



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Opening of the general debate.....	21
Speeches by Mr. de Freitas Valle (Brazil), Mr. Acheson (United States of America), Mr. Vyshinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. Belaúnde (Peru)	

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

Opening of the general debate

SPEECHES BY MR. DE FREITAS VALLE (BRAZIL), MR. ACHESON (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA), MR. VYSHINSKY (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS), AND MR. BELAÚNDE (PERU)

1. Mr. de FREITAS VALLE (Brazil): Because I am the first representative to have the honour to address the fifth session of the General Assembly, I beg to pay tribute to the memory of one of the founders of the United Nations, Field-Marshal Jan Christian Smuts, who passed away last week. In doing so, I feel sure that I speak the thoughts of all of us. Marshal Smuts was a brave soldier and it was because he fought many wars that he became one of the most enthusiastic leaders of the movement for peace in the world.

2. The General Assembly of the United Nations is not a stage. However, as we gather here, the eyes of the world turn to us as though we were on a stage; and this is due to the fact that all believe this Organization to be able to help the world to live. It is still the hope for peace that unites us, as figures in a drama, to the vast attentive audience.

3. Such hope has come to take the place which belonged, and should still belong, to confidence. There was confidence at San Francisco when, on stating the vote of Brazil for the rule of veto, it was possible for me to say:

“Such constructive step is taken as a demonstration of our belief in the good faith with which the four sponsoring Powers seek the granting of the right of veto as an inescapable necessity to the maintenance of peace and as a token of our confidence that they will make a prudent use of said right.”

4. None of us would today reiterate those words, for the plain truth is — and we all know it — that the right of veto has been abused.

5. If, just for the sake of demonstration, we wished to substantiate that assertion by the enunciation of a

single fact, we should hardly need to do more than to ask why the noble Italian nation has not yet been allowed to sit among us, in keeping with what was solemnly stipulated at the Paris Conference. Is it not true that the new Italy was given the assurance that it would come to work with us, on an equal footing, once the peace treaty it signed with its former enemies was ratified? Have we not seen, and are we not still seeing, as a consequence of the veto, fundamental decisions affecting Italy being taken without its full participation therein?

6. On the other hand, as was said from this very rostrum one year ago, whoever purposely misuses this forum shows thereby an implicit belief in it. It is evident that the Soviet Union would not be arousing the ever growing condemnation by the whole world of its hitherto negative attitude, were it not inspired by some constructive aim. May the Soviet Union some day decide to set forth the motives behind this unwarranted attitude, thus clearing the road for an understanding with those who put trust in its loyalty when it joined us as a co-worker for peace. Is it not expressed in Article 1 of our Charter that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to be a “centre for harmonizing the actions of nations”? A man has grounds to suspect he is wrong when he is sure he is right at a moment when everybody else thinks otherwise.

7. The events in South Korea, arising from the aggression unleashed from the north, motivated immediate and effective action by the Security Council. But they demonstrated also — and there no longer seems to be any doubt on this point — that it is necessary better to equip our Organization, the establishment of an international force and the creation of a system for the prompt mobilization of all common resources being kept in mind. The Member States did not fail to show solidarity with the United Nations. But upon one of them, one whose action in the cause of democracy commands the respect of all free men, has fallen almost the entire burden of the fighting. Some are joining it in

this effort. Many others have not yet been able to transform their good intentions into actual material assistance.

8. This deficiency on the part of many — a deficiency arising through no fault of theirs — stems partly from economic under-development. The generous idea of helping those regions to help themselves, so that for the benefit of all they may produce and consume more, can never be deemed overly ambitious. This problem is one of such magnitude that, although the Organization has already given attention to it, more and more comprehensive and positive measures are still needed.

9. Moreover, the fact can never be too often emphasized that, owing to the lack of an adequate programme for economic and financial assistance, many Member States are not yet in a position to render to the United Nations all the co-operation they would like to give. The problem which confronts those States is the simple one of developing their physical strength in order that they may offer it for the defence of the Organization.

10. Mutual assistance among the Member States is the corner-stone of our grand alliance. In the introduction to the excellent report¹ in which he demonstrates how much has been achieved by the United Nations during his tenure of office, Mr. Trygve Lie directs our attention to Article 103 of the Charter, which rightly determines that the obligations assumed by Member States in the Charter shall prevail over any other international obligations.

11. Apart from the paramount task of preserving peace, many questions were successfully settled. Others still challenge our decisions, among which I beg to mention those on the disposal of the former Italian colonies and on the adequate protection of the Holy Places, including — which is equally important — the free access thereto.

12. On the other hand, *horresco referens*, we have not as yet conceived a practical device for compelling States to respect or to restore, when by any means violated, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. However, so dominant was the desire in San Francisco to ensure definitely such rights and freedoms that the promise is six times enunciated in the Charter. And those who, like my very dear friend, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, happened to sit in the Co-ordination Committee at San Francisco, will recall that the same promise appeared twice as often in the drafts voted upon by the twelve committees.

13. It is quite impossible to go on without referring to the proceedings of the Security Council. When normally carried out, its activities are an indication that everything else in the Organization is functioning normally. If, on the contrary, this main spring gets jammed, everything else — even the specialized agencies — will be headed for trouble. The least of those predicaments — but still a serious one — is a resulting atmosphere of distrust, and sometimes of acrimony, among people who should work with a mind always open to unlimited co-operation.

14. It has been suggested that the way to deal with the situation would be to enlarge the functions and strengthen the powers of the General Assembly, to the detriment of the Security Council. But the Council is the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of peace, and it would be impossible to curtail its powers without incurring risk. What is truly indispensable is to achieve a complete change in the state of mind which has prevailed in the Security Council. We should think of what the Council should and can do and should not concentrate merely on technicalities of its rules of procedure, which are intended to guarantee the honest search for truth but which have nonetheless been used to block the functioning of the United Nations. The men who sit in the Council and the governments they represent ought to prove themselves equal to their mission, and so restore universal confidence in the Security Council. The world needs that confidence.

15. This severe but constructive criticism does not apply to the General Assembly or its Interim Committee, generally known as the "Little Assembly", over which Brazil had the gratifying honour to preside this year. But even in those organs the proceedings are often inadequate and incomplete, and this can be traced back to the atmosphere to which we have referred.

16. The Brazilian Government awaits with the utmost interest the report on the measures to be taken towards avoiding the proliferation of our agencies and meetings, the number of which, as was ascertained during the fourth session, have been increasing at an alarming rate.

17. This fifth session of the General Assembly, proclaimed by the President of the fourth session, General Rómulo, as the most historic of all, is, in the words of one of my colleagues, pregnant with destiny. Let us be worthy of this opportunity, which faces us with a dilemma: either to keep harrowing ourselves, thus destroying the hope still placed in the United Nations, or else, with our eyes set on the Creator and our hearts raised in a resolute effort to spare mankind the scourge of a new war, to reascend to a level which we should never have abandoned.

18. Peace is a matter of honesty. What was said over twenty years ago holds true today more than ever. Let us be honest with one another. Let each of us be honest with his fellow nationals who, without exception, hate war and detest violence. Let us be honest with the men and women of the generations to come, whose only inheritance from us will be intricate problems, whereas it is our clear duty, in recognition of the fight for democracy put up by their fathers, to pave their way to a destiny of happiness.

19. We all speak earnestly here of peace and disarmament, human rights and education, security and freedom. But we cling — why not avow it? — to rigid points of view, and that is why we do not reach the understanding which is the very reason for our association. Musical notes are likewise diverse and immutable, but from their harmonious fusing arise the most inspired melodies. Why not boldly seek to reduce our differences and reconcile our divergent opinions?

20. The fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is confronted with a most dramatic choice: light or darkness.

¹ See *Official Records of the fifth session of the General Assembly*, Supplement No. 1.

21. Mr. ACHESON (United States of America): This session of the General Assembly is a session of decision. Before us lies opportunity for action which can save the hope of peace, of security, of well-being and of justice for generations to come. Before us also lies opportunity for drift, for irresolution, for effort feebly made. In this direction is disaster. The choice is ours. It will be made whether we act or whether we do not act.

22. The peoples of the world know this. They will eagerly follow every word spoken here. Our words will reach them mingled with the sound of the battle now raging in Korea. There, men are dying, as our President said yesterday [277th meeting], are fighting and dying under the banner of the United Nations. Our Charter, born of the sacrifices of millions in war, is being consecrated anew at this very moment to the work of peace. The heroism of those men gives us this opportunity to meet and this opportunity to act. Our task is to be worthy of them and of the opportunity they have given us.

23. We meet also with full knowledge of the great anxiety which clutches at the hearts of the people of this earth. Men and women everywhere are weighted down with fear, fear of war, fear that man may be begetting his own destruction.

24. But man is not a helpless creature who must await an inexorable fate. It lies within our power to take action which, God willing, can avert the catastrophe whose shadow hangs over us. That terrible responsibility rests upon every man and every woman in this room. At the end of this meeting each of us must answer to his own conscience on what each of us has done here.

25. How have we come to this condition of fear and of jeopardy? The lifetime of many of us here in this room has seen the rise and fall of empires, the growth of powerful nations, the stirrings of great continents with new-born hope, the conquest of space and great inventions, both creative and destructive. We have lived in a century of alternating war and hope.

26. Now, the foundation of our hope is the United Nations. Five years ago we declared at San Francisco our determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war"; we declared our faith in fundamental human rights, our belief in justice and social progress. During the years that have intervened, some of us have worked hard to bring this about.

27. There is no longer any question whether the United Nations will survive, whether it will suffer the fate of the League of Nations. This question has been answered. If by nothing else, it has been answered by the United Nations action against aggression in Korea. Blood is thicker than ink. But the pall of fear has been cast over our hopes and our achievements.

28. What is the reason for this fear? Why is it that we have been unable to achieve peace and security through the United Nations in these five years? Why has there not been the co-operation among the great Powers which was to have buttressed the United Nations? Why have we not been able to reach an agreement on the control of atomic energy and the regulation of armaments? What has been the obstacle to a universal system of collective security?

29. We have been confronted with many and complex problems, but the main obstacle to peace is easy to iden-

tify, and there should be no mistake in anyone's mind about it. That obstacle has been created by the policies of the Soviet Union.

30. We should be very clear in our minds about this obstacle. It is not the rise of the USSR as a strong national Power which creates difficulties. It is not the existence of different social and economic systems in the world. Nor is it, I firmly believe, any desire on the part of the Russian people for war. The root of our trouble is to be found in the new imperialism, directed by the leaders of the Soviet Union.

31. To be more explicit, the USSR Government raises five barriers to peace.

32. First, Soviet efforts to bring about the collapse of the non-Soviet world, and thereby to fulfil a prediction of Soviet theory, have made genuine negotiation very difficult. The representative of Lebanon, Mr. Charles Malik, stated it precisely at the fourth session when he said: "There can be no greater disagreement than when one wants to eliminate your existence altogether."

33. Secondly, the shroud of secrecy which the Soviet leaders have wrapped around the people and the States they control is a great barrier to peace. This has nourished suspicion and misinformation, in both directions. It deprives governments of the moderating influence of contact between peoples. It stands in the way of the mutual knowledge and confidence which is essential to disarmament.

34. Thirdly, the rate at which the Soviet Union has been building arms and armies, far beyond any requirement of defence, has gravely endangered peace throughout the world. While other countries were demobilizing and converting their industries to peaceful purposes after the war, the USSR and the territories under its control pushed forward preparations for war. The Soviet Union has forced other countries to re-arm for their own defence.

35. Fourthly, the use by Soviet leaders of the international communist movement for direct and indirect aggression has been a great source of trouble in the world. With words which play upon honest aspirations and grievances, the Soviet leaders have manipulated the people of other States as pawns of Russian imperialism.

36. Fifthly, the Soviet use of violence to impose its will and its political system upon other peoples is a threat to the peace. There is nothing unusual in the fact that those who believe in some particular social order want to spread it throughout the world. But, as one of my predecessors, Secretary of State Adams, said of the efforts of an earlier Russian ruler, Czar Alexander, to establish the Holy Alliance, the Emperor "finds a happy coincidence between the dictates of his conscience and the interests of his Empire". The combination of this international ambition and the Soviet reliance on force and violence—though it be camouflaged as civil war—is a barrier to peaceful relations.

37. This conduct conflicts with the Charter of the United Nations. It conflicts with resolution 290 (IV), headed "Essentials of peace", adopted at our last session. It has created a great and terrible peril for the rest of the world.

38. But even this conduct has not made war inevitable—we, for our part, do not accept the idea that war is

inevitable. But it has lengthened the shadow which war casts over us. This fact cannot be obscured by propaganda which baits the hooks with words of peace, and in doing so profanes the highest aspirations of mankind.

39. There is only one real way the world can maintain peace and security in the face of this conduct. That is by strengthening its system of collective security. Our best hope of peace lies in our ability to make it absolutely plain to potential aggressors that aggression does not succeed. The security of those nations which want peace, and the security of the United Nations itself, demands the strength to prevent further acts of aggression.

40. One of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations, expressed in Article I of the Charter, is that it shall "take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of peace".

41. The action of the United Nations to put down the aggression which began on 25 June against the Republic of Korea was exactly the effective collective measure which was required. It marked a turning point in history, for it showed the way to an enforceable rule of law among nations.

42. The world waits now to see whether we can build on the start we have made. The United Nations must move forward energetically to develop a more adequate system of collective security, for if it does not move forward it will move back.

43. Article 24 of the Charter gives the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, and this is the way it should be. But if the Security Council is not able to act because of the obstructive tactics of a permanent member, the Charter does not leave the United Nations impotent. The obligation of all Members to take action to maintain or restore the peace does not disappear because of a veto. The Charter, in Articles 10, 11 and 14, also vests in the General Assembly authority and responsibility for matters affecting international peace. The General Assembly can and should organize itself to discharge its responsibility promptly and decisively if the Security Council is prevented from acting.

44. To this end, the United States delegation is placing before the General Assembly a number of recommendations designed to increase the effectiveness of United Nations action against aggression.

45. This programme will include the following proposals.

46. First, provision for the calling of an emergency session of the General Assembly upon twenty-four hours' notice if the Security Council is prevented from acting upon a breach of the peace or an act of aggression.

47. Secondly, the establishment by the General Assembly of a security patrol, a peace patrol, to provide immediate and independent observation and reporting from any area in which international conflict threatens, upon the invitation or with the consent of the State to be visited.

48. Thirdly, a plan under which each Member State would designate within its national armed forces a

United Nations unit or units, to be specially trained and equipped and continuously maintained in readiness for prompt service on behalf of the United Nations. To assist in the organization, training and equipping of such units, we shall suggest that a United Nations military advisor should be appointed. Until the forces provided for under Article 43 are made available to the United Nations, the availability of these national units will be an important step toward the development of a worldwide security system.

49. Fourthly, the establishment by the General Assembly of a committee to study and report on means which the United Nations might use through collective action—including the use of armed force—to carry out the purposes and principles of the Charter.

50. I shall request that these proposals should be added as an item to the agenda. It is the hope of my delegation that the General Assembly will act on these and other suggestions which may be offered for the strengthening of our collective security system.

51. In doing so, we must keep clearly before the world the purpose of our collective security system, so that no one can make any mistake about it.

52. We need this defensive strength against further aggression, in order to pass through this time of tension without catastrophe, and to reach a period when genuine negotiation may take its place as the normal means of settling disputes.

53. This perspective is reflected in the proposals of the Secretary-General for a twenty-year Programme [A/1304], a perspective from which we can derive the steadiness and patience required of us. This perspective takes into account the possibility that the USSR Government may not be inherently and unalterably committed to standing in the way of peace and that it may some day accept a live-and-let-live philosophy.

54. The Soviet leaders are realists, in some respects at least. As we succeed in building the necessary economic and defensive military strength, it will become clear to them, we hope, that the non-Soviet world will neither collapse nor be dismembered piecemeal. Some modification in their aggressive policies may follow, if they then recognize that the best interests of the Soviet Union require a co-operative relationship with the outside world.

55. Time may have its effect. It is only thirty-three years since the overthrow of the Czarist régime in Russia, and this is a short time in history. Like many other social and political movements before it, the Soviet Revolution may change. In doing so, it may rid itself of the policies which now prevent the USSR from living as a good neighbour with the rest of the world. We have no assurance that this will take place. But, as the United Nations strengthens its collective security system, the possibilities of this change in Soviet policy will increase. If this does not occur, the increase in our defensive strength will be the means of ensuring our survival and protecting the essential values of our societies. But our hope is that a strong collective security system will make genuine negotiation possible, and that this will in turn lead to a co-operative peace.

56. It is the firm belief of the people and the Government of the United States that the United Nations will

play an increasingly important role in the world during the period ahead, as we try to move safely through the present tensions. I have already stressed the importance we attach to the United Nations as the framework of an effective system of collective security. The steps we take to strengthen our collective security are not only essential to the survival of the United Nations, but will contribute positively toward its development. The close ties of a common defence are developing an added cohesion among regional groups. This is a significant step toward a closer relationship among nations and is part of the process of growth by which we are moving towards a larger sense of community under the United Nations.

57. The United States also attaches importance to the universal character of the United Nations, which enables it to serve as a point of contact between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world during this period of tension. As our efforts to strengthen the collective security system become more and more effective, and as tensions begin to ease, we believe that the United Nations will be increasingly important as a means of facilitating and encouraging positive and productive negotiation.

58. The United States is ready and will always be ready and willing to negotiate with a sincere desire to solve problems and we shall continue to hope that some time negotiation will not be merely an occasion for propaganda.

59. Solving the many difficult problems in the world must, of course, be a gradual process. It will not be achieved miraculously, it will not be achieved overnight, by sudden dramatic gestures. It will come about step by step. We must seek to solve such problems as we can, and we must endure the others until they, too, can be solved.

60. Among the immediately pressing problems which require the attention of the General Assembly are the aggression against the Republic of Korea and the problem of Formosa.

61. In a special and, indeed, a unique sense, the Republic of Korea is a responsibility of the United Nations. The actions of the General Assembly, at its second and third sessions in 1947 and 1948, outlined the United Nations aspirations for the future of Korea. Before the aggression of last June, the failure to achieve those purposes had been a matter of deep disappointment and of deep concern. The aggression of 25 June raised a new challenge, which was met by the stout action to which I have already referred.

62. I have every belief and every confidence that this challenge and this defiance of the authority of the United Nations will be crushed as it deserves to be, and that thereafter the future of this small and gallant country may be restored where it belongs—to the custody of its own people under the guidance of the United Nations. From the outset, the United States has given its full support to the actions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. We shall continue to support the decisions of the United Nations as the future course of events unfolds. We shall do our full part to maintain the impressive unity which has so far been demonstrated in connexion with Korea.

63. The aggressive attack upon the Republic of Korea created the urgent necessity for the military neutralization of the island of Formosa. The President of the United States, in announcing on 27 June the measures taken to effect that neutralization, emphasized that those measures were to prevent military attack by mainland forces against Formosa and by forces from Formosa against the mainland. The President made it clear, at that time, and he has made it clear on several occasions since, that those measures were taken without prejudice to the future political status of Formosa, and that the United States had no territorial ambitions and sought no special privileges or position with respect to Formosa.

64. It is the belief of my Government that the problem of Formosa and the nearly eight million people who inhabit it should not be settled by force or by unilateral action. We believe that the international community has a legitimate interest and concern in having this matter settled by peaceful means. Accordingly, the United States delegation proposes that the General Assembly should direct its attention to the solution of this problem in circumstances in which all parties concerned and interested have a full opportunity to express their views, and in which all parties concerned agree to refrain from the use of force while a peaceful and equitable solution is being sought. We shall therefore request that the question of Formosa should be added to the agenda as a matter of special and urgent importance.

65. Advances which can be made on these specific issues, and the improvement which can result from an effective collective security system, may help the United Nations to move in the direction of a settlement of further disputes as well. We also anticipate that, as our collective security system is strengthened, our efforts to achieve the regulation of armaments may begin to be productive.

66. My country reaffirms its support of the United Nations plan for the international control of atomic energy which would effectively prohibit atomic weapons. We shall continue to give sympathetic consideration to any other proposals that would equally or more effectively accomplish this purpose. We reaffirm our support of the efforts of the United Nations to work out the basis for effective regulation and reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces.

67. In talking about disarmament, we must keep one elementary point absolutely clear; that is, that the heart and core of any real disarmament is confidence that agreements are being carried out by every armed nation. No one nation can have that sort of confidence unless it has knowledge of the real facts in other countries and such knowledge can come only from international controls based upon free international inspection in every country. There are no safe shortcuts.

68. Disarmament has been the subject of a great deal of propaganda, and this will doubtless be the case in the future. To those who advance various disarmament plans for propaganda purposes, the United Nations has only to ask this simple question: if you mean what you say, are you willing to take the first step? That first step is the acceptance of effective safeguards under the United Nations. There can be no other basis for disarmament. Only when every nation is willing to move

into an era of open and friendly co-operation in the world community shall we begin to get genuine progress towards disarmament. We believe nevertheless that efforts in this direction should continue, that plans should be made, and negotiations should go on. This subject is of such vital significance that no stone should be left unturned in the hope that these efforts will some day be successful.

69. As Mr. Bredo Stabelli, the representative of Norway, put it so well at a meeting of the Commission for Conventional Armaments:

"No good farmer fails to prepare for the summer's sowing and harvest during the dark and cold days of fall and winter. In my country, lying astride the Arctic circle, the farmer would never reap any harvest at all if he were to postpone his labours until the growing season is upon him."

He went on:

"It requires courage and steadfast adherence to the principles of the United Nations to explore the possibilities of regulating and reducing armaments when rearmament to oppose lawless aggression is the dire need of the day. I trust, however, that the United Nations will not be found wanting in foresight and steadfastness in this important field."²

70. To reap the harvests of peace in the future, if I may make use of Mr. Stabelli's excellent image, we must plan and we must work now.

71. I have stressed the work we must do to strengthen and develop our collective security system. This is something that none of us wants to have to do, but in the world in which we live we have no choice but to push ahead energetically with this task.

72. Does this mean that all the other things we should like to be doing—the creative things, the productive things—should be put aside for a later time? Not at all. We must keep pushing ahead at the same time with our efforts to advance human well-being. We must carry on with our war against want, even as we arm against aggression. We must do these two things at the same time because that is the only way we can keep constantly before us the whole purpose of what we are doing.

73. Unlike the medieval monks who all through life kept before them a skull as a symbol of death, we must keep before our eyes the living thing we are working for—a better life for all people everywhere.

74. We have it in our power now, on the basis of the experience of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and of many of the Member governments, to transform the lives of millions of people, to take them out from under the spectre of want, to give people everywhere new hope. We can meet, and we must meet, the challenge of human misery, of hunger, poverty and disease.

75. As an example of the kind of need to which we must put our efforts, I should like to speak of the problem of the use and ownership of land, a source of misery and suffering to millions.

76. In many parts of the world, especially in Asia, nations have been seeking to achieve a better distribution

of land ownership. Leaders in India and Pakistan, for example, are keenly aware of this problem, and are taking steps to deal with it effectively.

77. In Japan, as the result of a land-reform programme, three million farmers—well over half of all the farmers in Japan—have acquired land. In the Republic of Korea, where previously there had been twice as many tenants as owners of land, a redistribution of farm-lands had, by the time the invasion took place, changed that ratio so that those who owned land outnumbered those who held their land in tenancy. Plans which were scheduled to be put into effect this summer would have made farm owners of 90 per cent of the farm families in Korea. In each of those countries, the result of redistribution of the land has been to give the individual farmer an opportunity to work for himself and to improve his status.

78. These examples I have cited are not slogans or phrases. They suggest what can be done on a co-operative, democratic basis, by processes of peaceful change, which respect the dignity of the individual and his right to self-reliance and a decent livelihood. The result has not been what has been called land-reform in certain other parts of the world—to collectivize the farmer and to place him under the complete control of the government instead of the land-owner.

79. Equally important is the problem of the better use of the land. Control of soil erosion, better seeds, better tools and better fertilizers are needed in almost every country, but especially in parts of Asia, Africa, parts of the Middle East and Latin America, where people suffer greatly from the inefficient use of land.

80. The major responsibility in these fields rests, of course, with governments, but the United Nations should make special efforts to advise and assist governments in improving land use and productivity. A considerable portion of the funds pledged for the technical assistance programme is already available, to enable us to push ahead with an attack on such problems as these, as well as problems of health, education, industrialization and public administration.

81. A vast opportunity awaits us to bring, by such means as the United Nations has been developing, new hope to millions whose most urgent needs are for food, for land and for human dignity. These efforts, and this experience, if concentrated on areas of particular need, can have a combined impact of exciting proportions. The place to begin, I submit to the Assembly, is Korea.

82. Just as Korea has become the symbol of resistance against aggression, so it can become also the vibrant symbol of the renewal of life.

83. A great deal is being done through the United Nations and under the Unified Command for the relief of the Korean people. This aid needs to be vastly increased. But there is another job which needs to be done, and a greater one than relief. As peace is restored in Korea, a tremendous job of reconstruction will be required.

84. The devastation which has overtaken Korea is a consequence of the aggression from the north. It is probably unrealistic to expect that those who might have prevented or recalled this aggression will make available the help needed to repair the damage caused by the inva-

² See S/C.3/SC.3/PV.30.

sion. The lives lost as the result of this aggression cannot be recalled, but as the people of Korea set about the task of re-establishing a free and independent nation, as they begin to rebuild their country, the United Nations must be prepared to marshal its resources and its experience to help them.

85. Here, by focusing on one place of extreme need, the United Nations and the specialized agencies can demonstrate to the world what they have learned about helping people to combat disease, to build hospitals, schools and factories, to train teachers and public administrators, to make the land fertile.

86. This is a job that can be done. It will take substantial effort and resources, but those are available. Fifty-three governments have pledged their support to the United Nations defence of Korea. Some of these governments have been unable to contribute military personnel or equipment. But all of them, I am sure, will want to contribute food, transportation and industrial equipment, construction materials and technicians to the great task of reconstruction.

87. My Government is prepared to join with the other Member nations in making resources and personnel available. When the conflict in Korea is brought to a successful conclusion, many of the doctors, engineers and other technicians, and much of the resources now being used to support the United Nations military action, will be made available by my Government to a United Nations recovery force.

88. I suggest that the General Assembly should call upon the Economic and Social Council to set up a United Nations recovery force to harness this great collective effort.

89. These measures not only will aid in restoring the people of Korea quickly to a condition of peace and independence, but they will demonstrate to the people of the world the creative and productive possibilities at the command of the United Nations. Out of the ashes of destruction, the United Nations can help the Korean people to create a society which will have lessons in it for other people everywhere on the earth. What the United Nations will be able to do here can help set a pattern of co-ordinated economic and social action in other places, where the need is for development rather than for rehabilitation.

90. We look forward, then, to a time when Members of the United Nations will be able to devote their energies and their resources to productive and creative activities, to the advancement of human welfare, rather than to armaments. When the time comes that a universal collective security system enables nations to reduce their burden of armaments, we hope that other nations will join with us in pledging a good part of the amount saved to such productive United Nations activities as I have been describing. A world such as that, in which nations without exception work together for the well-being of all mankind, seems a very distant goal in these days of peril, but our faith in its ultimate realization illumines all that we do now.

91. In building a more secure and prosperous world, we must never lose sight of the basic motivation of our effort: the inherent worth of the individual human person. Our aim is to create a world in which each human

being shall have the opportunity to fulfil his creative possibilities in harmony with all.

92. It is our hope that the relaxation in international tension, which we seek, will be accompanied by a great restoration of human liberty, where it is now lacking, and progress everywhere towards the "larger freedom". But the safeguarding of human freedom is not a distant goal, nor a project for the future. It is a constant, immediate and urgent concern of the United Nations. The United Nations should keep forever in mind the objectives set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and we should press forward with the work of our distinguished Commission on Human Rights. While we are engaged in creating conditions of real peace in the world, we must always go forward under the banner of liberty. Our faith and our strength are rooted in free institutions and the rights of man.

93. We speak here as representatives of governments, but we must also speak the hearts of our countrymen. We speak for people whose deep concern is whether the children are well or sick, whether there is enough food, whether the roof leaks, whether there will be peace. But peace, for them, is not just the absence of war. The peace the world wants must be free from fear—the fear of invasion, the fear of subversion, the fear of the knock on the door at midnight. The peace the world wants must be free from want, a peace in which neighbours help each other and together build a better life. The peace the world wants must be a moral peace, so that the spirit of man may be free and the barriers between the hearts and minds of men may drop away and leave men free to unite in brotherhood. This is the task before us.

94. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has begun its work, as always, by holding a general debate, in which it is customary to draw up the balance of the activities of the United Nations during the preceding year and to outline new problems and the methods of solving them. The general debate gives every delegation an opportunity to express its views on the questions which interest the Assembly and to state its position with regard to the proposals and plans submitted to the Assembly. Such an exchange of views promotes better understanding among the delegations and aids in the preparation of measures to enable us to join forces to put into effect agreed decisions.

95. However, the representatives of a number of delegations have taken a different course in the statements they have made today. For example, the United States Secretary of State did not hesitate in his speech to attack the Soviet Union in the rudest terms, in an attempt to steer the General Assembly away from the grave problems facing it, problems which are especially grave in view of the current international situation, in which both words and deeds should be weighed with particular care.

96. The Soviet Union delegation, however, will not follow the course along which the United States delegation has tried today to steer the General Assembly in order to divert it from the solution of those really vital problems which it is our duty to solve in the interest of all peace-loving nations and of all progressive men and women. The USSR delegation will not follow this course, since it is not the way to peace. We shall have occasion later to comment on the crude outbursts against

the Soviet Union which Mr. Acheson permitted himself to make from this rostrum. For the moment I think it more necessary and important to speak of our main purpose, a matter which is directly and intimately connected with the answer to the question of what should be done, in the present international situation, by the General Assembly and by all those who honestly and sincerely want to do their duty and to respond clearly and firmly to the urgent appeal of the conscience of millions of human beings who hate war and long for peace.

97. If we recall the preceding sessions of the General Assembly, we shall see that, in spite of all the obstacles which beset the path of the United Nations, a number of important resolutions were adopted to strengthen international peace and security. Among them, we might recall the important resolution 1 (I), adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in 1946, which recognized the need to prohibit the use of atomic energy for military purposes and to set up international control to that end; another, resolution 41 (I), adopted by the General Assembly in the same year on "principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments", in which the General Assembly recommended that the Security Council should formulate practical measures providing for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces; a third, resolution 110 (II), adopted by the General Assembly in 1947, during its second session, on "measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war"; and a number of other decisions on questions concerning the maintenance of peace and other important problems of international co-operation.

98. At the present moment the problems with which the United Nations is faced — averting the menace of a new war, strengthening co-operation among nations and ensuring international peace and security — have become even more acute.

99. When the United Nations was created, it was held essential to heed the grave lessons of the past, the lessons of the late lamented League of Nations, so that its errors and weaknesses might not be repeated.

100. The United Nations was created, as the Charter puts it, "to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of . . . common ends". It was based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all its Members, respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of every State, and concurring and unified action in the Security Council by the great Powers which bear the chief responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

101. The Soviet Union has always attached great importance to the United Nations. The head of the USSR Government, J. V. Stalin, commented on the value of the United Nations as early as 1946, at the very outset of its existence, saying that it was "an important instrument for the preservation of peace and international security". "The strength of this international Organization", he said on that occasion, "lies in the fact that it is based on the principle that States have equal rights, and not on the principle of domination of some States by others. If the United Nations succeeds in the future in maintaining this principle of equal rights, it will undoubtedly play an important and

constructive part in the cause of ensuring general peace and security."

102. That is the position of the USSR Government with regard to the United Nations. It is from this standpoint, too, that the Soviet Union evaluates its tasks at the present session.

103. The USSR Government holds that, given a sincere desire for co-operation, the United Nations, in spite of all the difficulties besetting it, can and must discharge its obligation to all progressive men and women, who have combined in a mighty movement against the menace of a new war and for the peace and welfare of the nations.

104. The role of the Security Council within the framework of the United Nations is well known: it bears the chief responsibility for the maintenance of peace. We know too that it is the duty of the five great Powers which are the permanent members of the Security Council — the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China and the USSR — to act in a spirit of unanimity and harmony, failing which the Council cannot take decisions on questions of international peace and security. For its decisions on such questions are considered adopted only when the concurring votes of all the permanent members of the Council are among the required seven affirmative votes cast.

105. I need not explain why the situation in the Security Council cannot be regarded as normal when even one of its permanent members is not represented, or when a person claiming to be a representative has not been accredited by the government in power in the State concerned. That, however, is the situation in the Security Council and in the United Nations in general with regard to China, whose seat is occupied by a person who in no way represents China and has not been accredited by the only lawful government — the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

106. The United States delegation in the Security Council and the delegations of some other States which support it are brutally violating the sovereign rights of the Chinese people by their stubborn refusal to satisfy the demands of the People's Republic of China that the representatives of the remnants of the reactionary Kuomintang clique should be expelled from the Security Council, and by preventing the recognition of the only accredited representative of China, Mr. Chang Wen-tien, whom the Central People's Government has appointed as its representative to the United Nations.

107. Furthermore, by its illegal acts, the United States is infringing the territorial inviolability and integrity of the People's Republic of China. That is evidenced by its action in respect of Taiwan, which is an inalienable part of China, as was recognized in the Cairo agreement of 1943 between the United States, the United Kingdom and China. It is evidenced as well by such acts as the violation by the United States Air Force of the Chinese frontiers.

108. With regard to the situation in Korea, I must point out that the United States delegation in the Security Council, together with some other delegations supporting it, have, as we know, adopted a number of illegal and unjust decisions on the Korean question. Those decisions were intended to camouflage the armed

intervention in Korea which, as we know, was begun even before the Security Council had adopted its resolution of 27 June 1950.³

109. The USSR delegation will deal with these important questions at greater length in the course of this session.

110. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers it necessary, however, to state at this time that the General Assembly will have failed in its duty if it does not exert all its influence and authority to ensure the peaceful settlement of the Korean question in accordance with principles of justice and international law.

111. While those countries which form part of the North Atlantic alliance are engaged in a mad armaments race, have unleashed a propaganda campaign for another war, and are doing their utmost to foment war hysteria, the USSR is doing peaceful, productive and creative work, and all its efforts are directed towards the further development of the national economy and the increased well-being and material standard of living of the Soviet people.

112. It is common knowledge that the budget of a State reflects in a way its life, plans and aspirations. If we examine the budget of the United States from such an angle, we are struck by the tremendous increase in the military appropriations of that country as compared with the pre-war period. Whereas in the 1938-1939 budget the United States military appropriations amounted to 1,077 million dollars, in 1948-1949 they amounted to 11,913 million dollars, and in 1949-1950 to 13,148 million dollars. In other words, the military appropriations in 1949-1950 were more than twelve times as high as those of the pre-war period.

113. I should like to point out that the above figures apply only to direct military appropriations. It should be borne in mind, however, that the United States budget also includes considerable appropriations for arming other countries which are parties to the North Atlantic alliance. Appropriations for that purpose amounted, in 1949-1950, to 1,359 million dollars.

114. United States military appropriations have particularly increased in connexion with the Korean events. The budget for 1950-1951 recently approved by the United States Congress provides for an additional 16,000 million dollars for direct military appropriations of the United States and for the armaments of other countries, not counting all the further appropriations which the President of the United States asked for after the Congress had examined the proposed budget.

115. It must be noted in this connexion that the United States is using its economic and political influence in every possible way to induce the United Kingdom, France and some other countries to increase their own military appropriations.

116. The foreign policy of the USSR has always been to strengthen friendly relations and co-operation with all peoples pursuing the same ends and consistently opposing military ventures and threats to international peace and security.

117. The Soviet State, from its very inception, has been steadfastly pursuing a policy of averting the threat of war and of strengthening peace. The Soviet people rightly feels that the great aims of socialist construction, of economic prosperity and cultural development for many years to come, can best be achieved under conditions of peace. The military ambitions and expansionist plans which have very often motivated the actions of influential circles in capitalist countries are alien to the Soviet people.

118. The Soviet Union, in its fight for peace, has consistently sought to secure the adoption of a number of important measures which could ensure the success of that fight and help to strengthen confidence in international relations and avert the threat of a new war. Among the most important measures of that kind which the USSR has been and is proposing are the reduction of armaments, the condemnation and prevention of war propaganda, the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to make sure that the prohibition is observed.

119. The important task of reducing armaments and armed forces is one with which all the peace-loving countries have long been faced. Four years ago, in 1946, the General Assembly adopted resolution 41 (I), in which it recognized the necessity of the earliest possible reduction of armaments and armed forces, and formulated practical measures to that end designed to ensure that the reduction of armaments applied to the major weapons of modern warfare and not merely to the minor weapons. At the same time the General Assembly recognized that it was essential to expedite the consideration of a convention for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and for the establishment of international control and inspection, so as to ensure the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes.

120. Need we go on to stress the vital importance of these measures for the strengthening of peace and of international security? These decisions represented a serious blow to the expansionist aspirations of those groups which had not learned all the necessary lessons from the failure of the aggressive plans of those who instigated the Second World War.

121. The reduction of armaments is in the interest of strengthening peace and meets the vital need of the peoples for the lightening of the heavy economic burden of ever-increasing expenditures caused by a frenzied armaments race.

122. The main responsibility for the reduction of armaments rests with the great Powers. That is why the USSR Government is bringing up the important question of the necessity for the great Powers of reducing their present armed forces—land forces, air forces of all kinds, and navy—by one-third in 1950, it being understood that the question of a further reduction of armed forces would be considered later, at one of the forthcoming sessions of the General Assembly.

123. To remove the threat of war and strengthen peace, it is of vital importance to renounce the use of atomic weapons and to establish the strict international control required. The USSR Government's proposals for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and the establishment of strict international control are

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council*, fifth year, No. 16.

enthusiastically supported by hundreds of millions of partisans of peace in all countries, for the conscience of the peoples cannot tolerate the threat of the use of the atomic weapon, which is a weapon of aggression and an inhuman instrument for mass destruction and the slaughter of peaceful populations.

124. The USSR Government has always stood and stands for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and the strict and effective international control which will ensure that atomic energy is not used for military purposes.

125. The discovery of atomic energy, which is one of the greatest scientific discoveries of our age and has created tremendous possibilities for increasing the forces of production and raising the standard of living of peoples, must not be used for destruction and slaughter. Atomic energy must be used wholly and exclusively for peaceful, constructive work.

126. It is the duty of the United Nations to put an end to the atomic weapon and the other major weapons of mass slaughter of populations. This is what millions and millions of people are demanding.

127. The Government of the Soviet Union deems it essential that the General Assembly should take all the steps in its power to implement the measures it has itself already approved in this matter, in order to achieve the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the condemnation as a war criminal of any government which is first to use the atomic weapon against another country.

128. The opponents of the idea of prohibiting the atomic weapon and of reducing armaments are those who are creating a war psychosis, making propaganda in favour of another war and preparing plans for such a war, all under the cover of insincere talk about "defence" and slander about the policy of the Soviet Union, which aims at peace.

129. For a long time already a feverish campaign has been conducted in the countries of the North Atlantic bloc to win over world public opinion to the idea of another war. This propaganda is not only not diminishing but is becoming more and more widespread under the most varied pretexts, which all have one and the same aim—to justify a mad race for armaments, including the atomic weapon.

130. The USSR Government assailed this propaganda as early as 1947, and again in 1948 and 1949.

131. As a result, the General Assembly adopted resolution 110 (II) condemning propaganda for another war and recommending to the governments of all States Members of the United Nations to take steps to encourage propaganda in favour of peace so as to strengthen and develop friendly relations among all nations.

132. At that time the most ardent war-mongers were mentioned by name, and they—Churchill, John Foster Dulles and a number of others—have still not desisted and are continuing their intrigues against the cause of peace. New war-mongers have joined their ranks, openly advertising their predatory plans. These propagandists of a new war include a number of responsible United States politicians and statesmen, as, for example, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,

former Secretary of Defense Johnson, Secretary of the Navy Matthews, General MacArthur, and others.

133. Some idea of their propaganda may be gathered from MacArthur's letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in which he sets forth his expansionist plans concerning China and the entire area of the Pacific. Further evidence may be seen in the recent statement of the Secretary of the Navy, Matthews, who in the name of peace shamelessly advocated a war of aggression. The former Secretary of Defense, Johnson, in a series of statements, has also openly advocated war, with the use of any weapons, even atomic and bacteriological.

134. The prohibition of war propaganda is in accordance with the vital interests of the peoples of the entire world. The USSR Government urges the General Assembly to take further steps to put an end to such propaganda, which is directed against peaceful co-operation among the peoples and which is sapping the very foundations of the United Nations. Such propaganda should not go unpunished and those guilty of it should be made to answer for their actions.

135. The USSR Government's peace proposals have in all cases been based on the premise that peace can be secured and strengthened by the combined efforts of all nations, great and small. At the same time, the Government of the Soviet Union bears in mind the special responsibility of the great Powers, which are most able to influence the course and development of international relations and are best equipped to prevent wars and strengthen peace. My Government therefore deems it vitally important that five Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union—should unite their efforts towards peace and conclude among themselves a covenant for the strengthening of peace. Such a covenant, supported by all peace-loving peoples, would be able to strengthen mutual confidence and, at the same time, the general resolve to remove the threat of a new war and to ensure international security.

136. The past year has been marked by events of international importance. The North Atlantic bloc and its military staffs have intensified their aggressive activity. A frenzied armaments race is in progress in the United States and a number of western European countries and propaganda in favour of a new war is being conducted and has been intensified of late. Continued efforts are being made to arm western Germany and Japan and to turn those countries into strategic bases for future aggression. A war is being waged in Korea, imposed by foreign interventionists upon the Korean people who are fighting for their independence and national unity. Europe has still not healed the wounds inflicted upon it during the last war, yet already the threat of a new war hangs over it.

137. In these circumstances the Government of the Soviet Union is continuing and intensifying its determined fight against the threat of a new war, and is firmly and consistently pressing its policy of peace and friendship among nations.

138. In order to strengthen peace and security among nations and to avert the threat of war, the USSR Government has instructed its delegation to submit to the General Assembly for its consideration the following declaration [A/1376]:

"Declaration on the removal of the threat of a new war and the strengthening of peace and security among the Nations"

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that the most important task of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security, and to strengthen and develop friendly relations among nations and co-operation between them in solving international problems,

"Expressing its firm determination to avert the threat of a new war and sharing the nations' inflexible will to peace as expressed by the hundreds of millions of signatures appended to the Stockholm appeal,

"Regarding the use of the atomic weapon and other means of the mass destruction of human beings as a most heinous international crime against humanity, and basing this attitude on the unanimously adopted General Assembly resolution of 1946 on the need for prohibiting the use of atomic energy for military purposes,

"Noting that the events at present taking place in Korea and other areas of the Pacific ocean emphasize with added force the extreme importance and urgency, from the point of view of international peace and security, of unifying for this purpose the efforts of the five Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council and bear special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace,

"Decides to adopt the following declaration :

"1. The General Assembly condemns the propaganda in favour of a new war now being conducted in a number of countries and urges all States to prohibit such propaganda in their countries and call those responsible to account.

"2. The General Assembly, recognizing that the use of the atomic weapon as a weapon of aggression and the mass destruction of human beings is contradictory to international conscience and honour and incompatible with membership of the United Nations, declares that the use of the atomic weapon shall be unconditionally prohibited and that a strict system of international control shall be instituted to ensure the exact and unconditional observance of this prohibition.

"The General Assembly also declares that the first government to use the atomic weapon or any other means for the mass destruction of human beings against any country will thereby commit a crime against humanity and be regarded as a war criminal.

"3. The General Assembly, acting in recognition of the need for strengthening peace, and taking into account the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council for ensuring peace, unanimously expresses the desire :

"(a) That the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union should combine their efforts for peace and conclude among themselves a pact for the strengthening of peace ;

"(b) That these great Powers should reduce their present armed forces (land forces, military air forces

of all kinds, naval forces) by one-third during 1950, and that the question of a further reduction of armed forces should be brought up for consideration at one of the forthcoming sessions of the General Assembly."

139. This is the path which the Soviet Union calls upon the nations to take in these grievous times. The General Assembly must take this path and go boldly forward along it. Such is our programme, a programme of struggle for peace, a programme to strengthen peace and co-operation between nations and to remove the threat of a new war.

140. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): The General Assembly of the United Nations is assuredly meeting a time of crisis. This crisis was foreseen by the smaller countries, which understood how precarious and uncertain were the grounds for the assumption that there would be unanimity among the great Powers; they realized that as soon as the balance of power was disrupted, one of those States might adopt a policy based on the discredited theory of the balance of power, notwithstanding the principles enunciated in the Charter.

141. The smaller countries considered that possibility, as well as the difficulty resulting from the paralysing effects of the veto. Hence they strove resolutely in support of two institutions which, to my mind, constitute the safeguard of the Organization. The first is the General Assembly, with its extensive powers; regional agreements constitute the second of those institutions. The purpose of those agreements is not only to seek the peaceful settlement of disputes, but also to provide for collective defence in case of an unforeseen attack.

142. This has been a tenacious and difficult struggle. Many delegations were in favour of keeping the Security Council, as was the case in the former League of Nations, in a position of theoretical supremacy. So far as responsibility was concerned, we accepted that supremacy, but could not admit it from the point of view of the general functions for promoting international peace and security.

143. The regional agreements were opposed in the name of universality, because it was thought that a prudent and reasonable geographical differentiation was incompatible with universality, when really it was nothing other than the application of the obvious and recognized sociological principle of the division of labour.

144. But the smaller nations won the day and the Assembly of the United Nations took on that perfect legal form proper for the body which was to represent the universal conscience of mankind in complete fulfilment of all the principles and purposes of the Charter.

145. This does not mean that we were so ingenuous as to think that in establishing an Assembly with such wide powers we should be setting up a sort of super-State. Not at all. We believed that there could be no exercise of national or international functions, whether or not they were considered sovereign, except on the basis of strict respect for law and international morality. We thought that the Assembly, however great its powers might be, should respect the law in force, that it should use and endorse the regional agreements and, above all, that in its work it should be inspired by the highest standards of international ethics and world public opinion.

146. But within these reasonable limits of an immense field of action, there still remained to the Assembly all those elements which militate in favour of peace, which draw the peoples of the world closer together by means of culture or economic co-operation and which enable them, at any moment, to unite to defend what is right and to oppose aggression. We place the functions of the Assembly precisely in this field of action, which does not offer the limitless scope of a super-State but a narrower range of authority, as clearly laid down in the Charter. Since the proposal submitted by the United States representative deals precisely with this subject, one of the main topics which we have to discuss and on which it is essential that all delegations should keep a clear mind is that of the functions of the Assembly.

147. I do not desire to abuse your patience, nevertheless I urgently request you to give me your attention while I make a short study of these functions.

148. We may say that the functions of the Assembly have been accorded varying importance. It has been said that there is some redundancy or repetition in the different Articles which deal with this question. A careful analysis of these Articles shows, however, that there is no redundancy. Occasionally some expression is repeated but there is a definite idea of the relative importance of the various functions of the Assembly. Article 10 states categorically that the Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the Charter, or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the Charter. I was glad to note that the United States Secretary of State, the leader of the United States delegation, referred to Article 1 of the Charter, because that first Article should be considered in connexion with Article 10. Article 1 is quite specific and states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to take effective measures to ensure peace, which means that not only the Council but also the Assembly may effectively take or recommend such measures.

149. Moreover, there is a very important part of Article 10 which we may call the structural part. It deals with the powers of the organs of the United Nations. I wonder: if any doubt should arise regarding the competence of these organs, would it have been possible to leave the problems unsolved, or do we not find in Article 10, which defines the powers of the Assembly and provides that it may make recommendations to the various organs relating to their powers, the solutions to many problems which might arise in the event of defective functioning of the Security Council?

150. But the Charter provides that the Assembly may discuss not only all questions relating to what we might call the letter of the Charter but also, as is clear from Article 11, paragraph 1, questions concerning international co-operation and the maintenance of international relations.

151. It has rightly been pointed out that in Article 11 the word "consider" is used, and this has a wider meaning than the word "discuss". But it will be seen that so far the Assembly has only general functions, either to apply the principles of the Charter or to ensure co-operation in the maintenance of international peace. But that interpretation would be mistaken, since paragraph 2 of this same Article 11 does not refer to a general dis-

ussion but gives the Assembly the power to discuss and to consider any questions, and to make recommendations. This means that, where a matter is not already being dealt with by the Security Council, the General Assembly is not only, as General Rómulo, representative of the Philippines, said, a debating society and an organ reflecting public opinion, but a body which can take positive measures on certain concrete problems.

152. It is clear that if these positive measures require effective action, not just "action" in the general meaning of the word, but "effective action", they are within the competence of the Security Council; and since there cannot be a double jurisdiction, the Assembly must waive its own and must make a recommendation or refer the question back to the Security Council. If the Council has assumed responsibility for the matter, the Assembly cannot intervene, unless requested to do so by the Council, or at the time when it is notified by the Secretary-General that the Council has ceased to deal with the matter.

153. Finally, let us remember the famous Vandenberg amendment. I should like to pay tribute to that great personality, Mr. Vandenberg, who is not only an American politician but a figure of world-wide repute. Taking note of the recommendation of all the younger countries that the Assembly should be made an effective institution, he proposed the amendment which now appears as Article 14 of the Charter, under which the Assembly may discuss any situation, regardless of its origin, in order that it may recommend measures for the maintenance of peace, and extend its jurisdiction to include violations of the provisions of the Charter.

154. Thus the Assembly is clearly competent to discuss, consider and make recommendations, if the Council does not itself make recommendations in the limited field of concrete, coercive action on any question; the Assembly not only has competence with respect to powers, to the purposes of the Charter and to international co-ordination, but can also examine all violations of the Charter itself.

155. This means, then, that the Assembly has the widest legal powers; but it is clear, I repeat, that these wide powers must always presuppose a respect for the laws in force. The Assembly was established to ensure respect for the law, and therefore it cannot assume a power incompatible with the sovereignty of a State, because the law imposes absolute respect for this sovereignty. The Assembly cannot assume any function which lies within the domestic jurisdiction or the constitution of any State. The Assembly cannot modify a situation resulting from bilateral or multilateral agreements. On the contrary, it must use its authority to approve and encourage recourse to the measures elaborated by the parties to these agreements. Finally, the Assembly cannot modify the scale of values established by regional arrangements for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

156. The Assembly's jurisdiction is thus clearly defined; it constitutes what may be called the legal foundation for any proposal for convening the Assembly in case of emergency to deal with the exigencies of peace when the Council is paralysed. I must point out that this is a question with which we have always been much concerned. At San Francisco, in the debates in

Committee II, we asked: can we accept an Assembly which is impotent when confronted with a paralysed Council? It would be tantamount to accepting that the United Nations was at the mercy of a single Power.

157. The veto has obviously gone far beyond the purpose for which it was devised. As I have already indicated here, the veto was not a right but an obligation; an obligation to seek unanimity, to explore every avenue of agreement and to sacrifice minor points of difference. There is a great difference between a right exercised as a privilege and the rule of unanimity considered as a constant obligation to ensure peace and to find a fitting solution to international problems. Even if such an agreement were not reached, if the great Powers were not under an immense moral obligation to make a constant effort of readjustment in order to achieve the desired unanimity, it is obvious that the fate of this Organization, which was conceived by men who had fought for peace, which reflected the ultimate achievement of international law and was, as it were, the ornament of civilization, could not be left to the capricious will of one Power or at the mercy of irreconcilable disagreement. If the Assembly were powerless and did not possess the full powers, which I have indicated, to discuss, consider and, in certain cases, to make effective recommendations, then the veto would have brought about the paralysis not only of the Security Council but also, in some measure, the paralysis and disintegration of the Organization itself. It would have justified the terrible irony with which a representative, perhaps too ironical or too prophetic, said that the conflicts among the small Powers disappeared in the United Nations and that the United Nations itself disappeared in the conflicts among the great Powers.

158. That was not the true intention and the spirit of the founders of the Organization. The Latin American countries, however, perceived clearly, from the outset, that at some stage the veto would paralyse or hamper the action of the United Nations by paralysing the Security Council. And since they felt that the defence of the continent, which was in some ways a basis—perhaps the principal basis—for a peaceful future, should not be left to the mercy of shifts in the balance of power, they proposed regional arrangements. It was said that regional arrangements would destroy the universal character of the Organization. It was said that they would be unworkable and would lead to the formation of separate and hostile blocs. We replied that the division of labour did not imply disintegration but that sociologically it was an affirmation of unity and integrity, and the facts have borne this out.

159. The regional arrangements have been fruitful. Not only have they saved and strengthened the fifty-year old Pan-American Union and, in some measure, guaranteed the peace of the continent against intra-continental and extra-continental conflicts and aggression, but also, illustrating, perhaps, Nietzsche's dictum that he who acts does not trouble himself about principles, they have had the far-reaching effect of opening the way for the North Atlantic Treaty and the agreements between European countries for their own defence.

160. We who owe so much to Europe and who feel that spiritually we are its children, nurtured in its culture, must welcome the fact that Europe has

grasped, as the American institutions have done, the principle of these regional arrangements which are a safeguard against possible aggression in the future.

161. I know that some may say that these regional arrangements, which imply defence and mutual support and co-operation in enforcement measures, are to some extent a return to the old policy of armed peace and the balance of power, which was always precarious and unstable and which has been supposed—often without justification, for there are many instances in which the balance of power has prevented aggression—to be the cause of past wars.

162. However, this is not a question of a policy of aggression. The United States Secretary of State gave a very clear definition of collective security. In the balance of power, everything depended upon power itself: if the balance was destroyed there was no limit to the influence of the State which had become predominant. What is needed today is to establish power in a reasonable manner and to distribute it in defence of right, under the authority of an international body. Only those who were tragically naïve could have believed that by the mere signing of the Charter of San Francisco and the eloquent proclamation of certain principles, a fundamental change would be wrought in human nature and that, either individually or collectively, the psychological laws of that unfathomable phenomenon called the will to power would be changed.

163. We made provision in the Charter for possible violations. The Charter laid down the principle of the limitation of armaments; but from the beginning we also knew that the application of the judicial principle of the limitation of armaments would encounter many difficulties. In point of fact, the Assembly was given the power to make recommendations with regard to armaments and the regulation of armaments. But we well knew that many interests might be opposed to such limitation. And finally a situation arose which in the future will be examined by historians and philosophers studying our civilization when they compare our peace with that of Westphalia, Utrecht, Paris or Vienna. This was the tragic situation: while the western Powers, which had suffered so much through the war, and in particular the European Powers which had been devastated, were reducing their military strength to a minimum and devoting themselves entirely to the work of reconstruction and the heavy programme of social reform, the great Eurasian Power was maintaining or increasing its reserves of manpower in an effort to substitute for the guarantees of the Charter the other guarantee of a chain of Powers or of nations which were subject to its influence and on which it endeavoured in every way to impose its ideology, in spite of the fact that those nations possessed a cultural heritage based on the supreme dignity of man and not on the absolute supremacy of the State.

164. It is not in rancour or in a spirit of acrimony that we are recalling this lack of equilibrium today. We well know that it is the desire of every delegation that this debate should preserve and, if possible, strengthen the spirit of understanding and good will, and that it should afford all nations an opportunity of vying with each other in their love of peace and above all in their sincere co-operation for the attainment of peace. But I must draw attention to the facts as they

are. I must stress that disequilibrium which has of course made it impossible to adopt certain measures for the limitation of armaments, or to adopt any such measures which would not simply fix an inequitable ratio or a ratio which, while resulting in a reduction in numbers, would lead to the continuation of this very disequilibrium which we condemn.

165. What we have to do, in fact, is to create the necessary enforcement organs within the framework of international authority; in a way, that means the creation of a new equilibrium, but this time of an equilibrium for peace and justice. I say a new equilibrium for peace and justice because our idealism cannot be naïve, because we must have a sense of reality and because it is true that right is endowed with immense moral force; for, though we shall never be able to accept the theory that might is right, we also know full well, and of this we are certain, that right has need of might. "We who have the right; we shall have the might; then there will be justice" was an old saying in England. We have the right; we must have might in order to have a living, breathing justice.

166. But to do this we need first strengthen the moral factors which fortunately do exist, and thus renew the spirit of confidence in our hearts; we must turn to the very countries from which we seem to be separated by an unbridgeable gulf and say to them: "Certain concepts of life cannot be spread by mechanical and revolutionary means. The idea that order can be forced upon nations by means of warfare or material influence was a utopian belief. It was also utopian to think that power would make them accept glorious freedom. It was equally utopian to believe that a particular concept of social justice could be imposed by force. Any policy which advocates the subversive spreading of certain principles leads only to an attack on the sacred right of nations to self-determination. Order, freedom and justice are happily reconcilable, but they can develop in a nation only thanks to the spontaneous forces of the native soil and vitality."

167. Let us impart this conviction of ours to the countries which have conjured up ideological theories

about us; let us tell them that we shall never attempt to impose our system and our way of life on anyone, but that neither shall we tolerate that a régime based on force, and which seeks to develop, should impose on us, and on the peoples who are united to us by the sacred bonds of the Charter, a concept of life which destroys human dignity and bases the structure of society on the play of blind forces or on the material imposition of power. And above all, let us avail ourselves of this moment to define that juridical position in which we can exert all our strength in favour of peace.

168. Let us have faith in our mission; let us have faith in that mission which is to support, encourage, and endorse by the verdict of humanity, the efforts which have been made to give effect to the Charter and to respect the territorial integrity of nations which have been subjected to force, efforts which have to some extent been given universal sanction. And let our attitude serve to encourage us to accept future sacrifices, with the conviction that in fighting for the rights of each nation, we are fighting for universal peace, because there can be no peace without justice.

169. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): There are no further speakers on the list for today.

170. Three delegations have asked to speak tomorrow. I suggest to the Assembly that the meeting should be closed now, and that our next meeting should be held tomorrow at 3 p.m.

171. The General Committee will meet tomorrow at 10.45 a.m. in Room A. I must ask the delegations which have already requested the inclusion of items on the agenda to be present in that room tomorrow morning, so that, should they wish to do so, they may take part in the Committee's debates on the inclusion of the items they have proposed.

172. The meeting is now closed. The next plenary meeting will be held tomorrow at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.