

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

PLENARY MEETING



Monday, 25 September 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	67
Speeches by Mr. Díaz Ordóñez (Dominican Republic), Mr. Kardelj (Yugoslavia), Mr. Tsiang (China), Mr. Jooste (Union of South Africa) and Mr. Dihigo y López Trigo (Cuba)	

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 9]

SPEECHES BY MR. DÍAZ ORDÓÑEZ (DOMINICAN REPUBLIC), MR. KARDELJ (YUGOSLAVIA), MR. TSIANG (CHINA), MR. JOOSTE (UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA) AND MR. DIHIGO LÓPEZ TRIGO (CUBA)

1. Mr. DIAZ ORDOÑEZ (Dominican Republic) (*translated from Spanish*): Had the United Nations not been faced in its five years of existence with countless obstacles, had it not been called upon to deal with so many alarming symptoms in the historical development of a convalescent world, it would be difficult to justify its creation, to welcome its birth and to hang on it, as men hoist a banner to a masthead, the hopes of peace and security of a profoundly disturbed epoch. The fact is that the struggle which this young yet already sorely tried Organization has waged, and is still waging, is the best proof of the timeliness of its conception and creation, and of the urgent and imperious need for the work it is doing today.

2. Certainly this has not been merely another episode in the political history of the peoples. The recent wars, with their unparalleled violence and enormous destructive power, engendered in the peoples a boundless desire for peace, concord and agreement. That is why the United Nations (united for agreement, concord and peace) neither can nor should be regarded as one of those familiar panaceas created for interested motives in international political laboratories with the object of providing temporary compromise solutions for more or less selfish problems; it must be recognized for what it is, a sacred idea conceived by the peoples at a time of grave and legitimate struggle for the permanent protection of their democratic existence, autonomy, dignity, peace and security.

3. For these reasons it is a crime to obstruct it in its

sacred mission. It is a crime to try to reduce it to a tool of selfish ideologies. It is a crime to use it as an instrument of war in times of peace. It is a crime not to render it due honour.

4. "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . ." Thus reads the opening sentence of the Preamble of the United Nations Charter. Yet, today one of these nations, "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" is violated and invaded by violent and brutal forces bent on extermination—the extermination of a people and of a nationality. I need hardly say that I am referring to the democratic Republic of South Korea.

5. In the degrading scale of interventions, unjust and injurious interventions by armed force marks the nadir below the zero of international politics. I belong to a country whose deepest and most prolonged historical afflictions have been painfully rooted in the most varied types of intervention. The Dominican Republic, with its experience of the martyrdom of intervention, is in a position to appreciate to the full the tragedy which the people of South Korea is suffering.

6. But what democratic people, even if it has itself never been the victim of treacherous aggression, can fail to have repudiated and condemn such an unprecedented and criminal outrage? The United Nations, composed of peoples which wish to be peoples, of men who strive to be men in the highest sense of the word, has taken on behalf of its Members the stand dictated in all of us by the deep-rooted instinct of self-preservation and the supreme and universally felt desire not to let foul aggression go unpunished.

7. By its energetic, resolute, unequivocal and united action, the United Nations has saved the faith of mankind in the principles of peace, and has taught the aggressors an eloquent lesson.

8. The blood now being shed by the American soldiers is redeeming the ideal of the United Nations—the ideal of peaceful possession and enjoyment of security. For the first time in history the community of nations has taken the decisive step of waging a victorious war on war. Never has such a tribute been rendered to peace, for never before has the conscience of mankind been so united in the face of brutal aggression. Let this object-lesson serve as a formal warning to aggressors everywhere, whether they be violators of the national rights of others or merely ideological aggressors; for any moral aggressor is potentially a military aggressor.

9. The Dominican Republic takes this opportunity to reaffirm its intention to offer its full co-operation and, as far as its resources permit, to assume its full share of the sacrifices necessary for the complete triumph of this just United Nations undertaking. This is not the first time—let us hope it may be the last—that my country, though not one of the greatest or most powerful, has calmly and bravely faced an unequal fight for the right, resolute and conscientious in the performance of its duty.

10. Before leaving this rostrum I should like to refer to a different matter connected with the United Nations. The question of the relations between Member States of the United Nations and Spain was placed on the agenda of the fifth session of the General Assembly at the initiative of the Dominican Republic [A/1310].

11. Apart from the reasons imposed by the logic of history and the irresistible force of tradition; apart from the historic heritage which has implanted in the soul of peoples a strong feeling of filial respect mingled with manly and honourable gratitude; apart from the fact that the Dominican Republic, as the first-born, wished by its action to express a desire rooted deep down in the national instinct of some twenty sister countries; apart from all this, the Dominican Republic was guided by two more immediate and realistic considerations, more timely and practical, when it asked the General Assembly first to consider and later to approve the resumption of normal and traditional relations between Member States of the United Nations and Spain.

12. These two considerations are, first, the sincere desire to point out—so that it may be taken into consideration—that there has been a change in world public opinion in favour of such relations since resolution 39 (I) was adopted on 12 December 1946; and, secondly, the fervent wish to contribute to this world Organization a new and constructive element of unity and agreement, an element which is the more necessary and desirable at a time when gales, blowing from a quarter we all know, are threatening to strip the petals off this white rose of peace which is called the United Nations Charter.

13. The Dominican Republic trusts that it is not alone in hoping for the adoption of this constructive and just proposal which, just and constructive as it is, it has submitted as a tribute to United Nations unity.

14. Mr. KARDELJ (Yugoslavia) (*translated from Russian*): An atmosphere of grave international tension, fraught with the dangers of war, dominates today both the work of the United Nations and the relations among nations in general. It is no overstatement to say that present world conditions submit the United Nations to one of its most difficult tests, the outcome of which will largely determine its future strength and role. It is high time that this Organization, which hundreds and

hundreds of millions of men and women rightly expect to find a solution of the deadlock in which the cause of peace at present finds itself, should show that it is capable of uniting the will of all its Members on one question, namely, that the peace of the world must be preserved. We firmly believe that in the present circumstances, too, the United Nations can achieve success in this respect and the events connected with the Korean war clearly show that this success must be achieved as soon as possible if we really want to stop the fatal race into a new world war.

15. It is obvious to all that under the present conditions mankind can overcome the danger of war only through the United Nations. To allow the disruption or weakening of the United Nations as a universal organization of nations for collective security would be tantamount to giving a green light to war. It is, therefore, our primary duty to preserve at all cost the universality of the United Nations and constantly strengthen the part it must play in all questions related to war and peace, in accordance with the spirit of the Charter.

16. However much we may feel dissatisfied with our achievements, or rather lack of achievements in connexion with the work of the United Nations, we need only consider the difficult situation in which mankind would find itself if there were no such Organization to realize its importance for world peace.

17. Nevertheless, the efforts to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument of peace and development of peaceful co-operation among nations on a basis of equality are meeting with four very harmful tendencies which, in any case, undermine the confidence of peoples in the future of the United Nations and are making it difficult for us to find the way to a lasting peace.

18. In the first place, I wish to stress the tendency to reduce the role of the United Nations to that of a mere propaganda rostrum. Discussions are very often conducted here not with any idea of achieving real success or of ensuring agreement among nations, but from a propaganda point of view and very often for the purpose of concealing the truth, of giving facts other names and justifying undemocratic and even aggressive practices. If we allow this tendency to prevail, the United Nations will become ineffective and incapable of taking competent action in questions of war and peace.

19. The second harmful tendency is that which aims at transforming the United Nations into a kind of super-state, that is to say, transforming it into a force which would interfere more and more in the internal affairs of individual States and jeopardize their independence. We must look at these things realistically, and if we do so, we cannot fail to see the possibility of the United Nations being transformed into the instrument for controlling other countries by a group of great nations. It is clear that such a tendency could only serve to deprive the United Nations of its universal character.

20. There is no doubt that we must unceasingly bend our efforts towards strengthening the system of international security so that aggression will be doomed in advance. In this respect, the Yugoslav delegation is, of course, ready to support all measures which are really designed to strengthen such a system of international security.

21. However, the United Nations can serve the cause of peace only if it assumes the character of a sort of

round-table conference of equal nations, resolved to safeguard peace and to create the necessary effective means but equally determined to prevent any misuse of these means for the purpose of interference in the internal affairs of States.

22. Thirdly, I would wish to emphasize that the independent initiative for peace by small and medium-sized States does not carry enough weight in the United Nations. It goes without saying that the influence and responsibility of great Powers in matters affecting world peace are of the greatest significance; however, the very fact that the fundamental contradictions in the present world are caused above all by a struggle to dominate smaller and weaker countries, clearly shows that the strengthening of the independent role and independent initiative of small and medium-sized Powers in the United Nations would make a considerable contribution to the effective work of the Organization.

23. This does not, of course, mean that the Yugoslav delegation is advocating a bloc of small Powers in opposition to the great Powers. On the contrary, the Yugoslav delegation favours a system of international security and therefore advocates a joint effort of large and small countries in the struggle to strengthen peace. But the Yugoslav delegation cannot regard as satisfactory the present situation when a very large number of small countries blindly follow the lead of this or that great Power. It is clear that this fact greatly hinders the United Nations from intervening effectively in many controversies and conflicts in the present day world.

24. Finally, I wish to refer again to the very regrettable fact, of which we are all well aware, that the United Nations pays far too little attention to questions of international economic co-operation and especially to those economic questions which are undoubtedly one of the sources of conflict among nations. It is, for instance, a fact that both the western group and the Soviet group, while developing their own international economic systems, avoid, to a greater or lesser degree, taking any measures to strengthen the role of the United Nations in questions of international economic co-operation.

25. However, in viewing the work of the United Nations critically, we must not forget that the conditions in the United Nations are but the reflection of the actual state of affairs among nations. The role and tasks of the United Nations could also therefore be defined in different terms. It could be said, in other words, that the achievements of the United Nations cannot be increased or its work improved if we do not endeavor to change international political practices outside the United Nations, if we do not oppose the struggle for hegemony in the world, a struggle which has engulfed mankind and is bringing it to the threshold of a new world war.

26. The peoples of Yugoslavia cannot accept the assumption that mankind must today choose between the domination of one great Power or another. We consider that there is another path, the difficult but necessary path of democratic struggle for a world of free and equal nations, for democratic relations among nations, against foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the peoples and for the all-around peaceful co-operation of nations on a basis of equality. We may speak of establishing a lasting peace only if we respect these principles.

27. For these reasons, the Yugoslav delegation attaches special importance to the draft declaration on rights and duties of States¹ which is based on these principles. We know that relations among States are not settled by mere declarations and that peace cannot be safeguarded by solemn statements and legal formulas alone. But we nonetheless consider that some such declaration would represent a powerful moral and political factor, more particularly in the struggle for the preservation of the independence and security of small and medium-sized States, and thereby in the struggle for the cause of peace. In the final analysis, the struggle for the strengthening of peace in the world is at present a struggle for democratic relations among nations and cannot be considered as anything else.

28. It would in any case be unfortunate were a tendency to prevail here to solve the question of peace merely in piecemeal fashion, in a fragmentary manner, by dealing with the various questions under dispute separately instead of approaching the question of peace as a whole, which is the problem of constantly strengthening the basic principles on which peace itself rests and, in the final analysis, the constant strengthening of the whole system of international security. The Yugoslav delegation does not wish to rule out the first method. On the contrary, it considers it to be essential, but that method can lead to success only if it is based on the efforts to accomplish the second task. The adoption of the declaration of the rights and duties of States would undoubtedly contribute towards the solution of our second task.

29. We have on the agenda of the United Nations such important problems as the reduction of armaments and the prohibition and control of atomic weapons, the solution of which would restore the faith of mankind in the possibility of establishing a more lasting peace. But we can count on solving these questions successfully under present conditions and with the present balance of world power only if we make the nations regain their confidence in the possibility of ensuring a lasting peace. Failing such confidence, these questions are today not only insoluble, but may easily become a general instrument of propagandist rivalry.

30. In this connexion, I would again like to emphasize the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations. Both the principles on which the Charter of the United Nations is based and political expediency require that China should be represented in the United Nations by its real government, that is, by the only government which can effectively assume on behalf of the Chinese people obligations and responsibilities in the United Nations. The delay in solving this question is, moreover, a very serious obstacle in finding a way out of present world tension.

31. And yet this question is not being solved here — not because it is in itself so difficult to solve, but because it is an integral part of an entire complex of problems on international relations which is as yet unsolved.

32. The Yugoslav delegation therefore insists not only on the solution of individual questions under dispute, but also on the continuous and general strengthening of the basic principles underlying the whole system of

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Resolutions*, resolution 375 (IV).

international security and of the practices governing contemporary international relations as a whole.

33. The Korean war is an object-lesson to all mankind. There is no doubt that the events in Korea are the direct result of the political division of the country and of interference in its internal affairs.

34. That is why the Yugoslav Government has adopted a special attitude in the Security Council with regard to the Korean war, as it considers that this is partly a civil war caused by the unusual position in which Korea found itself after the Second World War.

35. The peoples of Yugoslavia view with sympathy the Korean people's desire for independence and unity and its right to settle its domestic affairs without outside interference. It is also clear that a strong national movement towards democracy and liberation exists in Korea which aims at independence and the unification of the country and at the eradication of reactionary institutions inherited from the past when the Korean people were the slaves and servants of foreigners. The so-called Korean question, therefore, cannot be solved until the Korean people achieve independence and unity under a government democratically elected by the people themselves.

36. The Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, however, considers that the present policy of the Government of North Korea does not serve the cause of the true independence and unity of the Korean people. Whether we consider the war in Korea a civil war or not, that war is in the present circumstances bound to endanger world peace, bound to deal a blow at all peace efforts and to set in motion all the forces of war in the world. Recent events confirm this. Those who are inspiring the policy and activities of the North Korean Government have embarked upon an aggressive course, the consequences of which will have to be borne by the people of the whole world, while it is the Korean people who will, of course, shoulder the heaviest burden. This invariably happens when political movements and governments cease to be the organs of their own people and become instruments in foreign hands.

37. The Yugoslav delegation considers a speedy and peaceful solution of the Korean conflict to be in the interest both of the people of Korea and of world peace. Consequently, in the opinion of my delegation, the United Nations should strive to find a solution which would bring about a cessation of hostilities and the temporary re-establishment—pending the achievement of Korean unity—of the former demarcation line along the 38th parallel, which would render all acts of terrorism and vengeance in connexion with the consequences of the present war impossible and would enable the Korean people to hold democratic elections and elect a single national assembly and government.

38. Of course, in our opinion, there is today no alternative to such a solution—unless we decide to leave everything to the force of arms. Such a decision would be unsatisfactory in every respect and detrimental both to the interests of the Korean people itself and to the cause of world peace, because it would be fraught with the danger of a further spread of war.

39. I should like to stress that what we are disturbed by today is not only the tension which prevails in inter-

national relations, but also the fact that a number of methods for reaching international agreement are no longer resorted to, such as, for instance, direct negotiations between countries which are parties to a dispute, friendly mediation and so forth. There is also the added fact that we have so far been unable to find here in the General Assembly, through joint action and unanimous agreement, the means of establishing a United Nations body designed especially to promote international co-operation and mediation among nations, and to help parties to a dispute—with their consent—to solve specific disputes, so as to strengthen the part played by the small Powers in these endeavours and increase their active participation.

40. Desiring as it does to contribute in this connexion towards the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument of peace, the Yugoslav delegation is submitting a concrete proposal to the General Assembly.²

41. This proposal envisages the establishment of a permanent international commission of good offices, composed of the six non-permanent members of the Security Council and of six members especially elected by the Assembly from among United Nations Members—other than the permanent members of the Security Council. This commission would be required to encourage initiative in the peaceful and harmonious solution of international disputes and controversial questions. The basic method of work of this commission would be to examine without undue publicity (in order to avoid becoming another propaganda rostrum) all existing international disputes, not from the angle of their substance, but from the point of view of the possibility and desirability of direct negotiations and mediation between the parties to the dispute or between the largest number of States involved, in order to induce the parties to the dispute to open negotiations and try to find a satisfactory solution to the dispute. In other words, the commission which we propose should be established, would act as a catalyst, by promoting the method of direct talks and negotiations on questions which otherwise would furnish us with material for rhetorical battles for many years to come.

42. We have to strive, in the first place, of course, to preserve world peace and world security. This should on no account be taken to mean that we should confine our efforts to the political side of a question. Our concern with economic and social problems, which the Charter lays down as an important task of the United Nations, is now more important than ever for the preservation of peace. The Yugoslav delegation admits that important spade-work has already been done in this field and it would be highly regrettable if this work failed to bear fruit. However, the success achieved by our Organization in the economic and social sphere is extremely modest, especially when these activities are compared with the results obtained by international economic programmes undertaken outside the United Nations.

43. I wish, in this connexion, to draw attention to two problems which are, perhaps, not of the same importance but which are both equally typical. The first is the problem of international public financing, and the

² This proposal was subsequently distributed as document A/1401.

second, the problem of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

44. It is a generally recognized fact, for example, that technical assistance is insufficient and that it cannot by itself solve the problem of the economic development of under-developed countries. Yet, this question is still being approached along the old lines. International financing is considered as a somewhat more civilized form of the old investment system in which the determining factor was, of course, solely the economic interest of those who provided the means, and not the interest of those whose productive forces these means were supposed to promote. Not until such an approach to the economic and social activities of the United Nations is modified, not until the assistance given for the comprehensive development of productive forces in the under-developed countries becomes a genuine and guiding principle of United Nations activities in the economic and social sphere, will any progress be made in the problem of international financing.

45. This situation also accounts for the fact that today any small country pursuing an independent foreign policy cannot usually obtain, despite the existence of the United Nations, adequate economic support in the face of the economic pressure or economic aggression to which it is exposed. It is obvious that only the forces of aggression can benefit from such a situation.

46. The United Nations is therefore faced in this connexion with the following question: should a nation subjected to economic aggression or fighting for its economic independence or striving to overcome its economic and cultural backwardness obtain the economic support of the United Nations?

47. In our opinion, there is no question but that such support must be given, if only because such questions are so closely linked to the general question of the maintenance of peace. For this reason, the Yugoslav delegation attaches considerable importance to the question of the international financing of economic projects in the under-developed countries and considers that speedy practical steps should be taken without delay for the solution of this problem.

48. For the same reasons, the Yugoslav delegation is opposed to any attempt to wind up UNICEF or to make any fundamental change in its character, because this is an organization which has greatly helped the war-devastated and under-developed countries and which, by its structure and underlying conceptions, represents an important achievement of the United Nations in the field of international solidarity. Nor does the fact that these attempts to wind up or change UNICEF are supported by the country which has hitherto made the greatest contribution to the success of UNICEF render them any the less deplorable.

49. The head of the Chilean delegation quite rightly pointed out at the 281st meeting that mankind is spending scores of billions of dollars on armaments, war and destruction, while it is unable to create a fund of a few billions to cover the most essential financial needs of under-developed countries.

50. May I dwell briefly on one of Yugoslavia's most important international political problems. At the 279th meeting, Mr. Vyshinsky, said:

"The foreign policy of the USSR has always been to strengthen friendly relations and co-operation with all peoples pursuing the same ends . . ."

51. Those were Mr. Vyshinsky's words. However, the attitude of the Government of the Soviet Union towards Yugoslavia shows clearly that these words do not, for the time being, correspond to actual facts, that they are not, for the time being, sincere and that they are, for the time being, nothing but words. The USSR Government, and the governments under its influence, are in fact pursuing against the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, whose Government has always expressed its readiness to co-operate peacefully with all countries, including the Soviet Union, an aggressive policy of which the whole world is aware and which nothing can conceal. This policy is at present developing in accordance with the words of the former Bulgarian Foreign Minister Poptomov who, in his capacity as official representative of the Bulgarian Government, wrote on 8 January 1950, in the newspaper *Rabotnichesko Delo*, that the struggle against Yugoslavia "must be stepped up and waged with ever-increasing energy".

52. And, indeed, in accordance with this aggressive policy against the peoples of Yugoslavia, which is to be "stepped up and waged with ever-increasing energy", widespread political and propaganda activities have been organized. These activities are unprecedented in the concentration of means used to attain the maximum pressure.

53. Almost every day incidents are being organized and carried out along our frontiers. Groups of spies and saboteurs are being sent into our country. Our diplomatic representatives in the Eastern European countries are being expelled or their stay and the performance of their diplomatic duties are being rendered impossible by constant insults. Yugoslav national minorities in Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria are being dispersed. The old hatred among the Balkan peoples and the war psychosis in the Balkans are being artificially revived and fanned. The economic blockade of Yugoslavia is being carried to such lengths that Romania, for instance, has, in violation of all international obligations, severed all rail and postal traffic with Yugoslavia.

54. The military preparations and measures which are being organized along our borders are also part of the cold war against Yugoslavia. Trenches are being dug along the borders, fortifications constructed; troop movements are taking place; war material is being sent into the frontier zones; various measures of mobilization are being carried out and propaganda is being conducted to create a war psychosis and enmity between the peoples of Yugoslavia and their neighbours.

55. In order to illustrate this, may I quote a few statistics showing the scope of these anti-Yugoslav activities.

56. The East European Governments have broken forty-seven treaties concluded with Yugoslavia. By July 1950, 138 Yugoslav diplomats and other officials had been expelled or removed from their posts in these countries. In the course of two years, 896 frontier incidents have taken place on Yugoslavia's borders with Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania. More than twenty centres have been established in the countries of Eastern Europe to carry out subversive activities against

Yugoslavia; their sole activity consists in organizing and sending groups of saboteurs to that country.

57. The following figures will best illustrate the propaganda efforts made against Yugoslavia: During the first six months of 1950 the East European broadcasting stations beamed 6,732 anti-Yugoslav broadcasts in the languages of the peoples of Yugoslavia. If we calculate the duration of these broadcasts we reach the figure of 3,075 hours, that is, four months, eight days and three hours of unceasing anti-Yugoslav propaganda of the most aggressive and warmongering type. And all that in the course of six months!

58. All these subversive activities against our country are organized on a wholly official basis in the countries of Eastern Europe. As Yugoslavia is a small country and does not belong to any bloc of countries, the promoters of this anti-Yugoslav activity obviously consider that they need pay but scant attention to the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of another country. However, they overlook the fact that precisely for this reason, the aggressive character of the anti-Yugoslav campaign is all the more conspicuous.

59. Can such a policy be termed peaceful? Is it the expression of that concern for peace of which the representative of the USSR Government has spoken here? Does it correspond to the characteristics that Mr. Vyshinsky, in his speech in this Assembly, has attributed to the policy of the Soviet Union Government?

60. The answer to these questions is provided by the facts. And the facts are, as Mr. Vyshinsky is often wont to repeat, obstinate and cannot be altered by words.

61. When Mr. Vyshinsky therefore demands that warmongering propaganda be prohibited in all countries—a request with which we are in complete agreement—he ought, in the first place, to ensure such prohibition in his own country.

62. The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia is a socialist country. At the head of the Republic stand the political forces which have emerged from the war of national liberation and the socialist revolution. In view of this, the aggressive policy against socialist Yugoslavia is even more characteristic. The extraordinary bitterness and fury with which this anti-Yugoslav campaign is being waged shows that we are faced here both with a tendency to impose foreign hegemony upon an independent country and an attempt at reactionary intervention designed to silence a free people which demand equal and democratic relations among nations and especially among countries which claim to be socialist; to silence a free people who are blazing the trail for the further development of social democracy and are rejecting attempts to have methods of bureaucratic despotism imposed upon them from abroad.

63. Needless to say, the aggressive policy of the Soviet Union and other East European governments with regard to Yugoslavia is one of the chief factors determining the international political position of the Yugoslav Government and its attitude to the fundamental questions of world peace. This is why I have dwelt at somewhat greater length on the concrete aspects of this policy.

64. It is, however, evident that this policy towards Yugoslavia and the methods employed, can in no way be considered as something apart from the general trend

of the present-day foreign policy of the Soviet Union. There can be no doubt that the aggressive anti-Yugoslav campaign is not an isolated phenomenon, but only a particular manifestation of the general trend of this policy.

65. In advancing this criticism, I wish to emphasize that we by no means consider that the Soviet Union Government bears sole responsibility for the present world situation. We are, for instance, convinced that every attempt to exploit the present international situation for a crusade against communism is tantamount to a direct undermining of peace and co-operation among nations. Numerous remarks have been made on this subject, particularly in recent weeks, and they clearly show that their authors are either unwilling or unable to understand that the struggle for peace cannot be identified with the struggle for the preservation of some social system or other, and that peace cannot be preserved by means of a crusade against socialism or against the strivings of peoples towards freedom and independence. On the contrary, peace can be preserved only by combating domination and aggression wherever they appear, regardless of the political and ideological slogans behind which they conceal themselves. Therefore, one of the chief conditions of peace is undoubtedly the possibility of maintaining international co-operation among States of different social types; co-operation within the framework of an international security system constituting an obstacle to aggression as such, no matter by whom it is committed; a system which, at the same time, could not be transformed into an instrument for fighting one or another social system.

66. On the other hand, however, the trend and methods of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union since the Second World War have been such that the USSR Government cannot disclaim its share of the responsibility for the present international situation.

67. Such a policy has shaken the belief of the peoples that the USSR Government is really guided by peaceful intentions. Its leanings towards hegemony, its obvious tendency of forcibly imposing its will on other peoples who are developing along socialist lines, its contemptuous attitude towards the desires and sentiments of smaller nations, have alarmed the peoples. By its persistent tendency to bring every progressive movement under its absolute sway, the policy of the Soviet Union is undermining the forces of democracy in the world, and is constantly providing the real warmongering circles in the West with arguments against those who stand for peace. Recent events have proved this beyond any doubt. Is it not a fact that the Korean war has supplied the proponents of war in the Western countries with support and arguments wherewith they are today attacking peace-loving people, and even those ruling circles in various countries who are on the side of peace?

68. Is it not a fact that the temporary boycott by the Soviet Union of the United Nations has strengthened and encouraged all the enemies of the universal character of this Organization and of peaceful international co-operation among States with different social systems?

69. We must also adopt a critical attitude towards the point of view of the Soviet Union on the role of the great Powers and the mode of co-operation among them. We consider that such an attitude fails to take into

account the necessity of co-operation among nations on a basis of equality, and that it overlooks the necessity of consistent respect for democratic principles in the relations between large and small States. Peace does not depend on the great Powers coming to an agreement by any means whatsoever. Such a peace might mean war against the small nations. The example of the Soviet Union policy towards Yugoslavia has given us a practical idea of what a world based on the legalized hegemony of the strong over the weak would look like.

70. In actual fact, the fate of the world depends primarily on the extent to which we are able to prevent, or at least restrain, the tendency towards domination over weaker nations. If this is not borne in mind, then every agreement among the great Powers will necessarily be little more than an agreement on spheres of interest. Peace on such a basis is not peace. It is understandable that such tendencies are bound to provoke the distrust of the peoples.

71. It can be said without exaggeration that this policy on the part of the Soviet Union has not only contributed to the creation of the present international situation, but has also disappointed and alienated the great sympathies and hopes that the peoples had entertained with respect to the Soviet Union in the immediate aftermath of the war. It is becoming increasingly clear that one cannot constantly say one thing and do another. Peace-loving people throughout the world today demand, first and foremost, that the USSR Government bring its actions into harmony with its words.

72. Particular attention should be paid to the fact that the slogan under which this whole aggressive anti-Yugoslav campaign is being waged is the accusation that it is the Yugoslav Government which is preparing aggression against certain neighbouring countries, and which has allegedly allowed the Western Powers to make Yugoslavia their military base against the East European countries.

73. There is no need for the Yugoslav Government to refute such accusations. The aggressive campaign waged against Yugoslavia by the East European countries in the course of the last two years points with sufficient clarity to the real source of aggressive intention.

74. I should, nevertheless, like to say a few words concerning the policy of the Yugoslav Government.

75. Responsible Yugoslav representatives have stated time and again, and I am stating it once more on behalf of the Government I represent, that Yugoslavia belongs to no bloc, that it has concluded no public or secret military alliances with any country, that no foreign power possesses, either directly or indirectly, military bases on Yugoslav territory, and that no foreign power participates in any form in determining Yugoslav defence policy. Further, neither the peoples of Yugoslavia nor their Government nurture any aggressive intentions with regard to any neighbouring country, or in any way menace or wish to menace the peace and independence of any such country.

76. I am further authorized to state here on behalf of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia the following: the peoples of Yugoslavia have in the past defended and will in the future defend the independence and integrity of their country against all aggression and

against all attempts to threaten their right to be masters in their own house. The peoples of Yugoslavia, however, will not take part in any aggressive war and wish to live in lasting peace and peaceful co-operation with all nations, and especially with their neighbours. In accordance with this consistent peace-loving attitude, the Government of Yugoslavia declares that it is ready to conclude an agreement of lasting peace and non-aggression with each neighbouring country.

77. However, independently of the facts I have mentioned, it is necessary to emphasize that there is real danger today of aggression being launched, in certain circumstances, under the guise of defence from aggression.

78. Millions and millions of men and women in the world want peace. They will execrate any aggressor bringing war upon mankind. For this reason the aggressor hides himself and will always do so.

79. We, of course, bear in mind and welcome the progress achieved in the elaboration of international rules outlawing aggressive war. We have all accepted the principle that war must not be an instrument of national policy. We have all agreed that war can be considered justified only when it is waged for the defence of the national independence and territorial integrity of a State which has been the victim of an act of aggression.

80. However, today it is extremely important that the peoples should most resolutely oppose attempts made by covert aggressors to misuse the concept of lawful self-defence for the purpose of unleashing new wars. This applies particularly to the necessity of preventing the aggressor from developing a local conflict into a real war by invoking the principle of self-defence.

81. This has prompted the Yugoslav delegation to submit to the present session of the General Assembly a draft resolution³ the object of which is to prevent, or at least render difficult, such disguised aggression.

82. The basic idea of our draft resolution is that every state which, in whatsoever circumstances, is found to be engaged in military operations against another state shall be obliged to declare publicly within twenty-four hours its readiness to cease fire and its readiness to withdraw its armed forces from foreign territory and to carry out this undertaking, provided the opposing side makes a similar undertaking. A state failing to act in this manner will place itself in the position of an aggressor and will render itself responsible for the breach of peace.

83. The Yugoslav delegation believes that the adoption of this rule by the General Assembly would greatly lessen the possibility of disguised aggression. If this rule were adopted, any government conducting military operations under the guise of false self-defence would unquestionably be branded as an aggressor before the whole world and before its own people.

84. Finally, I wish to emphasize that the Government of Yugoslavia will for its part—whether the General Assembly accepts this proposal or not—adhere to the principles laid down therein.

³ This draft resolution was subsequently distributed as document A/1399.

85. All of us, and especially those of us who bear the primary responsibility for world peace, are in duty bound to draw the necessary conclusions from the experiences of post-war international developments and effect the necessary improvements in all spheres of international relations. We shall either all learn from past experiences and put an end to cold war methods, or we shall be compelled to admit the failure of all our efforts to find a way to peaceful agreement among nations; a failure which will sooner or later hurl mankind into the catastrophe of a new war. Mankind, which is yearning for a lasting peace, expects us to achieve practical results in this respect. Let us make every effort to be able to present mankind with such results so that we may, first of all, restore confidence to all peace-loving peoples in the possibility of achieving a lasting democratic peace.

86. Mr. TSIANG (China): The Secretary-General's annual report⁴ shows us the wide range of activities in which the United Nations has been engaged during the past year. In many fields notable achievements have been recorded, and in others good foundations have been laid. This positive and constructive work constitutes the bright side of an otherwise distressing picture of the world, and we must acknowledge our debt to the councils, commissions and committees and to the host of experts and international civil servants of the Secretariat for their devotion and contribution.

87. In ordinary times the peoples of the world would watch the progress of the work of the United Nations along the various lines with almost equal interest, but we are not living in ordinary times. The attention of the world is concentrated on one question, whether there will be war or peace. Indeed, although the United Nations Charter provides a number of organs performing within its own field a particular line of duty, the primary purpose of the United Nations is the prevention of war, that means the prevention of aggression and the prevention of breaches of the peace.

88. The United Nations has met its first great test in Korea—and met it magnificently—with the Security Council resolutions of 25 and 27 June 1950.⁵ The decisions of those two days have received the support of fifty-three Member States. In the judgment of my delegation, what the Security Council has done in the Korean crisis represents the greatest achievement of the United Nations since its foundation five years ago.

89. In the debates of the Security Council on 25 and 27 June 1950,⁶ when the Council went as far as to apply sanctions against the aggressor, the most notable feature was the fact that no delegation thought the Korean crisis was a mere civil war, although in appearance it might be called a civil war. Every delegation discarded the appearance and seized on the reality, which is the aggression of international communism, led and nourished by the Soviet Union.

90. It was only in August that one delegation tried to foist upon world public opinion the idea of civil war

in Korea. On 3 August 1950 the representative of the Soviet Union told the Security Council,⁷ and I quote from the verbatim record:

"It is clear to anyone with a grain of impartiality that a civil war is in progress in Korea between the North and South Koreans. The military operations between the North and South Koreans are of an internal character; they bear the character of a civil war. There is therefore no justification for regarding these military operations as aggression."

91. In advancing this theory, the representative of the Soviet Union was, of course, trying to lay down a basis for rejecting the deliberate judgment of the Security Council that Moscow's North Korean puppet had committed aggression. In that matter, Mr. Malik was faithfully carrying out the Communist Party line laid down for him. On 6 August the official Soviet daily *Izvestia* elaborated on this theory of civil war in the following words:

"Among the fundamental principles of international law, which regulate foreign policy relations between states, a principle that has gained universal acceptance in the inadmissibility of foreign intervention in the internal affairs of states. Contemporary international law views such intervention, in the form of an attack by one state on another, as a heinous international crime. . . . There has never been a question of regarding a struggle within one state, a civil war, an internal conflict, as aggression. Conversely, intervention by foreign states in internal conflicts, in civil wars in any country whatsoever, has invariably been designated as a typical manifestation of aggression."

92. *Izvestia* tried to brand the United Nations in general, and the United States in particular, as the aggressors in Korea. The Kremlin town crier even went so far as to refer to the American Civil War as a case in confirmation of the communist thesis. It so happened that in the Civil War in the United States the parties engaged were the North and South. The coincidence of names has been exploited by Soviet propaganda.

93. Mr. Malik and his masters are suddenly professing loyalty to doctrines of international law which once held true and which should still hold true. But we are not living in the sixties of the last century. This is the middle of the twentieth century—more than three decades after the degeneration and the destruction of the great democratic revolution in Russia.

94. The emergence of totalitarian Russia, fascist Italy and nazi Germany, whose partnership with Moscow was the signal for the Second World War, has created an international situation entirely different from the one which prevailed in the nineteenth century. Then, international law meant something. Now, two new decisive factors and developments have appeared to divide history into different epochs. The international situation today is totally different from the international situation in the nineteenth century.

95. In the first place, there exists today a world-wide organization which is devoted solely to the promotion and preparation, the fostering, fomenting and financing

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/1287)*.

⁵ See documents S/1501 and S/1511. The text of S/1511 is the same as that of S/1508/Rev.1 which appears in *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 16*.

⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, Nos. 15 and 16*.

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 24*.

of civil wars in all countries which are not ruled by a communist dictatorship subservient to the supreme dictator in the Kremlin. I refer to the Cominform, which is only an auxiliary of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

96. The second great factor which characterizes the international situation today, as distinct from the international situation in the nineteenth century, is the existence of a big Power which inspires, instigates, incites, organizes and orders civil wars in all countries which are not, or refuse to be, satellites of this big Power. I refer to communist Russia, the Government of which is the head and heart of a vast conspiracy to develop and direct civil wars in all lands not controlled by the Kremlin, with the purpose of turning those lands, through such civil wars, into dependencies of totalitarian Russia.

97. What the propagandists of Moscow call the Korean civil war is, of course, a part of this plan of world domination by Soviet Russia. The aggression of North Korea was organized, financed, directed and ordered by the Soviet Union Government. The so-called Korean civil war is not Korean at all; it is only a part of the Soviet campaign for world domination. This fundamental fact was well understood by all representatives in the Security Council in the last week of June and in the month of July. It was only on 3 August 1950 that the Soviet Union representative tried to becloud the issue. In spite of Soviet efforts, the essential nature of the Korean crisis remains clear to all the peoples of the world. Today, in the light of the two new factors which I have just mentioned, there are no more civil wars. Russian and communist preparation and intervention in the internal affairs in all free and democratic countries make of every civil war, in which the communists constitute one of the two fighting parties, an aggression threatening the peace and security of the world. In the hands of the rulers of the Kremlin and its world-wide quisling agencies, the Cominform and the World Federation of Trade Unions, the civil wars of today—in Korea, China, Burma, Indo-China, the Philippines—are only phases of Russian imperialism aiming at communist world subversion and Soviet world domination.

98. The Security Council has treated the Korean crisis as a case of aggression. I have no doubt that the General Assembly will do likewise.

99. The world has unfortunately experienced aggressions and breaches of the peace throughout its history. Roughly, we can divide aggressions into two types; one type is the brutal and open marching of the armies of one country into the territory of another. This is direct aggression. The most recent practitioner of this type of aggression was Hitler. We therefore can very well call this type of aggression Hitlerite aggression. I do not need to discuss this type at all, for it is a frankly brutal armed attack on one country by another.

100. We have reached a point in the world's history when the Hitlerite type of aggression is made more difficult by world public opinion and, at the same time, made less necessary by certain new devices of political and military infiltration. With a Communist Party implanted in almost every country, eager to overthrow the legally constituted government by violence and sure to receive the material aid of communist

parties of other countries, particularly of the Soviet Union, the technique of indirect aggression has been perfected. We have seen that technique used in Greece, China and now in Korea. Every civil war in which the communists participate as one of the antagonists, no matter in what country such civil war occurs, is aggression. This type of aggression should be named after its own master as I have named the other type after its master. This is Stalinist aggression. I warn the United Nations that it must adjust its mind and its machinery as quickly as possible to meet Stalinist aggression. For this reason, my delegation supports the programme of the United States delegation for united action for peace [A/1377].

101. The objectives of Stalinist aggression are clear to all. Ultimately, the objective is world domination. Stalinist aggression spares no country, whatever its political and social organization may be. It has already victimized countries of different political and social regimes.

102. The immediate objective of Stalinist aggression is the consolidation of its Eurasian power base. It has done well. Northern China, including Manchuria, Mongolia and Sinkiang, is virtually Soviet territory. Other parts of the Chinese mainland are partly controlled by Moscow's obedient puppets. Korea, were it not for the prompt and effective aid given by the United Nations, would have fallen under Soviet control.

103. The basic fact in the world today is this huge Eurasian Power. Countries of Western Europe and Southeastern Asia are all on the fringe of this huge bloc. Today, to speak of Europe and Asia as two different and separate continents, is totally unrealistic. There is no longer this division between Europe and Asia. Western Europe and Southeastern Asia face the same enemy. Any gain by the new imperial Power in one area will be utilized for conquest in the other area. I fear that unless this fundamental truth is recognized, and recognized clearly by all, we will fail to meet this menace.

104. Political and military strategists have in the past made the mistake of keeping in their minds this division of Europe and Asia. In connexion with it there is another false distinction, namely, that of the industrialized and non-industrialized nations. Some people still think that the industrialized nations have a high military potential and are therefore decisive in the world's struggle, whereas the non-industrialized nations have a low military potential and will therefore play a rather indifferent role in that struggle. This distinction disappears if we understand the meaning of the campaign in Korea correctly. Northern Korea is among the relatively under-developed areas of the world. Within the brief space of five years the Soviet Union, by giving to Northern Korea modern military machines and the technical knowledge that goes with these machines, managed to establish in Northern Korea a military power of considerable strength. What has been achieved in Northern Korea could be easily duplicated in other parts of Asia.

105. Under such circumstances, plans of defense based on any particular region of the world are bound to fail. Global aggression must be met with global defence.

106. In estimating the nature of Chinese communism, one section of world public opinion has passed from one

error to another. The earlier error was to the effect that the Chinese communists were simple agrarian reformers. That error was propagated for an obvious purpose. Unfortunately, it was accepted by certain circles and has naturally and inevitably done great damage to the cause of world peace and world freedom.

107. At present that error, without being repudiated, is replaced by another error, namely, that Chinese communism will become "Titoist". I doubt that the spread of totalitarianism would promote the freedom and happiness of mankind. I warn this General Assembly that in the case of China there is no possibility of Mao Tse-tung's becoming a second Tito. The Kremlin finds that one Tito is one too many. We can be sure that the Kremlin has taken and will continue to take effective measures to prevent the rise of another Tito. On the part of the Chinese communists, their outlook upon world affairs has always been identical to that of Moscow. In the twenty-nine years of the existence of the Chinese Communist Party there has not been a single occasion when the Chinese communists differed from their masters at Moscow on a question of world policy.

108. In domestic matters, Moscow is not demanding and has no reason to demand an identical time-table of sovietization. As to ultimate aims in the ordering of society, the puppet regime in Peiping has always been and is today in agreement with the Leninist-Stalinist ideology. To practise appeasement in the belief that Mao Tse-tung might be another Tito is as vain a hope as that indulged in by many people that Munich might be the final settlement with Hitler.

109. In the discussions in the United Nations, several speakers have mentioned the 450 million people of China, as if the speakers knew for certain what the 450 million Chinese really desired. I can assure the General Assembly that the Chinese people regard the setting up of the puppet regime in Peiping not as a revolution but as another instance of foreign conquest, that is, Russian conquest. That regime accepts the Russian ideology, serves Russian interests, and pledges itself to fight side by side with Russia. It is indeed amazing to find that several delegations in the General Assembly should consider that regime as able or willing to promote the aims of the United Nations and to act as representative of the Chinese people. In fact, that regime is neither able nor willing to promote the aims of the United Nations. In fact, that regime is totally un-Chinese. The Chinese people have not accepted and will never accept the communist regime. Given a moderate measure of moral and material aid, the 450 million Chinese will and can prove to the world that they remain a mighty contingent among the forces fighting for world freedom today.

110. Mr. G. P. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): I should like to express from this rostrum the sincere thanks of my delegation and my Government to those previous speakers who paid tribute to the memory of Field Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts. He was a great man and we South Africans are very sensible of the courtesy and kindness of Mr. de Freitas Valle, the head of the Brazilian delegation [279th meeting], and of Sir Carl Berendsen [280th meeting], the head of the delegation of New Zealand. Their remarks are greatly appreciated by my country.

111. It is doubtful whether in the history of the United Nations the representatives of its Members have met at a time more critical for the peace of the world. Despite every effort for peace, the nations of the world are now perilously close to war. The clouds which have gathered in the east are symptomatic of a greater conflict—a conflict which must be resolved if we are not to be engulfed in yet another holocaust.

112. This Organization, in which is represented a world still carrying the scars of yesterday's aggression, bears a terrifying responsibility—a responsibility which must be faced squarely, and faced squarely particularly by the great Powers who will have to proceed with the utmost caution if the conflict which now appears to loom ahead is not to be precipitated. However, the gravity of the situation is generally recognized and the need for sober and responsible action is fully appreciated. This is therefore a theme on which I need not expand. I will turn rather to the views of my Government on the crisis which has arisen in Korea.

113. The Government of the Union of South Africa deplores and condemns the clearly aggressive acts of the North Korean Government. Whatever arguments may be advanced to justify the invasion of South Korea, the fact remains that an act of international lawlessness has been committed, and committed too in a manner which shows careful premeditation and preparation. One of the purposes of the United Nations is to achieve a community of peace-loving nations determined to outlaw aggression. The invasion of South Korea therefore constitutes a deliberate defiance of the United Nations and is a negation of everything for which this Organization stands. My Government consequently welcomed the unequivocal resolution of the Security Council as well as the prompt action of the United States and other Governments, within the terms of that resolution, to check the aggressive plans of the invader.

114. I would like to say here that the rapidity with which the Security Council acted in the present crisis has been most heartening to my Government, as I know it must have been to many other Members. The manner in which certain Member States responded to the call for help was truly magnificent and the South African Government would wish me to associate the Union of South Africa with those States which have already paid tribute to the President of the United States of America for the courageous and steadfast manner in which he took the lead. To those who have sacrificed their lives to destroy aggression the South African Government pays most sincere and humble tribute. We must ensure that their sacrifice has not been vainly made.

115. In so far as the action taken by my country is concerned, it was difficult for the South African Government to see at the outset in what manner it could render assistance which would be both possible and effective. It soon became clear, however, that positive contributions would have to be made to the United Nations task force by all Member States who desired to align themselves with the opponents of unprovoked aggression, and my Government therefore announced its decision on 4 August to render military aid in the form of a completely equipped fighter squadron and ground staff.⁸ This was the only form of assistance which could

⁸ See document S/1669.

be made available at such short notice and we trust that it will prove to be effective. I may add that our fighter squadron with its ground staff is already on the way to Korea and should arrive there in the near future.

116. It is necessary that I explain at this stage that while the Union of South Africa found it necessary to give practical effect to the obligations it had accepted under the Charter, my Government has never regarded the Far East as falling within the sphere of its military responsibility in the preservation of world peace. The reasons for this will, of course, be apparent to all those who are conversant with military conditions in and the strategic importance of Africa. In this continent, which forms a gigantic link between the East and West, there are enormous resources, human and material, which are as yet virtually untapped. Tremendous efforts, for the most part unappreciated by those who do not know Africa, are being made to develop this vast land peopled by 150 million human beings—many of them as yet in a primitive state. Without the sustained and inspired efforts of those responsible for African administration, millions will remain so, their development arrested by disease and malnutrition—a fertile soil, therefore, for those who now sow ideological seeds with the object of creating world imperialism. We in Africa have a double duty, a duty to remove the scourge of human want and waste, and a duty to the democratic world in which we live. If Africa is not to be the scene of an ideological conflict in which the ultimate sufferers must be those who live in Africa, the administering Powers must spare no effort to promote the well-being of the inhabitants of the continent, to release them from the scourge of disease and malnutrition, and so bring home to these under-privileged the benefits of living in a free and democratic world; a world where all races can develop side by side and where all may advance towards the goal of freedom from want.

117. The Government of the Union of South Africa is very conscious of its responsibilities in this field of human endeavour. Believing that the greatest good can be achieved by technical collaboration between the administering Powers south of the Sahara, the South African Government has ensured that the services of its ablest technical experts are freely available at technological conferences and other forms of consultation called by those administering African territories. That the Union of South Africa is in the fortunate position of having made important advances in the application of science to African problems and that it is ready to assist other African Powers in the solution of these problems, was, I believe, amply demonstrated by the recent African Regional Scientific Conference convened by the Union of South Africa last year in Johannesburg. One of the fruits of this Conference has been the establishment of a Scientific Council for Africa under the chairmanship of a distinguished South African scientist.

118. Another development which my Government welcomed most warmly was the establishment in January 1950 of the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa south of the Sahara, a co-ordinating body on the metropolitan level. An immediate result of the formation of this Commission, of which the Union of South Africa is a member, has been the scheduling of a number of important scientific conferences on a variety of subjects of African interest. These include conferences to

be held in 1950, 1951 and 1952 to discuss such problems as African labour, African medical education, malaria control, African building and housing, African nutrition, African rural welfare, and the formation of African co-operative societies. In addition, there will be other discussions, for instance, on the co-ordination of the operation and development of transport in central and southern Africa. The great importance of these discussions to the future development of the African continent will, of course, be readily appreciated.

119. I believe that these steps to which I have referred constitute positive action towards the goal of improving the lot of those who at present eke out an existence in the under-developed areas of Africa. It is direct and vigorous action aimed at improving the conditions of life for many millions and it will enable the people of Africa finally to distinguish those who are concerned with their welfare and who seek to promote their best interests from those who seek to exploit them ideologically for primarily selfish ends.

120. In the course of the opening debate last year [226th plenary meeting] we had occasion to observe that we in Africa were the targets of much ill-informed criticism. We pointed out that the solution of African problems was an uphill task even for those who by their experience of actual conditions in Africa could claim to understand African psychology and the real magnitude of the problems involved. I would now urge that those who are so hasty in their criticisms of us in Africa, should clearly realize one thing, namely, that there is no ready panacea for Africa in its present state. The development of its backward peoples must follow an orderly and realistic pattern, and the process of social and economic advancement could be seriously jeopardized by the impact of destructive propaganda on the primitive mind. It is the policy of the South African Government to raise the standard of living of all the peoples of Africa; we are in fact striving to bring real and not illusory benefits. I venture to say that an unbiased glance at the records will reveal that our efforts have been attended with some measure of success, and I submit that an evaluation of the progress made in the development of Africa and its peoples would be both more objective and more helpful if greater credit were given to the path which has already been covered and less emphasis were placed on the road which still lies ahead. We, who bear the responsibility, are aware of the task which lies before us and are making great sacrifices towards its fulfilment.

121. In my opening remarks I referred to the critical state of world affairs. I also referred to the great responsibility which this Organization must face if the world is to be saved from another catastrophe. I think that it will be generally agreed that people in many parts of the world are gradually despairing of any hope that statesmen will ever achieve those international conditions which are essential to the future happiness and prosperity of mankind. Many doubt whether the nations of the world will ever be able to work together in close co-operation without resorting to international strife—whether international contact does not inevitably lead to conflict. These are the fears which this Organization must allay; these are the doubts which we must remove from the public mind.

122. This Organization has already, in many ways, justified its creation. Its record is a good one and it is the conviction of my Government that the blame for the world's present plight attaches not to defects inherent in the United Nations but rather to factors which are beyond its control. It is true of course that forces and conditions have emerged for which our founders made inadequate provision, forces which are rendering co-operation based on the Charter progressively more difficult. Yet, it is hard to see what more could have been done in 1945 to avoid this unhappy interplay of ideologies which now bedevils us. If we have erred in assuming sincerity and goodwill where none exist, then, at any rate, history will declare that we have erred on the right side.

123. Of course we have had our failures, but there have also been many successes. We cannot hope for the one without the other in a world which as yet appears to perceive but dimly the importance of sincere co-operation and the need for an understanding of each other's problems. All of us in the General Assembly have declared our belief in the fundamental principles of the Charter, and by the measure of our determination to uphold those principles we will either stand or fall. If we fall now, I do not think that an organization such as ours will rise again in our time.

124. It is essential, therefore, that we in this Organization should proceed with great caution and that we should maintain constant vigilance against forces and tendencies which threaten its future. It is my Government's desire that I draw attention to one or two such tendencies which are often overlooked when the major weakness of the United Nations—namely, the veto—is discussed and represented as a threat to the future of the Organization. The effects of the veto on the efficacy of the United Nations have been amply demonstrated by previous speakers. There can no longer be any possible doubt that the principle concerned is not a sound one and I feel sure that it will not continue indefinitely to be enshrined in our Charter.

125. I shall turn to other tendencies, less obvious perhaps, but in the long run equally dangerous.

126. Firstly, the Government of South Africa believes that there is a tendency to over-simplify the complex nature of the problem of international relations. These are, after all, human relations, and differences will not disappear merely by the intonation of pious hopes that those who disagree with us will see the light. A fundamental fact which should be recognized at all times is that the world, and this Organization, are not composed of identical peoples. There are differences in outlook and culture which are fundamental and which cannot be altered except, perhaps, by compulsion and conflict. It is not, therefore, always possible to evolve a single universal pattern to govern the many aspects of life—a pattern which can be applied in detail to all countries of the world. These fundamental differences must be recognized wherever we seek to reconcile our interests and whenever it is our desire to establish a common basis for international co-operation. It is the task—the onerous but essential task—of the United Nations to reconcile these different national and racial aspirations. It is not the function of the Organization to mould the peoples of the world according to a common pattern.

127. Let me add that it is one of the most significant facts of our day that the impact of world events on the family of nations is becoming more and more immediate, and that it is no longer possible to live in isolation. Aggressive nationalism and national ambition are no longer compatible with world peace and human progress. It is imperative, therefore, that this Organization should continue to exist and that in it and through it the world should achieve a system of international collaboration and co-operation which will save us from the evils of the past. This is only possible, however, if we approach our mutual problems in a spirit of goodwill and if we adopt an accommodating attitude with regard to each other's affairs and difficulties. There is no room today for a diplomacy which expresses a policy of national avarice with its concomitant suspicions and insincerity. It is no longer permissible to practise a diplomacy which postulates the growth and greatness of one nation at the expense of another.

128. Then there is a second tendency to which my Government desires me to draw attention. This tendency is a dangerous one in so far as it is threatening to create an atmosphere in the United Nations which will make it impossible for us ever to achieve a peaceful solution of any important dispute. I refer to the practice of resorting to hostile and acrimonious debate even on matters with regard to which there are legitimate and reasonable differences of opinion. It was indeed heartening to hear at the 277th meeting the preceding President of the Assembly, General Rómulo, asking speakers the other day to be more restrained in their statements. I hope that his request will have some effect on this unhealthy practice in order that we may achieve that fruitful co-operation which is so essential in this Organization, and in order that we may achieve solidarity, at least, amongst those of us who are genuinely striving for international peace and security. I am sure that other delegations will agree with mine that this unfortunate practice is slowly but surely engendering an atmosphere of confusion and hostility in which co-operation is becoming yearly more difficult and which must inevitably become a serious threat to the future of the United Nations.

129. May I illustrate my point by a brief reference to the more recent discussions in the Security Council? I submit that the attacks made in that body on the integrity of nations and on this Organization have had a most unfortunate effect on the public mind. The blasts of propaganda which emerged from those discussions can only, I fear, have served to confuse and alarm those who are seeking to give this Organization the status and prestige in international affairs which are essential if it is to play the part envisaged for it by its founders.

130. Having regard to the possible impact on public opinion of many of the propagandistic statements made in the Security Council in recent months I should like to conclude with one further observation on what is taking place today in Korea. The action of the United Nations in Korea has been persistently and vehemently misrepresented in the Security Council. It would be well, therefore, if those of us who support the United Nations in its operations in Korea made it plain once again that our actions rest entirely on our clear obligations under the Charter. We have undertaken collectively to preserve international peace, to oppose and de-

stroy aggression, and to outlaw international banditry. These are our obligations, obligations in respect of which we can accept no compromise, obligations which called for urgent and collective action.

131. Allow me also to add that we who practise the doctrine of democracy believe in our way of life. We do not seek to impose it upon others but we can never permit it to be destroyed by the aggressive acts of those who seek to enforce upon us their way of life, their ideologies.

132. Mr. DIHIGO Y LOPEZ TRIGO (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): Since we signed the United Nations Charter at San Francisco, the Assembly has never begun a session in a more difficult atmosphere. We cannot conceal the fact that the world situation is tense and that relations between the five great Powers have deteriorated with the passage of time. The apparent harmony which prevailed at San Francisco and London in 1945 and 1946 began to show signs of deterioration in 1947; there were serious divergencies of opinion in 1948, definite antagonism in 1949, and at the beginning of the fifth session of the Assembly in 1950, the situation can hardly be called encouraging.

133. After the anguish caused by the Second World War, hope was aroused by the establishment of the United Nations and with it came the illusion that mankind had fought its last war. Unfortunately, the confidence of mankind in this Organization was excessive. People believed that it was going to be the immediate panacea for all the ills of the world. When it became evident that the Organization was not as effective and strong as had been hoped, there was disillusionment as to its real value as a power to solve serious international problems and maintain peace.

134. Unfortunately, this attitude of world public opinion is partly justified. We cannot deny that on many occasions, after lengthy speeches, bitter debates, serious mutual accusations and the production of vast quantities of papers and documents, problems have remained without any final solution. Seeing this, the peoples of the world have been inclined to consider their rulers incompetent or, at least, to think that the United Nations is incapable of solving world conflicts and freeing humanity from the scourge of war.

135. The right of veto has contributed greatly to this state of affairs, because abuse of the veto has frequently served to paralyse the action of the Security Council.

136. In that respect, Cuba has a clear conscience. It not only fought against the veto with all its might at San Francisco, but Cuba and Colombia were the only nations which voted against its acceptance.⁹ We have always felt that the veto is a privilege liable to provoke friction and to impede the efficient functioning of the United Nations. We were told that the veto was essential in order to maintain unity among the great Powers since, by using the veto, each of these Powers could prevent action from being taken against its will, thereby eliminating any cause of friction or discord. Furthermore, we were solemnly informed that the veto would be used with moderation and that its use would be limited to cases of exceptional gravity.

137. Cuba, however, continued to fight against it, because as we then said, the veto would simply bring about a negative unity, a unity for inaction, instead of that positive unity for action which is exactly what is needed for the maintenance of peace. We also maintained that the veto might prevent the fulfilment of the fundamental aim of the United Nations, which is to prevent war, since, if one country were to attack another, a veto by one of the permanent members of the Security Council would be sufficient to prevent the United Nations from intervening and putting an end to the conflict.

138. Alas, time has shown that we were right. Not only has the veto failed to preserve unity among the great Powers, but on the contrary, on forty-five occasions it has frustrated action by the Council. What is even more serious, it might have paralysed that action completely in the case of Korea, which is the most serious issue which has as yet faced the United Nations.

139. If the Council's resolutions of 25 and 27 June had been vetoed, what would the situation in Korea be today? There could have been no intervention in the name of the United Nations against this brutal and unjustified aggression by North Korea, and South Korea would have been completely subjected to the rule of the invaders. Or else there would have been intervention of all kinds, but at the risk of charges of a violation, if not of the spirit, at least of the letter of the Charter. The energetic and liberating action of the Security Council in this case was made possible only by the fact that the nation which might have vetoed those decisions, was at the time absent from the Security Council through its own choice.

140. This shows that so long as there is a veto, the United Nations cannot fully discharge its function of maintaining peace. That is why guarantees against war have on occasion been sought outside its framework, as in the case of the North Atlantic Treaty, for which there would have been no reason if the Organization had completely fulfilled the hopes placed upon it.

141. Now, after five years, almost all the Members are convinced of what we maintained in San Francisco; that it is essential to remove the difficulties caused by the veto if we wish the United Nations to achieve its aims. As it has done from the beginning, Cuba will favour any measure to eliminate the veto or at least to lessen its pernicious results. Thus, the action of the United Nations, the only instrument which can save humanity from the horrors of a new war, will be strengthened.

142. If we look back on the history of the Organization, we see that most progressive actions have originated in the General Assembly. That is the most representative and democratic organ, because it includes representatives of all the Members and because agreements are there adopted by a majority of votes and there is no right of veto. We must therefore consider strengthening its powers in order to enable it to intervene more effectively in the solution of world problems.

143. However, the picture is not all unfavourable so far as the United Nations is concerned. In the first place, as has been stated, although international policy is not completely formed "by" the United Nations, it is formed "in" the United Nations. That proves that,

⁹ See *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, document 967, III/1/48, 20th meeting of Committee III/1.

despite all, the Organization is the centre of international relations and must become the directing principle in the life of the world.

144. It must further be given credit for positive successes in Greece, Iran, Indonesia, the Italian colonies and other political spheres, and for such notable work in the economic field as the studies of full employment, technical assistance to under-developed areas, and the economic and social progress of the peoples of Non-Self-Governing Territories. Above all, the case of Korea is decisive proof of how much the United Nations might achieve if it was not hindered by the veto, of what might be hoped if its action could be carried out without the difficulties which have so far beset it.

145. The events in Korea are very grievous, but they have served to show that the United Nations is not a body buried under a mountain of documents and discussions, but a dynamic entity capable, when necessary, of direct and impartial action. The swift protection extended to Southern Korea, which has prevented its absorption by the invaders and which makes us hope that it will be completely freed and unified in the near future, has restored the confidence of the small nations in the Organization and in its ability to save them from war and from the ambitious and imperialistic action of other nations. The lives, which the soldiers of the United Nations—to whom we express our admiration, gratitude and respect—are now offering in the fighting in Korea, are consolidating the United Nations as an instrument for the peace and progress of all peoples.

146. In our opinion, this war constitutes an event of historic proportions. It has shown that the United Nations Charter is not an academic document which may be flouted with impunity, but that behind it there is the will of most peoples to maintain at all costs the principles enshrined in it. It will serve not only to renew the faith of all nations, great and small, in the Organization, but also and, above all, it will serve as a warning to any possible transgressors that their efforts will be in vain and that the proper course is for all to try to collaborate in good faith for the benefit of mankind.

147. At this moment we are facing a new armaments race. The symptom is alarming because history shows that every armament race ends in a new war. Unfortunately, the ancient Latin saying *si vis pacem, para bellum* ("if you desire peace, prepare for war") still applies, but it is sad that such a situation should occur only five years after the creation of the United Nations, which was founded precisely in order to prevent wars and to preserve peace. In face of an armaments race, all we can do is to urge all countries, great and small, but especially the great nations, to bear in mind the solemn obligations they undertook at San Francisco and the more solemn responsibilities of all governments to their peoples and to mankind in general to make an effort to find the minimum of agreement necessary to avoid war.

148. A new war would be a cataclysm, and nobody can foresee its consequences. Whoever might be the victor, we may be certain that the whole of mankind would be the loser. It is not impossible to achieve that

minimum of agreement if all nations devote themselves in good faith to seeking a solution to the problems, leaving aside nationalistic ambitions and political and doctrinal imperialism. There are many worth-while things waiting to be done; they would contribute to the improvement of the condition of men, raise their moral and material standard of living, and help them to achieve happiness. Such plans, however, cannot be given the attention they need so long as we have to think about the necessity of preparing for war.

149. Democracy is a peaceful system which allows the individual freely to develop his personality and pursue his aims because within that system the State organization is regarded as an instrument to serve men and not as a fetish to which they are mercilessly sacrificed. Experience has shown that the true democracies are opposed to aggressive war because they are repelled by its very nature. We must remember that in order properly to meet war and defend themselves, the democracies must begin by suppressing, even if only temporarily, some of their most cherished principles; and war produces a disturbance which takes a long time to die down. Moreover, as democracy gives the individual a wide range of personal freedom and initiative, man strives to prosper by his own efforts and does not depend upon the action of the State; thus, the State is able to take a more calm and peaceful stand and is not so much subject to the pressure of individual necessity.

150. Furthermore, the essential element in democracy is the individual, and hence the tendency towards a greater recognition and respect of his fundamental rights. This is extremely important because so long as irritating discrimination continues and desires remain unsatisfied, so long as there are injustices which are not righted or legitimate rights which are not recognized, there cannot be that true social peace which is essential to universal peace. It is therefore necessary to act, with all due precautions, for the protection of human rights everywhere because we must indeed not forget that the human element stands over and above nationalisms and political and economic creeds.

151. In accordance with the Preamble of the Charter, the United Nations has solemnly promised mankind to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person", to "promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom." In order to fulfil those solemn and serious commitments which represent the hope of the world, it is necessary, firstly, to strengthen the action of the United Nations so that it may prevent war wherever it is likely to occur and by whomsoever it may be provoked; and, secondly, to strengthen democracy and the basic rights of man so that he may attain the full dignity which the human being deserves. Then, free from fear and want, he may find his own happiness, and, satisfied with what he has, will not be tempted to seize what belongs to others and provoke war to fulfil his own ambitions. If we fail in this undertaking, the United Nations will have failed. For the sake of mankind that failure must be prevented at all costs.

The meeting rose at 3 p.m.