



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 9:	
Opening of the general debate:	
Speeches by Mr. Pearson (Canada), Mr. Maza (Chile) and Mr. Dulles (United States of America).....	17

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

AGENDA ITEM 9

Opening of the general debate

SPEECHES BY MR. PEARSON (CANADA), MR. MAZA (CHILE) AND MR. DULLES (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

1. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): My first words must be to congratulate the President and ourselves on his election to the presidency. Being a mere male, he will not, I fear, as he himself has admitted, be able to preside with the grace of his distinguished predecessor, but I feel certain that he will follow her example in directing our meetings with efficiency, impartiality and courteous firmness.

2. This is the ninth year in which we have come together from all corners of the world to discuss and try to solve international problems in the hope, which is not often enough realized, that by doing so we may ease international tensions and promote human progress.

3. The United Nations, like other human institutions, is developing its own traditions, its own techniques. It has had its successes and its failures. Perhaps a disproportionate amount of attention has been devoted to the latter, which are indeed not so much the failures of the United Nations as an institution, as of the peoples and Governments which make up its membership.

4. This year many familiar faces are back again. This makes for continuity of representation which can be a source of strength to us. Also, many of the same old subjects are back again, some for the third or fourth year in succession. While this can become a source of weakness to the Organization, it is not necessarily so. The basic problems of international politics, arising out of political and economic insecurity, foreign domination and denial of human rights, lust for power, ignorance and greed—such problems have seldom been amenable to quick or easy solution.

5. It is therefore natural, indeed it is inevitable, that we should have a certain number of what I might call hardy perennials again on our agenda. But it is certainly not desirable to have too many of them, or have

them kept there for the wrong reasons and with the wrong results.

6. To insist on discussing the same question seven times in seven years does not necessarily bring us seven times nearer its solution. It may take us farther away from that desirable result, and, in so doing, lessen the repute and weaken the effectiveness of the United Nations. There is a danger in using our Assembly and its agenda year after year to apply pressures, without regard to circumstances, which may produce the reverse of the result which we seek, which may, also, subsequently produce equally unconstructive items on our agenda designed to apply counterpressures with equally negative results.

7. Quite apart from this intrinsic reason for us to exercise responsibility and restraint, there is always the consideration that in a deliberative body such as this Assembly, with the whole world as our agenda, we must apply priorities and show a sense of proportion in selecting those matters which should occupy our resources.

8. Since those resources, including time, are limited, it is essential, if we are to use them wisely, that we should examine the various demands which are made on them in the light of our basic purposes and against the background of the fundamental total problem of maintaining peace in the world.

9. It is true, of course that our title, the United Nations, denotes at this time aspiration rather than achievement. But this does not, I think, give any ground for cynicism or despondency. That our world is deeply and dangerously divided is nothing new in history. What is new is the fatal consequence, not merely for peace, but for existence itself if this division deteriorates into world conflict.

10. In a further effort to prevent such a tragedy, the scope of which is almost beyond our comprehension, those of us who are members of the Disarmament Commission attempted to reach agreement this spring¹ on arrangements and safeguards which could make possible the prohibition of atomic weapons and a general movement towards disarmament. It was disappointing on this occasion for us to find that the Soviet Union seemed as unwilling as ever to accept any adequate system of supervision and control, the indispensable prerequisite to progress in the field. Instead, they sought refuge in a slightly modified version of the old proposal which they have made year after year, that every government should first agree unconditionally to prohibit the use of atomic weapons, putting reliance on each other's word. If we could have this degree of confidence in mere verbal assurances, mutual trust and good will in the world would be so great, then the need not only for disarmament agreements but for

¹ The Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, created in accordance with General Assembly resolution 715 (VIII), met in London from 13 May to 22 June 1954.

disarmament itself would hardly exist. The hard reality that we have learned through costly experience is that we cannot trust unsupported promises; hence we have to put our trust in something else. The Soviet Union, for instance, and its friends refuse to accept the solemn assurance of its members that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is purely defensive and will never be used for any aggressive purpose. Why, then, would they accept a mere declaration that we would never use methods of atomic warfare?

11. However, the meetings in London this spring were, I think, far from futile in that a new basis was worked out by the British, the French, the Americans and ourselves, on which, once good faith and a general desire for progress are shared among all concerned, a real advance, I think, could be made.

12. In the meantime, whatever reliance can be placed on a reciprocal capacity to blow each other up gives at best cold and limited comfort. I hope that before it is too late something better and more civilized can be found. Thermonuclear devices are too dangerous, the threat that they pose to the very existence of life on this planet is too great, for sane men anywhere to view with equanimity their existence in a divided and frightened world.

13. Despite our setbacks on disarmament, there is hope that progress can be made in international co-operation for constructive uses of atomic power.

14. When he spoke to this Assembly last December [470th meeting] President Eisenhower made the significant proposal that there should be established an international agency under the aegis of the United Nations which would foster the growth of the new atomic technology for peaceful use. We in Canada believe this proposal to be very important, not only for its own merit, but because it implicitly recognizes the principles which are essential to the achievement of prosperity and the diminution of the threat of war throughout the world.

15. The first of these principles is that the endeavour to establish trust between nations by means of co-operative ventures aimed at the social and economic betterment of mankind should not be made conditional upon political agreements which are impossible until such mutual confidence has been achieved. Surely it is one of the first lessons of history and of the study of human nature that trust is a delicate plant of slow growth which takes time to flower, and that, conversely, suspicion is a hardy weed which cannot be killed merely by chopping off its foliage. It was with this in mind that the Canadian Government has observed with very great regret the discouraging refusal of the Soviet Union to consider these United States proposals except on conditions which have already been shown to be unacceptable to the great majority of the Members of the United Nations.

16. The second principle is that proposals for co-operation which are as important as these to all the countries of the world should be developed, in President Eisenhower's own words "under the aegis of the United Nations" [470th meeting, para. 114]. This is certainly one case in which we should not by-pass our world Organization.

17. Canada, like the United States and other free countries principally involved with atomic energy matters, believes that even in the absence—the regrettable absence—of Soviet Union participation, an international atomic energy agency along the lines proposed

by President Eisenhower could usefully be formed by the nations willing to subscribe to its aims and support its activities. My country is in a position to make a useful contribution to the work of such an agency and will be glad to do so. The Canadian delegation hopes that the proposal to establish an international atomic energy agency will prove to be an important step in the liberation of atomic energy from its military bonds, and that as the resources of more and more nations are applied to the problem the advance towards the application of atomic energy to peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind will become increasingly rapid.

18. International co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy cannot in itself remove the dangers of atomic destruction. These and other dangers have, however, brought their own response in the determination of many governments and millions of people to use our United Nations for the purpose of avoiding the grim tragedy of total destruction and of bringing about a better world than the one we have today.

19. The evolution of technological processes and developments in nuclear science have made mankind far more immediately interdependent than either public opinion or governments, in any part of the world, have yet realized. But, unfortunately, as our interdependence increases our divisions persist. The undeniable fact is that if we do not find the means to harmonize and reconcile these divisions, they may destroy us all. Naturally, this increases the importance of the United Nations as a centre of negotiation, of reconciliation and of unity. By unity I do not mean the lifeless uniformity which is the ideal of totalitarianism. If we are to do anything about these divisions, we must first recognize and try to understand them.

20. First, there is the fundamental division, as I see it, between totalitarian and free societies. In the former, the citizen is the mere servant of the State while, in international matters, reliance on force and aggressive expansion is a normal development however much the words "peace" and "co-existence" may be used to camouflage and confuse. Free societies, on the other hand, are based on the doctrine, however imperfectly realized in practice, that man has rights and duties above and beyond the States and governments which have been created by him in order to protect his freedom and security under law and justice.

21. Then there is a division between the self-governing and the non-self-governing parts of the world. Many people often, but I think mistakenly, equate this division with that between countries administering colonies on the one hand, and dependent territories on the other. In fact, of course, the non-self-governing part of the world is incomparably greater than this. People who are governed by a dictator whose power is based merely on military or police control are not self-governing, even if the dictator happens to be of the same race and to speak the same language as most of his subjects. The people of a puppet State, the satellite dictatorship of a totalitarian Power, are less self-governing than, for example, the people of a colony which is on the move, though sometimes the move may seem too slow, to national freedom under a democratic government.

22. Then there is the distinction between the highly industrialized parts of the world, with relatively advanced standards of living, and what are called the under-developed areas. Under the leadership of the

United Nations we are trying to do something about this, but the process, we are finding, is bound to be a slow one. I hope it remains steady.

23. The United Nations then, operating in a world thus deeply divided—and indeed made more necessary precisely because of that division—represents and must try to serve men on each side of each of these divisions without betraying or weakening the principles of its Charter in the process.

24. Our direction is clearly laid down: it is towards economic and social progress and away from poverty; it is towards full and free self-government and away from dictatorial regimes imposed from inside or from outside; towards the progressive realization of human rights and the dignity and worth of the individual person.

25. Our Organization has, I think, had significant success in dealing with each of these three main lines of division in our world. But in each there are problems and trends which cause concern and which, if they got out of hand, could easily lead to grave setbacks.

26. On the road towards self-government, for instance—we sometimes forget this—giant strides have been taken under United Nations auspices, and hundreds of millions of people in Asia, the Pacific and Africa, have during the past eight years become self-governing. But against this we must set the fact that some countries which formerly were self-governing democracies have fallen under foreign domination and have been subjected to totalitarian and outside control. Too often, it seems to me, debates in the United Nations on questions of colonialism and self-government ignore these setbacks, and blur the balance-sheet of freedom. I do not, of course, suggest that we should refrain from trying to make progress in one area merely because no progress seems practicable in another. But we should be careful not to confuse and mislead world opinion on these vital issues of self-government and freedom.

27. But the most important, and incomparably the most important, of the tasks of the United Nations remains that of keeping the peace, or, possibly, establishing the peace. Though in this field, too, we have had a number of achievements, there is less ground for satisfaction, or even for confidence, that the passage of time is necessarily bringing us closer to our goal. There is far more reason for anxiety than for complacency.

28. The United Nations has, I think, shown in Korea that it is capable of taking effective and successful international police action against local aggression. It must be remembered, however, that in this case one great Power—we pay tribute to it—was willing and able to lead and to shoulder most of the burden.

29. But apart from the problem of possible local aggression, and the risk of its spreading through hasty or ill-considered action, there remains the danger of a major conflict. Here, as I see it, the primary object of our world Organization must be prevention, rather than intervention.

30. Such a major conflict could be caused by deliberate aggression, or by accident, or miscalculation. Certainly the history of the last twenty-five years has shown that the danger of deliberate aggression by totalitarian empires is a real one. Such deliberate aggression can be and is being deterred by regional col-

lective security organizations, by defensive alliances, which make it clear that the peaceful nations cannot be destroyed and absorbed one by one. In this way, such arrangements—which are aimed against aggression wherever it comes from—deter attack and serve the cause of peace. They also restore the balance in threatened areas of the world and thereby contribute to stability and security.

31. Where such regional and defensive coalitions are necessary, they can readily be developed within the framework of the Charter. Our Charter recognizes and regulates them, but in no sense prevents them, providing they are organized and operate in accordance with its principles.

32. The United Nations itself, however, as a universal Organization—at least universal in principle—serves a more fundamental purpose in providing an efficient framework and endless opportunities for negotiation and conciliation under a system which embraces both sides in what we call the cold war. Those who would view with equanimity any reduction in United Nations membership so that those nations whose aggressive tendencies are understandably feared would be outside rather than inside our international system, have, I think, the wrong conception of the purposes and the possibilities of our Organization.

33. Quite apart from the danger of deliberate aggression, we must recognize that in a tense and fearful world there is also the risk of accidental war, brought about by miscalculation or a misreading or a misapprehension on each side of the other's intentions. Whatever the rights or wrongs of any particular situation, mistakes of this kind under modern conditions could be profoundly dangerous to the whole world. For these reasons—I know we all agree—the greatest importance should be attached to measures which can reduce international tensions, lower temperatures and remove the barriers to communication, whether they be psychological or physical.

34. In my view, nothing could be more dangerous in this divided world than a final and complete failure of man's ability to communicate with man across whatever differences of regime or race or economic conditions, across whatever curtains of fear, or iron or prejudice may exist. As I see it, one of the most vital of our purposes within the United Nations is to keep open and to develop these channels of communication, so that some day—and may it be soon!—when both sides are willing, they may be used for conciliation and eventual agreement.

35. Mankind is only beginning to develop and use the institutions of interdependence, of which the United Nations is by far the most important. This work will not be completed in a day. But it will not be completed at all unless we keep everlastingly at the job of building, of correcting those tendencies which have already made the work more difficult and which, if we are not careful, may stop it altogether.

36. In my view, one such tendency, as I have already indicated, is that of overloading our agenda with problems, some of which may be beyond the competence of this Assembly, or which can best be dealt with, in the first instance at least, by other methods of conciliation and settlement.

37. The United Nations is the main highway to international co-operation and unity. If we all try to use it at once for our purposes without observing sensible and responsible "rules of the road," the result will cer-

tainly be confusion, and may be collision. On the other hand, if the road is too often by-passed, it will fall into disuse, soon into disrepair, and ultimately into uselessness.

38. I feel sure that we all share the concern expressed by our Secretary-General in his introduction to the ninth annual report over the fact that the United Nations, with its unique facilities for negotiation and peaceful settlement, has not always been used for the purposes which it was intended to serve. You will recall that Mr. Hammarskjöld said [A/2663, p. xi]:

“To fail to use the United Nations machinery on those matters for which Governments have given to the Organization a special or primary responsibility under the Charter, or to improvise other arrangements without overriding practical and political reasons—to act thus may tend to weaken the position of the Organization and to reduce its influence and effectiveness, even when the ultimate purpose which it is intended to serve is a United Nations purpose.”

I think it is important that we recognize that danger.

39. There are, of course, a number of factors which, in certain instances, have brought about this “by-passing”. The Secretary-General reminded us of one when he said that the Organization as it exists today leaves out areas of the world and important States and peoples from its membership. Since 1950, twenty-one States have sought admission to this world forum without success.

40. So long as the United Nations fails to solve this problem of membership and representation, so long will the tendency grow to seek solutions, especially those which affect these unrepresented areas, outside the Organization.

41. Over the nine short years in which the United Nations has existed, it has been threatened from within and attacked from without. But with all its shortcomings it is impossible to visualize a world without the network of practice and precedent, the institutions and procedures for peace making and peace enforcement which we mean by the phrase “the United Nations”. If this United Nations did not exist, we should soon have to find another one.

42. The fact that the United Nations has lost somewhat in repute and prestige in the last few years is, I think, undeniable. That is due in part, I suppose, to the unrealistic expectations many persons previously held of the power of an agency, composed of sovereign States, to settle all the difficult and complex problems which have been thrown at it; it is due also to the deterioration in the international situation following the common victory in 1945; and it is due, finally—and we should not forget this—to certain weaknesses in our Organization and to the reluctance of some Powers, which had been increased by these weaknesses, to use the United Nations as it could and should be used for achieving the objects set out in our Charter.

43. The present situation then is cause for anxiety, but not for despair. It is a challenge to do better, not to lament over why we have not always succeeded.

44. The best way in which this present Assembly can meet this challenge is by making a good record of constructive achievement. My delegation hopes to make a worthwhile contribution to that end.

45. Mr. MAZA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to join in congratulating the President

upon being elected to conduct the proceedings of this ninth session of the Assembly. My country has great pleasure in congratulating you, Mr. President, because you represent a friendly country, and I myself am particularly gratified to do so because I have been fortunate enough to meet you at several international conferences, where I have had the opportunity of appreciating your vast knowledge, your vigorous personality and the understanding with which you consider other people's ideas. I am confident that, under a President endowed with these qualities, the Assembly will have a fruitful session and that by the time you have completed your task your prestige will have been greatly enhanced.

46. Before reading my statement, I should like to say a few words to explain why I have come to this rostrum before representatives of greater countries than my own. I was particularly anxious to be the first speaker, though I gladly yielded to the representative of Canada when he explained his personal reasons for wanting to speak first; it was not for any ridiculous ambition of being first, but because after this meeting or tomorrow's meeting the television cameras, the radio networks and the columns of the Press will be concentrated on the pronouncements of the representatives of the great Powers and the spotlight thrown upon them will cast into shadow what we, the representatives of the small countries, have to say. In size and population we are small, but there are many of us, and we represent a sector of international public opinion which, unfortunately—and I am not saying this as a complaint but as an appeal—is not adequately reflected in the great United States Press, in those many and powerful instruments of world-wide communication and dissemination of ideas which make up the press of that country. That press does not make the voices of the small nations heard as they should be, representing as they do a body of international public opinion which should be heeded and which should have the means of spreading its thoughts and ideas, for the small nations sincerely desire the establishment of a real basis for a stable world peace.

47. Forgive me for these remarks. I shall now read the written statement that I was eager to deliver at the right moment. I am going to read it slowly because it contains a few ideas which I should like to sink into the hearts and minds of the representatives of the big countries and to make an impression on the newspapers and communication media of this great country.

48. It is difficult to analyse the international situation over the period between one General Assembly and the next. However new the facts observed may appear to be, they form part of a complex of contradictions and difficulties which have beset the life of the international community since the end of the last world war, leaving no respite nor breathing space to the peoples, which placed their faith in the Charter signed at San Francisco in the belief that peace had been concluded with victory.

49. In his interesting annual report, the Secretary-General says that the United Nations is “a tool created by the Governments of Members to serve them in their efforts to establish and maintain peace, and is in no way an end in itself . . .” [A/2663, p. xi]. That statement is a necessary one; for if any new trend can be discerned in international affairs during the last year, it is the tendency on the part of certain countries to

seek procedures and solutions outside the Organization to which all belong.

50. At San Francisco it was thought that in future, nations would deal with their problems, difficulties or differences within the United Nations system and that with the co-operation of all it would be possible to seek solutions in a peaceful atmosphere.

51. However, there are States within our Organization which not only obstruct its work but which have even accused it of aggression because it participated, as it was bound to do, in the defence of the Republic of Korea. It is true that the last year has seen the end of hostilities in Korea and Indo-China, but it is no less true that had it not been for this forum of nations which desire peace and condemn aggression, these conflicts would not have been localized, brought under control and suppressed.

52. It is for that reason that my country expresses its grave concern that in some cases the United Nations system is not being used in matters which are part of the paramount responsibility conferred on it by the Member States signatories of the Charter. This tendency, as the Secretary-General very rightly says, "may tend to weaken the position of the Organization and to reduce its influence and effectiveness, even when the ultimate purpose which it is intended to serve is a United Nations purpose" [A/2663, p. xi]. Nations which are small in area and population have no part, and can have no part, in the shaping of important international events occurring outside the United Nations; yet at the same time they must resign themselves to bearing whatever consequences may ensue. We can understand that peace must be sought within or outside our Organization; but what we cannot understand is the acceptance as an accomplished fact of the thesis that peaceful coexistence or a mere respite in the cold war can be achieved only behind the back of the United Nations and in defiance of the principles of the Charter.

53. Our delegation reaffirms its faith in the system of collective security established at San Francisco, and believes that true peace, bringing tranquility to all nations and peoples—that is to say, a peace based on respect for human rights and offering the hope of an improvement in the standards of living prevailing to-day—can only be based on the principles of our Charter.

54. During the period I am reviewing—and also outside the United Nations system—there was a renewal of the propaganda campaign which calls itself "an appeal for coexistence". That slogan caused no surprise to the international community, for the years of constant tension and fear of aggression have taught nations to be surprised at nothing.

55. If the countries having the greatest influence in world decisions only resolved to live up to the principles of the Charter, the whole human race could co-exist in peace and prosperity. It is inconceivable that after the sacrifices of the last world war, after all the tragic experiences the peoples lived through, it should still be thought in some quarters that it is easier to ignore the United Nations and bargain in a world dominated and ruined by the burden of armaments over a precarious right to existence. I have stated, and I repeat, that peace is an aspiration of such transcendent importance that it does not matter whether we try to achieve it inside or outside our Organization; but while we must welcome any serious effort to achieve peace we cannot refrain, in this forum, from expressing

our doubts with respect to the so-called communist appeal for coexistence.

56. Not one inch of communist territory or territory dominated by communist troops has suffered aggression or been invaded by the forces of the free world. On the contrary, the territories of the free peoples have been attacked or invaded during these same years by communist forces in Europe and Asia, and the United Nations has been obliged for its part to assume grave responsibilities. Both in Korea and in Indo-China, peace has been obtained at the price of partitioning the territories and dividing the population.

57. Nevertheless, the propaganda machine of the aggressor, not of the victim of aggression, has launched the slogan of coexistence. Those who for years have prevented other nations from living in peace; those who have imposed perpetual tension and fear; those who have blighted the hopes of economic prosperity by forcing other countries to rearm, now speak of coexistence and invite us to share in it, but outside the United Nations Charter, which defines coexistence in terms which they cannot accept, namely, respect for human rights and the self-determination of peoples.

58. What is the price of this so-called coexistence? There is talk of admitting Communist China, the country which attacked Korea, into our Organization; of destroying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of closing our eyes to any emergency in Formosa. The price may be these or many other conditions; but there is one condition inherent in the entire Communist appeal for coexistence: the invitation to join, consciously or unconsciously, in the campaign of hatred against the United States.

59. Communist strategy, using various means to permeate world public opinion, has made its appeal for coexistence coincident with its vicious attack upon the United States. Attempts have been made to link nationalist movements, social awakening, aspirations for economic betterment and even cultural and racial differences by a common denominator of abiding unrelenting and persistent hatred, towards this nation, in an impressive campaign to shatter the solidarity and understanding which had developed in the international community during the trying years of the last world war. For all these reasons, we continue to think that the only form of coexistence worthy of free peoples is that proposed in the Charter of the United Nations. We have great problems and differences, but no one can put his trust in a system of coexistence nurtured on hatred for one of the members of the international community.

60. The agenda for this ninth session again draws the attention of Member States to those economic and social problems whose solution has been so long delayed.

61. There is no need to emphasize once more the close relationship which exists between peace and prosperity, between political conditions, and economic and social conditions; or to point out that the solution of some of the existing economic problems would help to strengthen the peace-loving forces of the world. It is a fact that the agencies created by the international community in the post-war period to deal with reconstruction, currency stabilization and the development of world production have done everything possible under their charters and with the resources at their disposal; but at the same time it is also true that the measures they

have taken have proved inadequate because of the immensity of the task. The statesmen of the post-war period failed to grasp the magnitude of the problems, both economic and social, which developed in the wake of the war, and the plans they made for a return to "normalcy" and a subsequent stabilization of international economic forces proved woefully inadequate.

62. In reviewing the Secretary-General's studies on economic development, international finance, agrarian reform, the development of natural resources, economic stability, full employment and international commodity problems, the reports of the regional economic commissions and the practical work of the principal agencies, such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization and others, a striking disproportion is to be noted between what is recommended to be done and what is actually being done or what we may hope to see done some day. We cannot but admit that international co-operation in this field has been characterized by generous intentions and modest achievements.

63. What is the main obstacle? My delegation believes that for some time economic considerations have been transformed into an appendage of or addendum to the general political and military situation. International resources seem to flow to the areas of greatest danger, and almost invariably arrive too late.

64. In addition—and it is necessary to state this here so that the views of all nations, large and small, may be known—there is a tendency to think that whatever is or has proved beneficial in the history of an industrialized country must necessarily be good for the development of a growing nation. Economic dogmas are as dangerous as political dogmas; perhaps they do not endanger peace or the peaceful coexistence of nations; but they undoubtedly jeopardize and distort the economic well-being of the great masses of the population and implant in the minds of the people an attitude of discontent and rebellion, as they perceive a high standard of living, which is appropriate to the country in which we live but unattainable to the majority of mankind.

65. This year the tenth Inter-American Conference was held at Caracas, and the countries of Latin America, without exception, spoke the same language and pointed out that those who are in a position to have a deciding voice in matters affecting international economic co-operation must understand the real conditions obtaining in the nations concerned before attempting to impose rules or remedies which are not in conformity with the true conditions in our countries.

66. The *Economic Survey of Latin America, 1953*² states that during the period 1945-1952 average *per capita* income in the Latin American countries rose 3.3 per cent, and that if this rate were maintained, Latin America could double its present standard of living in twenty-one years. It goes on to say, however, that this improvement resulted solely from increased income attributable to the terms of trade, which have now entered an unfavourable phase. In other words, we can no longer think of maintaining the rate of 3.3 per cent, and the dream of doubling the present standard of living will not be realized within the period of twenty-

one years. Behind the technical expression "terms of trade," what the report is really saying is that the output of the Latin-American continent is beginning to decline in value on the world market, and that the same commodities that it has been producing are now worth less money. Thus a country's effort, the mobilization of a country's resources to achieve its legitimate economic development, are undermined and weakened by the operation of international factors beyond its control.

67. If this is what is taking place in the field of production, let us see what has happened in that of international co-operation. During the period 1950-1953, net capital investment in Latin America amounted to an annual average of \$421 million which, allowing for certain credit operations carried out for the purpose of adjusting the balance of payments, made up a total flow of capital of less than \$530 million per annum. Of this amount, less than \$80 million were furnished by international credit agencies, the remainder consisting of private investment. The total volume of public investment in Latin America during the same period amounted to \$2,240 million; thus the contribution of international credit agencies to the whole of Latin America represented only 3 per cent of the total investment. Moreover, 56 per cent of the so-called "flow of private capital" resulted from the re-investment of profits; it did not represent fresh capital.

68. Finally, the total investment in Latin America between 1950 and 1953 from public funds and private capital was \$2,446 million, representing an annual average of \$611,500,000. During the same period, remittances to cover repatriation or redemption of capital amounted to \$358 million, or \$89,500,000 per annum, and service of capital (dividends, profits, royalties, interest, etc.) amounted to \$2,524 million, or \$631 million per annum. In other words, if we compare investment in Latin America with the Latin-American countries' disbursements during the period 1950-1953, we find that the investment was smaller than the disbursements by \$535 million. Our region is a good business proposition.

69. In this situation, we are receiving a generous amount of advice. We are told of the boundless importance of private enterprise and the danger of economic intervention by the State. Now our countries have long known, respected and encouraged private enterprise, but we prefer enterprise which is our own, which is national and which produces for the general good of the country. Latin-American private enterprise—an anomaly in the world of today—has no access to the international capital market. Foreign private enterprise has been and still is welcomed in our America; but it must be realized that it is interested only in exportable production; and furthermore, that the resulting service of capital heavily burdens our balance of payments.

70. Exaggerated fear of economic intervention by the State evidences ignorance of the real situation. Before the First World War, when the State was virtually a passive element in national production, international sources of credit offered their capital directly to the State in the form of loans or other means of credit. And now that the emphasis is on private enterprise and private enterprise alone, international credit cannot be obtained without a State guarantee. In short, it is a sign of our times that Latin America, an area

² E/CN.12/358. United Nations Publication, Sales No.: 1954.II.G.1.

which is in the full tide of development and in process of expansion, at a time when it most needs international assistance, exports capital instead of importing it and disburses far more in payments for services and other items than it absorbs into its economy in the form of public or private capital.

71. It was for these reasons that the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas unanimously agreed to adopt the proposal put forward by the Chilean delegation and decided that this year, during the session of the General Assembly, a meeting of Ministers of Finance and Economy of the American States should be held in Rio de Janeiro to discuss once and for all our common problems, in order to make clear what international co-operation really amounts to.

72. I have referred to the recent experience of the geographical area to which my country belongs in order to show you all one of the aspects of the drama of our time: the ignorance which exists of the true situation in which nations live and the obstinate persistence with which political and economic dogmas are imposed upon a humanity whose sole desire is for unity and understanding.

73. On behalf of my country I should like to say here that our approach to political as well as to economic and social problems should be founded upon respect for human rights. The events of the past year should make us reflect upon the danger inherent in the fact that the importance of those first two factors of international action may make us forget that the true object of the Charter is precisely to impose these minimum standards of civilized co-operation.

74. Despite the obstacles which confront it, our Organization should endeavour to intensify the work of drawing up the international covenants which have for long years been the study of the Commission on Human Rights. We cannot resign ourselves to the thought that the international situation destroys any hope of collective effort to enforce respect for these rights. Wherever there is any possibility of imposing or maintaining them, there our Organization should throw in the weight of all its experience and moral force.

75. In conclusion, I should like on behalf of my Government to express the hope that this session coming, after so many years of anxiety and cold war, may serve all our countries as an occasion for self-examination. We must understand that international events have developed in such a way that the worst may happen at any moment; that the responsibility which each of us bears in relation to his opportunities is enormous, for not only has fear and terror been spread throughout the continents but faith in this Organization has dwindled, and it is essential that we should raise our collective conduct to the high moral level of the Charter.

76. Chile greets the ninth session and declares its resolve to lend its assistance where it can and in such measure as it can, in order that when peace is spoken of, peace is really meant, and when co-operation is offered, we may be sure that what is offered is really co-operation.

77. Mr. DULLES (United States of America): I come to the opening of the ninth session of the General Assembly with a deep sense of the significance of this occasion. This annual gathering of the repre-

sentatives of sixty nations represents mankind's most hopeful effort to achieve peace with justice. Here is made manifest the close interdependence of today's world, and also the vast opportunity for constructive results which lies in good partnership efforts.

78. The people of the United States believe wholeheartedly in the Purposes and Principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations. That document marks a milestone in the understanding of the nature of peace. It recognizes that peace is not merely a passive concept, but a call to action. It is not enough to dislike war and to denounce it. War has been hated throughout the ages. Yet war has been recurrent throughout the ages. One reason is that men have never put into winning the peace efforts comparable to those which they put into winning a war. Mankind will never have lasting peace so long as men reserve their full resources for tasks of war. To preserve peace, and to do so without the sacrifice of essential freedoms, requires constant effort, sustained courage and at times a willingness to accept grave risks. That is the true spirit of peace.

79. During the year since we last met, many nations have actively worked together on behalf of a just and durable peace. There have been moments when it seemed the scales were precariously balanced between war and peace. That hazardous equation still exists, but at least we see the hazard and we strive to tip the balance in favour of peace.

80. The efforts which have been made during this past year are not to be appraised merely by whether in fact they have produced concrete settlements. The very fact of making intelligent, resolute and united efforts to seek just settlements has contributed of itself to peace, for it shows a dynamic spirit and a vigilance which are a warning to any potential aggressor. In the past, peace has often been lost by default. That, let us resolve, shall never happen again.

81. I cannot, of course, here touch upon the manifold activities which have recently occurred within and without this Organization. I shall therefore focus mainly upon certain political efforts with which my own country was actively associated as a partner.

82. Let me first speak of the Organization of American States. The inter-American system rests on a long tradition of co-operation for freedom and peace in this hemisphere. Faithfulness to that tradition and pride in it have served to spare this hemisphere from such wars as have tragically ravaged Europe and Asia during the last century and more. Last March, the tenth Conference of the Organization of American States met at Caracas, deliberated and declared that, if international communism gained control of the political institutions of any American State, that would be a danger to the peace and security of them all and would call for collective action to remove the threat. However aggressive communism may be adjudged elsewhere, we in this hemisphere, without exception, know that its intrusion here would open up grave conflicts, the like of which, happily, we have not known before.

83. In Guatemala, there developed an identifiable threat to the peace and security of this hemisphere. The American States exchanged views about this danger and were about to meet to deal with it collectively when the Guatemalan people themselves eliminated the threat.

84. In this connexion, there was occasion for the United Nations to apply the principles of our Charter, which, while affirming the universal jurisdiction of this Organization, do call for a resort first to regional arrangements, before resort to the Security Council. Those provisions had been hammered out in the course of debate at San Francisco, when our Charter was adopted. The American States at that time urged that their tested relationship should be co-ordinated with, and not totally replaced by, the United Nations, which they felt might not be dependable because of the veto power in the Security Council. It was therefore decided at that time to make regional associations a major feature of the United Nations peace system.

85. This year, the Organization of American States showed anew that it is ready, able and willing to maintain regional peace. Thereby, the provisions of our United Nations Charter have been vindicated, and the foundation for peace in the American hemisphere has been solidified.

86. Last year, when I spoke here, I said [*434th meeting, para. 25*] that "the division of Germany cannot be perpetuated without grave risk". In an effort to eliminate those risks, I went to Berlin last January to confer with the Foreign Ministers of the other three occupying Powers. There, the United States joined with the United Kingdom and France in presenting a proposal for the unification of Germany through free elections—elections which would be supervised by the United Nations or by some comparable impartial body. The Soviet Union countered with proposals which added up to an extension of the Soviet orbit to the Rhine. Accordingly, the dangerous division of Germany still persists. But, I may add, something else still persists—and that is our resolve, in the spirit of peace, to end the cruel injustice which is being done to Germany.

87. Last year, I also spoke of the Austrian treaty as being long overdue. I pointed out that as between the occupying Powers there was "no substantial item of disagreement" [*434th meeting, para. 27*]. At the Berlin Conference, the three Western occupying Powers eliminated the last vestige of disagreement by accepting the Soviet Union version of every article on which there was disagreement. It seemed, for a fleeting moment, that the Austrian treaty might be signed. Then the Soviet Union invented a new condition: it said that it would not free Austria from Soviet occupation until a German peace treaty had been concluded.

88. Now, there cannot be a German peace treaty until Germany is united. And so it goes on: Austria continues to be an indefinitely occupied nation. Nevertheless, here again we do not accept as final the denial of justice to unhappy Austria—the first victim of Hitlerite aggression and the object of the 1943 Moscow pledge of freedom and independence. The three Western Powers, constant in the spirit of peace, have again within recent days urged the Soviet Union to sign the Austrian State treaty as a deed which, far more than platitudinous words, will show whether other matters can be fruitfully discussed.

89. The problem of peace in Europe has become further complicated because of the recent setback to the consummation of the European Defence Community (EDC). That concept was born out of a re-

cognition that the best guarantee of permanent peace in Europe was an organic unity which would include France and Germany, and also that, if this unity merged the military forces of those two, and other European countries, their non-aggressive character would be assured—for such forces would clearly be unavailable for use except as the whole Community recognized the need for defensive action.

90. The votes of Communist deputies more than accounted for the parliamentary majority which in one country shelved the EDC. Thus, they acted to perpetuate European divisions which have recurrently bred wars. The free nations concerned, however, do not accept with resignation the perpetuation of what, historically, has been the world's worst fire-hazard. They are alert to the peril and are working actively to surmount it.

91. Last year, when I spoke here about Korea, I was able to report an armistice. That, I said, had occurred not because the Communist aggressors loved peace but because they had come up against an effective military barrier. I went on to say [*434th meeting, para. 16*]: "The Korean political conference, if the Communists come to it, will afford a better test."

92. It took seven months of arduous negotiations to bring about the political conference. When it occurred in Geneva, the United Nations side proposed the unification of Korea on the basis of free all-Korean elections to be supervised by the United Nations. This proposal was rejected by the communist side. They insisted that the United Nations must itself be treated as an instrument of aggression and debarred from any activity in relation to Korea. That counter-proposal, insulting to the United Nations, was unanimously rejected by those who proudly hailed the Korean action of the United Nations as the first example in all history of an international organization which in fact acted effectively against armed aggression.

93. The United States did not conclude that the unification of Korea must await another war. We have exerted all the influence that we possess in favour of a peaceful solution of the Korean problem, and we have not lost faith that such a solution is still possible.

94. At the Geneva Conference, the belligerents in Indo-China also dealt with the problem of peace. An eight-year conflict of mounting intensity was brought to a close. We can all rejoice that there has been an end to the killing. On the other hand, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that several hundred thousand persons in North Viet-Nam have, at their desire, been transferred to non-Communist areas and that there still remain millions unwillingly subject to an alien despotism. In this case, an end to fighting has been bought at a heavy price. The final result is still obscure.

95. One result, however, has been the driving home to the nations interested in South-East Asia of the importance of a collective organization for defence against further aggression. At Manila this month, eight nations met, and negotiated and signed a treaty calling for collective defence against aggression. The Manila Pact constitutes significant action taken under the United Nations Charter, which recognizes the inherent right not only of individual, but also of collective, self-defence. Those who cry out when others exercise their inherent right of self-defence only expose their own aggressive purposes.

96. The Manila Conference did much more than extend the area of collective security. It adopted a document known as the Pacific Charter. By that Charter the eight nations, Asian and non-Asian, which were meeting at Manila proclaimed in ringing terms the principles of self-determination, self-government and independence. This Charter, and the spirit of fellowship which gave it birth, should serve to end once and for all the myth that there is an inherent incompatibility between the East and the West. The peoples of Asia who are already free or who seek freedom need not remain weak, divided and unsupported in the face of the new imperialism which has already reduced to colonial servitude 800 million people of what were once fifteen truly independent nations.

97. The past year has been marked by intensive effort in the field of atomic energy. The United States has sought to share its commanding position in this field in ways which would permit many to join in a great new adventure in human welfare. We hoped to turn atomic energy from an instrument of death into a source of the enrichment of life.

98. I vividly recall that day—8 December 1953—[470th meeting]—when we here heard President Eisenhower propose that the nations possessing atomic material should co-operate under the auspices of the United Nations to create a world atomic bank into which they would each contribute fissionable material that would then be used for the purposes of productivity rather than of destruction. I shared the drama of that moment and sensed the universal applause which then greeted that proposal—applause which echoed round the world.

99. Because it oftentimes seems that negotiations publicly conducted with the Soviet Union tend to become mere propaganda contests, President Eisenhower proposed that these new negotiations should be privately conducted. So, the United States, after consultation with others, prepared and submitted a concrete, detailed proposal to carry out President Eisenhower's great conception. I myself met several times with the Soviet Foreign Minister at Berlin and at Geneva to discuss this matter. We are quite willing that all documents exchanged between the United States and the Soviet Union during these negotiations should be published.

100. We hoped and believed that if the Soviet Union would join with the United States, the United Kingdom and other nations possessing fissionable material and atomic "know-how", this act of co-operation might set a pattern which would extend itself elsewhere.

101. The plan we submitted could not have hurt anyone. It was motivated by the hope of lifting the darkest cloud that hangs over mankind. Its initial dimensions were not sufficient to impair the military capacity of the Soviet Union, and there was no apparent reason for its rejection. Above all, it was a practicable, easily workable plan, not dependent upon elaborate surveillance.

102. Nevertheless, the proposal was in effect rejected by the Soviet Union last April. Its rejection was not because of any alleged defects in the plan itself. Any such defects would certainly have been subject to negotiation. The Soviet position was, in effect, to say, "We will not co-operate to develop peacetime uses of atomic energy unless it is first of all agreed to renounce all those uses which provide the free nations with their strongest defence against aggression".

103. To date, the Soviet Union Government has shown no willingness to participate in the implementation of President Eisenhower's plan except on this completely unacceptable condition. Yesterday, when it was known that I would speak on this topic today, the Soviet Union broke a five months' silence by delivering a note in Moscow affirming its readiness to talk further. But the note still gave no indication that the Soviet Union had receded from its negative position.

104. The United States, of course, remains ready to negotiate with the Soviet Union, but we are not ready to suspend any longer our efforts to establish an international atomic agency.

105. The United States is determined that President Eisenhower's proposal shall not languish until it dies. We are determined that it shall be nurtured and developed, and we shall press on in close partnership with those nations which, inspired by the ideals of the United Nations, can make this great new force a tool of humanitarianism and of statesmanship, and not merely a fearsome addition to the arsenal of war.

106. The United States here proposes an agenda item which will enable us to report further on our efforts to explore and to develop the vast possibilities for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. These efforts have been and will be directed primarily towards the following ends:

(a) The creation of an international agency, whose initial membership will include nations from all regions of the world—and it is hoped that such an agency will start its work as early as next year;

(b) The calling of an international scientific conference, to consider this whole vast subject, to meet in the spring of 1955 under the auspices of the United Nations;

(c) The opening early next year, in the United States, of a reactor training school where students from abroad may learn the working principles of atomic energy with specific regard to its peacetime uses;

(d) The invitation to a substantial number of medical and surgical experts from abroad to participate in the work of our cancer hospitals—in which atomic energy techniques are among the most hopeful approaches to controlling this menace to mankind.

107. I want to make it perfectly clear that our planning excludes no nation from participation in this great venture. As our proposals take shape, all nations interested in participating and willing to take on the responsibilities of membership will be welcome to join with us in the planning and the execution of this programme.

108. Even though much is denied us by Soviet negation, nevertheless much remains that can be done. There is denied the immense relaxation of tension which might have occurred had the Soviet Union been willing to begin to co-operate with other nations in relation to what offers so much to fear, so much to hope. Nevertheless, there is much to be accomplished in the way of economic and humanitarian gains. There is no miracle to be wrought overnight. But a programme can be made and vitalized to assure that atomic energy can bring to millions a better way of life. To achieve that result is our firm resolve.

109. Closely allied to this question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy is the whole vast and complex question of disarmament.

110. At this Assembly last year the United States affirmed its ardent desire to reduce the burden of armament. I stated here [434th meeting] that the United States would vigorously carry forward the technical studies on armament control and limitation which are vital to any solution of this problem.

111. Last spring, the United States participated in discussions in London with the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and Canada on a Sub-Committee of our Disarmament Commission. We sought to find out whether a fresh approach to the problem could achieve a solution acceptable to the Soviet Union as well as to the free world. The record of these meetings has now been made public.³ It shows that the representatives of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States tried with patience and with ingenuity to explore all avenues of agreement with the Soviet Union which would be consistent with the security of all nations. Once more we made it clear, as we have again and again in the past, that we seek to eliminate the use of atomic energy for any purpose other than the purposes of peace.

112. These efforts were met by a flat refusal by the Soviet Union even to discuss our proposals on their merits. The crux of the Soviet position was that, even before it will engage in real negotiations on disarmament, it insists upon a paper ban by the major Powers of all use of nuclear elements. The great shield, the supreme deterrent, must first be abandoned, leaving the free nations exposed to the communists' unrivalled manpower. Once that inequality has been assured, then—perhaps—the Soviet Union will negotiate further from its then gained position of assured supremacy. Such procedure would not increase the security of any free nation.

113. Reluctantly, we must conclude that the Soviet Union has no present serious desire to negotiate on the disarmament problem. We shall continue to hope, and to seek, that the Soviet Union may ultimately come to co-operate on a programme which could end the wasteful diversion of vast economic wealth and bring it into the constructive service of mankind.

114. No doubt you will have observed that many of the efforts for peace to which I have referred were conducted outside the United Nations itself. It should not, however, be forgotten that the organs of the United Nations are themselves steadily carrying forward activities which contribute substantially, even though perhaps not spectacularly, to the political, economic and social conditions which are the foundation for peace. The United States wishes to pay a high tribute to those who perform these indispensable tasks.

115. If many major political developments have occurred outside the immediate framework of the United Nations, that is due to two causes—one good and one bad.

116. The Charter of the United Nations itself provides that the parties to any dispute which would endanger international peace and security should first of all seek a solution by negotiation, resort to regional agencies, or other peaceful means of their own choice. Only when such methods fail should there be resort

to the Security Council. In other words, the Security Council of the United Nations was never intended to be a court of first instance, but only a court of last resort. In this sense, the unprecedented peace efforts of the past year fall within the pattern which our Charter itself prescribes.

117. I refer to a second cause, and that is disturbing. It is the fact that the membership of the United Nations falls far short of representing the totality of those nations which are peace-loving, which are able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter and which include nations which are indispensable parties to many critical international problems. Fourteen nations are now debarred from membership only through the use—in reality the abuse—of the so-called veto power. None of these fourteen is in the category of Communist China, which has been found by the United Nations to be guilty of aggression. All fourteen are fully qualified, without a blemish, for membership.

118. Unless ways can be found to bring peace-loving, law-abiding nations into this Organization, then inevitably the power and influence of this Organization will progressively decline.

119. We are approaching the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. All of the Member Governments and their peoples may properly be thankful for the great accomplishments of the United Nations and for its unique service as a forum for international discussion. However, this coming anniversary must be made more than a date for self-congratulation. It is time to take account of the weaknesses of our Organization and of the ways in which it can be made to function better as a guarantor of peace and justice, and as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations. That indeed was the idea of the founders who planned for a Charter review conference to be called at the next annual session of our Assembly.

120. The search for peace has had its high hopes and its deep frustrations. But after the frustration, there is always renewed hope. On behalf of the United States, I would say in my closing words that we believe that international peace is an attainable goal. That is the premise which underlies all of our planning. We propose never to desist, never to admit discouragement, but confidently and steadily so to act that peace becomes for us a sustaining principle of action.

121. In that, we know that we shall not be alone. That is not merely because we have treaties of alliance and bonds of expediency. It is because the spirit of peace is a magnet which draws together many men and many nations, and makes of them a fellowship of loyal partners for peace.

122. The PRESIDENT: I have no more speakers on my list for today. Tomorrow morning at 10.30 we shall continue the general debate. Upon the conclusion of the list of the speakers who by then have signified their desire to speak, we shall consider, with the agreement of the Assembly, the report of the General Committee.

123. May I request representatives who wish to take part in the general debate to signify their desire to do so at the earliest moment convenient to them.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.

³ See DC/SC.1/SR.1, DC/SC.1/PV.2-14 and DC/SC.1/PV.17-20.