples in their struggle for independence and national freedom.

8. The historic changes which have come about in Asia are of tremendous significance. The emergence of the People's Republic of China and the heroic struggle of the Korean and Viet-Nameese peoples for national independence and liberation are conclusive proof of the fact that the will of the Asian peoples to defend their vital interests is unshakable and will prevail. To fail to take account of this is to close one's eyes to the facts.

9. The events of recent years have shown what an important part is being played in international affairs by that great Asian Power, the People's Republic of China, whose peace-loving policy has won the warm approval of millions of people throughout the world.

The constructive proposals put forward by the People's Republic of China, which participated in the Geneva Conference side by side with the other great Powers, made a great contribution to the results achieved. Thereby the People's Republic of China took its rightful place among the great Powers, and the restoration of its lawful rights in the United Nations is accordingly all the more urgently necessary.

10. The unfortunate vote taken in the General Assembly on the opening day of this session can only be deplored. By that decision, the People's Republic of China was once again prevented from taking its rightful place in the United Nations. It is essential that the United Nations should face the facts, and, in its own interests, rectify the present anomalous situation in which the people of China, six hundred million strong, are unrepresented in this Organization.

11. However, the progress made in 1953 and especially in 1954 towards a further relaxation of international tension is meeting with resistance from international reactionary circles—in the United States, in particular—which are endeavouring to nullify the successes of the forces of peace and are continuing and intensifying their anti-peace policy. At the very beginning of this year, leading representatives of American ruling circles announced their new long-term programme, the notorious policy of "positions of strength"—the so-called "new look", which in fact amounts to a policy of intensified military preparation and intimidation.

12. This is a highly disturbing development, for it has placed and is continuing to place more and more obstacles in the way of the peaceful settlement of international problems, and menaces every measure offering hope of a peaceful settlement of world issues. The continuance of the cold war, the carrying on of war propaganda and the dissemination of hatred among the peoples, the creation of aggressive blocs in various parts of the world, the construction of military bases in the territory of other States, and the adoption of a strategy based on the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons of mass destruction—these are policies constituting a grievous threat to the peace of the world.

13. The "new look" policy proclaimed by ruling circles in the United States can only be regarded as an attempt on their part to provoke new armed clashes, that is to say a new war, through the conversion of local disputes into a world conflict in which they would resort to "massive retaliation", using means, as they say, of their own choosing. Mr. Dulles himself, the United States Secretary of State, announced this "new look" in American foreign policy in a speech which he made on 12 January 1954. In line with this concept, the United States will itself decide whether to resort to "massive retaliation"—which is being openly advocated by responsible military and political leaders in the United States—and where and to what extent it is to take place.

14. It is quite obvious that the principal intention of this policy is to launch a preventive war. And it must be equally obvious to everyone what is meant by the words "means of their own choosing"; it must be obvious that those means include weapons of mass destruction, and that atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of the same type are no doubt being used, as before, as a main instrument of intimidation and a principal force of aggression.

15. The so-called new military planning, which is being carried on by United States ruling circles in accordance with what Hanson Baldwin, military analyst of the *New York Times*, called "basic United States strategy" in an article published in that newspaper on 15 January 1954, is being based more and more firmly on the idea of a world atomic war. It is accompanied by fresh appeals for the launching of preventive and atomic wars. It is further apparent from the general idea underlying this "new look" policy that American aggressive circles by no means contemplate any prohibition of the use of weapons of mass destruction; on the contrary, their military planning is based entirely on the proposed extensive use of such weapons.

16. General Gruenther, Supreme Commander of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, was reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* of 12 January 1954 as saying, in reply to a question about the possibility of prohibiting the use of atomic weapons, that he did not think there was any valid comparison between gas war and atomic war, and that he was convinced that atomic weapons would be used in any future war. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on 5 March 1954 that atomic weapons had acquired virtually conventional status in United States armaments, and that atomic weapons should be used simply as explosives of a new type.

17. Thus the Pentagon's "new look" planning places predominant emphasis on the mass-destructive power of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction. This shows that reactionary circles in the United States are continuing their policy of trampling underfoot the fundamental interests of peace-loving mankind, and proves once again that United States policy is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and constitutes a grave threat to international peace.

18. Mr. Dulles, the United States Secretary of State, said in the general debate [475th meeting, para. 120] that "international peace is an attainable goal". We are convinced that this goal can and must be attained. However, the "new look", the United States policy of "positions of strength" which was proclaimed early this year by none other than the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, will certainly not advance the cause of international peace; on the contrary, it is designed to make international peace impossible of achievement. The direct consequences of this policy are continued rearmament and the intensified militarization of national economies—features which the United States is forcing on the Western European countries also.

19. Rearmament brings astronomical profits to the arms-manufacturing monopolies, but at the same time it results in a systematic deterioration of standards of living for broad masses of people in the countries concerned. In international relations the "new look" policy is bringing about growing tension and increasing the threat of a new world war. Today the whole world is aware of the consequences of this pernicious policy, a policy resolutely condemned by all peace-loving peoples, whose only desire is for peaceful coexistence and the peaceful settlement of international disputes.

20. The economic difficulties created by the armaments race, the liquidation of United States monopoly of atomic and hydrogen weapons and its consequence,

the failure of the policy of intimidation; the failure, too, of attempts to halt the economic development of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the peoples' democracies, together with the constantly increasing interest of the capitalist States in the expansion of economic relations with these countries—all this offers graphic evidence of collapse of the policy of "positions of strength". The fundamental cause of this collapse is the fact that that policy is contrary to the vital interests of the peace-loving peoples and accordingly cannot win their support.

21. The "new look" policy which has been initiated by the ruling circles in the United States, and the importance which is being attached in these circles to weapons of mass destruction, increase the immediate danger of the outbreak of atomic and hydrogen war. The first essential, therefore, is the conclusion of an agreement for the unconditional prohibition of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The need for the banning of weapons of mass destruction is the more imperative in that atomic and hydrogen weapons are becoming more and more powerful, and their use would cause untold devastation.

22. The American hydrogen bomb tests carried out in the Pacific in the spring of this year show the ruthlessness of this atomic policy; at the same time, however, the universal revulsion which these United States atomic experiments have aroused among the Asian and other peoples demonstrated their determination to prevent the launching of atomic war. The peoples of Asia and the Pacific learned with justifiable anger that the American atom-mongers, disregarding the interests and even the lives of the local populations, were using for their experiments—experiments which were followed by disastrous consequences—not their own territory but territory thousands of miles away from the United States.

23. Prime Minister Nehru of India, in a statement in the Indian Parliament on 2 April 1954 [DC/44 and Corr.1], said:

"The open ocean appears no longer open, except in that those who sail on it for fishing or other legitimate purposes take greater and unknown risks caused by these explosions. It is of great concern to us that Asia and her peoples appear to be always nearer these occurrences and experiments and their fear-some consequences, actual and potential."

24. The indignation and revulsion of world public opinion against these experiments should be a grave warning to those who are spreading fear and war hysteria. What mankind expects, and is endeavouring to ensure, is that the great inventions of the human mind should be used for, and not against, civilization; not for mass destruction, but for peaceful ends, and for progress and prosperity in every sphere.

25. World public opinion welcomed the news that in the Soviet Union the practical use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes had already begun. As Mr. Vyshinsky, the Chairman of the Soviet delegation, said in his statement [484th meeting] that fact in itself strengthened faith in the tremendous future possibilities of atomic energy in the peaceful service of mankind.

26. The proposals submitted by the Soviet Union at this ninth session of the General Assembly show the way which the United Nations must follow if it wishes to make possible constructive decisions which would ease the burden of armaments and reduce international

tension. The Soviet proposals offer a genuine opportunity for the conclusion of a comprehensive international agreement providing for the substantial reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction, with the establishment of effective international control over the fulfilment of treaty obligations.

27. The Czechoslovak delegation is profoundly convinced that the Soviet proposals offer a sound basis for the conclusion of an agreement which would be the long-awaited answer to the aspiration and hopes of mankind. We unreservedly support the Soviet proposals, which, we are confident, will be acceptable to all who really desire the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction.

28. Every dispassionate observer of facts and events knows that "security" based on the policy of positions of strength and the formation of closed military blocs must lead to the division of the world into hostile camps, to feverish rearmament and to the aggravation of international tension. Such a conception of "security"—expressions of which were the European Defence Community ignominiously rejected by the French National Assembly under the pressure of French public opinion and the military bloc set up at Manila—will not lead to peace; the ends it pursues are precisely the opposite.

29. The military bloc created at Manila is essentially a bloc of colonial Powers, whose aim is to preserve their dominance and their political position in Asia and to turn back the clock of history, which has brought the peoples of Asia freedom and independence. The fact that the originators and adherents of the Manila Treaty are trying so hard to convince us of its defensive nature—as Mr. Dulles, Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Casey, the Australian representative, tried to do in their statements in the general debate—in no way alters the real nature of the Treaty; on the contrary, it merely emphasizes it. The Asian countries predominantly concerned—India, Burma and Indonesia—correctly interpreted the nature of the pact and refused to associate themselves with it. The abstention of the great majority of the Asian nations, representing more than four-fifths of the population of South-East Asia and more than nine-tenths of the population of the countries of Asia as a whole, is the most cogent possible testimony to the true nature of the new military bloc.

30. The division of Europe into closed groups of States presents a grave danger to peace and to the peaceful coexistence of European peoples, as the experience of the First and Second World Wars has shown. If we draw attention to the lessons of the First and Second World Wars, the reason is that one cannot fail to see in them analogies with events now taking place—particularly those which have recently occurred in Western Germany.

31. The peoples of Europe are well aware that a leading part in the organization of the two world wars was played by German militarism, that same militarism whose rebirth it is planned to hasten by the inclusion of West Germany in the Atlantic Pact. But the peoples of Europe are also very aware that there were real possibilities of checking the forces of reaction and war by applying the principle of collective security. If the Second World War occurred nevertheless, that was precisely because the aggressor succeeded in dividing Europe into military camps.

32. This lesson of history has cost many European peoples dear, among them the people of Czechoslovakia. That is why the Czechoslovak people associate themselves with the other European nations in emphatically protesting against the United States plan of creating hostile blocs in Europe, and against the policy of the remilitarization of West Germany.

33. In the present international situation what is more than ever necessary is, not the division of Europe into hostile camps, but the development of friendly co-operation between all the peoples of Europe and the concentration of efforts to establish mutual security.

34. The experience of two world wars compels the nations of Europe to seek a reliable path to the strengthening of peace in Europe. Such a path exists. It consists in the endeavour to establish a collective security system which will answer the basic national interests of all European countries.

35. As early as the Berlin Conference, the Soviet Union put forward the draft principles of a general European treaty on collective security in Europe. The draft principles received the support of a considerable number of countries. A system of general European collective security in which all European States participated regardless of differences in social structure would also create an atmosphere favourable to the settlement of the German question on a peaceful and democratic basis. Under these Soviet proposals it would be possible for both the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, and after the unification of Germany, for a unified German State, to participate in the treaty. Thus, the obstacles to the settlement of the German question which have been created in recent years by the policy of remilitarizing West Germany would be removed.

36. In addition, the conclusion of a general European treaty on collective security would unquestionably contribute to the settlement of the Austrian question by removing the threat of an *Anschluss* and of the swallowing-up of Austria by a militarized West Germany. It is well known that the impossibility of concluding the Austrian State Treaty was due to the opposition of the Western Powers to the adoption of effective measures against this threat of *Anschluss*. The need for such effective measures is rendered more pressing by the fact that in the last few years the call for the return of Austria under the yoke of the German monopolies and for a new *Anschluss* has become increasingly insistent both in West Germany and in Austria.

37. In the face of these facts, no well-informed person will be deceived by the attempts of those who would absolve their governments of responsibility for the delay in settling the Austrian question—attempts which have been going on for several years and which have been renewed here during the general debate by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Lloyd.

38. In Austria itself, the conviction is constantly gaining ground that the most rapid method of securing the genuine independence, the territorial integrity and the inviolability of the frontiers of democratic Austria lies within a general European collective security system.

39. The establishment of such a general European defence system would make for a decidedly healthier atmosphere in Europe, hold the forces of aggression in check, make it possible to put an end to the feverish armaments race, and develop peaceful co-operation,

as well as economic and cultural relations between States on a lasting basis.

40. The principles of collective security embodied in the Soviet proposals are based on respect for the national sovereignty of all countries, large and small, regardless of their social structure; hence, they correspond fully with the interests of all European peoples.

41. In this connexion it must be borne in mind that the consistent application of the principle of respect for the sovereignty of States is of paramount importance today. Its importance is all the greater in that the opponents of peace and those seeking world domination are disseminating theories that the concept of the sovereignty of States is obsolete and harmful, and are setting up all manner of supranational organizations—of which the European Defence Community project is an example—and similar groupings to help in the realization of their plans. It is no coincidence that the authors of these attacks on the sovereignty of States are the very people who at the same time instigate interventionist activities in the domestic affairs of other States. The principle of consistent respect for the sovereignty of States is in fact the basis of peaceful co-operation between peoples, and hence the indispensable basis of any effective system of collective security.

42. The Czechoslovak people, having had bitter experience of German expansionist aggression in the past, are watching the course of events in West Germany, Czechoslovakia's immediate neighbour, with sharpened attention. Despite the hard-won experience of two world wars, the policy of reviving German militarism is not only being preached again, but is even being applied in the western part of Germany.

43. With the backing of ruling circles in the United States of America, which seek to arm the West German militarists as quickly as possible, Hitler's politicians and generals are becoming ever more prominent in West Germany. Their policy of revenge is voiced with ever-increasing insolence. It is an unheard-of piece of insolence and a proof of the danger represented by German militarism that a former Hitlerite general should openly be calling for the occupation of France. The *New York Journal-American* of 25 September 1954 published an interview with General von Falkenhausen, the former German military governor of Occupied France and Belgium, in which he recommended that France should be occupied "for her own protection". When the journalist interviewing him observed that in talking of occupying France he was using strong language and advocating strong measures, the general ominously replied: "Isn't it about time that strong language was being used and very strong measures taken?"

44. Since the collapse of the European Defence Community, aggressive circles, especially in the United States, have been devoting much energy to the realization of their plan to revive West German militarism and a military coalition with the West German *revanchistes* in another form, under some new label, as the outcome of the London negotiations shows.

45. In his speech during the general debate [487th meeting], Mr. Lloyd spoke as a firm supporter of the policy of remilitarizing West Germany and expressed satisfaction at the results of the London Conference. Everybody knows, however, that to arm the West

German militarists within the system of the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty would be just as dangerous to peace in Europe and the world as to revive the Wehrmacht within the system of a European army. That fact is not altered by any talk of so-called guarantees. Such talk merely betrays the uneasy conscience of its authors, and their aim is to deceive world public opinion and weaken its vigilance.

46. In its note of 27 September 1954, the Czechoslovak Government conveyed to the Governments of a number of European countries which had formerly been the victims of Hitlerite aggression an urgent warning against the danger of a revival of German militarism and spirit of revenge. The Czechoslovak Government's note calls for the taking of the necessary steps for a peaceful settlement of the German question and the establishment of a system of collective security in Europe. In its note, the Czechoslovak Government reaffirms its conviction that the strengthening of peaceful political, economic and cultural ties between the countries of Europe, irrespective of differences in social structure, would be an important contribution to peace and security in Europe and a big step forward towards a settlement of the German question.

47. The revival of an aggressive German army and its inclusion in a military coalition would confirm the partition of Germany, accelerate the armaments race and still further accentuate those disagreements between the two parts of Europe which stand in the way of European security.

48. Hence, the draft European collective security treaty submitted at the Berlin Conference by Mr. V. M. Molotov, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, is of particular importance, for its entry into force would mean the removal of that danger and the creation of conditions for the peaceful coexistence and collaboration of all European nations.

49. The function of the United Nations in the present situation is to exert every effort to establish and apply the principles of the peaceful settlement of international disputes and the development of friendly collaboration between the nations. States must decide the important issues in the present international situation by their common efforts and in accordance with the principles of the Charter. The United Nations must also help effectively in restoring normal international relations and in bringing about a further relaxation of international tension. The peoples of the world call for the preservation and strengthening of peace, and they sincerely desire that the United Nations should renew and strengthen its authority by overcoming the forces which are leading it away from faithful observance of the Charter.

50. The Czechoslovak Government, which faithfully discharges its obligations under the Charter, is wholeheartedly in favour of the development of all forms of friendly collaboration between nations, so that they may freely develop their national life and mutual relations in conditions of peace. It is convinced that such collaboration can prosper if based on mutual equality, consistent observance of the principle of non-interference and the fulfilment of international obligations.

51. In its domestic policy, the Czechoslovak Government is devoting a large proportion of State resources to promoting industrial and agricultural production and trade and transport, so as to secure a steady improve-

ment in the material conditions and cultural level of the whole nation. With the tireless, disinterested help of the Soviet Union, and in close collaboration with the people's democracies, the Czechoslovak people have achieved considerable success in following such a policy during the last five years. There is no unemployment, poverty or hunger among the workers in the Czechoslovakia Republic, and *per capita* consumption has increased during this period by one-fifth.

52. Further evidence of the Czechoslovak Government's peaceful policy is offered by the fact that in 1954 budgetary allocations for education, cultural purposes, public health and social welfare amounted to 31.2 per cent of the whole budget, while those for national defence amounted to only 8.9 per cent.

53. The Czechoslovak people are vitally interested in the preservation of peace, for they know that only in conditions of peace can steady progress in welfare be fully maintained. In order to strengthen peace and peaceful collaboration among the nations, an end must be put to all forms of propaganda aimed at deluding world public opinion by spreading doubts as to the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different systems of social organization. The purpose of the fictitious allegations and slander repeated in the various forms of war propaganda is to create an atmosphere of fear and war hysteria and thus to prepare the ground psychologically for a new war. Such propaganda is being intensified in a large number of countries. Not a few national and responsible military leaders, especially in the United States, are bluntly urging war.

54. Only recently, Senator Knowland, the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States, published in *Collier's* magazine of 1 October 1954 an article characteristically entitled "We Must Be Willing To Fight Now", in which he attempts to prove the impossibility of the peaceful coexistence of the two systems, calls the termination of the Korean and Indo-Chinese wars a big mistake, and urges that war should be started immediately. In his speech in Detroit on 27 September 1954, Admiral Radford, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, reaffirmed the policy of massive retaliation propounded by Secretary of State Dulles. General Gruenther, Supreme Commander of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, keeps repeating that atomic weapons will be used in the future war.

55. In its efforts to condition the people psychologically and increase war hysteria, war propaganda in the United States uses methods which recall those employed during the period preceding the Second World War. In the *New York Times* of 29 April 1954, Hanson Baldwin, the newspaper's military analyst, already wrote about the "age of the push-button and of atomic arms". Thus, the peoples of the United States and other countries are being persuaded that war and the use of the most frightful weapons are inevitable.

56. The military propaganda in the United States leaves no one in any doubt as to who is the intended victim of the attack that is being prepared. With a cynicism which arouses disgust and justified indignation among all peace-loving peoples, the military strategists calculate exactly how many hours of flight are necessary to drop bombs on the industrial centres of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the people's democracies.

57. An editorial in the weekly *U.S. News & World Report* states, with the indifference of a merchant of death, that for its \$700 million assistance to Spain the United States will receive a base from which jet bombers with atomic bombs will be able to fly to Moscow in a few hours; and in an article published in the 24 August 1954 issue of the magazine *Look*, the former United States Ambassador Bullitt attempts to frighten the Americans with the danger apparently lurking in the peaceful development of the People's Republic of China. He calls for the "liberation" of the Chinese mainland, and proposes that a war should be started in which the Americans would use only naval and air forces for atomic attack, while the burden of the ground fighting would be left—in accordance with the declared principle of "Asians against Asians"—to the forces of Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee.

58. These few examples show that, despite the condemnation of war propaganda contained in the General Assembly resolution 110 (II) of 3 November 1947, intensified war propaganda is being conducted in a number of countries, especially the United States. This propaganda is being engaged in at a time when the nations are trying to achieve an improvement in their mutual relations and a relaxation of international tension, and when their efforts in this direction have already resulted in such considerable successes as the termination of the war in Korea and Indo-China.

59. The propaganda in favour of a new war which is being conducted in a number of countries cannot be interpreted otherwise than as an effort to spread hatred and enmity among peoples and aggravate the international situation. The General Assembly of the United Nations cannot ignore these facts.

60. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore proposes that a new item, entitled "Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war" should be included in the agenda of the General Assembly.

61. At the same time, the Czechoslovak delegation proposes the following draft resolution [A/2744]:

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that the cessation of hostilities in Korea and the restoration of peace in Indo-China have contributed to a relaxation of tension in international relations and that more favourable conditions have consequently been created for the settlement of unsolved international problems and the strengthening of peace,

"Noting at the same time that propaganda in favour of a new war, which was condemned by the General Assembly in a special resolution adopted on 3 November 1947, not only has not been brought to an end, but is becoming increasingly prevalent in many countries, that appeals for war and for the use of war bases in foreign territories for the invasion and bombardment of the large cities and industrial centres of various countries with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons are being systematically broadcast through the press, radio and cinema and that public officials not infrequently call for aggressive action against other States,

"Recognizing that aggressive propaganda of this kind constitutes a serious obstacle to the further relaxation of international tension and the improvement of relations between States,

"Calls upon all Governments strictly to observe the General Assembly resolution of 3 November 1947 condemning all forms of propaganda, in whatsoever country conducted, which is either designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, and

"Recommends that all States, both Members and non-Members of the United Nations, should take effective measures against all forms of propaganda tending to create hostility and hatred among nations and increasing the danger of a new world war as being incompatible with the fundamental principles and purposes of the United Nations and as constituting a serious obstacle to the development of normal relations among States and the strengthening of world peace."

62. The Czechoslovak people desires peace with all its heart, and it is therefore exerting itself to the utmost to promote the strengthening of peace and the peaceful coexistence of nations. We are firmly convinced that the cause of peace, which is the cause of all ordinary people throughout the world, will prevail.

63. The ninth session of the General Assembly can do much to strengthen peace and international security. The Czechoslovak delegation will seek with all its strength to help the General Assembly to deal successfully with the tasks which a peace-loving humanity expects it to accomplish.

64. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria): The United Nations General Assembly is again in session. In the past, we have had eight regular and two special sessions. On each and every occasion, we have assembled in honourable ceremony and dispersed in a distinguished fashion. On each and every occasion, we have begun the session with a minute of prayer or meditation, and we have ended with a warm exchange of best wishes. On each and every occasion, we have recited the Charter in the plenary meetings, we have consulted rules of procedure in committee meetings, and we have been occupied with resolutions, motions, points of order and voting, all in an atmosphere charged with the heat and dust of controversy. But at the end of the day we have cooled down at social gatherings where we have enjoyed intellectual and liquid refreshment. On each and every occasion, we have presented the world with ringing speeches, with promising resolutions, and with eloquent appeals. Yet, on each and every occasion, one single question, a star question, a brutal question, has arisen in the minds of the peoples all over the world: what has become of our Charter?

65. One fact we know beyond any shadow of doubt, and I beg to state it before you with every expression of apology. In the cornerstone of this magnificent building we placed a magnificent copy of the Charter in a magnificent ceremony. But the whole reality should be told not in metaphor, but in vibrant truth.

66. To begin with, international security has not been secured; it is still precarious. It is still exposed to the dangers of threats and intimidation. It is true that wars have ceased, but the art of war is flourishing in a wild race. The reduction of tension that marks our day has not been achieved by this Organization. The credit should go where it belongs: it should go to those who laboured day and night to achieve what has been achieved. But it is still true that whole peoples in every corner of the globe are trembling, literally trembling,

under the plague of fear, suspicion and restlessness. Nine years ago, our Organization was established by the United Nations, which were united in their efforts to achieve peace and to achieve justice and democracy. The prospects now are neither dim or grim; but we should not deny that the Organization now stands with the nations disunited.

67. We cannot legitimately claim that we are bent, heart and soul, will and action, on upholding the objectives and purposes of our sublime Charter. Nine years ago we pledged ourselves, in the very first words of our Charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". That was our first and foremost pledge, yet at certain intervals during the life of our Organization, the danger of universal war has been imminent, and highly imminent. This General Assembly can be sure that such a war would not bring untold sorrow to mankind, for no one may survive to suffer any feeling of sorrow.

68. It is no secret that certain Members of this Organization have in their possession sufficient atomic energy to destroy all human and inhuman energy. In an attempt to conquer nature, man's genius has brought into existence a weapon capable of terminating our existence, a weapon ready to undo what human genius has done since time immemorial. But the picture is not entirely gloomy. We feel a certain degree of confidence. The great Powers stand in a state of uncertainty, a state of ignorance regarding each other's capacity to produce this devastating weapon. Short of any effective means of control and supervision, it seems that the salvation of mankind at this very moment rests upon this fortunate state of uncertainty and ignorance. Perhaps it is without precedent that mankind enjoys the blessing of a state of ignorance.

69. But a further gleam of hope has found its way into the deliberations of this session. We feel that we have been given a breathing space by the additional item inscribed on the agenda of this session which envisages a scheme for international co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Let us hope that this will be adopted unanimously, not by vote as usual, but by unanimous will and action. Silent action, after all, is louder than the loudest words.

70. In the field of regional stability, the Middle East has shown marked signs of improvement. The long-standing Anglo-Egyptian dispute is drawing to an end. It is true that the negotiating party is Egypt; but the problem, by its nature, is a major Arab problem that has long deeply disturbed the Arab world. States members of the Arab League have not failed to seize every opportunity to support Egypt's national aspirations. The success of the Cairo talks can be of great significance. Egypt is a leading Arab State. It holds an intermediate position in the Arab world. It is, therefore, imperative that Egypt should be met all the way, not half-way. The security of the region, to say nothing of other legitimate reasons, leaves no room for bargaining or hesitation.

71. But one aspect of the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations must be revealed, and it is worth while to pause for a moment of recreation, at least. Ever since the beginning of these negotiations, a subversive endeavour has been going on to undermine them. The task here fell upon Israel. Israel spared no efforts to obstruct the negotia-

tions at various stages. At last, when it found that the negotiations were continuing and proceeding towards a successful end, Israel discovered that it was necessary to call upon its last reserve. Israel decided to disturb the negotiations. Israel decided to disturb the waters and to go fishing for trouble and dissension. Here are the facts.

72. On 28 September 1954, the S.S. *Bat Galim*, an Israel vessel of 500 tons, entered the territorial waters of Egypt, approached the harbour of Suez and immediately opened fire on two Egyptian fishing boats. One of the boats sank, and two Egyptian fishermen were lost. In simple words, this is nothing but aggression; this is nothing but an act of lawlessness.

73. But that is not the whole story. One other step was necessary, and Israel took that step yesterday—and only yesterday. Israel lodged a complaint with the Security Council, and the item now awaits the Council's consideration. The story as a whole is typical of Israel's conduct—I would not say misconduct. In an attempt to halt the Anglo-Egyptian negotiations, Israel found it expedient to transfer the whole problem to the Security Council. But the Security Council, after all, requires a complaint; a complaint, after all, requires an incident. Israel finds no difficulty in meeting all these requirements. Thus, an incident was engineered and a complaint was lodged. It is now in the archives of the Security Council.

74. Israel certainly can produce another entirely different version. I would not for a moment doubt the ability of Israel to produce any story it likes. Israel may unfold its thousand and one grievances, its sacrifices, its state of siege and whatnot. Israel may as well unfold the record of its heroism and how it attained its liberty and independence through blood, sweat and tears. Certainly Israel has attained its independence through blood, sweat and tears; with this I would not disagree except for one, and only one, qualification—except for one, and only one, exception. The tears are Israel's; that is quite certain. The blood belongs to the adventurers, the military mercenaries of Europe; and the sweat, eventually and finally, belongs to the taxpayers of the United States. And this is Israel.

75. I now move to another objective of the Charter, which, without any introduction whatsoever, readily presents itself to the mind of the world. It is the principle of self-determination. I am afraid that on more than one occasion we have betrayed this international obligation. This charge is sufficiently corroborated by a lengthy line of examples. Millions of people all over the world are denied their sacred right to self-determination. Nations that have recently exercised that sacred right were able to do so only as a result of a bitter struggle, a struggle to fight for that right, a struggle to capture that right. It seemed as though the principle of self-determination had to be fought for with resolute determination. The world would have hoped very much that the right of self-determination should be exercised on its own merits and on its own values—not by war, but by demand and desire, simple desire. In the Charter each and every right stands as of right, without might. But it is to our deep regret that a tendency is growing in the United Nations to resist with great determination the right of self-determination. Outside the United Nations this tendency expresses itself in wholesale repression, imprisonment and acts of tyranny. Many people in Asia and Africa are endeavouring to achieve their

national aspirations by their sweat, by their blood and by their tears—but never by the Charter. No doubt, at this very moment, thousands of men and women of various creeds and colours are suffering death, torture and untold hardships for no fault of theirs, for no guilt and for no reason whatsoever except their desire to live free, unmolested and with human dignity. The evidence is overwhelming. A few illustrations might suffice to establish our contention. We shall confine ourselves to problems that are fresh in our minds and alive in our hearts.

76. Let us take the problem of North Africa under French rule. I shall speak with restraint, I shall speak with moderation—offending nobody and respecting everybody. Those territories were the site of brilliant civilization and the seat of outstanding Arab dynasties of wide name and fame. In the nineteenth century their life was integrated in the chapter of European imperialism. Dismemberment and direct rule soon followed. Ever since, the whole area has known no peace or tranquillity. In the two World Wars, the soldiers of North Africa won the admiration of Europe for their feats of indescribable bravery. Their contribution to the cause of freedom has broken every record. But their countries remained under the heel of foreign rule. Thus, the irony of fate has decreed—look what it decreed!—that they should live without freedom and die for liberty. It is undeniable that the peoples of North Africa have an inherent right to self-determination. They are entitled to their national aspirations. But nothing as yet has been achieved. Consequently, these crucial questions arise. Have these people the right to self-determination? Are they entitled to free and democratic institutions? Are they entitled to develop their national culture, economy and social life as they please and as they need? I venture to say that your answer is in the affirmative. So let us practise what we preach. Let us recognize the rights of these peoples to freedom and liberty. So far, our Organization has only recognized a right attained by might. So far, our Organization has only recognized liberty after a struggle, but it does not itself struggle to achieve liberty.

77. A ray of light, however, is stealing toward the continent in darkness. Negotiations between France and Tunisia have started. We rejoice in this beginning—I am addressing myself to the chief representative of France—we hope to rejoice at the end. We are following the talks with interest and sympathy. Those territories are part and parcel of the Arab world. Those peoples are our kith and kin. Their liberty is the cornerstone of the structure of peace in that area. We hope that the Paris negotiations will prepare the ground for freedom and friendship. We should, however, note with appreciation and satisfaction the fact that the French delegation has not opposed the inclusion of the problems of Tunisia and Morocco in the agenda of this session.

78. The head of the French delegation made a remarkable statement yesterday [487th meeting]. With exemplary eloquence and clarity, he insisted that the United Nations should stop presenting two faces and speaking with two voices. This is really an admirable approach. The failure of the United Nations is due precisely to its appearing before the world with two faces and two voices. However, two—that is, the number 2—is only a very humble and mild enumeration. The United Nations should stop presenting two faces

and speaking with two voices. The only face should be that of the Charter, and the only voice should be that of freedom and liberty.

79. We therefore hope that France, at the forthcoming session of the United Nations, will find its way to include an item entitled, "The independence of the peoples of North Africa and their admission to the United Nations". France would be making history. It would be another French Revolution, with all its glory and with all its honour.

80. This is our stand on the principle of self-determination. This was our attitude in previous sessions. We shall continue to take this attitude at the present session and at every session to follow. When we are called upon to make a choice, our choice will always be for the cause of freedom, liberty and democracy. This explains our stand in respect of the items on West Irian and Cyprus. A nation in its fatherland is entitled to self-determination. I say "in its fatherland" with emphasis and full meaning. Peoples not in their fatherland are not entitled to sovereignty. Occupation and invasion, no matter how remote, are not valid grounds for sovereignty. It is not proper at this stage to express the view of my delegation conclusively and finally on the questions of West Irian and Cyprus. But one thing is final and conclusive: once we are convinced in fact and in law that the peoples in Cyprus and West Irian are in their homelands in full legitimacy, we are prepared to recognize with no hesitation their right to self-determination.

81. I now propose to deal with the Palestine problem, which is the last question on which I shall speak. This is a rather chronic item. It is almost as old as the Organization itself. No one knows with certainty which will survive the other. The problem became a United Nations concern in the middle of 1947. In eight sessions, the question has been subjected to hair-splitting examination. The relevant records and documents in the United Nations by themselves constitute a voluminous library; the resolutions alone, up to this very moment, on careful enumeration amount to fifty-five. What a record! It breaks every past record.

82. Broadly speaking, these resolutions deal with the partition of Palestine, the internationalization of Jerusalem, the repatriation of the refugees and the general security of the country.

83. It is not my intention to unfold the tragedy that began with the Balfour Declaration on 2 November 1917. Nor is it my intention to portray the lamentable record of British policy in its endeavour to establish the Jewish National Home upon the Palestine population. Likewise, I shall not endeavour to place before you a bloody picture of Zionist atrocities before and after Israel, atrocities committed against the defenceless and innocent population of Palestine. I shall only confine myself to the outstanding facts of the problem, not in their frame of history, but as they stand now, and only now.

84. To begin with, the United Nations, as you all know, recommended the establishment of a Jewish State on Arab soil with almost an Arab majority of population. To preserve its sanctity and tranquillity, the Jerusalem area was to be neutralized, demilitarized and internationalized. It was to be administered by a Governor with full authority from the United Nations. The Trusteeship Council, after laborious effort, adopted

a comprehensive Statute for the administration of the Jerusalem area [A/1286]. As to the Palestine refugees, the Assembly decided on every occasion that the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be allowed to return, while the others choosing not to return should be adequately compensated. These are the facts with nothing added and nothing taken away.

85. But what is the present situation? It speaks for itself. Regarding the territorial question, it is a fact that Israel now holds 5,000 square kilometres of land in excess of that allotted to it under the partition scheme of the United Nations. In this area there exist tens of Arab cities and villages where thousands and thousands of refugees could be readily settled. Israel claims that it has won the area on the battlefield. Israel declares that what it has taken by war can only be surrendered by war. What a peace-loving Member of your Organization!

86. As far as the Jerusalem area is concerned, internationalization has not been effected. The Statute of the Trusteeship Council lies at rest in the archives of this Organization. Israel has declared this city to be its eternal capital. As a second Berlin, a Berlin in the Middle East, Jerusalem is resigning itself to destiny. Its holy shrines, sacred to millions of believers of every creed and denomination, could be reduced to smoke and ashes before the matter could be placed on the agenda of the Security Council. It could be reduced to ruins before the Security Council is able to place the item on its agenda.

87. With regard to the refugees, the problem is growing, in number and in gravity. A whole nation was uprooted from its fatherland. This is the eighth year of its life in exile, life in tents, in caves, in shattered buildings, with a deeply rooted longing to go back to the homeland that has been handed down to them from their fathers and grandfathers. So far, not a single refugee has been repatriated. Arab property, the assets of generations, the sweat of generations, the toil of generations since time immemorial, is now seized by Israel for the benefit of Israel.

88. What is the net result? It is a fact beyond controversy that Israel rejects the resolutions of the General Assembly. Israel refuses to abide by the demarcation lines in the partition plan. Israel refuses to repatriate the refugees. Israel refuses to internationalize Jerusalem. On these three major issues, Israel ignores the wishes of the international community. Time and time again this honourable Assembly has urged Israel to implement those resolutions. International conciliation and mediation have failed to prevail with Israel. Mediation has met with the same fate as the martyr himself, Count Bernadotte. The Palestine Conciliation Commission, meeting in every capital and in every climate, could not dislodge Israel from the obstinate position it has taken in rejecting the resolutions of the General Assembly.

89. The matter, therefore, now stands crystal clear. Israel refuses to implement your resolutions. Your mediation has failed. Your conciliation has been frustrated. We humbly submit that the deadlock could be broken. I say that with all honesty and with all sincerity. It could be broken by the establishment of a Palestine commission with wide powers to give effect to the resolutions of the General Assembly. The processes of implementation require that Jerusalem should

be the headquarters of that commission. The question of membership in this commission would be of paramount importance. We believe the commission should be composed of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, France and China—the five permanent members of the Security Council. Ultimately, responsibility for international peace and security rests in the hands of this supreme organ. As to priority of action, we believe that the repatriation of the refugees must come first and foremost, the Jerusalem question and the territorial question to follow in due course. After all, we are not suggesting solutions. These suggestions are nothing but your resolutions.

90. Should Israel fail to give the necessary co-operation and support to this commission, Israel would have to stand squarely before the penalties of the Charter. Political and economic sanctions and loss of membership are sufficient guarantees to reduce rebellion to acquiescence and obedience. Israel, after all, as you all know, lives not from within but from without. Israel's body is in Palestine, but its veins and arteries lie far abroad.

91. Acting on these lines, the General Assembly, we believe, would be faithful to its resolutions and would act in keeping with the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

92. In closing, allow me to address myself to each and every delegation and to the whole world at large. Here is the high road to peace, leading to the land of peace. The establishment of a Palestine commission with full power and support can make your resolutions a living reality. Let us act, and act with sincerity and honesty, before the situation gets out of hand.

93. Mr. POPOVIC (Yugoslavia) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, permit me to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the General Assembly, and to associate my delegation with the mark of deep confidence tendered to you.

94. At the same time I wish to express my delegation's high esteem for the President of the eighth session of the General Assembly, Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit. We pay tribute to the dignity and impartiality with which Mrs. Pandit carried out her important duties as President of the General Assembly.

95. The ninth session of the General Assembly is being held in a new international atmosphere. In our opinion, it is particularly important now to reach as wide agreement as possible on the significance of this situation. This would enable us to seek in concert the most suitable ways and means of gradually settling existing difficulties and problems.

96. I think we are not entitled to neglect any phenomenon or event likely to strengthen any reasonable hope that the effects of the culminating phase of the "cold war" will at last be overcome. Consequently, any thoughtful evaluation of the international situation must be divorced from current propaganda. In the last analysis, this constitutes the safeguard and the prerequisite of any correct and realistic policy. No valid policy can be pursued if what is presented to public opinion is in permanent conflict with the analysis on which political action is based.

97. We think—and this seems to us to confirm the accuracy of the analyses we have made in the past—that the international situation as a whole has recently

advanced in the direction of creating new positive opportunities for a *rapprochement* of views and for more fruitful international co-operation.

98. Among the most salient facts which bear out this viewpoint should be mentioned the cessation of hostilities in Korea and Indo-China. The importance of these events, by reason of their general implications, undeniably extends far beyond the frontiers of the territories in which war was fought. This fact is adequately demonstrated by the international nature of the interests involved in these "local wars", in their development and their cessation. It is this international aspect which has always engendered the fear that these conflicts might spread.

99. It has now been shown, we feel, that a solution can be found through negotiation for any situation, even for those which are apparently the most hopeless and where the parties involved are already engaged in full-scale war.

100. Without in any way underestimating the role or the contribution of the negotiators, it seems to me that an international event of such significance could not have occurred if it had not been introduced and preceded by a general improvement in international conditions and prospects. The favourable outcome of the negotiations is at the same time a particularly important contribution to the future development of this procedure.

101. Although, as is often the case, political relations between nations have not kept pace with the objective possibilities themselves, we feel that an improvement in international relations may be expected.

102. While it is true that the international situation involves important new factors, it cannot be described, interpreted or dealt with correctly within the framework or on the basis of attitudes and formulas which are already outmoded, or by giving way to the inertia of deeply ingrained preconceived ideas and pragmatic prejudgments rooted in adverse attitudes. In fact, events have already discredited these methods as instruments for interpreting or effecting positive changes in reality.

103. From the critical period of the "cold war" the world has inherited the tendency of the parties concerned to interpret and to present every solution of international problems in terms of the defeat or the victory of one of the parties and its practical policy. This is, in our opinion, an erroneous viewpoint. For in spite of and independently of transitory judgments and political calculations, peace has been strengthened in an extremely sensitive area of the world, thanks in the last analysis to the countless efforts of the great majority of mankind.

104. The evidence that negotiation is necessary and that agreement is possible should cause us to measure the extent of the responsibilities of governments and of statesmen as regards the influence they may exert on the future course of events.

105. Is the picture of favourable opportunities that I have just sketched here not too optimistic? I do not think so, for the following reasons. First, it is time for political realism to become an active and constructive force, and for the world to lose the habit of seeing only the negative and discouraging side. Secondly, such an attitude of exaggerated optimism would fit in neither with our intentions nor our way

of looking at things. For we realize full well that there is the ever-present danger that problems which have been only partially settled and other problems which are still unsolved may become more serious.

106. It is obvious that a balance has been struck in the general relationship of forces, and the efforts of the United Nations to organize collective defence against aggression have in all probability made a decisive contribution to this end. First and foremost, in our opinion, we have gained time, which is of immense importance to all of us. It seems justifiable to interpret the fact that a respite of a few years has been gained in this atomic age as meaning that war has been lastingly averted. Secondly, it is our common duty to take advantage of this relaxation of tension to maintain and prolong the trend by giving it fresh impetus, that is, by directing our principal efforts towards establishing an increasing prosperity, instead of condemning ourselves to even more burdensome expenditure on armaments.

107. The relative calm and equilibrium in which we are living today are accompanied by unprecedented instability in economic affairs. The economic disequilibrium in the world, and in particular the fact that in present circumstances the economic progress of certain countries places most of the other countries of the world in a position of economic inequality, constitutes a continuing danger, likely to provoke new conflicts. In a situation in which the immediate threat of war has decreased, and with it the justification for any unnecessary haste in the alignment of battlefronts, we must see to it that the real problems assume the prominence they deserve, while not neglecting any opportunity of promoting a relaxation of tension.

108. If the facts here cited correspond to reality, they make it incumbent upon us to adopt a fresh approach to problems and difficulties, to use new methods. We have already said that in our view it was necessary to rid ourselves of concepts and ways of thinking implanted in our minds by the bitter "cold war". The political arsenal of the "cold war" comprises: the East-West antinomy, which is only too real in political matters, but which is actually unrealistic and unworkable; division into blocs; alignment of States according to their ideology and the like, and even to some extent the concept of peaceful coexistence, which must be understood today as armed coexistence. By resorting in practical politics to such rigid and over-simplified terms and concepts which cannot encompass the entire complexity and diversity of international relations, there is a risk that these relations will be aggravated and reduced to their most antagonistic elements, or, in other words, that the opportunities for co-operation and the constructive consideration of unsolved problems will be hampered. In this connexion, it cannot be denied that the existing military blocs, which were formed in the East immediately after the war, although they are not formally designated as such, actually constituted an association whose formation and existence played a considerable part in aggravating and even in unleashing the "cold war".

109. Above all there was no justification for the creation of military blocs, tacit or overt, formed on ideological lines. Such an association of necessity conceals or generates tendencies towards intervention and admits the use of force as an instrument of political action.

110. With regard to passive peaceful coexistence, I think that it is not by accident that some of the speakers who have preceded me on this rostrum have demonstrated its inadequacy. Generally speaking, this coexistence has already been brought about, more or less. But coexistence cannot prevail if it is not transformed into active international co-operation.

111. Marshal Tito, President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, in discussing this problem in his speech of 19 September 1954, made the following statement:

"I have already said that the immense majority of mankind considers the settlement of disputes by war absurd. Nevertheless, contentious problems do exist. How are they to be solved? Obviously I cannot give you a recipe, but we must perseveringly follow the road which leads towards the peaceful settlement of disputes. Moreover, I should like to emphasize that it is possible for the world as it is—socialist, communist and capitalist—to exist. There are States with different systems in the world. Must these States set out on a crusade, one against the other, and must the strongest impose its system on the others; or, on the contrary, should they collaborate in the existing circumstances? I believe that the coexistence of different systems in the world offers the only solution. It is the only means of avoiding conflicts. Such coexistence requires an end to the ideological propaganda war, which goes so far as to threaten the use of armed force. The coexistence of nations is necessary and possible; that is to say, they must collaborate in all questions which are of mutual concern. There are no two countries in the world which have no common interests which would permit mutual collaboration. Obviously this may seem utopian if we observe the present developments of events abroad. But this will cease to be utopian when people understand that it is the only way out, that it is the only possibility for coexistence, peaceful co-operation and energetic action against aggression and war. Today this is our task and that of all progressive men."

112. In short, the battle for peace which was won in Korea, in Indo-China and elsewhere has not been won against any one political ideology, even less to the advantage of another, but solely against aggression and war as an instrument of policy. In face of the danger of relying solely on recourse to arms, a real and not an ideological danger, it is justifiable and necessary to organize collective defence under the auspices of the United Nations in order to resist the aggressor if the aggression cannot be halted in time.

113. I feel that it was important to make these explanatory statements in order to avoid being misunderstood. We are not in favour of any kind of neutrality in the face of aggression. We think that two camps are more than we need. For this reason we are not in favour of a "third force", but only in favour of a solution contrary to that implied by blocs; in other words we are in favour of peaceful and constructive international collaboration. I am sure you will believe me when I say that my country and my Government will do their utmost, as they have in the past, to maintain their place in the forefront of the struggle for peace and against aggression.

114. We are firmly convinced that fresh opportunities have been or are in the process of being created to solve specific problems which have been awaiting a solution for some time. I should like to mention a few of the main questions among those on the agenda of this Assembly without wishing, of course, to minimize other items on which my Government's views have already been repeatedly expressed.

115. My Government has always given very serious attention to the problem of disarmament and has made every effort to ensure that real progress was achieved in this matter. We have come to this session in the hope that, despite past failures, we shall be able to make progress in this problem. We feel that both general as well as special conditions have matured so that measures could be taken which would enable us to take at least the first steps. We now feel that this hope is about to be realized. This is the significance we wish to attach to the Soviet Government's acceptance of the French and United Kingdom memorandum [DC/53, annex 9] as a point of departure for future discussions. Furthermore, the United States initiative in the matter of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is working towards the same end.

116. In this sense we welcome the Franco-British memorandum. Without entering here into the substance of the memorandum, it should be emphasized that the document is imbued with a spirit of realism and compromise, and that it creates real prospects of agreement. For this reason it is today the most propitious basis for the study of the disarmament question.

117. The Soviet proposals submitted during the general debate [484th meeting] show that the Soviet Union has drawn closer to the proposals put forward in London by the French and United Kingdom representatives and supported by the United States. Consequently, there is reason to believe that at this session of the General Assembly the disarmament question will be discussed for the first time on a realistic basis without the speakers adopting diametrically opposed positions at the outset.

118. This fact is all the more significant inasmuch as the very application of the procedure provided in the memorandum of France and the United Kingdom, as well as a constructive discussion on the basis of this proposal, might lead to a situation in which the danger of war would continue to recede and humanity would be saved from the catastrophic consequences of the use of modern weapons of destruction such as the atomic and the hydrogen bomb. This would help to give a strong new impetus to the relaxation of international tension and to the improvement of conditions for the solution of all other contentious questions.

119. Many economic problems, such as the weakening of multilateral trade, the paralysis of the international flow of capital, the chronic non-convertibility of currencies, and the like, are only external manifestations of the fundamental disequilibrium in the world's economy known to all of us as the problem of the underdeveloped countries. The Secretary-General rightly emphasized in his annual report [A/2663] that this problem should continue to be our main preoccupation. Moreover, the problem is eloquently expressed in the monstrous contradiction of a world where food surpluses in certain areas go hand in hand with tragic undernourishment and famine in other regions of the world.

120. We have the parallel problem of the unequal rate of economic development in various parts of the world. This problem is particularly serious for the peoples living in the under-developed countries. Nevertheless, it is equally fraught with crisis for the industrial countries. This was expressed with remarkable clarity by Mr. Scheyven, the representative of Belgium, when he said on 19 July in the Economic and Social Council [810th meeting] that the prosperity of some nations depended more and more on the prosperity of others and that the poverty of the latter slowed the pace of the former.

121. The activities of our Organization in this field, such as the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the United Nations Children's Fund, have so far not only enabled us to achieve great results, but have also shown us the path to follow. The problem of an expanded United Nations programme for the under-developed countries is in truth not new; but the present situation would seem to permit and even to require that we tackle it more energetically.

122. Last year we adopted a declaration [resolution 724 A (VIII)] promising in general terms that some of the savings realized through a reduction of armaments would be allocated to the special fund for economic development. However, it is obvious that accelerated economic development of the under-developed countries must not be made conditional upon the success achieved in international disarmament. On the contrary, the existence and the functioning of such a fund could, of itself, greatly assist in creating a general atmosphere favourable to disarmament. Later, once internationally controlled disarmament has been achieved—and we believe it will be in the not-too-distant future—large additional resources could be made available to the fund, and it could thus have a decisive impact on the pace of economic development in vast areas of the world. My country has expressed its readiness to contribute at once as much as it can to such a fund.

123. The problem of the use of atomic energy is closely linked with that of the development of the under-developed countries and the question of disarmament. By saying that these problems are closely related, I do not mean that the solution of one of them should in any way be made conditional upon the solution of the others. On the contrary, we are convinced that the unconditional solution of each of these problems would contribute to an effective solution of the others.

124. The advent of atomic power, and the immense increase in productive forces it makes possible, has made the present framework of international relations too narrow, and calls for an infinitely greater measure of economic interdependence and co-operation. These new sources of power and prosperity do not, of course, in any way diminish the need for a much greater and more equitable use of already existing possibilities and resources. We therefore warmly welcome the initiative taken by the United States in proposing that practical possibilities for the use of atomic energy for non-military purposes should be studied within the framework of our Organization.

125. The attitude of the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia towards international problems is, generally speaking, determined by its efforts for the maintenance of peace and the development

of the largest possible measure of international co-operation, based on the principles of independence, equal rights and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

126. It is in the light of this analysis of the international situation and of the Yugoslav Government's policy that, in our opinion, the significance of the treaty of mutual assistance, political co-operation and alliance recently signed by Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia should be measured. I am convinced that it is not lacking in modesty to say that the co-operation of these three countries extends beyond the frontiers of the Balkan region and is an important contribution to the consolidation of peace in Europe. We have here, in fact, not only an example of coexistence, but a living illustration of the possibility of fruitful co-operation in all fields between countries with different social systems. It is a regional organization which in essence is fully in harmony with the spirit and aims of the United Nations Charter and which encourages wider international co-operation. We feel that the latter criterion—the question whether a given regional agreement facilitates or hinders participation in broader international co-operation—is the best way of determining whether an agreement is or is not consistent with the spirit of the Charter.

127. My country's policy in Europe is guided by the same principles. We are fully convinced that the creation of a united, democratic and peaceful Europe has become a historical necessity, irrespective of the existence of any immediate danger of aggression. That is why today, when we seem to have the necessary time at our disposal, it has become even more obvious that we cannot expect to reach lasting solutions in Europe through exclusively military co-operation, but only through co-operation between equal and independent European nations in all fields, directing our main efforts towards a lasting reduction of intra-European antagonisms. This includes, first and foremost, the settlement of differences between France and Germany.

128. In this connexion, the Yugoslav Government is convinced, as it has said repeatedly, that it is necessary for us, while continuing our efforts to achieve the unity of Germany—which, it seems, can only be attained in a far less tense international atmosphere—frankly to admit that it has become practically impossible to continue to deny Germany the right to its sovereignty and to rearmament, but partial, limited and controlled rearmament, keeping constantly in mind the fears of other nations, which were only too well justified by the tragic experiences of the past.

129. To place military preoccupations and reasons in the foreground—that is, to reduce the problem to the number of military divisions—would be to run the risk of playing into the hands of militaristic tendencies. And it is natural that the European countries should be especially sensitive to this risk.

130. However, if these essential precautionary measures are taken, what matters now is that the European nations should reach agreement of their own free will, on the basis of equality and independence, and in a spirit of co-operation and political non-exclusiveness, while respecting their common interests. It seems to us that efforts to unify Europe should be judged in accordance with these general criteria and not only in accordance with the original formulas which necessarily bear the stamp of the time when they were drafted.

131. As regards the Austrian problem, we are convinced that a satisfactory solution could have been reached had it not—to the detriment of universal peace and of the interests and rights of Austria—been made conditional, artificially, on other questions. A gradual return to normal conditions in the relations between my country and the countries of Western Europe has been evident during the past year. We note with satisfaction that the governments of those countries have realized that a return to normal conditions cannot be confined to words, but must be translated into deeds. Yugoslavia will continue, as in the past, to take an active part in the improvement of relations with those countries, on the basis of its fundamental political principles. On such a basis, our close and friendly relations with the Western nations cannot in any way be adversely affected.

132. Yugoslavia, resolved to apply these principles in order to consolidate peace, has made the maximum effort, at the greatest sacrifice, to reach a compromise solution of the Trieste question. I am glad to be able to refer in this Assembly to the agreement which was signed this very morning in London by all the Governments directly concerned and the text of which, together with the accompanying joint declaration, has just been submitted to the Security Council [S/3301]. Allow me to express here my profound conviction that this agreement will prove the starting point of fruitful and friendly relations between my country and Italy.

133. Besides our friendly relations with all the Western countries, we have very cordial relations with many Asian countries, especially India and Burma, having similar economic and social problems and a common desire to ensure peace and the development of international co-operation. It is against that background that President Tito will soon visit these two countries.

134. It is also by basing ourselves on that appraisal of the situation that we explain our attitude towards the role and responsibility of our Organization in the solution of international problems. It is precisely because we regard the United Nations as one of the main factors in the formulation of new methods in in-

ternational relations that we, without feeling that we should reiterate their arguments, associate ourselves with those who have criticized in this Assembly the tendency to solve some of the most important international problems outside the United Nations, as well as the tendency to minimize or to by-pass the primary role which the United Nations should play in the maintenance of international peace and security, especially in the elimination of causes of tension.

135. In this spirit we also support the many speakers who have emphasized here that the principle of the universality of the United Nations must be fully and logically implemented. The present situation is all the more abnormal in view of the fact that the effective international role of some of the States in question has been recognized in practice when it has proved impossible to dispense any longer with their participation in certain vitally important international negotiations.

136. The Secretary-General has referred to all the problems which we have just mentioned. He has done so in a very convincing manner in the introduction to his annual report, especially where he states that in the struggle for peace the full implications of the fact of interdependence must be accepted, and when he emphasizes the bad effect of a split into different camps which has developed among the Member nations.

137. Despite the unavoidable failures and shortcomings which are apparent in the work of the United Nations, and which are primarily a reflection of the state of international relations, I feel that it is only fair to draw particular attention to the mission of our Organization, which is virtually irreplaceable as a body that personifies and guarantees the continuity of negotiations and the meeting of opinions, irrespective of the favourable or unfavourable atmosphere of international relations.

138. The great successes so far achieved by the United Nations testify to its ever greater role in international life. We are convinced that, in present conditions, that role will continue to grow, and my country is ready, as it has always been in the past, to give its full and enthusiastic support to the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.