

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



Tuesday, 15 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	135
Speeches by Mr. Baranovsky (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Gomez Ruiz (Venezuela), Mr. Koprulu (Turkey), Mr. Kardelj (Yugoslavia), Mr. Henriquez Ureña (Dominican Republic) and Mr. Hélou (Lebanon)	

President : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. BARANOVSKY (UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC), MR. GOMEZ RUIZ (VENEZUELA), MR. KOPRULU (TURKEY), MR. KARDELJ (YUGOSLAVIA), MR. HENRIQUEZ UREÑA (DOMINICAN REPUBLIC) AND MR. HELOU (LEBANON).

1. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*) : The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has come here, as it came to the previous session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, anxious to join representatives of the other peace-loving countries in the fight to strengthen peace and combat the threat of a new world war. That is the task and main purpose of this sixth session.

2. The Ukrainian Government is clearly aware of the serious changes in the international situation since the fifth session, changes which have greatly complicated inter-State relations. The international tension, which has become particularly acute of late, is creating misgivings and alarm among the peoples of the world lest a new world war break out. The policy of hostility to the USSR and the people's democracies pursued by the United States of America has reached the point of threatening the cause of peace. This policy, dictated by the greed of American millionaires and multi-millionaires in their reckless desire for world domination, is poisoning the international atmosphere.

3. By bringing new countries into the North Atlantic bloc, forming new aggressive alliances in the Mediterranean region and the Pacific basin, and reviving military centres in Germany and Japan, the United States is making it patent that its military preparations are directed against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies.

4. With war in view the United States is feverishly increasing its armed forces and pressing its partners in the North Atlantic bloc to rearm, heedless of the fact that the diversion of vast sums to war preparations exhausts the national resources of the European countries and brings their economies to the brink of catastrophe. Last year, for example, the armed forces of the United States more than doubled. Those of Great Britain came near to a

million men. France and other European countries are maintaining several hundred thousand men under arms. Official reports show that the military expenditure of the United States this year, including "military aid", the creation of military bases in the territory of other countries and the cost of the Korean war, has reached the fabulous figure of \$80,000 million.

5. In its preparations for world war the United States has covered the globe with a network of its garrisons and naval and air bases. There is literally not a single corner of the world of strategic importance in the foreign territories of the capitalist countries upon which the United States of America has not tried to set up its aggressive support points. To its four hundred or more existing military bases in over sixty countries and archipelagoes, the United States has recently added new bases in France, Austria, Italy, Germany, Greece, French Morocco, Northern Pakistan and Greenland. In addition, United States military aerodromes have been built in Japan, Cuba, Costa Rica and Thailand. Preparations are being made for the United States to take over British military bases in the Mediterranean and for establishing military support points in Israel. According to the American Press, plans are being made for seventy-seven supplementary American military and air bases in Europe, the Mediterranean and North Africa.

6. In their numerous statements the American war leaders and representatives of American ruling circles do not conceal their intention to surround the Soviet Union and the people's democracies with a chain of American war bases, close to our frontiers, in order to make it possible for armies of air pirates simultaneously to invade the territory of the Soviet Republics and that of our friends.

7. To disguise the obviously aggressive character of the preparations of the United States of America and its satellites for war against the Soviet Union, the ruling circles in the United States, Great Britain, France and other countries are alleging that the arms race is due to the fact that the great armed forces of the Soviet Union are a threat to the West. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Eden have adduced this argument at the present session to justify appeals for intensified armament.

8. The Soviet Union has never made a secret of the numbers of its armed forces. It is common knowledge,

from a speech made by the head of the Government of the Soviet Union, that several successive demobilizations of the personnel of the USSR armed forces took place after the Second World War. This speech of J.V. Stalin, together with the texts of the laws of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union demobilizing thirty-three age groups, was published at the time in the Soviet Press, thus providing the government of any country with sufficient information on the subject. It is to the interest of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Eden, however, to maintain silence on that point.

9. Mr. Eden must also be aware that in a note to the United Kingdom Government in February 1951 the USSR Government stated *inter alia* that the armed forces of the Soviet Union, land, sea and air, are now approximately the same as in 1939, that is to say, before the Second World War began. Is it not obvious that this represents the minimum required to defend the vast territories of the Soviet Union and its extensive frontiers? Do these facts give any grounds for what Mr. Acheson says about the alleged superiority of the Soviet Union's armed forces and the military helplessness of the countries of Europe?

10. Must we not suppose that Mr. Acheson invented the military danger from the Soviet Union in order to whip up the enthusiasm of his European partners in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc, who are afraid of the dangerous economic and social effects of the reckless arms race, and, in spite of the assertions of the President of the United States, are reluctant to allow themselves to be persuaded by General Eisenhower to spend more on armaments?

11. The following passage occurred in a recent report of L.P. Beria, the Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: "In the United States the governmental machinery is being increasingly captured by the capitalist monopolies". The aggressive foreign policy of the present Government of the United States is the policy of the American millionaires and multi-millionaires. The imperialists are careful to conceal the direct connexion between the increase of armaments and the steadily mounting curve of the American monopolies' war profits. The greater part of the vast sums spent by the United States of America on armaments, which come from the American taxpayers, has gone into the pockets of the big American firms producing tanks, guns, aircraft, motor vehicles and other arms and military equipment.

12. Here are some data showing the fabulous profits made by the American monopolists who are growing rich on war.

13. The average annual profits of the American monopolies, which amounted to \$3,400 million in 1936-39, this year even exceeded the high figures for the Second World War and reached the figure of \$18,500 million per annum. General Motors, which as everyone knows is controlled by the du Pont and Morgan Companies, in the course of last year alone increased its net profits by 38 per cent; while the 730 largest American monopolies made a net profit in 1950 of some \$8,000 million. The profits of companies producing means of transport have increased by 95 per cent, those of oil companies by 50 per cent, and those of mining companies by 45 per cent above the figure for last year.

14. Is it surprising then that the American millionaires and multi-millionaires have no intention of giving up the high monopolist profits they are making out of the arms race, and are reckoning to increase those profits by letting loose a new war? This attitude on the part of American business circles has been expressed with cynical frankness by

Mr. Wilson, United States Director of so-called defense mobilization, who, as is well known, is a representative of the House of Morgan. In connexion with the proposal of the USSR representative in the United Nations for a cease-fire in Korea, he declared that any possibility, however slight, of a clearing of the atmosphere in international relations was a threat to the economy of the United States. This policy enriches the capitalist monopolies, but ruins the workers, reduces their standard of living and dooms them to poverty and want.

15. In the present circumstances, when the international situation has grown more difficult thanks to the influence of the United States of America, what is the position of the United Nations, created as an instrument of peace and for the peaceful settlement of international disputes?

16. The past year has been marked by further departures by the United Nations from the principles proclaimed at the San Francisco Conference, as well as by many violations of the Charter. The United Nations has approved and sanctioned the intervention of the United States of America in Korea and, under pressure from that country, is helping to extend that aggression. The United Nations has put itself to shame by adopting a decision declaring the People's Republic of China the aggressor while, in obvious contradiction of the facts, the real aggressor, the United States of America which has seized the Chinese territory of Taiwan and invaded the territory of Korea, has been proclaimed the defending party. These and many other facts indicate that the aggressive nucleus in the United Nations, headed by the United States of America, has made considerable progress this year in adapting that international Organization to the aims of United States foreign policy.

17. But the great masses refuse to believe that the Soviet Union is responsible for the present international tension and are showing ever greater opposition to the aggressive policy of unleashing a new world war pursued by the United States of America and the other Western States, which have paralysed the United Nations as an instrument of peace and persistently strive to turn it into a weapon of war.

18. Indeed, how can simple people be persuaded that the Soviet Union desires war and has aggressive intentions when it is not engaged in waging warfare anywhere, when it is not participating in any armed skirmishes, when it is not building aerodromes or military bases in foreign territory and when it has not entered into any of the aggressive blocs? Who will believe the fable that it is possible to spend thousands of millions of roubles on peaceful construction, steadily lower the price of goods, raise the people's standard of living and at the same time carry on preparation for war? The simple people of the capitalist countries know from their own experience what is the cost of the armaments race and the war preparations going on in their countries.

19. The peoples of the world do not trust their political leaders and refuse to believe in the inevitability of a new war. Faced with the threat to peace, they see only one means of averting war, the means which J. V. Stalin pointed out to them and which consists of taking the cause of peace into their own hands. Hundreds of millions of people have joined the movement in defence of peace, which the bosses of the Atlantic bloc at first ignored and with which they did not wish to reckon, and it has since been transformed into a powerful force, capable of disrupting the plans of the instigators of a new world war.

20. In order to calm public opinion, particularly in European countries, where the public has been alarmed at the scale of the war preparations and the rapid occupation of their countries by the Americans, a three-power "peace" sortie has been launched at the sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, with the aim of concealing the aggressive character of the North Atlantic bloc and of passing off the military preparations of the United States of America and its European partners as "defence measures".

21. This spurious manoeuvre is also designed to impart an outwardly peaceable character to the attitude of the delegations of the United States and other Western Powers at the present session of the General Assembly.

22. The plan for the regulation, limitation and reduction of armaments, submitted to the General Assembly in the joint declaration of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France [A/1943], received wide publicity in speeches by the United States President and the Secretary of State, as being a "fresh approach" and a "new programme". Mr. Eden wished to assure us of this.

23. Are the proposals in the three-Power declaration genuinely original, and do they pursue the aims attributed to them? A careful study of the plan shows that it in no way envisages the reduction of armaments, at least for the present. This task is replaced by one of more modest scale, the gradual verification and census of armaments. The main features of the proposal are copied bodily from the famous Baruch Plan. Like the Baruch Plan, the present plan is to be implemented gradually and by stages. The perniciousness of this approach has already been unmasked by Soviet delegations on other occasions.

24. In very truth, on the basis of this plan, it is necessary to begin, as Mr. Acheson explained, "with the simplest things". Thus, soldiers' billy-cans and knapsacks will be inventoried first, then the work will go on to, let us say, an inventory of penknives and daggers, and afterwards of rifles and machine-guns.

25. As in the Baruch Plan, modern armaments such as jet aircraft, tanks, super-dreadnoughts and, finally, atomic weapons, will be reached only at the very end of the census. How many months, years and even decades will this require? As regards the basic problem to which, indeed, a disarmament plan should be devoted, it appears that in the course of the census certain measures are to be elaborated, about which the declaration speaks very vaguely.

26. The three-power proposal is silent on the problem of who is to lay down criteria for the reduction of armaments and of how the permitted levels for the various types of armaments are to be determined. The declaration makes no provision whatsoever for the prohibition of atomic weapons. If this is mentioned in the proposals, it is merely as an item in the census and verification, and only for the purpose of diverting attention and deceiving public opinion. The declaration is also silent on the subject of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Such an attitude with respect to the most dangerous categories of weapons will surprise no one.

27. The United States of America has always opposed prohibition of the use of means for the mass annihilation and barbaric destruction of human beings, and for the laying of peaceful towns and villages in ruins.

28. As long ago as 1899 the United States Government refused to adhere to the convention prohibiting the use of dum-dum bullets. In 1925 it refused to ratify the Geneva

protocol prohibiting the use of noxious gases and bacteriological weapons of war. As is well known, in 1945 the United States Government dropped atomic bombs upon the peaceful towns of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, annihilating thousands of defenceless women and children. The consensus of opinion among experts was that this inhumane act had no military significance whatsoever.

29. Omitting reference in the three-Power proposal to atomic, chemical and bacteriological weapons, the American imperialists and their subordinates, making preparations for a new world war, do not wish to bind themselves with anything that might hinder the realization of their monstrous plans for the annihilation of peoples.

30. Thus, after examining the three-Power declaration, it is possible to find definitive provision only for the collection of secret information on the armaments and armed forces of every country by the representatives of any State. In proposing this census, has not Mr. Acheson the same purpose in view as the one for which that collector of "news", the American journalist William Oatis, was brought to book in Czechoslovakia?

31. It is worthy of note that, as a preliminary condition for the reduction of armaments, the United States lays down the elimination of the causes of the present tension in international relations, and, above all, a cease-fire in Korea.

32. The war in Korea must indeed be brought to an end immediately. But it is precisely the United States of America, which unleashed this predatory war and has been waging it for approximately two years, that is doing everything to protract a military adventure. American land and air forces are barbarously destroying the peaceful population and towns of Korea by napalm and air bombardment. The American military authorities, acting on orders from Washington, are dragging out the armistice negotiations; they are ever creating new difficulties and are heaping obstacle upon obstacle to hinder the outcome of the negotiations. They provoke conflicts and shamelessly bombard the neutral zone where the negotiations are being carried on, menacing the lives of the Korean and Chinese delegates. This reveals the United States Government's real intention, which is to secure the breaking-off of the negotiations and then cast the blame on the command of the Korean People's Army and the Chinese volunteers.

33. Although in its statements the United States connects the problem of disarmament with that of the cessation of hostilities in Korea, in actual fact it is not in any way proposing to reduce armaments even after the end of the Korean war. Half way through this year Wilson, to whom we referred above, stated in his report to the President that the United States must continue its rearmament programme, whether or not fighting stops in Korea.

34. This statement fully reveals the hypocritical character of the first condition the United States lays down as a prerequisite for disarmament. With regard to the second condition for disarmament, the removal of the causes of the present tension in international relations, this repeats the demand made by the United States as long ago as 1947 for so-called "international confidence" as a prerequisite for disarmament. As you will see, therefore, this proposal also is not new. This condition, as we have repeatedly shown, turns the whole problem of disarmament upside down.

35. Everyone must be aware that it is precisely disarmament, an end to further expansion of war industries and of the creation of new military formations which must be the chief means of easing the present tension in interna-

tional relations ; that would be effective as no other measure could. Preparedness to disarm would be an excellent prerequisite for the elimination of differences of opinion between the great Powers. Without this, any "peace plans" and declarations about peace will be empty and useless verbiage, serving only to distract attention from the basic problem of preventing a new war.

36. Mr. Eden's speech at the present session did little to explain the position of the three Powers on the question of disarmament. If the United States, England and France do in fact genuinely desire disarmament, then why do they simultaneously force the armaments race and expand aggressive blocs ? It would appear from a recent statement by Mr. Churchill, who, we are quite sure, is well acquainted with the state of the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc, that the participants in this aggressive union dispose of resources greatly exceeding the armed forces of the USSR and the people's democracies. Hence the so-called "balance of power with the East" has already been more than attained, although it is the alleged absence of that balance which is said to have terrified the authors of the Atlantic bloc.

37. Spurious "peace" declarations can deceive nobody. The many statements and the appeals of the President and the military and political leaders of the present United States Government for more armament correspond more closely with the actual foreign policy line which the ruling circles of the United States of America are pursuing, as they feverishly prepare for a new world war.

38. That is why we regard the three-Power declaration as a propaganda document, not at all intended for serious study of the problem of disarmament and, therefore, not proposing any concrete measures. We must rather assume that the purpose of the three-Power declaration is to distract attention from the real and urgent problems involved in the strengthening of peace and the security of the peoples.

39. The Ukrainian delegation considers that in the present state of international tension, the United Nations must carry out particularly effective and speedy measures against the war preparations being made under the leadership of the United States of America by countries members of the North Atlantic bloc.

40. The USSR delegation has submitted to the sixth session of the General Assembly a proposal [A/1944] for "measures to combat the threat of a new world war and to strengthen peace and friendship among the nations". The Ukrainian delegation unreservedly supports these proposals and fully associates itself with them. It stresses that the proposals, unlike the three-Power declaration, have real substance and constitute a programme of concrete and effective measures for averting the threat of war and for strengthening international security.

41. The USSR proposals clearly define the tasks of the United Nations with regard to aggressive blocs created for the purpose of unleashing war, as well as with regard to States which establish military bases on foreign territory. The establishment of these bases, and participation in the aggressive Atlantic bloc, are proclaimed incompatible with membership of the United Nations. In a similar direct and clear manner conditions are laid down for terminating the war in Korea.

42. Instead of idle talk about a reduction of armaments, the USSR delegation submits a concrete proposal for the convening of a world conference to examine the question of a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments, and also of practical measures for prohibiting atomic

weapons and establishing international control over the implementation of this prohibition. All countries are invited to the discussion of this important problem, not excluding those which for various reasons have not yet entered the United Nations.

43. Finally, the USSR Government again puts forward the proposal for the conclusion of a peace pact between the five great Powers and calls upon all peace-loving States to adhere to it.

44. This proposal is supported by 562 million men and women throughout the globe, who have clearly declared themselves in favour of the unification of effort by peace-loving Powers for the attainment of peace.

45. In submitting its proposals, the USSR delegation and the delegations supporting the proposals count on the spirit of co-operation and harmony in the solution of international problems triumphing in the United Nations.

46. The Ukrainian delegation calls upon all sound elements in the United Nations to join in the struggle of the peace-loving countries against the threat of a new war and to support the USSR proposal for the defence of peace and against the transformation of the United Nations into an instrument of war.

47. Mr. GOMEZ RUIZ (Venezuela) (*translated from Spanish*): Venezuela is attending this Assembly in the spirit in which it always attends international conferences ; it has come here to offer in all sincerity its co-operation to the United Nations in the tasks that lie before it and is prepared to consider fully all the views expressed in a spirit of fraternity and constructive frankness, without which nothing lasting or real can be achieved. It will, in short, unite its efforts with those being exerted here in pursuance of the ideals of our Organization, and it is prepared to concur in and support any action which will benefit the peoples of the world. Our delegation's attitude is dictated by, and is in keeping with, the deep-rooted traditions of Venezuela and is an expression of the feelings of our countrymen.

48. Venezuela believes in the efficacy of our system and consequently it loyally fulfils its obligations as a Member State, not only on the universal plane within the Organization, but also in its bilateral relations with other countries, since it is of opinion that only thus can the work in which we are engaged progress. It would have been useless for us to have given our support to the principles laid down in the Charter and to have subscribed to the decisions adopted by this body through its various organs if we were, in bilateral policy, to betray the ideals of the United Nations and disregard its fundamental purposes.

49. However, our attitude is not inspired solely by the duty of remaining true to our past and to our people ; we are also convinced that by nobility and sincerity of political purposes alone can peace be achieved. Systems for the prevention of war which are theoretically perfect may be put forward, but if goodwill and sincerity of purpose are absent, the time will come when all systems will fail and all methods prove ineffective, since real peace can only be attained when there is a universal conscience embodying and integrating similar ideals and consequently inspiring action of the same moral calibre.

50. From a practical point of view, we are well aware that any system of peace which can be devised must, if it is to be effective, be able to count on the support and the goodwill of all States, and particularly of those States which bear the greatest share of responsibility for its

plementation. My delegation was therefore surprised and disappointed to see that when the United States, France and the United Kingdom, in complete loyalty and with an unquestionable desire for harmony, presented disarmament plan and offered genuine possibilities for understanding, a minority remained aloof from the general spirit of harmony and agreement by which almost all the countries represented here were animated, and persisted in maintaining a negative and intransigent attitude. I repeat that we were surprised and disappointed to see that when these three Powers stated their readiness to enter immediately into negotiations within the United Nations regarding disarmament, a destructive and discordant reply was made to that proposal, thus precluding any friendly understanding. As representative of Venezuela, I feel it my duty to make the voice of my country heard at this time of danger, which is also a time of hope, and to express the wish that harmony and understanding will be established that is what our peoples ask of us and what they expect to be the outcome of our deliberations.

I should like now to indicate more explicitly the position which the Venezuelan delegation will adopt in regard to some of the items on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly.

When, in July 1950, the aggression against the Korean public occurred, Venezuela reacted by condemning that flagrant attack, as did various other Members of the United Nations. The reasons for that reaction were obvious, since such an attack was clearly inconsistent with the purposes and principles which we accepted on signing the Charter at San Francisco. A year and a half have passed since the outbreak of hostilities. During that time much blood has been shed and, in spite of persistent efforts to restore peace in that region, war has continued with further casualties and the danger of an extension of the conflict remains. Collective security action by the Organization, which was put to the test for the first time, is living in Korea in a spirit of unshakable and ever-widening determination. However, this state of affairs, though inevitable for reasons of which we are all aware, is a source of constant concern to those of us who believe in the United Nations' work for peace. We trust therefore that hostilities may soon end, on the understanding however that peace must be achieved under conditions of justice and that the authority of the Organization is thereby reinforced.

Only an unshakable determination to repel the aggressor has made it possible for the system of co-operation, which had to be hastily improvised in Korea, to yield practical results. To that end, in order to obviate any need for improvisation in the future, the General Assembly decided, at its fifth session, the resolution [377 (V)] entitled "Initiating for Peace". That resolution set up the Collective Measures Committee, of which Venezuela has had the honour to be a member and whose report will be discussed at this session.

Although the ideal of a universal system of collective security is one of long standing, this is certainly the first time that such a system has been worked out in detail and the will to put it into effect. For that very reason, the report to be discussed by this Assembly will suffer from the natural imperfections characteristic of all beginnings. Collective security, if it is to be worthy of that name and if it is to function efficiently, must be based

on the individual security of all those countries which are prepared to contribute to the common effort for the maintenance and restoration of peace. A country would not be working for this vital purpose if it neglected its own defence, thus creating an area readily vulnerable not only to military but also to economic aggression. Individual efforts by countries to strengthen their defences in order to contribute towards joint defence constitute one positive method of preventing the outbreak of new problems. Moreover, the aim pursued by a collective security system is primarily to discourage aggression before it occurs. In order to achieve this, it is necessary not only for all national efforts to be co-ordinated but also to ensure that no country or area may be regarded as an easy prey for a potential aggressor who would try eventually to undertake action on a more far-reaching scale. The report of the Collective Measures Committee does indeed take these circumstances into account. However, it might be desirable to state them more clearly.

55. Of course, if an effective understanding of the proposals made regarding disarmament could be reached and if all peoples were unanimous in their will to arrive at a real plan for the realization of peace, the collective security system would then have as its basis universal co-operation in the defence of a common aim rather than the need for preventing new conflicts; it would be established in order to strengthen the Charter and give it life rather than to attempt to curb ambitions contrary to its purposes. Venezuela, then, is prepared to continue to co-operate in the effort for universal security in the same way as it has done in the regional security system of the Organization of American States, and it is sincerely gratified at having been a member of the Collective Measures Committee, whose work and whose report constitute, beyond any doubt, a step forward towards the ideal of establishing law and justice as the guiding principles of international relations.

56. Thus also, Venezuela will continue to support the plans for developing international economic co-operation through the United Nations. Gradually but surely, the idea of interdependence has been accepted in this field: the idea that all countries, large and small, should direct their efforts towards the welfare of all nations as a whole and the recognition that the progress and development of the economic potentialities of any area of the world lead to a state of well-being and higher standards of living for all nations.

57. The belief that freedom from social unrest and that economic welfare could exist in some countries side by side with misery and hunger in others has been strongly disproved by recent history. My country has consequently noted with particular sympathy the marked interest with which the Organization has taken up the problems of economic development. To bring to under-developed regions the capital and technical knowledge essential to them, thereby creating more favourable conditions of wealth and welfare, is not only a comprehensive and generous humanitarian task, but also enlightened and intelligent action in keeping with political and social reality.

58. It is not yet possible to make a final appraisal of the work which the United Nations, directly or through the various specialized agencies, has been accomplishing in this field. The recent impetus given to technical assistance programmes is, nevertheless, a clear sign, auguring well for the future, of the interest with which these problems are now being considered at the present time. My country

wishes to express its enthusiasm for this work of co-operation, which will form a solid foundation for the final achievement of world peace.

59. Since the first session of the Assembly in 1946, the delegation of Venezuela has continued to maintain the principle of the universality of the Organization. Unfortunately, however, the result of the voting in the Security Council has denied the United Nations the valuable co-operation of various countries which have requested admission to the Organization. Among them, may I refer specifically to Italy, a nation with glorious traditions, whose democratic spirit today and the vigour with which it has regained its place amongst the most progressive States, make its presence within our Organization of the utmost importance. Consequently, my delegation is extremely anxious that, at the present session, the Assembly should thoroughly study the problem of the admission of this State in order to arrive at a satisfactory solution which would put an end to this unjust situation incompatible with the interests of the Organization.

60. Venezuela is also gratified to note the proposal of the three great Western Powers for the restoration of German unity, as it feels that the United Nations cannot remain indifferent to the fate of Germany. Morally, and in accordance with the Charter, they are interested parties in the solution of this problem. When the great Powers became responsible for the administration of Germany, they did not do so in order to keep the country divided but with the intention of re-educating it as a peace-loving State. The present situation, artificial as it is, can only be considered as temporary; it is essential to seek a solution to put an end to it.

61. I should not like to leave this rostrum without expressing the earnest hope of the Government of Venezuela that this Assembly may lead to the adoption of decisions for ensuring peace and bringing well-being to all countries of the world. I would also reiterate our sentiments of admiration and gratitude for the French nation, which once again has received us with its splendid and generous hospitality.

62. Mr. KOPRULU (Turkey) (*translated from French*): Let me first join with those who have preceded me on this rostrum in expressing my thanks to the French people and Government for the cordial invitation they have extended to us in requesting us to sit in Paris, and for the generous hospitality we have received. Our presence here coincides with the celebration of the bi-millenary of the foundation of Paris. In this coincidence I like to see a happy omen for the success and durability of our Organization.

63. In our times, when peoples enjoy democratic government, it is not only a right but, I should say, almost an obligation for representatives of governments to mount this rostrum and, at the same time, to express their hopes and their anxieties, their views and their ideas regarding the solutions to international problems.

64. Turkey, essentially a peace-loving country, to which expansionist ambitions and aggressive ideas are foreign and whose sole aim is to fulfil its desire to work in order to further the welfare of its population, has a foreign policy which aims only at peace and security.

65. It is because the United Nations was established with the primary objective of maintaining peace and security, the prerequisites of progress, that my country is, and remains, firmly attached to this Organization. We are convinced that only by sincerely implementing the

principles of the Charter can the necessary conditions be established for good international relations and mutual understanding between peoples, without which our common heritage of human civilization cannot survive.

66. Many of the hopes we had placed in the United Nations are in process of fulfilment. The activities of our Organization in the social field and the stimulus it has given to the concept of co-operation to rehabilitate the world economy are already bearing fruit. On the other hand, some of the objectives for which our Organization was created have unfortunately not enjoyed the same success. But these are the very objectives which we all wish to attain most ardently, I might say anxiously, since they concern the achievement of peace and security.

67. The concept prevailing at the establishment of our Organization was that it should be universal, and yet many and great Powers, for example Italy, still remain outside the United Nations, which are in every respect worthy of being represented in it and which are unfortunately not yet among us today. We know why.

68. In the pursuit of collective security, our Organization has been confronted with obstacles. For example, the veto and a spirit of distrust continue to paralyse the efforts made for an effective regulation of armaments and the creation of the armed forces provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

69. In spite of these obstacles, the majority of the United Nations, refusing to be discouraged, have sought and found in the Charter itself ways and means of making the Organization work more effectively and suitable methods of strengthening collective security. The resolution [377 (V)] entitled "Uniting for Peace", adopted last year by the General Assembly, is an encouraging example in this direction. We must endeavour to make the machinery created last year more effective and, in this connexion, the indications given in the report of the Collective Measures Committee and the plan proposed by the three Western Powers [A/1943] as a basis for the progressive reduction of armaments can, if they are put into effect and implemented in good faith, greatly ease the anxieties which today vitiate the international atmosphere. The report, and these proposals, have our full support. Like the resolutions adopted last year, those which we shall draft this year, to be effective, will require all nations for which law, justice, equality and the sovereignty of peoples are more than mere words, to be prepared to implement them boldly and, if necessary, to make sacrifices to ensure their success.

70. The peace-loving nations of the world have found, in the spirit and letter of the Charter, a means of ensuring the maintenance of peace and of collective security. I refer to regional agreements and to the North Atlantic Treaty in particular.

71. Turkey is essentially a peace-loving country. Its population, consisting mainly of farmers, has no aggressive ideas and has no ambitions outside its own territory. Its aim is to ensure the welfare of its citizens, which war could only destroy. But Turkey is not resigned to having peace at any price. For centuries it has had to defend its existence by bitter struggles; it will continue to do so whatever the circumstances and whenever necessary. If, for these reasons and because of its geographical position, Turkey has wished to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty, it has done so for the same reasons which have obliged it for twelve years to maintain a strong army to the detriment of its welfare and economic development.

72. The danger which overshadows the world cannot be removed by words, and the existence of a people cannot be made a stake in manœuvres of propaganda and of ideological strategy. In the free world we cannot allow aggression to be rewarded with success. It is only by being strong that we can remove the threat of force. Our primary duty is to be strong enough to prevent war or, if war ever breaks out, to be able to repel aggression. Our attitude is dictated by realities; what we say is sincere, without mental reservations, and can easily be understood by all who are really pursuing the objectives of peace, liberty and justice.

73. The North Atlantic Treaty is not an aggressive combine; the unarmed peoples who conceived it have one objective, that of defence. And it is because of this that Turkey has never ceased to proclaim the value which it attached to normal friendly relations with all peoples and why it has wanted to accede to this treaty, because the treaty, as also the defence machinery it involves, is only intended to prevent or to repel aggression in order to allow the peoples of the world to continue their peaceful occupations on the path of progress. No one must read into the treaty any cause for anxiety unless he himself has aggressive intentions.

74. I should now like to pass to another part of our Organization's work. There are a number of disputes in the present world. The United Nations have already had to deal with some of them. Some have already been solved and others are still being discussed. We are convinced that all these disputes will be settled the more satisfactorily the greater the good faith and mutual understanding of the parties concerned. In this connexion, we firmly hope to see peace and tranquility soon re-established in the Near East.

75. In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about what may certainly be considered to be the greatest expression of the United Nations spirit: Korea. It is there that our Organization has, for the first time, shown by acts its determination to oppose aggression. And the reason why the United Nations has played an active part in the operations in the war there, the reason why our soldiers have fought in Korea as if their own territory was being invaded or threatened, is because they believe in the independence and freedom of peoples and look upon the United Nations and collective security as the best means of guaranteeing and safeguarding their ideal.

76. Mr. KARDELJ (Yugoslavia) (*translated from Russian*): Never before in history has mankind longed so fervently as now for genuine international security and real peace; and never, in all probability, have men participated so widely and devotedly as they are participating today in efforts to strengthen peace and security. Yet we all feel that confidence in the possibility of preserving peace has been seriously undermined and that the life of mankind as a whole is being overshadowed by the grave threat of war.

77. It would be dangerous, in such serious times, to indulge in propaganda contests, which only obscure the real problem of the causes and cure of international tension. This is particularly true of all attempts to hide behind words about peace the acts which lead to war, or to divert mankind's longing for peace entirely into discussion of secondary features of the present crisis in international relations and away from its real and direct causes.

78. According to the cheap propaganda of the Cominform type, the whole world is divided into friends of peace and warmongers; such were Mr. Vyshinsky's words

from this rostrum. But the issue of war or peace does not really depend so much on whether a particular State desires war or not, but primarily on what it does or, more accurately, on the aims it pursues in its international policy. In affairs of this kind men determine the fate of peace only to a limited extent; in the last resort, war and peace have their own inherent logic. A government which pursues a policy of domination and aggression towards other countries, even though it does not want war—or at any rate world war—is preparing war by its policy. Be this as it may, one fact is beyond dispute: formal peace declarations and proposals for reductions in armaments, prohibition of atomic weapons, a five-Power pact, and so on do not in themselves by any means prove that the government making them is genuinely working for peace.

79. Let us remember the lessons of the recent past. In the period immediately preceding the Second World War, Hitler juggled with a number of peace proposals, and his manœuvres led to a propaganda game appallingly similar to the one we are witnessing at present. From 1933 to the outbreak of the Second World War, Hitler made a variety of "proposals" for arms reductions and the prohibition of certain types of weapons. In 1936 he proposed what was called the twenty-five-year peace plan for Europe. Together with Mussolini he persistently proposed a "four-Power pact", and finally succeeded in obtaining one. Even after the war had already broken out, in 1939, Hitler said:

"The most important need of the European and non-European economy is the establishment of an unconditionally guaranteed peace and a feeling of confidence among the nations... For this necessary feeling of confidence the first essential is to settle the question of the use of contemporary weapons and its extent"...

80. And in September 1938, when he launched his conquest of Czechoslovakia, Hitler said:

"Germany's love of peace is demonstrated by the facts. We have made a whole series of proposals for the limitation of armaments"...

"I made this proposal: Germany was prepared to limit its army to 200,000 provided that the armies of other States did not exceed that figure..."

"I made yet another proposal: Germany was prepared provided other States agreed to do the same, to give up its heavy armaments and armaments of offence—tanks, bombers and, if necessary, aircraft in general, heavy and super-heavy artillery..."

"Throughout these years I have genuinely pursued a peace policy in practice. I have tackled every question, even when its solution appeared impossible, with the firm resolve to settle it by peaceful means..."

81. Today we all know what Hitler's aims were in making these proposals. I have not quoted these passages merely in order to make mechanical comparisons. I have quoted them to show that peace-loving words and proposals for the reduction of armaments or the prohibition of any particular weapon do not always in themselves constitute proof of peaceful intentions but may in certain cases serve aggressive, hegemonic aims. We can have confidence in the sincerity of such proposals only when they are at the same time in harmony with the practical policies pursued in international relations by their proposers, since it is precisely these policies which reflect the true attitude of any government toward peace.

82. At the present time aggressive war represents as a rule the continuation of a hegemonic policy. If we wish to fight against war, we must first of all combat that very

policy. In other words, we consider that the prime duty of the United Nations in its efforts to strengthen peace is to endeavour to uphold democratic principles in international relations, for only they can guarantee independence and equality, and hence peace, to the nations. Unless practical efforts of this kind are made by each individual nation and each individual government, we shall be unable to create the necessary conditions for the solution of the outstanding problems of the present international political crisis. Universal peace, independence and equality of nations and their democratic mutual relations cannot today be isolated from each other. Anyone who attempts to use the United Nations for hypocritical propaganda and at the same time, in practice, makes it impossible to solve and eliminate those disputes and critical situations which are the real and direct source of international tension, abuses the United Nations and the peaceful aspirations of mankind. This applies not only to such major, pressing issues as Korea and Germany, but also to a large number of other questions which spring from a hegemonic policy and undemocratic and aggressive actions in international relations.

83. A typical and highly dangerous situation of this kind has arisen in Yugoslav-Soviet relations as a result of the aggressive pressure exerted by the Government of the Soviet Union; and it is precisely for these reasons that the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia has decided to submit a complaint to the United Nations [A/1946]. Since the Yugoslav delegation will later submit detailed evidence of this situation, I shall not at this point dwell in detail on the facts in which the situation itself is manifested.

84. The aggressive pressure upon Yugoslavia takes the following principal forms: systematic organization of frontier incidents, constantly increasing in scope and frequency; complete economic blockade, including even the cessation of rail and postal communications; obstruction of normal diplomatic contacts to a degree almost tantamount to a rupture of diplomatic relations; discrimination against and persecution and expulsion of the Yugoslav diplomatic staff remaining in those countries; persistent attempts to interfere in our internal affairs; systematic threats and intimidation by means of diplomatic actions; military demonstrations, official statements by responsible persons, propaganda, and the like; incitement of governments under the influence of the USSR to hostile acts against Yugoslavia; attempts to establish in our country subversive espionage and diversionary activities aimed at undermining its defensive strength, at setting up agencies of Soviet foreign policy in Yugoslavia and at overthrowing its political régime by violence; monstrous campaign of slander, falsehood and deceit; public appeals to the peoples of Yugoslavia from official authorities in the Soviet bloc inciting them to overthrow the Government by violence; the terrorization and persecution of persons belonging to our national minorities and of our citizens in the countries of the Soviet bloc; the violation of all clauses of peace treaties in so far as they relate to obligations towards Yugoslavia; the unilateral breach of almost all treaties and agreements concluded between the countries of the Soviet bloc and Yugoslavia; the breaking of all cultural and other ties and so on.

85. In view of such a policy and such acts by the countries of the Soviet bloc towards Yugoslavia, we are obliged to reckon with the rapid and continuous growth of the military strength of Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. The growth of military strength in these countries has already far exceeded the limits provided in the peace

treaty. Only two years ago those countries had 14 divisions on our frontiers, whereas now there are about 25 divisions on the Yugoslav frontiers out of a total of about 53 divisions available to those countries and Albania, excluding police forces. This figure does not include USSR forces stationed in those countries. If that is the situation, surely it is clear that the peoples of Yugoslavia are justly alarmed for their future peace and independence.

86. The Yugoslav Government has complained to the General Assembly of the hostile acts of [the Governments of the USSR and the other governments of the Soviet bloc on two grounds: first, because it considers that the number of such acts by States of the Soviet bloc has so increased as to become a serious threat to the independence and peace of the peoples of Yugoslavia and at the same time one of the sources of danger to peace in general; and secondly because, apart from the immediate urgency of the matter, the Yugoslav Government considers that the United Nations should always help to avert a situation which might in time develop into a direct threat to world peace. The situation created by the aggressive pressure of the USSR, on Yugoslavia is just such a one, and it therefore quite justifiably evokes anxiety and concern not only among the peoples of Yugoslavia but among other peoples as well.

87. The question arises: why is the USSR Government exerting aggressive pressure on Yugoslavia, and what exactly does it want from Yugoslavia?

88. In Yugoslavia's relations with the neighbouring countries of the Soviet bloc there are no unsettled questions such as might account for aggressive activity towards Yugoslavia. The peoples of Yugoslavia entertain neither hatred nor any kind of hostile intentions towards their neighbours.

89. In general matters of international policy Yugoslavia has always adopted peaceful positions; it has always striven and is still striving to secure the peaceful settlement of difficult problems by means of mutual agreement and universal, peaceful, international collaboration. Yugoslavia is a small country, and everyone knows that it cannot threaten the independence and security of the Soviet Union and a whole group of countries.

90. The official representatives of the Yugoslav Government have emphasized frequently that Yugoslavia wishes to live in peace with the neighbouring countries, and that its whole foreign policy has developed in that direction. Moreover, at the session of the General Assembly of the United Nations last year, acting on behalf of the Yugoslav government, I officially proposed to neighbouring countries, whose governments have the audacity to assert that they are threatened with danger from Yugoslavia, that they should conclude an agreement of non-aggression. In spite of all this, USSR aggressive pressure on Yugoslavia is increasing annually, despite the innumerable "peaceful" pronouncements which the USSR representatives make whenever it suits them.

91. The substance of the matter is that the Government of the Soviet Union regards Yugoslavia as its war loot, its "trophy" obtained during the Second World War, and its activities have therefore been directed from the outset towards subjecting Yugoslavia and its peoples, their strength and their economic wealth to Soviet hegemony and exploitation.

92. The Government of the USSR no longer recognizes international co-operation based on equal rights. It merely demands obedience from other nations. No one can

express that truth as clearly as the Soviet Union itself has expressed it through the notorious anti-Yugoslav resolution of the Cominform in 1948, which openly called upon the Yugoslav peoples to force their Governments to comply with the demands of the Cominform—that is to say, to subject itself to the hegemony of the USSR—or to depose it and set up another which would submit to such enslavement. But never in the history of the peoples of Yugoslavia have they once deposed their government because it did not wish to submit to foreign hegemony. On the contrary, they have often deposed governments which have begun to submit to such hegemony. It is absolutely clear that our nation has now again unanimously supported its Government's protest against the aggressive tendencies of a foreign government.

93. The USSR plan directed against the independence and freedom of the peoples of Yugoslavia was in fact drawn up long ago, at the time of the Second World War. The Government of the Soviet Union began its attempts to achieve its aims by the old and tried method of turning the ruling political forces in Yugoslavia into its tools. As the Yugoslav Government did not appear to be a suitable mechanism for the achievement of such a purpose, it was first subjected to attack; then all kinds of threats, intimidations, provocations, military demonstrations and economic and political pressure were used in order to force the peoples of Yugoslavia to bend the knee and submit to foreign hegemony. That is the fundamental cause of the situation which has now arisen in Soviet-Yugoslav relations.

94. The peoples of Yugoslavia and their Government, for their part, seek peace on their frontiers and are prepared to do everything compatible with their sovereignty, freedom and honour to maintain peace and thus to make their contribution to the strengthening of peace throughout the world. Nevertheless, let there be no misunderstanding: we have never bent our knees to threats in the past and we shall not bend them now, whether these threats represent a measure of intimidation and pressure or a presage of aggressive action in the future.

95. We do not expect the Government of the Soviet Union to regard our internal structure with affection, but we are at least entitled to expect it to refrain from planning to subject Yugoslavia to its hegemony, to cease its aggressive pressure and hostile acts against our country, and to show that minimum of respect for the sovereignty of a free nation without which no international co-operation is possible. But the delegation of the Soviet Union replies with insults and slander to the peaceful intentions of the Yugoslav Government, which hopes that the possibility of avoiding disputes which arouse anxiety in the minds of all peace-loving people will be discussed constructively here. With regard to those methods I have nothing to add to what the Yugoslav representative said in his reply two days ago [342nd meeting]. I should, however, like to point out one more fact.

96. These tactics, which consist in first heaping slander upon an independent country and its government and then in making this slander the pretext for disregarding quite openly all international obligations and the most elementary principles of relations between nations and for subjecting that country to the demands of foreign hegemony, are by no means new or subtle. In spite of them, however, facts remain facts.

97. Moreover, if the purpose of this method is to avoid replying on the substance of the issue, it is a bad method. The people of Yugoslavia and all peace-loving peoples

want a substantive answer, an answer to concrete questions concerning respect for the independence of a free people and the maintenance of universal peace. In particular, they wish to know whether the Government of the Soviet Union is prepared to concord its policy towards Yugoslavia even to a certain extent with the peaceful statement which USSR representatives make here so often. No slander can obscure the reality, peaceful intent and constructive character of this question, as raised by the people of Yugoslavia and in the form in which it has been submitted here by the Yugoslav delegation.

98. In view of the purpose of the United Nations "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples..." (Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Charter) and of its power to "...recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations..." (Article 14 of the Charter), the Yugoslav delegation hereby expresses its wish for the General Assembly to recommend that the USSR Government and other Governments of the Soviet bloc should render their behaviour in relation to Yugoslavia, as a member of the United Nations, compatible with the spirit of the principles of the United Nations Charter; restore to diplomatic relations their generally accepted meaning; establish a frontier system by agreement with Yugoslavia; agree to the establishment of joint commissions for the settlement of frontier incidents; and take any other necessary measures for the peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes between those countries and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

99. We are fully aware that these peaceful proposals bear no relation to the aggressive quality of the hostile acts of the governments of the Soviet bloc against Yugoslavia, but the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia nevertheless wishes to do everything in its power to help to find a solution of these problems and not to aggravate an international situation which is already very serious. Let the governments of the Soviet bloc show a minimum measure of preparedness to maintain friendly relations with the peoples of Yugoslavia.

100. The issue of Soviet aggressive pressure against Yugoslavia is not merely an individual case or a specific dispute. No; it is typical of the present state of affairs in the world, and especially of the fundamental cleavage between words and deeds which now characterizes the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. This issue illustrates one of the principal factual reasons for the present international crisis, one of the fundamental obstacles to any stabilization of international relations. Although it is true that the organizers of this aggressive pressure against Yugoslavia have achieved no results in Yugoslavia itself, they have achieved such results in other countries of eastern Europe.

101. The Polish representative, among others, recently adduced [342nd meeting] an "argument" against the Yugoslav complaint, to the effect that although we have spoken for four years of an imminent invasion of Yugoslavia, no such invasion has yet taken place.

102. Let us disregard the substance of this strange "argument". Nevertheless, the listener cannot fail to see something tragic in the fact that such an argument is put forward by the Polish representative in particular. It is true that matters have not reached a point where an invasion of Yugoslavia has taken place in the Technical sense of that word, but the Polish representative fails to

observe that during that time, behind the smoke screen of the anti-Yugoslav campaign, his own country, Poland, and other eastern European countries have in fact been annexed. The attack against Yugoslavia represented the beginning of the complete subjugation of the eastern European countries, which was carried out by ways and means which failed in Yugoslavia. The independent socialist development of these countries has been brought to an end. The trials in the capitals of eastern European countries, at which Yugoslavia was accused, were not in fact trials directed against Yugoslavia. They were directed against these same eastern European countries, and at them those countries' own independence was tried and sentenced.

103. But this is not all. Simultaneously with the final subjugation of these countries, a new stage in post-war international political relations was inaugurated. The existence of a number of really free and independent socialist governments in eastern Europe would have made it possible to strengthen and develop further the idea of international co-operation based on equal rights, and this would have facilitated the solution of many difficult international problems which remained unsettled after the Second World War. But the subjugation of these countries to a foreign hegemony consigned to the background this democratic concept, which had already received the seal of approval in the United Nations Charter, and the dangerous principle of the balance of power of the great Powers and the consequent division of spheres of influence began to flourish in its place. This has created such a tense situation in Europe, that it has become impossible to settle any question at all without disrupting the delicate balance between the great Powers which has now replaced the peaceful co-operation of great and small nations based on equal rights.

104. The Yugoslav delegation considers that the real reason why a number of questions have not yet been settled consists, not in any differences in the formal approach to their solution, but in the fact that no general conditions of international confidence have been created and that all these questions represent component parts of this international "balance", which is based exclusively on the strength of the great Powers. In actual fact, however, mankind can strengthen peace only in so far as it can retard the progress of hegemonic tendencies, the desire to achieve mastery and control over other nations, and can oppose solid, material, moral and political obstacles to such tendencies. The more democracy there is in international relations, the greater are the guarantees of the maintenance of peace.

105. That is the point of view from which the Yugoslav delegation considers the proposals of the Government of the USSR, which are now being submitted by that delegation. It is proposed that we should reduce armaments and prohibit atomic weapons. In principle, the Yugoslav delegation supports both proposals. Nevertheless, the approach to this question should not be abstract and pacifistic, but should have regard to its eventual practical bearing on the general cause of peace. Pressure against the freedom and independence of nations may also be conducted without the atomic bomb, since, as has often been stated in the Assembly, "conventional" bombs, aviation, various types of heavy artillery, and so on, can also be highly "effective" methods of mass destruction.

106. While such proposals are submitted separately from the settlement of urgent questions of international relations and separately from the effort to neutralize the fundamental

causes of the existing international tension which I have mentioned before, they will remain exclusively a propaganda weapon. Mankind needs an assurance that definite measures for the reduction of armaments cannot lead to the strengthening of one bloc and to the consequent clearing of the road for its aggressive pressure upon smaller and weaker nations. In the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, such confidence can be created, in the first place, by general efforts to strengthen democratic relations between nations, relations of mutual respect for their independence and equal rights. We consider that in that connexion governments should prove their love of peace by the policy they conduct in practice.

107. It is also proposed that we should conclude a "five-Power pact". It has often been stated here that a five-Power pact will be useless if it merely repeats the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter. It is obvious that sixty nations have greater weight than five. Nevertheless, if the five-Power pact does not serve the same purposes as the United Nations Charter, it can only represent a short-lived attempt to obviate the existing differences between the great Powers by establishing spheres of influence, and can only achieve a temporary stabilization of international relations through a new division of the world into spheres of influence. It must be clear to everyone that such a five-Power "peace pact" would in fact mean foreign mastery or war to a number of small and weaker nations. At the same time it would mean the end of the United Nations, the failure of this great democratic and progressive undertaking, international co-operation and collective security. Such a failure would also constitute a triumph for and an unleashing of all anti-democratic and aggressive forces in the world and would finally lead inevitably to a new world war. Recent history gives us convincing proof of this. Let us recall that no more than a year elapsed between the Four-Power Munich Agreement and the beginning of the Second World War. The conditions are even less favourable now than they were thirteen years ago. Of course, this does not mean that we do not consider individual consultations between the great Powers necessary for the strengthening of peace. These Powers bear the main responsibility for the fate of the world and for war. In that connexion the meeting between the highest representatives of the four great Powers, which was suggested here by the President of the French Republic, might have a positive effect.

108. At the present time negotiations are taking place in Korea with a view to concluding military activities. Not only the Korean people but all peace-loving humanity wholeheartedly desires the success of these talks. Nevertheless even in the most favourable circumstances, even if these talks are soon concluded successfully, we must bear in mind that we shall really have extinguished the fire only temporarily, and that its causes will remain practically unaffected.

109. The example of the Korean war shows more clearly than any other post-war event that attempts to achieve hegemonistic purposes by means of direct pressure or by turning certain political groups or movements into tools of the policy of a given foreign government is the continual reason for new world-wide clashes now more than at any other time. On the other hand, that example confirms the old truth that the most genuine movement towards national liberation must lose its free character and fail, if it becomes a tool of the foreign policy of another country.

110. That was the part played by USSR influence in Korea. That is why we attach such great importance to the strengthening of the independence and equal rights

of nations and, in general, to struggles for democratic relations between nations at the present time—together, of course, with the simultaneous expansion of international co-operation and the participation, based on equal rights, of all nations in international organs serving the common interests and purposes. We believe, I repeat, that this is the only way which will lead us to that indispensable confidence in the hope of maintaining peace without which it would be impossible to solve the greatest problems of contemporary international relations, such as the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons.

111. With reference to my Government and my country, I must state clearly that we regret being obliged to spend such a vast percentage of our national income on armaments and that we regret being obliged to appeal to foreign countries for assistance in a rearmament which we need only in order to defend our peace and independence, instead of using that assistance for the economic development of our country and hence for the increase of the contribution which our country might make to peaceful economic exchanges. Nevertheless, while the Government of the USSR continues to do everything in its power to subject our peoples to its mastery and to its economic exploitation, we can have no confidence in its peaceful statements and even less confidence in the sincerity and peaceful nature of its proposals concerning the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons. There can be no faith in the maintenance of peace throughout the world while nations have to fear for their independence and for their right to do as they wish in their own countries. If we eliminate aggressive threats, if we eliminate the fear of peoples for their freedom and independence, if we enable nations which have been subject to aggressive pressure and threats to believe once more that their peace and freedom will be respected, then such demands as reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons will give rise to greater confidence and will be accepted by all nations in good faith.

112. The Yugoslav delegation, considering that democratic relations between nations represent one of the principal conditions of peace and that the measure of respect for such relations may also be regarded as a measure of the contributions made by peoples and governments to the strengthening of peace throughout the world, reiterates its conviction that the confirmation of the rights and duties of States in international relations in a special United Nations declaration would make a highly useful contribution to the strengthening of confidence in the possibility of maintaining peace. In any case the Yugoslav delegation will continue to support action based on that idea.

113. Moreover, the elimination of vast economic differences between nations (and) assistance to under-developed countries with a view to hastening their economic development, is another of the permanent concrete aims of our efforts to paralyse the fundamental causes of war. Although it cannot be said that nothing has been done in his connexion, it will only be possible to speak of any decisive achievement in the matter when the relevant decision is made on the principal question, that of the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries. The Yugoslav delegation continues to believe that the establishment of a world fund for economic assistance to under-developed countries, with a corresponding democratic organization to control its use, would be one of the most important contributions to the cause of peaceful co-operation.

114. The events of the past year have undoubtedly shown that the United Nations represents the greatest obstacle

to aggressive tendencies which has ever been created by united mankind. The peoples of Yugoslavia are the more conscious of that fact because, at a difficult time in their history, they met with sympathy and received considerable support from the United Nations. In the present international situation, to abandon this Organization would be to deprive ourselves of the last possibility of peaceful international agreement and to give a clear field to the elements of force, the elements of aggression and war. Thus, any attack against the United Nations with a view to undermining the Organization is in fact an activity directed against world peace.

115. In the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, the future of the United Nations largely depends on the extent to which we can develop in it the independent initiative towards peace of all nations, great and small. The world does not need a special pact of the five great Powers, but it does need extensive independent activity by the small and medium States in finding ways which can lead us out of the present international tension. These countries cannot and need not belong to any bloc, but they represent an extremely strong moral, political and material factor, which may considerably assist the peaceful settlement of outstanding disputes.

116. Another question on which the future of the United Nations will depend is the direction in which its machinery for collective security develops. We consider it impossible to combat aggression only by means of declarations of principle and criticism having the nature of propaganda. The Yugoslav delegation considers that the first duty of peace-loving nations is to combat direct, aggressive threats, and it is convinced that the United Nations machinery for collective security may succeed in opposing obstacles to such threats. Only those who do not wish mankind to possess a weapon against aggression can take the view that that weapon should be abandoned merely because it may be abused in certain circumstances.

117. I do not wish to discuss in detail the proposals of the Collective Measures Committee, which in our opinion still contain certain weaknesses and failings, since we shall have ample opportunities to speak of this later. I shall only touch on one aspect of the problem here. We must not forget that the system of collective security is not in itself the creator of peace, although it may contribute to that cause. It is primarily a warning to a possible aggressor, a warning which intimates to him that, if he violates the only principles on which peaceful international co-operation can be based, he will be confronted with the collective resistance of all nations. But the United Nations should in the first place concern itself with action for the peaceful settlement of misunderstandings by direct negotiations between the parties, by conciliation and by mediation. Operation of collective security machinery should never hamper the United Nations in carrying out these tasks or in its efforts to be universal in its membership. If the United Nations develops in that direction it will play a highly important part in the general efforts of mankind to maintain and strengthen peace, and in promoting the further development, qualitative and quantitative, of peaceful international co-operation. The peoples and Government of Yugoslavia will support the United Nations in all aspects of this work.

118. In conclusion I should like, on behalf of the Yugoslav delegation, to join in expressions of gratitude to hospitable France and to the beautiful city of Paris. I would wish that we could be as unanimous in our decisions relating to the maintenance of peace and on respect for the rights of

nations and persons as we are unanimous in our delight with Paris and in our respect for those great social, cultural and philosophical achievements which Paris and France have given to all humanity for many centuries.

119. Mr. HENRIQUEZ URENA (Dominican Republic) (*translated from Spanish*): In the list of items proposed for the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly, one on which the Collective Measures Committee has made a very thorough report is particularly outstanding: "Methods which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter".

120. The inclusion of this item holds out ground for hope, because all, or almost all, the political items in the agenda might yield results, could we but attain unanimity of opinion and resolve upon the adoption of such methods. Questions like the international control of atomic energy or the reduction and limitation of armaments could be solved provided we first reach general agreement on the manner in which peace is to be maintained and strengthened. We should also be on the way to finding practical and useful solutions for problems like those connected with the threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of certain Members of this world Organization. If we attain agreement on methods, we shall have gone half way towards putting them into effect.

121. I therefore attach the utmost importance to the item arising out of the report of the Collective Measures Committee, for, if we were to succeed in taking a unanimous decision on it we should be able, sooner or later, to solve all the other political problems before us.

122. Nevertheless, the prospect before us is not encouraging. From the very first meeting of this session the sharp division of opinion on political problems has made itself felt. At earlier sessions, as we set to work, we were hopeful of reaching practical results in the political sphere and it was only as the days went by that the deep divergence of views became apparent, postponing the adoption of a concerted plan for peace and security. Our initial feeling of optimism was replaced by discouragement and scepticism.

123. I trust that on this occasion the reverse will be the case; I trust that the initial disappointment will very soon be replaced by renewed hope and faith. Or are we to believe the prophets who say that a new war is imminent? I cannot and will not believe that there is any nation which would dare to take upon itself the responsibility for unleashing a new world struggle which would shatter the achievements of civilization and our dearest and most fervent hopes of achieving a better future for mankind.

124. Is it possible that once again, wherever we turn our eyes, we shall see suffering, terror and desolation? Is it possible that once again death and destruction will rain from the skies, that tanks will ravage the fields made fertile by the farmer's patient toil, that whole cities will disappear in a day as though by an evil spell, and that with them thousands of non-combatants will perish sacrificed to homicidal mania, old men awaiting a peaceful death in prayer or meditation, innocent children just awakening with a smile to the delights of life? Is it possible that we should return to barbarism and that the spiritual forces which constitute the dignity of the human mind should be unavailing to prevent it, as though, stripping ourselves of the attributes of civilization, which has nurtured and fostered the noble collective ideals of mankind, we were to return to grope our way blindly through the dark forests of instinct.

125. No! We abjure the appalling nightmare. War should now be a moral impossibility and all men must unite in their resolve to condemn it as such. And the best means of securing that end and avoiding war is the study and adoption of effective methods for the maintenance of international peace and security.

126. Clearly, if the adoption of such methods is to be wholly efficacious, it is vital that we should achieve that effective universality to which the United Nations aspires; another item on our agenda, that relating to the admission of new members, tends towards that end.

127. If all peace-loving nations which observe the principles of the Charter are to be admitted to the United Nations, it is unreasonable that, in the absence of any evidence that they have departed from those principles, the door of the United Nations should be shut against them by the arbitrary mechanism which is known as the "rule of unanimity" but which should rather be termed the "privilege of the veto". I do not propose at this point to discuss the privileges enjoyed by the permanent members of the Security Council because of their greater responsibility for the destiny of mankind, but I consider it excessive, in the matter of the admission of new members, that they should have the power, by the mere casting of a single negative vote, to prevent the entry of other States into the United Nations.

128. Such a course might result in inconsistent and illogical decisions. Take, for instance, the case of Libya; suppose that, after the General Assembly has decided to set up an independent State there, when the time comes to put that decision into effect and, as a natural consequence of its fulfillment, to admit Libya to the United Nations, the new nation, created by the will of the Assembly, were prevented from taking its place among us for lack of a necessary vote in the Security Council. That situation has already arisen in the case of the Republic of Korea which was established by the United Nations and which has been the scene of the outbreak of the most serious conflict with which the United Nations has so far been faced. The case of Korea is such that we can safely say that it is putting to the test the integrity and resolution which our Organization must display if it is to survive.

129. Insecurity and disagreement hang like threatening shadows over the work to which we have set our hands. Even so, the United Nations presses on with its task of bettering the political structure of the world and ensuring the well-being of all nations.

130. In the economic field, an indication of the paramount importance of our work, is given by the most comprehensive and important of the items to be considered by the Second Committee: the economic development of under-developed countries, under three heads, financing, land reform and technical assistance.

131. Similarly, in the social field, efforts are being continued to improve the position of refugees and stateless persons and to give the latter a status, while progress has also been made with the draft international covenant on human rights.

132. The work carried on, with increasing efficiency, by the Trusteeship Council has produced a number of important items for discussion by the Fourth Committee, including the rural economic development of the Trust Territories, the abolition of corporal punishment and the development of administrative unions affecting Trust Territories; to these items we must add the consideration of information

from Non-Self-Governing Territories. Because of their substance, two items which involve points of fundamental legal importance are also to be dealt with by the Fourth Committee: the question of South-West Africa and the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council.

133. The Fifth Committee will as usual have to consider the administrative and financial work of the Organization; and, lastly, the Sixth Committee has to consider various problems of special importance in the development of law, beginning with the report of the International Law Commission.² In some cases, because the subjects under consideration are new, it is important that States Members should have more time to study them, which is the reason why the General Committee has recommended that the discussion of the draft code of offences against peace and security of mankind should be postponed until the seventh session. In other cases, for example, the draft declaration on rights and duties of States, objections have already been raised regarding the inclusion of certain principles which, being new, cannot be regarded as being fully incorporated in positive law and which, in the view of certain States Members, are a counsel of perfection in the development of law, although they do not believe that they have yet reached the point when they should be accepted as rules of law. The Latin American nations have already embodied many of these principles in positive form within the framework of the Organization of American States and will not, therefore, have any objection to them, but they may seek means of finding common ground with those Members which regard them only as a counsel of perfection. I feel sure, in short, that acceptable solutions can be found to avoid delay in the approval and adoption of the draft.

134. Thus, the United Nations is continuing without pause the constructive work on which it has embarked. If our efforts could achieve as much in the political as in the technical field, the success of the United Nations would be decisive and complete. There is, however, no cause to be faint-hearted. We must cherish the hope that, though the road be rough and difficult, we shall, for the good of humanity, succeed in ensuring that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter finally prevail throughout the world.

135. (*Translated from French*): I do not wish to conclude without paying tribute to our host, immortal France. I shall therefore try, albeit haltingly, to express in the grand tongue of Renan and Chateaubriand my hope that the glorious spirit of France may be a source of inspiration to us in the accomplishment of our work. France, above all countries, has, throughout its history, professed and maintained with ardent faith the cult of beauty, the mind and liberty.

136. Mr. HELOU (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): My delegation joins whole-heartedly in the tribute which so many speakers here have paid, and which was repeated but a few moments ago, to the hospitality of France. We vote too with pleasure that this session of the General Assembly coincides with the two thousandth anniversary of Paris, with the flowering of an age-long tradition of moderation, grace and balance, of a human civilization that testifies so clearly to a sense of universality.

137. At previous meetings and again today we have heard many and very useful suggestions and proposals which we all, I am sure, find helpful in directing our work.

However, at this sixth session of our Assembly, which is opening at a time of such dire uncertainty, distress and anxiety, I should like first of all, on behalf of my country, to repeat our profession of faith in international co-operation, in the principles which regulate it, in the deep-seated solidarity it evokes despite all the antagonisms and conflicts that appear upon the surface. This profession of faith and the observances it implies are, I believe, even more effective than the search in our committees for methods and texts whereby peace may be ensured. I do not, of course, wish to underestimate the long and patient work carried on for the codification of international relations, or to minimize our contribution to the study of constructive proposals for checking ventures; nor yet do I fail to appreciate the value and generosity of the economic, social and cultural assistance proffered by our Organization to the whole world, a subject on which we have listened [*337th and 338th meetings*] to eloquent accounts from the directors of the specialized agencies. I should like merely to say that our confidence is less in elaborated texts than in the spirit which gives them life, less in techniques than in the moral system which inspires them and, at the outset of my remarks, to proclaim in simple but forceful terms the primacy of the spiritual factor in this as in every other field.

138. Material goods, without which neither peoples nor individuals can live, are by their very nature capable of being measured and weighed; they are limited in quantity and are such that they cannot be shared without being divided. The distribution of wealth does not make *ipso facto* for agreement; far from it! If it meant merely that the goods of this world could be selfishly hoarded by some, if it were not governed and guided by higher considerations, if it did not express and imply a desire for order, equilibrium and peace, it would be a cause of dissension and conflict.

139. Peace is achieved through justice. I can say so all the more freely because I represent a small nation. I feel no apprehension on that account; far from it! On the contrary, I claim for the small nations, as a cause for pride and a title of nobility, the privilege of having decisively linked their destiny with the reign of right, of having identified their own cause and their security with the cause of right. How fortunate are they in their weakness, a purely material weakness! Fortunate in that their weakness, spares them the temptations of conquest and domination and leads them to take as the standard of their existence the principles of justice universally proclaimed and thus to be the most zealous of all the Members of the United Nations to hold aloft the lamp of real progress.

140. Thus, we, the small nations, know that we are making a powerful contribution to the security of all the others. If, to use Pascal's expression, the right emerges strengthened from our efforts, the numerical importance, the territorial area of the nations which have contributed to those efforts are of little account; and the support given by one of them, by Lebanon for example, to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is seen to have a greater influence on history than many a military venture and many a conquest by force of arms. But if in the end it is force that is justified and prevails in relations among the nations, of what nation, however powerful, can it be said that it is safe for ever from insecurity and aggression? In this collaboration between the great and the small for the preservation of peace, it is by the fate of the small nations and by the success of their efforts that the value and efficacy of the joint work can be gauged. And it is far from paradoxical to maintain that the great are not making a concession, but are reaping an immense advantage by conferring with the small on the basis of sovereign equality.

² *Ibid.*, Supplement No 9.

141. It is on that score that my country takes a keen interest in all the items on our session's agenda, just as it feels convinced of having made a large and valuable contribution to the United Nations during the last six years. We have brought to the task goodwill and a warm heart, an experience rapidly acquired in international assemblies and the resources of a wisdom derived from several thousand years of history and from our immediate contiguity to the very sites of Revelation.

142. While noting with satisfaction and confidence the progress made by the United Nations in the path of understanding and peace, my country considers it its right and its moral obligation to point out the failures and, at times, the bitter and hear-rending disappointments encountered. And in doing so we are not indulging in barren criticism but because we wish to contribute to the righting of wrongs and to anticipate and prepare for the future.

143. This then is the time to remind you that we, and the Organization with us, will not be saved by more texts, more motions, more proposals but, in many instances, by a reform of the spirit in which this Organization functions. Some decisions are taken in which one would look in vain for any conformity with the ideal, so frequently proclaimed, of peace with justice. Others remain a dead letter.

144. How can Lebanon fail to evoke as an illustration of both these classes of decision—and I could give you many other examples—the long drawn out drama of Palestine upon our frontiers, that has cost countless despairing victims upon our territory? How cruel is the irony of a formula when it is seen to be but a sin against the spirit! In this tragedy of Palestine, the iniquity we shall never cease to denounce was perpetrated in the name of the highest ideals of equity and charity. Nearly a million Arab refugees have for years been enduring indescribable sufferings on the pretext that other refugees must be found a home and, on the pretext of a home, a centre for an empire. A country that has resounded with so many messages of universal charity has been bathed in blood, conquered and given over to the most intransigent racial hatred by the very people, who, justly complaining of the consequences of racial hatred, appealed to men's compassion for their hard lot.

145. At the same time some are striving, in the name of conciliation, to sanction the *fait accompli*. The resolutions which the Assembly has adopted one after another over the past four years on the question of the refugees and the territorial question are now a matter for compromise, and the internationalization of Jerusalem, to which the day of mourning has returned, has, it seems, been reduced to a meagre and questionable assurance of free access to the Holy Places.

146. While I discharge this elementary duty of branding the injustices and violences suffered in Palestine, I should like for a moment to dwell on the problems of Jerusalem which affords the clearest evidence of that violence and injustice. Let there be no mistake. We are not singling out this problem and detaching it from its background; but we regard it a key problem, a test problem, because we see it as a problem of pure and unadulterated justice. By that I mean that it is uncontaminated by any political, economic or military consideration which might obscure the data.

147. The point therefore to which we cannot close our eyes is this. If the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly are not applied to Jerusalem, the city to

which the whole body of both Christianity and Islam—more than a hundred thousand human beings—are bound by their very faith, if they are not applied to a measure of internationalization prompted neither by favour nor by bias, what solution can we hope for the whole Palestinian-Arab problem, for the Arab refugees of Palestine? Is it imagined that it will have no effect upon the peoples' confidence in our Organization, in its justice and efficacy? Is not every nation led to consider itself in a state of emergency and to tell itself that despite all our advocacy and striving, the work of justice and peace has not borne fruit but that, for all the variety of organizations we have created, the spirit of self-interest lives on, the old warmongering spirit of self-interest that destroys all co-operation?

148. The truth is that justice, like peace, is indivisible. It would be vain to suppose that an injustice committed anywhere in the world could settle anything or anybody. It would be vain to try to choose between injustice and disorder. Injustice is itself disorder and insecurity. If an injustice is committed, we must realize that all our laws may be disrupted. Injustice itself is thus subject to a higher justice, and those who triumph in defiance of the right must fear to see their unjust victories swallowed up in the ruin of the whole United Nations structure whose foundations they have undermined.

149. I wish to make myself quite clear. I am not deluded enough to suppose that one more speech can make any immediate difference to the course of events. I have only a moderate belief in the persuasive power of speech. But I believe in the absolute power of truth. I believe that sooner or later the truth, although scorned and trampled on, will be avenged. I believe that truth is not a mere philosophic, abstract concept but a living reality, that it has being, and is the supreme director of history and its laws. I believe that everything done in defiance of the truth bears in itself the stigma of transience and disaster, and I say that, not from a feeling of exaggerated idealism but from a wide awake sense of reality, taught by the daily lesson of experience. For a nation, for the collectivity of nations to hearken to the language of truth in spite of prejudice and every other hindrance is to take out a sort of life insurance policy.

150. It is with this rule in mind, a rule instinct with wisdom and prudence, that the delegation of Lebanon will carry on its work and assures you of its collaboration. A member of the Arab League and of the United Nations, Lebanon brings the same spirit to these two forms of co-operation, the one on the regional and the other on the international level. The obligations they impose on it are of the same kind. In the Arab League, it has always, like all the other States in the League, adhered to the principles of the United Nations Charter. In the United Nations it asks that those same principles be applied to the solution of the problems of the Arab States, in whatever form they may present themselves and in whatever sector they may arise.

151. To understand us you must consider us not only from the political and strategic point of view but first and foremost on the plane of the mind and the emotions, not only on the level of geography but on that of geography and history taken together. We are the birthplace of world religions and of some of the world's major civilizations. Situated at the meeting place of three continents and of the great ideological movements of this century and of the past, we must be considered not merely as a "position" but as a physical, social and spiritual link indispensable to the peace of the world.

152. I do not wish to anticipate what the leaders of the other Arab delegations may have to say, nor to repeat the clear and temperate statements made at a previous meeting by the head of the delegation of Iraq [340th meeting], but I can without temerity interpret the views of the countries in the Arab League by requesting more understanding for these countries with their venerable past and their vast prospects for the future. During the decisive period through which we are passing and which is of particular importance in Egypt, whose national aspirations we cherish and whose contribution to civilization is so substantial, this is but the language of reason, equity and peace. For countries of the Arab League, and for mine in particular, it is an honour that we should be the instrument of nature for the recon-

ciliation of values which the discoveries and progress of the century are bringing ever closer together. It is for this reason and in this capacity that we wish to assist to the utmost of our power in solving the problems dividing the nations and we hope our problems will find the same measure of comprehension,

153. We are not here merely to make demands, but to contribute to the enthronement of international harmony and right. To sum up, by following the path of justice for all we are ensuring peace.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.