



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Draft international covenant on human rights and measures of implementation : report of the Economic and Social Council : report of the Third Committee (A/2112) (<i>concluded</i>).....	573
The problem of the independence of Korea : report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea <i>and</i> Relief and rehabilitation of Korea : report of the United Nations Agent General for Korean Reconstruction : report of the First Committee and the Joint Second and Third Committee, meeting jointly (A/2114).....	520
Closing of the sixth session.....	525
Minute of silent prayer or meditation.....	528

President : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

**Draft international covenant on human rights and
measures of implementation : report of the
Economic and Social Council : report of the Third
Committee (A/2112) (*concluded*)**

[Agenda item 29]

1. Mr. DE ALBA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*) :
The Mexican delegation to the fifth session of the General
Assembly was associated with the drafting, presentation
and adoption of General Assembly resolution 421 (V).
That resolution gives expression to the unity of the covenant
on human rights ; it states that the covenant cannot be
broken up into separate compartments, and it establishes
in clear terms the concept of the close inter-dependence
existing between civil and political rights and economic,
social and cultural rights.
2. This session can claim to have taken a great step
forward, for not a single delegation has argued that the
Covenant should not include social, cultural and economic
rights. Some delegations have suggested that those rights
should be embodied in two covenants, but they still adhered
to the view that social rights should be included in the
widest sense of the term.
3. With the same good faith and the same lofty aims
that have been expressed by certain delegations which
maintain the position they expounded on previous occasions,
my delegation adheres to the attitude it adopted at previous
sessions. We set out from a series of very simple ideas
—a charter, a declaration, a covenant. In the Mexican
constitution civil and political rights and the particular
guarantees therefor, as also economic, social and cultural
rights are included in the same instrument which is the
supreme national law. It is thus clear that both sets of
rights are inter-dependent and complementary to each
other.
4. Two covenants might open the door to all sorts of
loopholes and escape clauses and moreover we believe that

many changes would occur and many years slip by before
two such very important instruments could be drawn up,
let alone approved.

5. My delegation feels that for the time being we should
work on the basis of the Universal Declaration of Human
Rights and, as I have already said on another occasion,
we prefer a good declaration to a divided and ineffective
covenant. That is why we shall vote for the Chilean
amendment.

6. The documents before us ask us to vote for a very
important article, that on the right of peoples to self-deter-
mination. The work of the Third Committee may be
described as slow and tedious, but never as barren or
unproductive. It studied the problems of the covenant
on human rights in all their manifold aspects, and it laid
special emphasis on the right of self-determination. That
is perhaps one of the most fruitful and transcendent
achievements to the credit of the Assembly's sixth session.
The application of that article and the vistas it opens
before us are of immense importance to non-self-governing
peoples who have yet to attain independence or autonomy.

7. One might say, without being guilty of rhetoric, that
Franklin Delano Roosevelt is present at these discussions
and is a witness to the vote that is about to be taken on the
self-determination of peoples, for he expressed himself
incisively and categorically on that subject.

8. The right to self-determination is a social and political
doctrine which bears a deep American imprint of Anglo-
Saxon America and Latin America. Roosevelt frequently
referred to the heroes of Spanish-American independence.
The founders of the Spanish-American republics fought,
and many of them died, in the struggles for independence
and self-determination, during the wars which went on
in America throughout nearly the whole nineteenth century.
The blood of Spanish-American patriots flowed freely
during the whole of the nineteenth century for the conquest

and consolidation of the right of peoples to self-determination, self-government and independence.

9. Now, instead of war to the death, the path lies open to the United Nations by which it can help the peoples through pacific measures and bring complete independence to those peoples who still do not enjoy it. The road is open for negotiations between the peoples who are natives of the soil and colonial governments. One might say that the United Nations Charter invites us to assist in bringing about throughout the world what I may term a revolution by consent and in the common interest.

10. Through the clearing of the air and the creation of an atmosphere propitious to confidence, through the eradication of all barren agitation and unprofitable demagoguery, the way is open within the framework of the United Nations, for the realization of this important step forward in the history of mankind. The United Nations is not only bound by the Charter to obviate international wars; it is also its duty to see that in the domestic affairs and in the autonomous and independent life of the peoples no disputes or disturbances shall occur that might lead to or cause unrest or create trouble spots which could in one way or another endanger world peace.

11. Our delegation will therefore support the Chilean amendment as well as draft resolution III on the right of peoples to self-determination and all the other draft resolutions contained in the report of the Third Committee.

12. Some of you may find shortcomings in draft resolution III on the right of peoples to self-determination. Some who crave perfection may think the drafting unsatisfactory, but it must be taken in the spirit in which it was framed, and it must be remembered that this is the early stage before this text is transmitted to the Commission on Human Rights, where it will be improved and where redundancies and ambiguities of wording will be eliminated. But fundamentally it is so meritorious and praiseworthy an effort and one that falls so squarely within the provisions of the Charter that my delegation will vote for it in the form in which it has been submitted by the Third Committee.

13. Mr. CASSIN (France) (*translated from French*): At the beginning of this session of the Assembly the French delegation explained the three aims we were to try to achieve during the session. We expressed the wish, first, that the Assembly should be enabled in 1952 to vote treaty obligations regarding human rights in order to meet the expectations of public opinion; secondly, that these provisions should not be a mere repetition of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but should be effective and should be accompanied by practical and useful measures of implementation; and thirdly, that these treaty provisions should be such that they can be ratified by the largest possible number of governments and nations, because human rights must, once they have been proclaimed, be put into force.

14. Pursuant to these three aims, our delegation will explain its position with regard to the various draft resolutions now submitted to the Assembly for consideration.

15. We shall vote for draft resolution I; we shall not be able to vote for the Chilean amendment [A/2115] to that resolution, for the following reasons.

16. First, the draft resolution has retained all the elements which gave its particular value to resolution 421 (V) adopted by the Assembly at its last session. The first of the important questions that resolution 421 (V) settled was that it was impossible to draft a covenant on the civil and political rights without at the same time taking steps to deal with the economic, social and cultural rights. The need for two

simultaneous covenants, or for two categories of provisions, is clearly stated in the draft resolution before us. In the Commission on Human Rights the French delegation never believed that provisions for one category of rights could be brought before the Assembly unaccompanied by provisions dealing with the other category. It believes that the Assembly's vote on this idea of simultaneity will be of the utmost importance.

17. The second point from resolution 421 (V) retained in the draft resolution is the unity of purpose, the coherence of the work of protecting human rights. In order to enforce the Declaration it is necessary to observe common principles, to co-ordinate the instruments of implementation and to adopt so far as possible, similar provisions and analogous implementation—to the extent that this is feasible. Here too the draft resolution is satisfactory.

18. There thus remains a third disputed point: the question whether there are to be one or two covenants. My country would have been more favourable to a single covenant if that had been shown to be more practical. Our position is not based upon any dogma extolling or establishing a hierarchy, an inequality between the two categories of fundamental rights, between civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights.

19. We worked loyally in the Commission on Human Rights to achieve this unity; but we must keep our eyes fixed on realities if we are to do so successfully. It was found that there are two different forms of obligation in the single covenant, namely, immediate juridical obligations and others which require the preparation and adoption of long-term programmes. We could undoubtedly have both kinds of obligation in each of the two covenants in question, but no one can deny that in general there are more economic, social and cultural rights in the second category than in the first.

20. Secondly, my country has been strongly influenced by the attitude of peoples which cannot be suspected either of colonialism, imperialism or capitalism, but which also have immense needs and are not yet fully developed. I shall take as an example the fact that India and Lebanon were the original sponsors of the draft resolution which we feel we are ready to vote on. We also wish to show consideration for the views of peoples other than our own.

21. Thirdly, I must say to my colleagues who are in perfect good faith about the question of the single covenant that they would have been right and they would be right if there had been any intention of splitting up and drafting piecemeal a document called a declaration. But it is not the Declaration we are dealing with, but the enforcement of the Declaration. In each of your national Constitutions you have a single document, but the laws enforcing the Constitution are always different laws enacted successively, even if they converge.

22. Furthermore, if we can complete the two covenants, there would be nothing to prevent a very large number of ratifications in the two fields and the under-developed countries would be able, by ratifying in large numbers the covenant on the economic, social and cultural rights, to exercise strong moral pressure on the other countries as a whole, which would mean that the two covenants might obtain an impressive number of ratifications, whereas a single covenant might encounter serious difficulties.

23. As far as my own country is concerned, we shall not await the covenant before doing our duty. At this very moment, the National Assembly has voted a labour code for the French overseas territories which is being at present examined by the Council of the Republic and, before the

covenant on economic rights has emerged, we shall be in a position to subscribe to its obligations and, above all, to enforce them.

24. We regret that the discussions on the implementation could not be carried further at the present session of the Assembly. We should have liked the Commission on Human Rights to have received policy directives with regard to certain important points which it unfortunately will have to do without. Nevertheless, we shall vote in particular for resolutions II and V on implementation, which will help the Commission's work.

25. Finally, I come to draft resolution III, proposing the insertion in the draft international covenant of provisions on the right of peoples to self-determination. Here again, our position is clear. We have no objection to a reaffirmation of this principle, either in the preamble of the covenant or covenants or in a separate document, because the Charter has enshrined this principle and it is not at all a bad thing for the world at large to consider how it may be respected.

26. But what we should like to warn our fellow delegations against is the insertion in a covenant on human rights of a provision which concerns purely collective rights. The provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights emerged from the revolt of free peoples against the totalitarian massacres and atrocities of the last war; there was a desire to restore to the human person his dignity and prestige and to defend them in practice. That is the goal of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Human rights are, moreover, purely individual rights, or such collective rights as the right to vote, trade union rights or the right of association; but the right of peoples is necessarily and exclusively a collective right and is connected with the totality of the human freedoms which the Charter was intended to proclaim. The Charter has balanced parts, and it is natural to study the right of peoples to self-determination in its own place and human rights in their place. Let us avoid downward trends that upset the balance of the Charter.

27. Besides, the mandatory language of the operative part of draft resolution III imposes a method with rather serious implications. The Commission on Human Rights has not been left the least latitude and there will be serious difficulties in drafting this principle in legal form. In adopting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights you thereby adopted article 29, which stated that the rights of the individual are limited by the rights of others, by the rights of the community and by the individual's duties to the community. If you want to draft a covenant on the right of peoples to self-determination with any juridical validity, are you not bound to speak of the duties of each people to the international community and of the limitation of the rights of each people in the interests of peace?

28. That is a large political problem and, I tell you frankly, the Commission on Human Rights can undertake to see how the right fits in with the other rights, but it is not competent to study the political problem. In any case, it cannot study it alone, any more than it could have studied the economic, social and cultural rights alone, because in the case of those rights it discussed them with the representatives of the ILO, UNESCO et cetera and relied on those agencies for advice.

29. In brief, draft resolution III gives rise to grave objections. In our view, the most serious is that of the delay likely to be caused the work of the Commission on Human Rights and the risk of a general failure of governments to ratify the draft covenants.

30. I speak with all sincerity. My delegation will support the Danish proposals designed to relieve this draft resolution

of what it contains of unjust discrimination against certain peoples and certain States. But whatever resolutions are adopted, my country will not engage in sabotage. It will continue to work zealously in the light of the Charter for effective international protection of human rights.

31. What we wish is to caution the Assembly both against refusals to act and against exaggerated promises which might jeopardize the success of its mission. It is better to produce co-ordinated and methodical work worthy of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to give the peoples tangible results than to present them with the magnificent draft of a covenant which may never, perhaps, see the light of day.

32. Mr. PAVLOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation considers that the draft resolution which proposes that there should be two covenants on human rights, instead of a single covenant covering both civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights, having been approved by a very narrow majority in the Third Committee, should be rejected by the Assembly.

33. The aim of this draft resolution is to secure an uncalled for reconsideration of the decision taken at the fifth session of the General Assembly in 1950 [*resolution 421 E (V)*] to the effect that the enjoyment of civil and political freedoms and the possession of economic, social and cultural rights are interconnected and interdependent, and asking the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission on Human Rights, in accordance with the spirit of the Universal Declaration, to include in the draft covenant a clear expression of economic, social and cultural rights in a manner which relates them to the civil and political freedoms proclaimed by the draft covenant. It is this decision, taken at the fifth session of the General Assembly, on the interconnection and interdependence of economic and political rights and their inclusion in a single covenant on human rights that we are now asked to reconsider.

34. It should be emphasized that this decision, which was taken a year ago at the General Assembly's fifth session, was never implemented, either by the Economic and Social Council or by the Commission on Human Rights. The records of the commission indicate that it had not time enough to cope with this task. However, without waiting for the commission to do this work, a group of delegations has rushed through the Third Committee a decision to divide the single covenant on human rights into two separate instruments, one enumerating political and civil rights, the other economic, social and cultural rights. Thus, the General Assembly, without waiting for its previous decision to be implemented, is being forced to adopt a new decision to the exact opposite effect.

35. This reconsideration of the decision to have a single covenant on human rights is a matter of interest to those States whose representatives in the United Nations have always objected to including in the human rights covenant economic, social and cultural rights, such as the right to work, to leisure, education, social insurance and welfare and medical care. It is common knowledge that the most persistent opponents of such inclusion have always been the United States and United Kingdom delegations.

36. The USSR delegation, as the champions of the interests of the vast majority of the population of all the countries of the world, that is to say, of the workers, has always, at every stage in the drafting of the covenant, insisted that it must include economic and social, as well as political and civil rights. The stand of the USSR delegation on this point is based on the experience of our own

country. Our constitution embodies both the basic social, economic and cultural rights and the basic political and civil rights. In the Soviet Union, all these human rights are not only proclaimed and statutorily affirmed, but they are also materially guaranteed by the whole structure of our society. We recognize the unity and interdependence of all these rights. We regard economic and social rights as the basis of all other rights. If there is no right to work, to social insurance, leisure, education, housing and medical assistance, the articles on the right to life, liberty, equality and freedom of association lose their significance and have little value, as we have often pointed out. The society we are building in our country we have built not to repress individual freedom, but to allow the individual to feel truly free, free in the real sense of the word. It is difficult to conceive of individual freedom in the case of an unemployed man who has nothing to eat, and can find no outlet for his labour. True freedom can exist only where exploitation is eliminated, where no-one is oppressed by his fellows, where there is no unemployment or poverty, and where a man no longer lives in daily fear of losing work and home and food. Only in such a society can there be any real—not paper—freedom, individual or other.

37. It is on the basis of these hypotheses and of this experience that we have maintained that, if economic and social rights were separated from political rights, with the latter embodied in a separate covenant, the result would be to transform the covenant on political rights and freedoms into a meaningless declaration, designed only to deceive the popular masses.

38. The USSR delegation, of course, realizes that it is impossible to expect that the covenant should proclaim the principles and provisions of the constitution of the Soviet State—a socialist State—and of the people's democracies, where the rights enumerated are statutorily affirmed and implemented in a new form of social structure. It must be remembered that this has been made possible, in the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, by the fact that, in these countries, exploitation of man by man has been done away with and the foundations laid for the universal respect and genuine observance of human rights. The situation in other countries is entirely different and this must be borne in mind in drafting the covenant on human rights.

39. The problem is to produce certain minimum provisions which the General Assembly could recommend for inclusion in the covenant and, accordingly, in the national legislations of all United Nations Members parties to the covenant. Such minimum provisions would necessarily imply the unity of economic and social rights and political rights.

40. Such a decision as that proposed by the delegations of the Anglo-American bloc would mean a blow at human rights; it would be a retrograde step by comparison with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly in 1948. The United Nations would find itself still further away from its goal of helping to establish human rights, protecting and promoting respect for human rights, than it was in 1948. Political rights would, as a result of such a decision, have no real foundation; social and economic rights, being separated from political rights, would in that respect not be guaranteed, which would mean that, in countries where economic and social rights are not yet embodied in legislation, the position of persons most closely interested in those rights would be worsened.

41. The separation of the single covenant into two covenants would enable countries unwilling to establish the economic and social rights, which affect millions of working people, to evade compliance with that pressing requirement.

The drafting of two covenants on human rights would thus do nothing to improve the present situation in those countries and, in particular, in the underdeveloped countries and Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories.

42. For these reasons the USSR delegation is opposed to reconsideration of the 1950 General Assembly decision concerning a single covenant on human rights and insists that this decision should be maintained and that provisions on both civil and political and economic, social and cultural rights should be included in the human rights covenant. The USSR delegation hopes that all delegations which are loyal to the principles of the United Nations Charter will support this general policy to include political, economic and social rights in the human rights covenant on an equal footing.

43. The USSR delegation considers that it would be right for the majority of delegations to vote also for the inclusion in the human rights covenant of an article on the right of all peoples and nations to self-determination, an article which is immensely important to all colonial and non-self-governing peoples.

44. In 1948 the USSR delegation proposed, at the session of the Assembly during which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was on the agenda, that the Declaration should include an article on the right of every people and every nation to national self-determination specifying that States responsible for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories should promote the realization of that right in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations as applied to the peoples of those territories and that States should guarantee their national minorities the right to use their own native language and to have their own schools, libraries, museums and other cultural and educational institutions.

45. At the present session we have supported the provisions contained in draft resolution III on the right to self-determination, reflecting the aspirations of millions of colonial peoples. "All peoples have a right to self-determination". We have been told here that this wording is not perfect but I would like to emphasize that it contains the main essentials. It also contains all the other points that should be included in the covenant on human rights; they would be drafted by the Commission on Human Rights. Events have shown that large numbers of the oppressed and disinherited peoples in colonies and Trust Territories are becoming increasingly conscious of their own intolerable position, and of the iniquitous attitude of the colonial Powers, which forcibly interfere in their affairs, hinder their development, diminish their rights. These peoples are now taking up the fight for their rights. Recognition, in the covenant on human rights, of the right of peoples to self-determination, would be in strict accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter, and would help these peoples and nations to stand on their own feet and advance towards democracy, freedom and independence.

46. The USSR delegation will, as in the past, vote in favour of a single pact, and against separating political and civil rights from economic, social and cultural rights.

47. The USSR delegation will, accordingly, support the Chilean draft resolution [A/2115] for a single covenant on human rights.

48. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): On behalf of the Saudi Arabian delegation, may I be allowed to state that we will support the Chilean amendment to draft resolution A for, in spite of the arguments we have heard to the contrary, we still believe that a single covenant on human rights should be formulated. In fact, we still maintain

that human rights and freedoms, whether civil and political on the one hand or economic, social and cultural on the other hand, are so interconnected and interdependent that their separation into two documents would be artificial and arbitrary. Indeed, any human rights covenant which does not explicitly safeguard economic, social and cultural rights would, at best, be no more than an affirmation of civil and political rights which are to be found in almost all national constitutions and in the statute laws of Member States.

49. Most of those who have been advocating two separate covenants seem to overlook the lessons of history and brush aside the climacteric changes which have everywhere been convulsing people in recent times. The world today is not on the verge, but in the midst of a colossal social and economic revolution which, if not met with prompt reforms, may easily pave the way for dictatorship and consequent global wars and conflicts. More than one-half of the world's population today is destitute, and millions upon millions are living on the brink of starvation. Meanwhile the leaders of highly developed countries, instead of adopting bold economic measures to meet this critical situation, through their representatives, basing their arguments on so-called technical grounds, speak of evolutionary progress and counsel patience.

50. Patience is a luxury in which only the satiated can complacently indulge. Conversely, impatience has assumed the virulence of an epidemic among the poor and destitute, in other words among the under-privileged peoples of the world. We in the United Nations can afford to be patient because we belong to the satiated class, regardless of our political affinities. In so far as our personal welfare is concerned, it does not matter much one way or the other if one covenant or two covenants are separately or simultaneously presented for signature. But what about the one billion or more people in the world who are clamouring against an endemic state of hunger and disease? What about those intransigent millions amongst them who have started to revolt when they discovered that, merely raising their voices, was not enough to secure for them even man's elemental birthright of food, shelter and clothing, let alone social and cultural rights? You must behave and be patient, they are told. Civil and political rights will soon be yours — at least it is hoped so once the covenant on these rights is elaborated and signed. But, the intransigent millions interrupt, what about the economic, social and cultural rights? Eventually—eventually, is the reply. "Eventually" implies times. Time? How long—five years, a score of years or a full century? Let us not forget that time is the substance of life itself. Whatever the length of time, the intransigent millions have chosen not to wait and be patient; otherwise most governments would not be goaded into action and an attempt to improve their lot; otherwise most governments would not be asserting that man's economic, social and cultural rights cannot be divorced from civil and political rights.

51. In the nature of man's existence and in his relationship to society all these rights are an indivisible whole. Try to split them and the result would be a human explosion far more powerful and fearful than that of the atom. Once you have a widespread human explosion in the world, in other words a revolution, it takes a dictator to stem it. Once a dictator becomes well-entrenched and very powerful, other countries develop fear and begin large-scale defence programmes, and it is by virtue of such programmes that governments of so-called democratic countries resort to a disguised form of totalitarian rule and end by becoming themselves dictatorial. Such situations lead to a state of emergency being declared everywhere. The exercise of

civil and political rights becomes jeopardized in consequence and, should war be declared, most of these rights would be suspended, not only for the duration of the conflict but for several years afterwards. All this has happened, not only in ancient history but within our own lifetime. Two major wars, interspersed by sporadic and quite often prolonged states of emergency, do not seem to have been enough to jolt us into the consciousness that economic stringency has been to a large extent at the root of abnormal and frequently suicidal behaviour in the international field.

52. The indigenous people of the world will no longer be soothed or calmed down by being presented with documents which promise them protection of life by law without adequate food, which promise them freedom from servitude without the security of work, which promise them, in other words, a multitude of political and civil rights without those economic and social conditions without which liberty and the sanctity of life become mere words. The indigenous people seething with unrest will no longer be beguiled by empty promises but may revolt, they may fight, and they may die fighting, with the result that in the upheaval and turmoil political and civil rights will be suspended for many years. It is indeed tragic that rebellion and revolution should be resorted to once in a while in history as the method for bringing about reform in this world.

53. I do not know how much time I have at my disposal, but I cannot let this occasion pass without replying to Mr. Dehousse of Belgium. He seemed to make fun of the draft resolution on the right of self-determination that we approved in the Third Committee, simply because it so happened that he belonged to a minority. Every time a minority meets with a defeat some of its members try to rationalize their stand and engage in sarcasm and make fun of either the incoherence or the unintelligibility of a certain text.

54. I may perhaps be allowed one or two more minutes, because when I speak on this right of self-determination I am speaking on the part of millions who should be sitting in this General Assembly. A lot of water, so to speak, has flowed under the bridge since a request was made for the insertion of an article on self-determination in the covenant. The anguished cry for freedom and liberation from the foreign yoke in many parts of the world has risen to a very high pitch, so that even those who had been compelled to block their ears with the cotton wool of political expediency can no longer deny that they can hear it. Nor can those who have so far shielded their eyes from the dawn of a new day for those clamouring for freedom pretend that the night is not over and that darkness still prevails. I must repeat, for the benefit of Mr. Dehousse and of all those who support him in the spirit he manifested before us, that during the last twelve months or so, since the amendment submitted by Afghanistan and Saudi Arabia¹ on self-determination was incorporated in a resolution adopted by the General Assembly [*resolution 421 D (V)*], the pressure on the gates of freedom has increased and millions and millions of people trying to break through have been kept at bay with bayonets and with tanks and machine guns. So great has been the pressure that those in the front rows have fallen as martyrs of freedom, while thousands taken into custody languish in prison depths and thousands more live in hiding, driven from the comfort of their homes. There are also those who, from fear of being killed or impounded, have fled their native land and now live as

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 63, document A/C.3/L.88.

exiles in foreign climes just because they could articulate more eloquently their burning desire and that of their fellow men for freedom and self-determination.

55. What we are asking here is that the people living in the Non-Self-Governing Territories should be free. They cannot enjoy any human rights unless they are free, and it is in a document like the covenant that self-determination should be proclaimed. As I have no further time left in which to speak, I will end by saying that I support all those who have spoken in favour of inserting an article on the right of peoples to self-determination.

56. Mahmoud AZMI Bey (Egypt) (*translated from French*): Being the last on the list, the Egyptian delegation hastens to bring to a close the general discussion on the Third Committee's recommendations concerning the draft international covenant on human rights, by indicating its support for the Chilean amendment [A/2115] to draft resolution I. In doing so, the Egyptian delegation is anxious to prevent the General Assembly from abandoning the position taken at its fifth session in favour of formulating economic, social and cultural rights with civil and political rights in a single covenant, and so to save from possible shipwreck a piece of work which would redound to the honour of the United Nations.

57. From the discussions at the General Assembly's fifth session, the seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council's thirteenth session, as well as the General Assembly's current, sixth session, my delegation has the impression that some States—more especially the great Powers—are haunted by the fear of seeing the covenant on human rights completed and opened for signature and ratification. In some cases this fear is due to a jealousy, which I would describe as pathological, of any interference whatever in what they regard as the hermetically closed field of their domestic affairs; in others, to the measures of international supervision to which the application of the covenant would be subjected to the advantage of some of their citizens who are segregated from society owing to discriminatory inhibitions; in yet other cases, to the inevitable consequence of extending the application of the covenant to territories under the sway of those States.

58. Thanks to the clear and precise directives given by the General Assembly at its fifth session and to the salutary effects of the participation of the specialized agencies in the seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, the latter carried through its work and was on the point of completing its task, but for the short time allotted to it; lacking directives on certain specific questions, the Commission requested the Economic and Social Council to obtain for it those directives from the sixth session of the General Assembly. The Council asked the Assembly to reconsider its resolution 421 E (V) and to agree to the preparation of two covenants instead of one; and the Third Committee, by a very small majority of eight votes, has taken the same course.

59. The Commission on Human Rights would thus have to resume the work it was on the point of completing, but on a new basis and with a new approach, with the consequent risk of again being short of time and failing to fulfil its mission. And so we shall have played into the hands of the apprehensive minority, and the international covenant on human rights will never see the light of day or, at least through the subterfuge of simultaneous signature, will suffer the same fate as has befallen the two conventions on freedom of information.

60. I have no wish to be a bird of ill omen, but I cannot help feeling that, if the Chilean amendment is not adopted,

the General Assembly will again be in default at its seventh session as it was at its sixth and will cause world public opinion such deep disappointment that it will forget the enthusiasm with which it received the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in December 1948; and the prestige of the United Nations will greatly suffer thereby.

61. Having said this, the Egyptian delegation wishes to state that, whatever the result of the vote on the Chilean amendment, the Egyptian representatives on the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council will take part in the work on the covenant or covenants of human rights with the utmost loyalty and good will and without any prejudice whatever.

62. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Third Committee recommends that the General Assembly should adopt the seven draft resolutions which appear in its report [A/2112].

63. In addition, there is an amendment submitted by the delegation Chile [A/2115] proposing to replace operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution I with the following text:

"Reaffirms its directives in resolution 421 E (V) to the effect that it 'Decides to include in the Covenant on Human Rights economic, social and cultural rights'."

64. We shall proceed to vote on this amendment.

65. Mrs FIGUEROA (Chile) (*speaking from the floor*) (*translated from Spanish*): I request a vote by roll call.

66. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Chilean delegation having requested a roll-call vote, we shall proceed to vote accordingly.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Bolivia, having been drawn by lot by the President, voted first.

In favour: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina.

Against: Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Greece, Honduras, Iceland, India, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Panama, Philippines, Syria.

The amendment was rejected by 29 votes to 25, with 4 abstentions.

67. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution I.

Draft resolution I was adopted by 27 votes to 20, with 3 abstentions.

68. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall vote next on draft resolution II.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

69. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution III. A request has been made that the vote on this draft resolution should be taken paragraph by paragraph with a separate vote on certain phrases in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part.

70. We shall first vote on each paragraph of the preamble. I therefore put the first paragraph to the vote.

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 40 votes to 4, with 10 abstentions.

71. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the second paragraph of the preamble.

The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

72. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall vote next on the third paragraph of the preamble.

The third paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 44 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

73. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the fourth paragraph of the preamble, composed of sub-paragraphs (i), (ii) and (iii).

The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 45 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

74. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the paragraph 1 of the operative part. I put to the vote the first phrase as follows: "1. Decides to include in the International Covenant or Covenants on Human Rights an article..."

The phrase was adopted by 41 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions.

75. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the next phrase, which reads: "...on the right of all peoples and nations to self-determination..."

The phrase was adopted by 43 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

76. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the following phrase: "...in reaffirmation of the principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations".

The phrase was adopted by 46 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

77. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): A separate vote has been requested on the following phrase: "This article shall be drafted in the following terms: 'All peoples shall have the right of self-determination'..."

78. A vote by roll-call has just been requested on this phrase.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Liberia, having been drawn by lot by the President, voted first.

In favour: Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon.

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France.

Abstaining: Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Iceland, Israel.

The phrase was adopted by 36 votes to 11, with 12 abstentions.

79. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The next phrase which I shall put to the vote is worded as follows: "...and shall stipulate that all States, including those having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories, should promote the

realization of that right in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations..."

The phrase was adopted by 37 votes to 6, with 7 abstentions.

80. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The next phrase to be put to the vote is the last phrase of paragraph 1 of the operative part, namely "...and that States having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories should promote the realization of that right in relation to the peoples of such Territories;"

The phrase was adopted by 33 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on paragraph 2 of the operative part. I shall put this to the vote in two parts and we shall first vote on the sentence I am now going to read—"2. Requests the Commission on Human Rights to prepare recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples and to submit these recommendations to the General Assembly at its seventh session."

The first sentence of paragraph 2 was adopted by 37 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

82. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I shall now put the remainder of paragraph 2 of the operative part to the vote.

The remainder of paragraph 2 was rejected by 21 votes to 19, with 9 abstentions.

83. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I shall put to the vote draft resolution III as amended.

Draft resolution III, as amended, was adopted by 42 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.

84. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I shall put to the vote draft resolution IV.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 32 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

85. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall proceed to vote on draft resolution V.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

86. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on draft resolution VI.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

87. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Finally, we shall vote on draft resolution VII.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 37 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Poland who wishes to explain her vote.

89. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) (*translated from French*): The Economic and Social Council, disregarding the recommendations made at the General Assembly's fifth session, has succeeded in reopening at the sixth session the discussion of a subject on which final decisions were taken a year ago. Resolution 421 E (V) clearly stipulated that a draft covenant on human rights should be drawn up containing articles relating to political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights.

90. The United States delegation, sponsor of the thesis that the covenant should be divided into two parts, failed to secure acceptance of its proposal at the Assembly's fifth session. Taking advantage, however, of the favourable composition of the Economic and Social Council, the United States delegation, at the Council's thirteenth session,

sabotaged the implementation of the decision taken at the fifth session of the Assembly.

91. This year the same delegation has formulated its thesis somewhat differently but the sense remains the same. Its argument is that two covenants should be drawn up simultaneously and simultaneously submitted for signature and ratification. The illogical nature of such an arrangement was exposed during the Third Committee's discussions when several delegations pointed out that this requirement of simultaneity, being contingent upon the good faith of signatory governments, would in effect preclude full enjoyment of the benefits of the covenant on human rights.

92. The Polish delegation has always taken the position that it is essential to draft but one single covenant covering all rights, political, civil, economic, social and cultural. We consider that civil and political rights cannot be respected unless based on economic, social and cultural rights. The right to life will be a dead letter if a man is not given the right to work. The article of the draft covenant which states that no one shall be held in slavery will ring hollow if the worker is not assured the right to rest. Denied the opportunity for rest, the worker is in fact nothing but a slave. Another article of the covenant which stipulates that no one shall be held in servitude will lose all practical value if the working masses are not guaranteed social rights. In countries where the workers have no social insurance, and especially no unemployment insurance, they are compelled to accept any work and any wage, always assuming they find work. Through the pressure exercised by famine and poverty large numbers of people are held in servitude. The article which speaks of the equality of all before the law will also be shorn of its substance unless it rests on the basis of rights prohibiting all racial discrimination. Many similar examples could be cited to demonstrate the soundness of the thesis that a single covenant is required.

93. My delegation is convinced that the division of the covenant on human rights into two or more parts is contrary to what the mass of workers expect of the United Nations.

94. We voted therefore against draft resolution I inviting the Commission on Human Rights to draw up separate covenants. We voted for the Chilean amendment calling for reaffirmation of section E of resolution 421 (V) and recommending that a single covenant should be prepared embracing political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights.

95. We voted also for resolution III aiming at the inclusion in the covenant on human rights of an article on the right of peoples and nations to self-determination. The adoption of that resolution was in our view, all the more necessary as, although the principle is stated in the Charter of the United Nations, it is being violated daily, particularly in non-self-governing countries and colonial territories. Recent events have amply shown the magnitude of the danger that such violations represent for world peace.

The problem of the independence of Korea : report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and Relief and rehabilitation of Korea : report of the United Nations Agent General for Korean Reconstruction : report of the First Committee and the Joint Second and Third Committee, meeting jointly (A/2114)

[Agenda items 17 and 27]

Mr. Thors (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, submitted the report of the First Committee and of the Joint Second and Third Committee, meeting jointly (A/2114) and then spoke as follows :

96. Mr. THORS (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee : I venture to say that it is the most fervent desire of the United Nations that peace may be brought to the suffering, devastated and war-torn country of Korea. Accordingly, our draft resolution expresses the desire to facilitate to the greatest possible extent the negotiations at Panmunjon and the conclusion of an armistice in Korea.

97. Furthermore, the United Nations is desirous that reconstruction, relief and rehabilitation may proceed and progress, and that more bloodshed may be spared. The whole world prays for peace and anxiously awaits hopeful news from the armistice negotiations in Korea. Those negotiations must not fail.

98. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : The First Committee and the Joint Second and Third Committee, meeting jointly, recommend adoption by the General Assembly of the draft resolution appearing in the report [A/2114].

99. I remind representatives who wish to explain their votes that they should ask for their names to be included in the list of speakers.

100. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*) : The United States and United Kingdom delegations, at the sixth session of the General Assembly, have done all they could to prevent the Korean question being discussed by systematically rejecting the USSR proposal that the General Assembly should examine it immediately.

101. The draft resolution [A/1962] submitted on 17 November 1951 by Mr. Vyshinsky, the Chairman of the USSR delegation, proposed that the General Assembly should take steps to ensure the immediate cessation by both sides of military operations in Korea, the conclusion of an armistice, and the withdrawal of troops from the 38th parallel within ten days. The USSR draft resolution also proposed that all foreign troops and foreign volunteer detachments should be withdrawn from Korea within three months. This USSR draft resolution was turned down by the delegations of the Anglo-American bloc.

102. On 3 January the USSR delegation submitted to the First Committee a proposal [A/C.1/688] for convening a periodic meeting of the Security Council to consider, first and foremost, what measures the Council should take to bring about the successful conclusion of the armistice negotiations that are being conducted in Korea. That USSR proposal, however, was also rejected by the United States delegation and the United States following in the United Nations.

103. On 9 January, when the First Committee reached the question of Korean independence on its agenda, the USSR delegation insisted that this item should be considered without delay. Objections, however, were raised by the United States delegation and the Anglo American bloc.

104. Mr. Vyshinsky, the Chairman of the USSR delegation, even then exposed the intentions of United States ruling circles to prevent discussion of the Korean question at the sixth session of the General Assembly. At that time, early in January, the United States representatives had still not decided to disclose their intentions completely. The Anglo-American bloc delegations simply forced the First Committee to decide to defer consideration of the Korean question and pass on to other items on the agenda.

105. Then, when the discussion of all the other items had been completed, and the agenda was exhausted, no further dissimulation was possible. They had to drop the mask and come out into the open. Arbitrarily, with utter disregard

for legality and in violation of the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and its Committees, the United States delegation, together with the delegations of the United Kingdom and France, submitted a draft resolution proposing that the question of Korea should not be considered at the sixth session of the General Assembly. That draft resolution was submitted neither to the First Committee nor to the General Committee but to a non-existent combination of the First and Joint Second and Third Committees. By thus bringing pressure to bear on the officials of the Assembly and its Committees, and making use for their own particular ends of American members of the United Nations Secretariat, these delegations by-passed the General Committee of the Assembly, convened a meeting of a committee of their own creation and thus arbitrarily removed the Korean question from the First Committee's agenda.

106. It is not at all surprising that the USSR delegation and several other delegations protested strongly against such arbitrary action by the Anglo-American bloc in the General Assembly.

107. Once again the voting machine was set in action. The competence of this illegal committee was approved by the votes of the Anglo-American group, and a resolution proposing that the Korean question should not be considered at the current session was then foisted on it. Such are the illegitimate origins of the draft resolution now before the plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

108. Accordingly, by means of unscrupulous, underhand machinations, and in direct violation of the Charter and of the rules of procedure, the Anglo-American bloc is imposing its will on the General Assembly. All this completely exposes the real aims and intentions of the United States Government. It is afraid of the Korean question being discussed in the General Assembly, afraid of sane international criticism; afraid to face world public opinion and answer for its aggression against the Korean people and its actions in Korea, its deliberate protraction of the armistice negotiations, and, finally, its policy and plans for widening aggression in the Far East. The United States Government and the group under its leadership are in a great hurry to foist this illegal resolution on the Assembly and get rid of the Korean question altogether, letting it be settled by force of arms and leaving it to the American militarists and the American command in Korea to dispose of and settle the Korean question. This is now crystal-clear to all.

109. And there is something else, too, that is clear: namely, that it is for the United States, which launched the aggressive war in Korea, to put an end to it. It is a party to the armistice talks, and it should therefore take steps to bring them to a successful conclusion. The United States Government must bear full responsibility both for any breaking off, under any pretext, by the American side, of the armistice talks and an expansion of American aggression against the Korean people and also for an expansion of such aggression in the Far East. Whatever tricks or backstairs procedural manoeuvres it may employ, either within the United Nations or outside, the United States Government cannot evade this responsibility.

110. The USSR delegation, which regards a peaceful settlement of the Korean question as one of the important measures for removing the tension now prevailing in international relations, insists that the General Assembly should immediately and without delay consider the Korean question and take the necessary decision.

111. The General Assembly has the power to compel the American aggressors to put an end to their aggression

against the Korean people and expedite the conclusion of an armistice. The vote on the previous question on our agenda shows that the General Assembly has the means of bringing influence to bear on the colonizers and imperialists. The General Assembly is also able to take steps to promote a successful conclusion of negotiations for a cease-fire in Korea.

112. The USSR delegation, therefore, urges the General Assembly to reject the joint United States, United Kingdom and French draft resolution designed to encourage and continue American aggression in Korea and urges it to instruct the First Committee to consider the Korean question forthwith with that end in view.

113. For the above reasons, the USSR delegation will vote against the United States, United Kingdom and French draft resolution.

114. Mr. MACAPAGAL (Philippines): Representing a country which has troops in Korea and has actively participated in the United Nations action to repel aggression in that area, the Philippine delegation would like to state the basis of its vote on the draft resolution before us. It is an interesting coincidence that the discussion on the draft resolution on Korea, which was approved by the Joint Committee, should take place during the concluding meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly. The most difficult and contentious problem before the United Nations has not seemed likely to afford us the opportunity of concluding our deliberations in Paris on a note of diminished passion or of tranquillity or hope. Yet the bitter debate which took place in the Joint Committee on this draft resolution, and which seems to persist in this plenary meeting, could make us wish that a good angel might descend upon us to mollify our anger and enable us to invest this last meeting with the dignity and even cordiality which the occasion so obviously requires.

115. This draft resolution seeks to postpone the discussion of the problem of the independence of Korea to a special session or to an emergency special session in New York, as the case may be, depending on whether the current armistice negotiations in Panmunjom succeed or fail.

116. My delegation notes that its purpose is explicitly stated in the draft resolution itself. It affirms the desire of the General Assembly that the armistice negotiations should be brought to a successful conclusion as soon as possible. It also affirms the intention of the General Assembly to discuss the political aspects of the problem of Korea as soon as it is officially notified of the conclusion of the armistice, or as soon as other circumstances so warrant.

117. Finally, the General Assembly affirms its continuing interest in the rehabilitation of Korea.

118. In all candour it is difficult to see how such a draft resolution could be opposed by any delegation which sincerely desires a speedy conclusion of the armistice negotiations and the cessation of hostilities in Korea. Those negotiations, it will be recalled, were made possible in the first place through the action of the Soviet Union itself, and it was clearly understood from the beginning that the negotiations would concern only questions of a military character.

119. In supporting this draft resolution, the Philippine delegation spurns the charge that the Philippines, together with the United States, the United Kingdom and others, by desiring a deferment of a political discussion of the Korean problem, does not wish for the termination of the Korean war. Nobody who is interested in ferreting out ulterior motives can point the finger of suspicion at those of us who wish to postpone a political discussion to a later

date, although he might very well do so at those who demand a political discussion now.

120. My country sent a military unit to Korea because it is a loyal Member of the United Nations, and because, under its Constitution, it rejects aggression as an instrument of national policy and considers that it must be stopped, whenever and wherever it rears its ugly head, by the combined strength of the peace-loving States. It is plain from this that, like our associates in Korea, we want the armistice negotiations to succeed, we want the hostilities to come to an end, and we want peace in Korea.

121. The Soviet Union says that it desires the same things. The question therefore resolves itself into quite a simple one. It is whether or not a discussion of the political issues at this time would help or would hamper the armistice negotiations. It should be obvious to any impartial mind that a debate on the political aspects of a Korean settlement at this time would surely hamper and may even render impossible the success of the current negotiations. The sixteen Member States which are participating in the United Nations action in Korea are of this view, and thirty-five other Member States, including those who as a rule do not take sides in the conflict of the great Powers, have indicated, by their vote in the Joint Committee, that they share or incline to this opinion. The Soviet Union and four other Member States which, by their own declaration, are not directly involved in the Korean situation, have taken a contrary view. With all due respect, I wish to say that this vote has nothing in common with decisions which the Soviet Union likes to characterize as those of the mechanical majority of the United Nations. It is a decision taken on the basis of the clear and undistorted facts of the situation, and formulated strictly in accordance with a logical and common-sense appraisal of the facts. Moreover, the adoption of this draft resolution would be in the interest of no particular nation or nations but in the interest solely of the restoration of peace in Korea. There would seem to be no reason, therefore, for the USSR opposition to this draft resolution.

122. Nothing we can say or do now at this last meeting of the sixth General Assembly session can redress or cancel the bitterness which for the most part has characterized our deliberations; but a unanimous vote on this neutral draft resolution concerning the most contentious problem before the United Nations could give this session the note of sober dignity and diminished tension which we desire and which all the world would welcome. While argument may arise as to whether at this session we have moved forward or backward or remained at a standstill in the quest for peace, we can at least feel certain that, by voting for this draft resolution, we move forward, for it constitutes a forward step in the restoration and maintenance of peace in Korea and perchance in other parts of the world.

123. For these reasons the Philippine delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, and it addresses an earnest appeal to others to do the same.

124. Mr. HRSEL (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has before it an illegal draft resolution, the form of which is contrary to the United Nations Charter and the General Assembly's rules of procedure and the substance of which is completely at variance with the fundamental purpose of the United Nations, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security.

125. Violation of the United Nations Charter and rules of procedure, violation of treaties and agreements, violation of the competence of individual organs of the United Nations and violation of the generally-accepted practices and usages

of the General Assembly and other United Nations organs—those are the means and methods adopted by the Anglo-American majority in the United Nations. By violating the United Nations Charter, distorting the rules of procedure of United Nations organs, pushing their resolutions through by the mechanical majority and thus outwardly legalizing their actions directed against the Charter and against the purposes and principles of our Organization, the ruling circles of the United States are trying at all costs to turn it into an obedient tool of their aggressive policy, i.e. to a tool which should help the American monopolists to establish their hegemony over the whole world.

126. The draft resolution submitted for the General Assembly's consideration to-day was approved at the illegally convened so-called joint meeting of the First Committee and the Joint Second and Third Committee, and is thus being illegally submitted to the General Assembly.

127. One need only cite rules 41, 42, 43 and 107 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to show the absolute illegality of the conduct of the Chairman of the joint meeting of the First Committee and the Joint Second and Third Committee, the absolute illegality of the so-called joint meeting of those Committees, of the work of that meeting and, hence, of this draft which is now referred to the vote of the General Assembly.

128. The so-called joint meeting of the First Committee and the Joint Second and Third Committee was convened under the pressure of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. These States are not anxious for the General Assembly to have a proper discussion either of item 17 of its agenda, "Problem of the independence of Korea", or item 27, concerning the relief and rehabilitation of Korea. Under the flimsy pretext of not wishing to interrupt the peace talks at Panmunjom, the United States, which is the real aggressor and disturber of peace and security in Korea and the Far East, is trying to postpone the discussion of the Korean problem and thus to prolong the war in Korea.

129. The governing circles of the United States began their aggression in Korea in June 1950. Since then, the American aggressors have been waging the war in Korea with a barbarity unprecedented in history and are laying waste the Korean countryside. They are razing towns and villages to the ground, bombing and slaughtering the civilian population and terrorizing the peace-loving Korean people. The armistice talks which were begun in Korea on the generous, peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union are being systematically and deliberately prolonged by the American aggressors. The American aggressors and the American monopolies, which are one and the same, are pursuing the single purpose of prolonging the war in Korea as long as possible. The draft resolution submitted to us to-day serves to prove this anew.

130. These facts cannot be concealed by the repetitious statements of the ruling circles of the United States to the effect that they want to end the war in Korea. These statements are just as hypocritical and false as all the other lies of the Americans about the origin of the armed conflict in Korea. American aggression in Korea is a historically proven fact. Another such fact is the heroic struggle of the Korean people against the American aggressors, against the imperialist enslavers and exploiters.

131. The Czechoslovak delegation resolutely spurns this illegally submitted draft resolution, which will not be of the slightest help in settling the Korean question, and insists that the General Assembly should direct the First Committee to give immediate consideration to this important question of Korea.

132. The American aggressors and their lackeys may try to distort the reasons for the events which are taking place in Korea and falsify the course of those events. The American aggressors and their lackeys may falsify the past. They may lie about the present. One thing, however, they will not succeed in doing : they will not succeed in avoiding the defeat of imperialist aggression ; they will not succeed in preventing the victory of peace over war.

133. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : There are no more speakers on my list for explanations of vote on the draft resolution. Accordingly, we shall proceed to the vote. The delegation of Yemen has requested that the preamble and sections I and II of the draft should be voted on separately.

134. I call for the vote on the preamble.

The preamble was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions

135. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : We shall now vote on section I of the draft resolution.

Section I of the draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

136. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : We shall next vote on section II of the draft resolution.

Section II of the draft resolution was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

137. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the President, voted first.

In favour : Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against : Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining : Chile, Yemen.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 51 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

138. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : The United States representative has asked leave to explain his vote.

139. Mr. GROSS (United States of America) : My delegation believes that the vote which has just been taken, and which repeats the overwhelming support for this resolution in the joint meeting of the First and the Joint Second and Third Committees, manifests the will and determination of the United Nations, clearly expressed through its highest organ, the General Assembly, to reach an armistice in Korea.

140. From 25 June 1950, from the hour of the outbreak of the unprovoked aggression against the Republic of Korea, it has been the firm purpose of the United Nations and of my Government, as a loyal supporter of the United Nations, to bring about an end to aggression in Korea and the speediest possible termination of the hostilities. The United

States Government, responsible for the Unified Command, has pledged itself and pledges itself again here, to do everything in its power to bring about a just, an honourable and a satisfactory armistice in Korea.

141. We are disturbed and disappointed at the slow course of the negotiations at Panmunjom, but we believe that an armistice is possible. We shall do our best to bring that about, and the reason we are anxious to bring about an armistice in Korea is not merely the wish to terminate the sacrifice of lives, of property and of fortunes, and the devastation which aggression has brought to that country, but it has been and remains our purpose to make it possible, as soon as possible and with the least delay, to turn to the political and economic questions affecting the future of Korea.

142. We do not think that discussions here and now can possibly facilitate the armistice negotiations. The USSR representatives have, in their repeated statements and interventions in the Committee, made clear, and I think they persuaded the vast majority of the members of this Assembly, why this resolution is justified. At no time did the USSR Foreign Minister or the present chairman of the delegation, Mr. Malik, in their repeated interventions, find it possible to discuss the subject of Korea without doing four things, all of which in our judgment are harmful to the course of the negotiations and show the adverse impact which discussions here would have upon the negotiations.

143. In the first place, the USSR representatives apparently found it necessary to seek to inject political issues, such as the question of the withdrawal of forces from Korea, despite the fact that before the negotiations for an armistice began it was agreed by all parties, and agreed by the Soviet Union itself, that the negotiations should be confined to the military terms of an armistice.

144. Secondly, the USSR representatives have felt impelled to seek to reopen the question, closed in negotiations, as to where an armistice line should be drawn.

145. In the third place, the USSR representatives found themselves impelled to seek the transfer to Paris of military matters under negotiation in Korea. In each of the repeated interventions, the USSR representatives referred to such questions as prisoners of war and airfields—military matters under negotiation at the present moment in Korea.

146. Finally, the USSR representatives felt impelled, as they put it, to facilitate the negotiations by branding the United Nations negotiators with such terms as "maniacs" and "cannibals". This was the programme proposed by the Soviet Union to facilitate the negotiations at Panmunjom.

147. This resolution is wise in both its parts. In the first part it seeks to make clear the policy of the United Nations that, as soon as an armistice is concluded, we shall turn at once to the consideration of political and economic questions regarding the future of Korea. The second part of the resolution is in our view equally important, for the second part makes it possible for the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds to seek to raise the necessary funds to deal with the present problems of relief and rehabilitation which must be dealt with now without delay.

148. I would conclude by saying that, along with other Members of the United Nations who have not merely professed but demonstrated an unshakable loyalty to the Organization, we are fully aware of our own responsibilities in Korea, and we know that the United Nations policy remains, and will remain, to see a unified and an independent

Korea built after an armistice is reached. But what is of most immediate importance, it seems to us, is that we must exercise our responsibility to ensure that nothing shall be done here to delay or to prevent the conclusion of an armistice under conditions which will safeguard the future of the State, the peace of the area and the welfare of the Korean people.

149. It is for these reasons that my delegation was proud to sponsor and to vote for the three-Power draft resolution along with the Governments of the United Kingdom and France.

150. Mr. BIRECKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): The United States representative has just told us that he is proud of his work on the agenda item concerning Korea. He is proud to have created a situation in which the United Nations can do nothing to expedite the talks at Panmunjom and to put an end to the sufferings of the Korean people caused by the mass destruction going on in Korea, mainly through the action of the United States army of occupation.

151. We have also been told that the vote on the resolution reflected the desire to reach a conclusion in the armistice talks. The United Nations must do nothing. It must not interfere in what is happening in Korea. According to the United States representative, that will expedite the conversations at Panmunjom. Maybe that reasoning holds good for that representative, who gave us today some examples of his attitude to the Korean affair, an attitude which is in keeping with United States tactics ever since the beginning. He told us that the United States Government was disappointed by the slowness of the talks. But who can make them go faster if not that Government? Who is a party to them if not the United States Government? If the United States representative thinks that these talks are going too slowly, he has only to turn to his own Government in order to speed them up, instead of telling us here that he regrets they are so slow.

152. The United States representative also told us that he deplored the destruction inflicted, alas, upon the Korean people. But who is destroying Korea today? American planes, American guns, the American army of occupation. If the United States representative feels that such destruction is harmful to the Korean people—as we have always maintained—he has only to turn to his own Government to put an end to it.

153. We have been told that the USSR proposal for expediting the talks and promoting their speedy and successful conclusion through a meeting of the Security Council amounted to an attempt to transfer the armistice talks to Paris. That is an obvious lie, one that has been several times refuted from this rostrum and in the First Committee. There has never been any question of that; the only intention was to bring the talks to a speedy conclusion.

154. The United States draft resolution, endorsed by the United Kingdom and France, aims at removing from the agenda of the current session the problems arising from the United States aggression in Korea, and was discussed at a joint meeting of the First, Second and Third Committees convened for that purpose. The Polish delegation protests against the way in which that joint meeting was organized. No recommendation by the General Committee, no decision by the General Assembly itself authorized the convening of the joint meeting of the three Committees. The problem of the independence of Korea, according to a previous decision of the General

Assembly, was to be discussed by the First Committee alone, while the rehabilitation of Korea was to have been considered in the Joint Second and Third Committee. As can be seen, the joint meeting of the Committees was convened illegally.

155. That action was instigated by the United States, United Kingdom and French delegations, which were not only opposed to having the General Assembly discuss the problems arising from the United States aggression in Korea, but also tried to restrict the discussion to their own draft resolution at a single joint meeting of the three Committees. It is therefore evident that the United States delegation shies at no irregularity or illegality in order to prevent the United Nations from considering any aspect of the Korean situation. The reasons for that attitude were disclosed by us at the joint meeting of the First, Second and Third Committees. We pointed out that the United States delegation was trying first and foremost to prevent world opinion from learning the whole truth about the preparations of the United States Government to extend the Korean conflict, and more especially the preparations being made in south-east Asia by the United States, United Kingdom and French Governments to attack the People's Republic of China.

156. The attempts of the United States delegation to stifle any discussion on Korea at the current session and to prevent the United Nations from intervening are all the easier to understand when we remember that a secret meeting of United States, United Kingdom and French staff officers is being held in Washington at this very moment to finalize the preparations for aggression against the People's Republic of China. This secret conference follows on the conference held for the same purpose at Washington in mid-January by General Bradley, General Juin and General Slim. We now see why the United States delegation has, in these circumstances, spared no effort to prevent the present session from dealing with Korea.

157. Moreover, the United States delegation is anxious to hush up any publicity for the way in which the United States representatives at Panmunjom are preventing the conclusion of an armistice. But we know now that it is the United States delegation which is rendering impossible the conclusion of the armistice at Panmunjom by the demands that are being made in defiance of the agreements signed by the United States Government and of the spirit and letter of international law.

158. Nor would the United States delegation like the practices of the United States army of occupation, which is laying Korea waste, to be disclosed here. Hundreds of towns and villages are known to have been destroyed, thousands of men and women to have perished, at the hands of the United States army of intervention in Korea, which is carrying out the order to kill at sight anything on the move. There have been objections to the use of the word "cannibals" in this place. I should like to recall what was said in September 1951 by an expert on the subject, the famous Hitlerite General Friessner, who is today engaged on reviving the *Wehrmacht* on the orders of the United States Government. General Friessner said that the actions of the United States troops in Korea justified the exactions perpetrated by the German army.

159. The Polish delegation voted against the three-Power draft resolution, because it prevents the United Nations from taking up the Korean problem. The resolution enslaves the United Nations to the will of the United States Government which may at any moment use it to cover up further aggression.

Closing of the sixth session

160. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We have completed our agenda for to-day and at the same time we have also completed the work of the General Assembly at its sixth session.

161. I call upon Mr. Trygve Lie, the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

162. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Before the sixth session of the General Assembly comes to its end, I wish to say a few words of thanks on behalf of the Secretariat and myself as your Secretary-General.

163. First, our thanks and admiration are extended to the Government and people of France for their gracious hospitality, for the splendid building, facilities and services provided during the months when this beautiful city of Paris has been the headquarters of the United Nations.

164. Secondly, I wish to thank the representatives for the kind words they have said to me, in public and in private, about the work of the Secretariat during this session. We shall continue our efforts to render the most efficient services possible to the delegations and to the United Nations as a whole.

165. Finally, I wish to thank our distinguished President, Mr. Padilla Nervo, and to pay a tribute to his patience, to his unfailing loyalty to the cause of the United Nations, and to his constructive approach to the problems of peace and social progress which confront the world. I ask the President's leave to present to him now this gavel, suitably inscribed, as a memento of his term of office in a post of high distinction and responsibility—the Presidency of the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. He deserves it.

The Secretary-General then presented the gavel to the President.

166. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom): Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, the acting chairman of my delegation, who unfortunately has had to return to London on account of parliamentary duties, has asked me to apologize for his absence to-day and to express on his behalf, and on behalf of the United Kingdom delegation, gratitude to the President for the ability and firmness combined with courtesy and impartiality with which he has unfailingly conducted the business of the General Assembly.

167. I feel sure that I am expressing the views of all other delegations when I congratulate Mr. Padilla Nervo on the great skill with which he has performed his onerous duties as President.

168. At the same time I should like to tender our thanks to the French Government for having made such excellent arrangements for the holding of the Assembly in that Paris which we all love so well. We in my country know something of the difficulties which arise in providing all the necessary facilities, with all the complications such as the requirement for simultaneous interpretation into several languages. A great deal of work and organization must have been necessary in order to provide the very good working conditions in which our meetings have been held. We are extremely grateful to France also for the most warm-hearted and generous hospitality which has met us everywhere during our stay in Paris.

169. The smoothness with which our daily work has been carried out is, of course, due to a large extent to the industry and skill of the Secretariat. I wish to address to the Secretary-General and to the entire Secretariat the thanks of my delegation for the way in which all the many

tasks which fall to them have been so efficiently performed. We owe them a large debt for the great care and thoroughness with which they have assisted us.

170. The Assembly will recall that in 1949 some modifications of the rules of procedure were approved and have since, I believe, come into force. It was hoped at the time that those modifications would assist the Assembly in carrying out its business smoothly. I suggest that experience at this session and the last session has fully justified that hope. The wise and skilful application of the rules in question by the Chairmen and the other officials of the Assembly has greatly helped the efficient conduct of the proceedings. I feel, however, that we should all keep under review the possibility of further improvements in our procedure which might help us to carry out our work efficiently while, of course, giving all delegations the fullest opportunity to express completely their views on the various items under discussion.

171. And so we end our momentous session in Paris, conscious of having worked hard if not always as constructively as we should have wished, and determined as ever to seize every chance of constructive debates in the future. Let us indeed hope that the last resolution which the Assembly adopted a few moments ago will result in such constructive discussions not being delayed unduly.

172. Mrs. ROOSEVELT (United States of America): I am only sorry to-day that Mr. Austin has not been able to return to say these parting words, but I will try to say them as nearly as he would have liked to have them said.

173. A farewell to Paris is never easy. It is particularly difficult when one has enjoyed the hospitality of this most lovely city for three months as a representative to the General Assembly. The courtesy, the generosity and the friendship which the Government and the people of France have extended to the United Nations generally, and to all of us individually, will always be a treasured memory. I am thinking not only of the superb manner in which the Palais de Chaillot was prepared for our session and all the other official arrangements which have been so efficiently carried out; I am thinking also of the many thoughtful gestures which we have enjoyed outside the Assembly—the special performances of the Opera, the lighting of the Louvre, the reception of the City of Paris and the numerous acts of hospitality by the Government, by private groups and by individual citizens. The open-hearted warmth of the French people and their genius for friendship have been amply demonstrated to this Assembly. On behalf of the United States I wish to express our deep appreciation.

174. To the President we owe a special debt for his leadership and guidance. He has dealt with us firmly but gently, patiently but expeditiously. He has been at one and the same time a good leader and a good neighbour to us all. The United States feels particularly grateful to him for his earnest efforts to advance the cause of disarmament. The Disarmament Commission set up with his assistance could achieve a turning-point in the history of man's effort to be secure and free from the burden of arms. We hope fervently that it will. We hope fervently that this Assembly will prove to have been a good beginning.

175. I know that the President would think it remiss not to acknowledge the support which all of us have received from the Secretary-General, from Mr. Cordier and from all the devoted and untiring members of the Secretariat. The efficient and dependable work of this staff is far more than an administrative achievement; it is an expression and demonstration of faith in this international institution. Support for this institution stands on the knowledge and

understanding of the peoples whose aims and aspirations we seek to represent. We must, therefore, acknowledge the indispensable contribution made to the work of the United Nations by the representatives of the Press, radio, film and television.

176. The United States delegation also wishes to express its appreciation of the tribute which France and this Assembly extended to the young men who came before us from the battlefields of Korea as living symbols of the United Nations' determination to live and to grow in strength for the good of all peoples and of all nations.

177. We leave this Assembly with a deep awareness of how much remains to be done before peace, freedom and justice prevail throughout the world community. Much more remains to be done about waging the only kind of war that people anywhere really want to wage—the war against hunger, disease, ignorance and prejudice. The task before us is greatly helped by a General Assembly session which reflects as accurately as this one has the problems of our swiftly changing world. The world profits by this annual reminder of those things which must be thought about and worked on during the months between our sessions. Here, too, we face day after day a tragic reality of our time: the isolation of a small group of our Members from the rest of us. I pray this will not always be. Throughout this session I have watched for signs of a change in attitude. I have been disappointed, but I am not discouraged. All of us must keep on hoping and working for a change, constantly asking ourselves if we are doing all we can to make clear our desire to live in peace and friendship with all our neighbours in the world community. As we separate, it is right that we should be gravely concerned with the gaps that still separate us from each other, with the problems that we have left unsolved. Time will help us find answers which now elude us. A higher power operates in the world and endows mankind with faith in its capacity for achievement. We can do no less than to hold firmly to that faith and resolve in the time that is given to each of us to do our best for the peoples whose faith, whose hopes and aspirations, bring us together under the flag of the United Nations to work for peace.

178. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): On behalf of the Soviet Union delegation I wish from this rostrum to thank the freedom-loving French people for the hospitality which it has, for the second time, extended to the General Assembly.

179. In particular, I wish to thank the French people for the numerous letters, telegrams and other communications and for the numerous delegations sent by various sections of the people to the USSR delegation and other delegations to the General Assembly, calling for peace and asking the Assembly to take concrete decisions to prohibit the atomic weapon and reduce armaments and to take steps to put an end to the threat of a new world war and develop friendly relations between nations. These letters, telegrams and other communications, and these numerous delegations, have inspired the USSR and other delegations in their struggle for these noble and lofty aims and ideals.

180. I should also like to refer to the work of the President, and to the innate tact, patience, perseverance and objectivity he has displayed in guiding the Assembly and in discharging his most responsible duties in such complicated circumstances.

181. I should also like, on behalf of the USSR delegation, to thank the members of the Secretariat, and particularly the Russian language translators and interpreters, who have worked hard to expedite the work of the General Assembly.

182. With regard to the results of the work of the General Assembly's sixth session there is no reason to regard it as successful. As a result of the resistance of the American bloc, headed by the United States delegation, the General Assembly has been unable to take a single decision which would have effectively strengthened international peace and security, ended the armaments race or relaxed international tension.

183. The USSR delegation's concrete proposals for measures to combat the threat of a new war and strengthen international peace and friendship were rejected by the American bloc, chiefly by the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom. The proposal for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control over that prohibition, the proposal for a one-third reduction of armaments within a year by the five great Powers, the proposal for the conclusion of a peace pact by those Powers—all these proposals were also rejected. Instead, the General Assembly had foisted on it the empty and insipid resolution of three delegations, those of the United States, the United Kingdom and France; this resolution really replaces the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the limitation of armaments by empty proposals for a census and inventory of conventional armaments, and postpones to a remote and unspecified future the question of prohibiting the atomic weapon and of effecting a limitation of armaments and armed forces.

184. Consideration of the Korean question was not permitted; it was deliberately blocked so as to make it possible to continue aggression in Korea and extend it in the Far East.

185. In order that the United Nations might continue to be used as a cloak for a policy of aggression, the General Assembly had foisted on it the so-called "collective measures" resolution. By opposing the adoption by the General Assembly of concrete decisions on measures to strengthen international peace and security and halt the new world war, the American bloc at this session has diverted attention to secondary, meaningless problems such as the Tito and Kuomintang slanders. The United States and United Kingdom delegations orated about human rights for certain particular purposes, but they opposed and voted against one of the most important rights, the right of nations and peoples to self-determination.

186. Such are the results. In the light of the above facts there is every reason to say that the work of the General Assembly's sixth session has been fruitless, so far as strengthening international peace and security is concerned. Moreover, a number of resolutions have been foisted on the General Assembly which are designed not to put an end to, but to encourage, cover up and expand American aggression. Those who claim any substantial successes for this session are either consciously perverting the truth in order to mislead the peoples of the world, or they are fostering illusions, which is equally harmful.

187. Those are the brief comments which the USSR delegation would like to make on the closure of the Assembly session.

188. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I still have two speakers on my list and, with the Assembly's consent, I should like for the last time at this session to apply rule 74 and to declare the list of speakers closed.

189. I call upon the representative of El Salvador.

190. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): I have not come here to contribute, in the name of the Salvadoran delegation, to a final chapter of recrimination or to a final attempt to re-open discussion at this closing

meeting of the Assembly on the more or less difficult and thorny problems with which we have had to deal during this session of the General Assembly.

191. I simply wish to express the feelings of my delegation and of all the Central American delegations—Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica—which, together with El Salvador, constitute a single group, and I think that I can at the same time speak on behalf of all the Latin American countries in expressing our most heartfelt thanks to immortal France, to its Government and its people for all the facilities and assistance they have given us during this session of the Assembly. Once more they have shown us their hospitality and their greatness in co-operating with us towards the accomplishment of our goals. The results will be seen later, but in any event what we have achieved does mark a step forward in the accomplishment of the organization's very difficult task and we are grateful for all the help we have been given to enable us to carry out that task on the banks of the Seine, in the very heart of this beautiful and enchanting city which we shall leave with very real regret, as the United States representative so rightly said.

192. And I think I may also speak on behalf of the Latin American delegations in expressing our gratitude to each and every department of the Secretariat, to the Secretary-General, the Assistant Secretaries-General and the translators, for the efficiency, devotion and zeal with which they have at all times helped us to make this Assembly as successful as possible. Once more they have shown us how they can work and they deserve our thanks.

193. In addition, I think I am also expressing the feelings of all Latin Americans in congratulating and thanking the eminent Latin American who, with his many undeniable qualities, has presided over this Assembly, an honour which has already been conferred upon Latin America more than once before.

194. We are very proud and gratified that an internationalist of such high qualities and such ability to guide the Assembly's work has occupied the highest post here and I think I am interpreting the feelings of our delegations in proffering the warmest congratulations to Mexico, its distinguished representative and the whole Mexican delegation.

195. Mr. Robert SCHUMAN (France) (*translated from French*): First of all I should like, on behalf of the French Government and of my country, to thank all those who have come to this rostrum and have spoken in such kind terms of France and Paris. We were very conscious of and fully appreciated the honour done us in the choice of our capital as the site for the sixth session.

196. And now I should like in my turn to pay a tribute to the President of this Assembly for his impartiality, his tact and his firmness and also to the Secretary-General who has become the permanent embodiment of our Organization. The French Government is particularly grateful for the understanding he showed on all occasions whenever we had to overcome material difficulties.

197. We should also like to thank all the members of the Secretariat and of the delegations who have been good enough to facilitate our work.

198. Thanks to the help thus afforded us, you have found during these three months an atmosphere of sympathy for each one of you personally and of respect for the authority you represent.

199. It is true that the positive results of our work are not always what we had hoped they would be, but still some progress has been made in the search for ways and means

of ensuring peace and putting an end to war. At the same time, nothing has happened to increase the existing tension. And this time, again, personal contacts have strengthened the confidence we must all have in the good will of men, regardless of divergencies of ideas and sometimes of objectives. We have succeeded in lessening the prejudices which divide us and too often jeopardize the understanding so greatly needed.

200. I believe that you will leave our country fully convinced that, in spite of all our manifold difficulties, both general and particular, our country is still confident in the future, places its hope in the co-operation of the peoples and remains faithful to its traditions and its duties of international solidarity. Our good wishes go with you, with each of you personally, and to the governments you represent and to all your countries without any distinction whatever. Further meetings will be convened because we must untiringly continue and intensify our efforts in the service of a task which is never quite completed: the task of peace.

201. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The sixth session of the General Assembly has completed its work. I should like to thank all delegations for their co-operation in carrying out our joint responsibility. I should also like to thank those who have spoken from this rostrum for their kind words and all representatives without exception for their support and tolerance which have rendered my task so much easier during this sixth session of the General Assembly.

202. I shall not try on this occasion to assess the results of our work because it is so recent that we are still too close to it to be able to see it in its true light and judge it at its true value or to appreciate all the possible consequences. But I do want to emphasize one important point: I am certain that we shall go our ways with greater confidence in the possibility of avoiding a fresh disaster. In spite of all the words of violence we have heard, the differences that persist and the problems which remain unresolved, the Assembly's work at this session has contributed to the achievement of the aims we all pursue.

203. All of us I am sure, will take with us the certainty that we have, in greater or lesser degree, helped to put the international world on the right path for the immediate future, perhaps even for all time. This in itself is very encouraging. As long as the disputes which divide States remain before the United Nations it will always be possible to strive for a temporary or permanent solution.

204. This, for example, in my opinion, is the true significance of the decisions we have taken on the Korean question, decisions which have quite correctly been interpreted as a vote for the success of the efforts being made to restore peace to that country. The United Nations and the peoples of the world desire and hope for a speedy armistice. The cessation of hostilities in Korea under conditions consistent with the political objectives of the United Nations would be a real step forward towards world peace and would facilitate a peaceful and just solution of many other problems.

205. The Assembly has also considered at this session the more general problems relating to the maintenance of peace. In paying particular attention to collective security and disarmament it has focused its work on the very essence of our basic task.

206. With regard to disarmament, the general agreement as to the necessity of finding a solution is worthy of special note. All governments have shown themselves not only prepared but also anxious to solve this problem and to free the peoples of the world from the heavy burdens and the

diversion of effort which inevitably accompany rearmament programmes. No matter how small may be the progress we have made towards this goal, we must welcome it with satisfaction and realize that the most significant fact about it is that it should act as a stimulus to encourage us to carry on our work in seeking a final settlement of this world-wide problem. We should be glad that all the great Powers in this Assembly have agreed upon the creation of the organ which is to carry out these negotiations. The peoples of the world are anxiously awaiting the re-opening of discussions which have for some time past remained suspended for all practical purposes. I should also like to point out that the small Powers are playing an increasingly active part in the discussions on this subject and they can thereby effectively carry out their function of conciliation and mediation.

207. With regard to measures for collective security, the Assembly has in these last weeks made some progress in its study of the measures to be taken in the case of an impairment of the higher considerations set forth in our Charter. Seen in this light, collective security presupposes that, in the first place, all the possibilities of peaceful settlement will be applied and accordingly demands the constant improvement of our methods of conciliation and mediation.

208. We must realize that the system of alliances and the balance of power, which were the sole solutions in the past, have now been historically superseded. The modern world has at its disposal an instrument which it has itself created: the juridical and political centralization of all the international elements of power in an Organization representing the whole world community. Let us use this instrument to the full and we shall find in it the solutions best suited to our times.

209. In the economic field, I should like to lay special stress on the resolutions adopted for the betterment of the under-developed countries. These resolutions, together with those adopted previously, help to integrate into one truly juridical concept two factors which were previously regarded as having only moral significance: technical assistance and economic aid. Gradually the conscience of mankind has become aware of the economic interdependence of the peoples. We know to-day that the existence of abject poverty in any country is bound to affect the material well-being of all the others.

210. During this session, the General Assembly has promoted respect for human rights and has reaffirmed the principle of the self-determination of peoples. It has also paid particular attention to the political advancement of peoples which have not yet attained complete self-government.

211. With the independence of the United Kingdom of Libya, the General Assembly has celebrated at this session the fulfilment of the work started by the United Nations at previous sessions.

212. Lastly, I should like to refer to another fact which I consider encouraging. At this session of the Assembly the general desire for universal representation in our Organization has found emphatic expression. Let us hope that in the not-too-distant future all peace-loving States may join the United Nations and make their contribution towards the achievement of its highest purposes.

213. I now wish to fulfil an obligation which gives me great pleasure. On behalf of this Assembly, I should like to thank the people and the Government of France and the City of Paris for the warm and generous hospitality they have given us.

214. I believe that I am also faithfully interpreting the general feeling of all delegations in expressing our appreciation of the work which all members of the Secretariat have performed with their usual efficiency and competence during this Assembly session. In particular, I wish to thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, and Mr. Andrew Cordier for the very valuable assistance they have given me in the discharge of my duties.

Minute of silent prayer or meditation

215. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before closing this plenary meeting the Assembly will observe a minute of silent prayer or meditation in accordance with the procedure which has become traditional.

The representatives stood in silence.

216. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I declare closed the sixth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 2.10 p.m.