

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## FIFTH SESSION

### Official Records



## PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 27 September 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

### CONTENTS

	Page
General debate (continued) .....	127

Speeches by Mr. Quevedo (Ecuador), Mr. R. Schuman (France),  
Sir Benegal N. Rau (India), Mr. Sharett (Israel) and Mr. González  
(Venezuela)

*President:* Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

### General debate (continued)

#### [Agenda item 9]

SPEECHES BY MR. QUEVEDO (ECUADOR), MR. R. SCHUMAN (FRANCE), SIR BENEGAL N. RAU (INDIA), MR. SHARETT (ISRAEL) AND MR. GONZÁLEZ (VENEZUELA)

1. Mr. QUEVEDO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish, first of all, to pay a well-deserved tribute to the men who are fighting in Korea. In particular I wish to pay a tribute to those who not being of Korean nationality are not therefore fighting to defend the frontiers of their fatherland or to gain material advantages for their countries, and are not inspired by passion or by hate. Without anger and with friendly feelings towards the Korean people these men are sacrificing their youth and even their lives for an idea, the idea that violence shall be banished from the earth as a means of solving the problems that beset the peoples of the world; that aggression shall be crushed so that it shall never confront the world again, and the United Nations Charter, which has been accepted as the supreme rule of international law, shall prevail. Seldom have men taken up arms for a more noble or fruitful task.

2. It should be noted that in its report<sup>1</sup> to this Assembly, the United Nations Commission on Korea, which is an international and impartial commission, has emphasized that the forces of the Korean Republic scarcely had the organization or arms for a purely defensive action; that the invasion was not the result of a provocative attack on North Korea across the 38th parallel as has been alleged; that the North Korean attack was deliberately prepared beforehand;

that it formed an essential part of the policy of North Korea which was aimed at securing by force what it could not gain by other means, and that the North Korean authorities unleashed a war of aggression in order to further this policy.

3. International communists, and those who follow that political line without being or admitting they are communists, are well aware that this is the truth although they try to distort the facts and to present them in such a way as to make it appear that the Korean question is an imperialist adventure on the part of the United States. It is regrettable that in some countries their propaganda has convinced and deceived small groups of men of good faith and some young people who in their youthful fervour have allowed themselves to be blinded and swayed by the fallacies of international communist propaganda. The majority of the world, however, now realizes that the United Nations laid down an exemplary line of conduct in initiating collective action against aggression for the first time in history, and that the United Nations sought and desired, and still desires a free and unified Korea which shall work out its own destiny without pressure of any kind.

4. Those who have been deceived should be made to reflect on the fact that the fifty-three countries which endorsed the Security Council's action to quell the North Korean aggression did so in accordance with the Charter, and in order to ensure that the United Nations will, in future, likewise repel any other aggression against one of their number.

5. Bearing all this in mind, the report of the Korean Commission is particularly important since it proves that events have once again justified the United Nations action, and the report gives the world irrefutable proof that the aggression against the Republic of Korea was premeditated.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 16.*

6. We must emphasize that this alone is the true situation which drew the free nations together to support the Security Council's action in different ways, according to their own means.

7. The Members of the United Nations know that in acting thus they have not been used as tools to assist or conceal a war of conquest or a colonial war, but have done so in order that the United Nations Charter, collective security and the repelling of aggression, may serve as a rampart today and become a vital and convincing reality in the future.

8. The statement made by the United States representative at our [279th] meeting on 20 September is therefore significant; he urged us to strengthen the system of collective security and told us: "Our best hope of peace lies in our ability to make it absolutely plain to potential aggressors that aggression does not succeed".

9. This appeal to collective security however has one inevitable consequence: peace and collective security are indivisible. Aggression must be quelled by collective action whoever the aggressor may be, not only when it strikes in the north but also when anyone seeks to impose his will by force whether it be in the south, in the east or in the west.

10. Aggression must be quelled not only when it constitutes a threat to all or some of the Members of the United Nations but also when it violates the rights or integrity of any Member State. If, at some time in the future, we put down an act of aggression against some country, all other countries which love peace and have faith and confidence in it, will do everything in their power to help build up collective security. We must put down aggression against any country no matter how small that country may be; in fact, the smaller and weaker the country, the greater the efforts we must make.

11. If we are to save the international situation we must begin by knowing the facts. The first requirement in any effort to save humanity from destruction in a new war is to try to understand the realities of the world and the problems with which we are faced.

12. As has already been said in this Assembly, and almost everything has been said here, the international situation may perhaps be gauged by the fact that many millions of human beings are suffering hardships and that most of mankind lives in dire poverty and cannot satisfy those needs which the more advanced peoples of North America and part of Western Europe consider necessities.

13. I feel therefore that we should congratulate seven members of the British Commonwealth of Nations on the efforts which they are now making to raise the standard of living and improve social conditions for such a large section of humanity.

14. I wonder whether a similar effort to co-ordinate and plan the potential resources of Latin America would not be a great contribution to strengthening the democratic sector of the world which seeks peace and not aggression. The majority of the population of the world longs for urgent and continuous action which will progressively satisfy its needs.

15. If that majority finds that its aspirations towards a just and progressive system of social welfare cannot be achieved through methods and governments which harmonize, balance and combine democratic freedom with energetic social action, hundreds of millions of workers may in the future gradually be won over by those who seek social revolution as a prerequisite for human happiness.

16. On the other hand, we must confess that in all countries which have not yet obtained independence there is a deep-rooted and justified movement in that direction. When unsatisfied social needs are combined with the will of the people for political independence, the result is a force which is difficult to check because it is just and because it is deeply rooted in the soul of the people.

17. If there is an attempt to counteract these two forces or this combined force through pressure by a superior force, then there arises on the world scene the political paradox of movements which are international by conviction and by their recognized tactics, but which wear the mantle of essentially national and nationalist aspirations, appearing as defenders of the independence and nationality of the peoples of the world.

18. In our opinion, a number of conclusions and lessons are to be drawn from the facts and the situations referred to. It is fortunately true that the action taken by the United Nations in Korea was a necessary step to prevent the Organization from disintegrating as an effective political instrument. Unless that action had been taken, the Charter would at this moment be another useless scrap of paper.

19. It is also true that the energetic decisions of the Security Council and the support of almost all the Members of the Organization have inspired confidence in the political effectiveness of the United Nations in the hearts of the free peoples of the world, in that very large part of mankind which can and does receive free information and which follows the progress of world events day by day.

20. Today we are faced with a task which we must not avoid or delay: to inspire confidence in the social effectiveness of our Organization through a broad programme of social justice.

21. If we really wish that faith in the United Nations should become more deeply rooted, more universal and permanent among the masses of the world and, in particular, of those countries which are already seeking or struggling for political independence, our Organization must stress boldly and emphatically two tasks set forth in the Charter: first, the task of assembling all the resources available to the United Nations to continue and extend the campaign in defence of the popular masses by improving their standards of living; and, secondly, the task of serving as an effective instrument to enable the nations of the world to achieve and enjoy freedom, independence and territorial integrity.

22. The United Nations should not only be the daring standard bearer of social progress and political independence, but should also appear in that role to the peoples of all continents especially those which are the scene of great social and political movements of

this kind. The reason is that if the United Nations—unjustly, it is true, since its conduct does not warrant such a judgment—should appear to certain peoples as the instrument of social reaction, of colonialism or political aggression, our efforts would encounter further obstacles and our ideals would be met by lack of confidence on the part of the people.

23. The social and economic improvement and independence of peoples are therefore essential prerequisites for international peace. Otherwise, in the final analysis, people who are suffering oppression and misery would seek to overthrow a regime imposed upon them against their will.

24. If this is the international situation, charged as it is with explosives, there is a danger that a conflict may break out and engulf us in a sea of blood.

25. Therefore, the primary, most elemental and urgent need is to ensure the defence and the life of the peoples who desire peace, but within a system of freedom and justice.

26. For the same reason, in our opinion, the proposals of the United States representative [A/1377] are appropriate to achieve effective United Nations action in cases of emergency by making it possible to convene the General Assembly rapidly and to establish a committee of collective action and a peace patrol to keep watch in places where new aggression may arise or has arisen.

27. The proposal that each Member should designate units within its national forces which would be equipped and trained to serve the United Nations represents so great a step forward and so great an innovation in the progress of the international Organization that my delegation believes it deserves careful consideration by each government in the light of its material resources and its respective legal and constitutional provisions.

28. All of us, great and small, must therefore seek to strengthen the rampart of collective security so that it will become so high and so imposing that no one will dare to cross it.

29. It is said that nations with great economic and military strength have a greater responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and that, when armed force is unleashed, they are the ones to make the efforts and the sacrifices that are within their power. The great Powers, however, cannot do everything alone and the world also needs the co-ordinated action and the extraordinary moral and political force which small and medium-sized States can exert jointly as factors for peace and collective security, in defence of an organization like our which should continue to pursue its objective of achieving universality.

30. All the States that are sincerely resolved to respect the principles of the Charter must co-operate so that the principles and rules it establishes may become as flexible and effective an instrument in the Assembly as it was in the Security Council at the beginning of the Korean conflict.

31. The unity, co-ordination and speed of action of those countries which are at present members of the communist bloc should make us pause. Those States act in an orderly fashion as if they already constituted a unified and organized bloc of nations which, it appears,

at least, is not paralysed by the veto. No member of that friendly group appears to run counter to the direction in which it moves or to obstruct its actions.

32. Meanwhile, unless we succeed in improving the present situation in the United Nations, the use of the veto can, in practice, at the will of a single nation, paralyse the essential functions of the Security Council to halt aggression.

33. The conclusion to be drawn is obvious. While taking care that the United Nations does not lose its essentially international character, let us make of it an effective instrument capable of acting with the speed and co-ordination shown by the communist group.

34. If those who are able to eliminate the power of veto from the Charter do not wish to do so, and if those who wish to see it eliminated are unable to achieve their end, we have no other recourse than to make the Assembly a bulwark against aggression. Here, the opposition of the minority cannot paralyse the action of the majority.

35. It is true that the Western nations have been compelled, by the historical experience of the past five years, not to rely on declarations of peaceful intent, and to increase their military preparedness. It is also true, on the other hand, that we, the peace-loving countries of the United Nations, are now obliged to align ourselves more solidly, both on a regional and on a world basis, not for purposes of attack, but in order to live in security and repel aggression, whenever, wherever and from whomever it may come. This is the first and basic necessity of our existence. There must be no doubt on this point.

36. But to limit our efforts to such action might be interpreted as an admission that we believe a new world conflict is inevitable, and that the principles of the Charter, under which we live, are invalid and ineffective. The spirit in which the Charter was written compels us to believe that peace is possible as long as it is not totally destroyed, and to seek its preservation with every means at our disposal.

37. Apart from the essential values of international life, such as morality, and justice, much may have to be sacrificed in order to safeguard peace: from the proud confidence in one's own strength to collective pride; belief in the infallibility of doctrines to considerations of prestige.

38. If the worst should come, our sacrifices for the preservation of peace might be a hundred times greater than those required of us now; and each group of states would lose that which, fundamentally, it is trying to defend today—the very type of social and political organization in which it desires to live. Some would lose their dream of world empire, their desire for power to regulate the life of society through the iron hand of small dictatorial groups, and their grandiose plans for material construction. Others would have to sacrifice their love of individual and collective freedom, of free enterprise, of gradual social progress, the constant aim of which is to promote justice without sacrificing liberty and without reducing man to the status of a mere cog in the machinery of the state. All of us would have to renounce our dream of ever increasing social well-being.

39. In a major world conflict, would not individual freedom be the first casualty? And would not the first result of such a conflict be the permanent strengthening of the state at the expense of the individual—the multiplication of state controls and interventions beyond anything yet dreamed of? Could individual liberty endure in the face of the universal regimentation of national forces which modern war imposes?

40. Let us, therefore, together with the group resolved upon defence, endeavour once more to take positive action for the preservation of peace; and even though there might seem to be no good reason for confidence in the outcome, let us nevertheless persist in our positive efforts to ward off the catastrophe.

41. We cannot believe that all possibilities of an understanding between the great Powers with opposing international policies have been exhausted, or that the countries which are contemplating or encouraging aggression may not come to recognize, in the end, that that policy does not pay and that all humanity will lose by it.

42. This Assembly may perhaps afford the world one of its last opportunities of averting the catastrophe. The anguished feeling that a new world conflict is approaching has created an oppressive atmosphere that weighs heavy upon the hearts of the peoples of the world. Without being pessimistic in regard to long-range programmes, we must in all sincerity confess that few possibilities exist, within the framework of the normal work of the United Nations organs, for immediate and concrete action to ward off the dangers which threaten world peace, or to relieve quickly the international tension under which we live, in constant fear for our countries, our children, our homes.

43. The noble efforts made in the past—until quite recently—to bring into direct contact the statesmen upon whose policies the future of mankind depends, have been unsuccessful, perhaps, among other reasons, because of the difficulty in organizing international conferences on so high a political level, when there is little probability of success.

44. Perhaps because it is difficult to give up all hope, there remains a flicker of faith in the peoples of the world, that the worst can always be avoided if we try hard enough. The statesman who fights resolutely for peace, in the face of adverse circumstances, is as much a hero as the soldier who gives his life for his country.

45. The simple ordinary people of the world know nothing of politics or diplomacy; the man in the street and the boy who sheds his blood in battle may not, perhaps, have lost their hope that direct personal contact between the leaders of the great Powers which gravitate in such different orbits—now encroaching dangerously upon each other—may still improve the situation to some extent, or ward off the storm.

46. The common man cannot, I think, bring himself to believe that an exchange of ideas between ministers for foreign affairs, when it is an informal, verbal exchange which cannot act as a boomerang against any of the parties attending, can be entirely useless and to no avail. We ourselves cannot believe that it is so.

47. Let us admit one fact which appears certain: in the course of the next few months we shall not see a repeti-

tion of the event which has come to pass here, namely, the meeting together in one room of high-ranking leaders in international politics who represent nations with opposing views. Were we now to open the doors of this Assembly hall to the peoples of the world, it is probable that a clamorous demand would fall upon our ears—a demand that the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the great Powers should speak directly with one another, without public address systems, nor verbatim records, nor minutes, but without prejudice to those defensive measures which experience, as well as national and international security, force upon us all. The peoples of the world would tell those Ministers that their talks together cannot paralyse their efforts to strengthen the defence of their own peoples, and would demand that these high officials should not leave New York, this political capital of the world, until they have made some concrete progress, if at all possible, towards easing the tension which oppresses us all.

48. The Preamble and Article 1 of the Charter compel us to leave no possibility unexplored in our efforts to maintain peace.

49. For the foregoing reasons, the delegation of Ecuador expresses its firm hope that the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States holding permanent membership in the Security Council, profiting by their presence here together in New York, will take this opportunity to exchange views, individually or in groups in an informal manner, in order to explore all possibilities of lessening the present international tension.

50. Nothing will be lost, and something may be gained, if these statesmen, conscious of their tremendous responsibility in these times fraught with danger, can talk frankly among themselves, in a determined effort to find the difficult road which will lead mankind away from the terrible scourge of war.

51. Mr. R. SCHUMAN (France) (*translated from French*): At the conclusion of this general discussion, in which so much eloquence has been expended and in which the anxieties and hopes of the five continents have found highly qualified interpreters, it is difficult to add further considerations or to make a choice among the proposals submitted to the Assembly.

52. As regards these proposals, I would not wish to anticipate the debates which, according to our rules of procedure, will take place later, in committee or in plenary meeting. They will be the concern of our representatives and our experts. We shall have to distinguish, among the various suggestions, between those whose object is propaganda and the furtherance of political strategy, and those which offer serious and sincerely studied reforms.

53. The customary theme of our speeches is peace, which is the very essence of our task and the *raison d'être* of this Organization. Peace is an end: it is the crowning of a collective effort, an effort of good will in the first place, and then a constructive effort in the search for a better organization of the world. There is no peace without security, no security without justice. Words of peace are uttered in vain so long as there exists a threat to the freedom of peoples. Since the ghastly war in which the freedom of the world was almost engulfed in tyranny, our peoples have placed all

their hopes for peace and security in the United Nations. They expect that it will ensure effective protection against aggression and the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

54. Unfortunately, past results have not yet completely fulfilled this expectation and this need. The authority of the Organization is not sufficiently unchallengeable to be accepted by all, or, if need be, to be imposed upon all. It is not supported by an organized force, permanently available and sufficiently powerful to prevent or punish aggression.

55. It is true that this authority is about to be imposed in Korea. It is to the especial credit of the United States that, from the first day, it understood the importance of what was at stake and accepted the principal risks and sacrifices of this common endeavour which has restored the confidence of peace-loving countries.

56. Despite this comforting fact, it must be admitted that procedural delays and the threat of the veto still overshadows any collective action. More than ever, a reform of our methods of work and a better co-ordination of our efforts and our means of action are essential.

57. Several speakers have expressed satisfaction at the speed with which the Council took its decisions concerning Korea, as well as at the effectiveness of subsequent action. The French Government fully shares those sentiments. It hopes that the United Nations may, if need be, display similar speed and efficacy in the future. It therefore welcomes the views expressed by the Secretary of State of the United States [279th meeting]. It will consider with the greatest attention the specific proposals which will be formulated by the United States delegation.

58. In dealing with such far-reaching plans, it would seem that especial heed should be constantly paid to the method of their consideration. In the first place, it is important to have a clear picture of the purpose which it is designed to achieve. Once this picture is clearly outlined, one must determine what can be achieved by modifying our procedure, whether customary or codified in our rules; what would entail an interpretation of the Charter, which the Assembly is obviously qualified to decide upon; and, finally, what would call for a modification of the Charter, which has laid down its own rules for a possible amendment.

59. We expect the authority and efficacy of our Organization to be strengthened in the future. Meanwhile, our governments, being responsible for peace and security, could not and cannot be resigned to the passive expectation of future reforms, nor can they be satisfied with a form of collective protection which is more theoretical than real. As we know, the Charter itself authorizes and encourages the setting up of regional groups, as well as any other initiative for the implementation of legitimate collective defense, pending the full development of universal institutions.

60. France has adhered to and will continue to give her support to these regional peace organizations which, it is true, are provisional and partial solutions, but which are justified by the present imperfections of the world Organization. They will be superfluous when the United Nations has become a reality and when its authority is imposed everywhere and in all circum-

stances. We fervently hope that war will soon become physically impossible, but, until then, we shall be well advised to secure ourselves against it. To be in a position to defend peace by force of arms is the traditional method, but it is not the only way, nor the best one for preventing war. We must awaken in the hearts of our peoples the feeling of their solidarity, of the community of their destinies, of the impossibility—as we see every day—of solving the gravest problems of the hour by national action alone and thus implant the idea, and later arouse the will, for supra-national co-operation, which will gradually replace the ill-feeling and mistrust of the past. That is the task and the real duty which is incumbent upon most of us.

61. In Europe in the first place, where France occupies a privileged position, the French have responded to all the calls of that nature which their own Government or other countries have made to them. It was thus that the Council of Europe was set up. In its sixteen months of existence, the Consultative Assembly in Strasbourg has striven to create a European spirit, over and above frontiers and parties. We welcome the results already achieved—the birth of a supra-national conscience and of a common task and responsibility, without prejudice to the legitimate diversity of national traditions and interests. We hope that we are on the way to creating a European authority which, in certain fields and in certain circumstances, would have powers of decision.

62. The organization of Europe and of peace in Europe cannot, however, be seriously undertaken—as France realizes full well—until the old Franco-German antagonism has been eradicated and until this focus of contention has disappeared from the heart of Europe. My country recognizes its duty not to shirk such a reconciliation; what is more, it was incumbent upon it to take the initiative in this matter. We have done so in a sphere where military considerations play no part and in which peaceful and constructive co-operation is the sole object; it is a sphere so important that the action we take will exert a decisive influence on all our economies thus associated.

63. We have proposed—and we have been negotiating for rather more than three months with Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg—the pooling of our coal and steel production and the creation of a single market for those two products, which would circulate freely in the territories of these six countries, inhabited by 160 million people. Such an elimination of customs duties and of any other protective or restrictive measures calls for an equalization of production costs, which have so far varied widely in those countries. It will therefore be necessary to attempt to harmonize wage-price policy and social and fiscal legislation. Such an alignment of production costs must not, however, entail any disadvantage for the wage-earners; it should, on the contrary, open up better prospects for their future. A high authority, appointed by the governments, but acting under its own responsibility, will lay down rules and enforce their observance. It will be the first supra-national institution, independent both of governments and of private interests. Its members will not deliberate or vote under instructions, as representatives of national or private interests. They would have in mind only the collective interests of their associated countries. The



governments will, however, be authorized to approach this authority in order to give advance notice of their views, or to submit to an international tribunal any decisions which may seem to them seriously to jeopardize the general interests of their respective countries. Finally, the authority will be answerable for its activities to an inter-parliamentary political assembly, which will have power to dissolve it and order its replacement.

64. As may easily be seen, this is a bold attempt to breach national egotisms in favour of a supra-national concept. The authority will not be a cartel, aiming at maintaining or increasing profits, even at the cost of restricting production or lowering wages. On the contrary, the goal will be to increase output, internal consumption and exports by the better organization of production and the reduction of costs, and to maintain full employment.

65. The countries associated in this ambitious but essentially peaceful task will no longer be tempted to wage war; indeed, war between them will become unthinkable and impracticable. Their economic activities will be progressively united or aligned in other fields besides those of coal and steel. The undertaking will be the common task of the six countries which are bold enough to attempt it in the interests of their associated peoples. And we express the hope that the experiment of an independent supra-national authority will go forward, opening up hitherto undreamed-of prospects for the peace of Europe.

66. This year again, peace will have constituted the refrain of our speeches; it will be the principal object of our labours, the ideal, pursued like a fleeting phantom and often repudiated in practice. Are we hypocritical or are we simply feeble in our efforts to ensure a peace which our peoples are nevertheless unanimous in desiring, ardently and sincerely? If we could rid our thoughts and our actions of all national egotism and utilitarian prejudice, if we could really base our actions and decisions on the principles inculcated in us by religion and philosophy, things would be better, in spite of the inevitable shortcomings of human nature.

67. But in our present state of mind, we too often take up a problem, or the settlement of a dispute, in the spirit of partisans concerned primarily with the defence of their own interests, more or less disguised under general considerations. Can peoples and governments acquire and practise a supra-national spirit? That is the problem before us. The Charter is based upon such an idea; it presupposes it as a living reality. The Charter is and will remain vitiated in its implementation and operation until we come to be inspired, without reserve or ulterior motive, by the collective interests of our countries; until we succeed in making our governments admit, in our parliaments and consequently in this Assembly, the primacy of the supra-national common good. We are still far from that point, and yet we must live and act and not despair.

68. How can we then serve the cause of peace in this torn world of today, in spite of the bitter competition of national interests, in spite of the passionate antagonism of political and economic ideologies and, sometimes, in spite of racial prejudices and traditional rivalries? Is it enough to engage in propaganda for peace while permitting the passions which threaten

peace to thrive? Is it enough to call for the prohibition of arms, without first having ensured a minimum of effective security?

69. In three successive years, it has been proposed to us that we should unite in order to strengthen peace, that we should ban war propaganda and that we should prohibit certain weapons and reduce our stocks of others. This is not the time to study the technical aspects of these problems; they are not new problems, since they had already occupied the attention of the League of Nations for many years. But I wish in my turn, very frankly, without passion and in all fairness, to make a preliminary point in this connexion.

70. Before speaking of peace, it is necessary to create an atmosphere of peace and, as has already been said, to restore mutual confidence. It is necessary first and foremost that those who speak of peace should stop attacking and give the example of a peace-loving spirit.

71. We are living in a state of unrest which is general and, worse still, which is deliberately maintained. Sometimes it is a case of territorial claims; sometimes of direct and violent interference in the political life and organization of countries; and sometimes of control systematically established and maintained over enemy territory or areas liberated from the enemy. Ideological expansion is just as harmful to peace as imperialist expansion; it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the two. The existence of satellite States is contrary to the idea of peace and to the principle of self-determination.

72. The will to peace must be made manifest otherwise than in words and propaganda. Each government must try by its practical conduct to convince the rest of the world that it wishes to live in peace and let live in peace—that is to say, that it desires to leave every country free to choose its political and economic system. The coexistence in the world of different régimes, respectful of one another, must be generally and honestly accepted. Furthermore, territories which are organizing or reconstituting themselves politically must be allowed to do so in freedom, if necessary under international supervision when specific difficulties arise, but without pressure, through elections and under the guarantees offered by any true democracy.

73. Is it possible to speak sincerely of peace while at the same time maintaining organizations of which the officially avowed purpose is to promote and maintain violent agitation and civil war in other countries?

74. Before any discussion or negotiation, I put this question: are we all prepared to renounce such actions, to disband such organizations and to engage only in such forms of propaganda and to make such claims as are compatible with free democracy and the secure existence of the State itself? Until we have a clear and convincing reply to this question and until all our attitudes conform to these principles, which are those of the Charter, our conversations will be sterile and our agreements a snare and a delusion.

75. Our peoples want peace, sincerely and resolutely. The word has for them the charm of a wonderful melody to which they love to listen. To extract from them signatures for fallacious petitions claiming to lead them towards peace, while actions run counter to such intentions, is to abuse their confidence.

76. We are met here in order that our will to peace may be put to the test otherwise than in empty words. We shall be judged by our peoples and by history on the policy we pursue; the results we achieve will be in proportion to the tenacity and the sincerity with which we succeed in uniting our efforts.

77. My Government, for its part, is resolved to continue along the road it has taken. Bold and fruitful ideas have always had an appeal for the French people and, faithful to this tradition, France is striving to ensure the acceptance of the concept of a supra-national authority. By spontaneously renouncing a part of their sovereignty in favour of such an authority, States will furnish decisive evidence of their will to build a peaceful and better world. By pooling their national resources and energies, they will drive back poverty and war.

78. Sir Benegal N. RAU (India): Mr. President, let me begin by congratulating you, as many others have done before me, on your election to the high office of President of the Assembly. This is the second year in succession in which this honour has fallen to the representative of an Asian country, and apart from its obvious personal aspect as reflecting the admiration and esteem in which you are held by your colleagues here, it perhaps marks also the growing importance of Asia in world affairs.

79. Indeed, 1950 has been an important year in the history of Asia. The 26th of January 1950 saw the birth of the Indian Republic. A little earlier there was established another republic in South-East Asia; the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, now reconstituted as the Republic of Indonesia, the country with the largest Moslem population in the world. India has had the closest links with Indonesia from remote antiquity and hopes that Indonesia will join us in the near future as a Member of the United Nations. It is a matter of great gratification to my delegation that the Security Council, at its last meeting,<sup>2</sup> accepted, by an almost unanimous vote, the Indian proposal that Indonesia's application for membership should be immediately recommended to the General Assembly; and we have every reason to believe that the General Assembly will soon accept the recommendation with equal sympathy and good will.

80. Another noticeable feature of 1950 has been the emergence of what I may call new China which, since the beginning of the year, has made several fruitless attempts to obtain representation in the United Nations and its organs.

81. This is a matter to which, as you all know, the Government of India attaches the greatest importance and my delegation is glad that, although our recent draft resolution [A/1365] on the subject was defeated [277th meeting] by an apparently large majority, the door has nevertheless not been finally closed. Since the question is to be studied further, I need not say more on it just now, but I cannot refrain from correcting a frequent error or half-truth. It has been said in various quarters during the last few days that the Indian draft resolution to which I have alluded was defeated by an overwhelm-

ing majority, because only 16 countries voted for it, while 33 voted against it and 10 abstained from voting. It must be pointed out that the adverse votes included that of Nationalist China. Leaving that vote out of account, as being the very vote whose validity was in issue, I find that the total population of the countries which voted against the draft resolution was 412 millions, while the total population of the countries that voted for it was 809 millions; the abstentions accounted for 117 millions. Lest anybody should imagine that the supporters were mainly the communist countries, I have computed separately the population figures of the indisputably non-communist countries that voted for the draft resolution. These add up to 527 millions as compared with 282 millions of the communist countries. Thus, on a population basis and even taking into account only non-communist countries, the draft resolution, far from being defeated by an overwhelming majority, may be said to have been actually carried.

82. To pass on. From the international point of view, the most significant event of 1950 has been the Korean conflict and the action taken by the Security Council in that connexion. It has been said that the League of Nations perished because it could not or would not act even in the face of what it considered to be aggression; 1950 has shown, or at least created the hope, that such need not be the fate of the United Nations. I may, incidentally, mention that the Government of India's support or acceptance of the crucial resolutions of the Security Council was discussed at great length at a special session of the Indian Parliament held about the beginning of August. The discussion lasted for several days and took into account not only the facts that were known at the time when the Security Council adopted the resolutions but also the subsequent course of events. Ultimately the Indian Parliament, without a dissentient vote, endorsed the Government of India's support of the decisions of the Security Council. The Prime Minister of India said in the course of the debate:

"Our policy is, first, of course, that aggression has taken place by North Korea over South Korea. That is a wrong act that has to be condemned, that has to be resisted. Secondly, that so far as possible the war should not be spread beyond Korea. And thirdly that we should explore means of ending this war. The future of Korea must be decided entirely by the Koreans themselves."

83. The future of Korea and of Formosa will be amongst the most important questions for our discussion during the present session. These are former Japanese territories regarding whose disposal there have been certain declarations in the past, but whose actual disposal still remains to be made. It will be remembered that we had a somewhat similar problem to deal with last year—the disposal of certain former Italian colonies. The big four had been unable to agree on this matter and had therefore turned over the problem to the General Assembly. We referred it to one of our Committees which, after some discussion, referred it to a sub-committee; the sub-committee, after several weeks of work, produced a solution which was ultimately accepted by the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly [resolution 289 (IV)] and, in the case of some of the territories, without a dissentient vote even from the big four, which had been unable to agree in the

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 45.

first instance. My delegation hopes that we shall be able to handle with equal success the questions of Korea and Formosa.

84. Our discussion of the future of Korea—which, under a slightly different name, is the first item on the agenda of the First Committee—would be greatly facilitated by an early restoration of peace in that country.

85. My delegation has always taken an active interest in the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories. The report of the Special Committee<sup>8</sup> which considered the information on the economic, social and educational conditions in those territories will come up in due course before the General Assembly for our endorsement. At this stage, my delegation will make only one or two general observations.

86. The information transmitted by the Administering Powers to the Secretary-General is undoubtedly limited by paragraph e of Article 73 of the Charter and does not refer in specific terms to political conditions in these territories. Nevertheless, the General Assembly cannot ignore the implications of Article 73 as a whole, which promises to the peoples of those territories, until they attain a full measure of self-government, that certain vital principles will be recognized in their administration, namely—and here I am using the words of the Charter—that the interests of the peoples are paramount, that they must be afforded just treatment and protection against abuses, and that they must be helped to become self-governing. These principles are meant to apply to every aspect of the administration, with no qualifications other than that due respect should be shown to the cultures of the peoples concerned and to their political aspirations.

87. The General Assembly must on every possible occasion encourage the fullest collaboration between the administering Powers and its various specialized agencies in the Non-Self-Governing Territories.

88. The under-developed regions of the world are in urgent need of a great deal of assistance. Poverty, disease, ignorance and hunger are widespread in these regions, and the promotion of constructive measures of development—to use once again the words of the Charter—is an immediate necessity. In many parts of the world today—and especially in Asia and Africa, where millions of people owe allegiance to foreign Powers—situations are developing of increasing seriousness and danger. These people have in many territories become acutely conscious both of their economic and social backwardness and of their political dependence. It is in circumstances such as these that revolutionary doctrines spread and take root with extraordinary swiftness.

89. For the furtherance of international peace and security, which finds a prominent place among the principles to which administering Powers have pledged themselves under Article 73, it is essential that they should revise their conceptions of the relationship between themselves and Non-Self-Governing Territories in accordance with the spirit of the times.

90. Reference has been made to Kashmir as one of the danger spots in Asia. Sir Owen Dixon, the United

Nations mediator, has recently submitted his report to the Security Council<sup>4</sup> and I need not say much on the subject here. My delegation hopes that the Council will duly note the view which Sir Owen Dixon himself was prepared to adopt: that, when the Kashmir frontier was crossed on 20 October 1947 by hostile elements and again when units of the regular Pakistan forces moved into the territory of the State in May 1948, these were violations of international law.

91. One of the greatest evils in the world today is racial discrimination, and many countries therefore forbid it by law. It is amazing that at this juncture any Member of the United Nations should embark upon it as a deliberate policy sanctioned and enforced by the law. Such a policy will ultimately lead to inter-continental race conflicts and is therefore a menace to the peace of the world. The plea of domestic jurisdiction will not excuse it any more than the plea of the sanctity of the home can justify the storing of dynamite.

92. Several delegations have already pointed out that the Security Council was able to act as it did in June and July last only because of an accidental combination of circumstances which may not recur, and certain suggestions have been placed before us designed to create or set in motion alternative machinery for the purpose of dealing with future situations of the same kind.

93. These suggestions merit and will receive our most careful consideration in due course; for the moment I should like to call attention to something more fundamental than questions of machinery. At the root of all the conflicts inside and outside the United Nations is a pervading fear of aggression. Let me quote a great British historian, Arnold Toynbee, who, in August 1947, wrote:

“In the West we have a notion that Russia is the aggressor, as indeed she has all the appearance of being when looked at through Western eyes . . . To Russian eyes appearances are just the contrary.”<sup>5</sup>

94. The writer goes on to discuss the historical reasons for this mutual fear of aggression, reasons into which we need not enter here. What does concern us immediately is whether we can do anything towards removing the fear which undoubtedly exists on both sides; for, so long as it exists on either side, however irrational it may be, we cannot escape from the vicious spiral of arming and counter-arming. We may be sure that the people of no part of the world, whether in the West or in the East or in the Far East or anywhere else, want war, and yet they feel compelled to spend vast sums of money on preparations for defence against aggression. Can we do nothing to dissipate this constant and wasteful dread of war?

95. I speak with great diffidence, but the subject is so important that I cannot refrain from making a suggestion or two. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France are all present, or could easily be, in New York. Could they not meet—with or without others—and discuss or re-discuss at least the most outstanding

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplements Nos. 17 and 17A.*

<sup>4</sup> See document S/1791.

<sup>5</sup> See Toynbee, Arnold J., *Civilization on Trial*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1948, page 167.



matters of disagreement between them? Could they not have something corresponding to one of those special periodic meetings of the Security Council which are prescribed in Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Charter?

96. Perhaps such discussions have not been very fruitful in the past; they may fail again; but the attempt is worth making. Even if nothing else came of them, the Ministers could at least reaffirm jointly what each of their countries has already affirmed separately in signing the Charter, namely, that they would settle all their international disputes by peaceful means, and the psychological effect upon an anxious world would be far from negligible.

97. But this need not be the only step; other steps could follow. For example, there might be an exchange of good will missions, whether official or unofficial, between the countries concerned. And then, as the result, further steps might suggest themselves, until the whole atmosphere was cleansed. Once the fear of war is reduced to a minimum—for no one imagines that it can be completely removed—we can devote ourselves whole-heartedly to the tasks of peace.

98. I believe that at present the entire expenditure of the United Nations in a normal year is less than the annual interest—I repeat, the annual interest—on the cost of the equipment needed for the production of a single atomic bomb. This will give some idea of the colossal waste which the fear of war entails, apart from the destructiveness of war itself. There is so much human misery in the world—often preventable, but sometimes due to natural calamities that cannot be prevented, as in large parts of India today—and so much that the United Nations with an expanded budget can do to mitigate it, that I have ventured to make these suggestions.

99. My delegation will study with special interest the resolutions of which the Yugoslav delegation has given notice [282nd meeting]. One of them is in line with a suggestion which my delegation recently made in the Security Council in connexion with the Korean conflict.<sup>6</sup>

100. I should like to end on a note of tempered hope in the words of a celebrated biologist:

“War is not inevitable to man. His aggressiveness can be canalized into other outlets; his political machinery can be designed to make war less likely. These things can be done; but to do them will require a great deal of hard thinking and hard work.”

101. Mr. SHARETT (Israel): At the beginning of my remarks, I should like to associate my delegation, as indeed the people of Israel, with the tribute paid from this rostrum to that great South African, Jan Christiaan Smuts. The world has lost in him a statesman of outstanding courage, creative spirit and bold vision. Israel and the Jewish people mourn the passing of a distinguished humanitarian, whose consistent friendship and support were to them an unfailing source of moral strength. The name of Field Marshal Smuts will forever illumine the record of mankind's struggle for justice and freedom.

102. The fateful question which overhangs this Assembly is whether the world will survive the present political cleavage or whether it will be engulfed. The question is, can rival systems coexist peacefully or must their struggle end in deadly clash? Based on conflicting philosophies and divergent ways of life, can they achieve a balance of self-restraint and mutual tolerance, leaving it to peaceful evolution to resolve the issue—or will they be irresistibly driven to a war of total annihilation? Will all nations, whatever their political doctrine, find an overriding common purpose in the preservation of civilization and of life itself, or is mankind to give up all hope? Will scientific progress serve as an instrument of salvation or as a weapon of suicide?

103. Let us be honest and frank. There is no complete certainty in an optimistic answer. Dangers will not be banished merely by pious wishes. The challenge to survival must be sternly taken up, and a collective effort at self-rescue is by no means certain to fail. The more determined the effort, the greater its chances of triumph.

104. To divide the world into two camps is to oversimplify the issue. Even among the countries adhering to the Soviet pattern, uniformity is by no means absolute. In other parts of the world, there prevails a wide diversity of constitutional régimes and social orders. It is fallacious to draw the dividing line between imperialism and true brotherhood of peoples. Imperialism is not an attribute of social philosophy but a product of physical might. Nor is it true to represent the issue as of capitalism versus socialism. The claim of communism as practised in the Soviet Union to be accepted as the only true form of socialist society is widely contested. On the other hand, in many a country of orthodox democracy, patterns of life rightly claimed to be socialistic are progressively emerging. Far-reaching social progress is being achieved without any resort to violence or curtailment of liberty.

105. The point at issue is not how this or that system is to be appraised, and which is superior to the rest, but whether a system rightly or wrongly held to be superior by some governments should be imposed by force on other countries, either through invasion from outside or through subversion from within.

106. Here is the crux of the problem. It is not a question of mere ethics whether such an imposition would be iniquitous or just. The crucial point is that an attempt to spread a régime by fire and sword across the frontiers of any State or to instigate it by interference conjures up immediately the nightmare of world catastrophe. The present international order is a highly delicate organism balanced precariously on the brink of a precipice. Any violent shock may spell disaster. In these highly sensitive times every military move, indeed every act of statesmanship, must be judged by reference to its effect on world peace, not merely because war is an evil but because peace and survival have become synonymous.

107. The young democracy of Israel draws its inspiration from ancient origins; at the same time it is its ambition to emulate the best in modern society. Freedom is the very breath of Israel's existence and development. Its democracy is based upon full political and cultural liberty in its internal life and on unrestricted contact of its citizens with the world outside. To defend these

<sup>6</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 29.

freedoms against any menace Israel is ready to fight with the same determination as it fought for its independence.

108. But much as Israel cherishes these principles of true democracy and hopes that they may prevail everywhere, it fully recognizes the right of other nations to work out their salvation and to fulfil their destiny along different lines. Mutual tolerance of divergent political civilizations is the corner-stone of world security. Scrupulous non-interference in the internal life of others is the universal shield of peace and stability.

109. The preponderance of the great Powers in world affairs places on them the brunt of responsibility for the preservation of international peace. This special position of the five permanent members of the Security Council is specifically recognized in the Charter. Just because the international divergencies are most sharply pronounced in their relationships and in view of the decisive effect of their behaviour on the fate of the whole world, their restraint and sense of responsibility must serve as examples to all. Accordingly, any initiative in uniting the five great Powers for a concerted endeavour on behalf of universal peace, such as has been urged here by several representatives, and notably by the representative of the Soviet Union [279th meeting], is to be heartily welcomed by all other nations. It is obvious that such an endeavour, if successful, is the surest and the shortest way to the goal.

110. But approval of a method does not always signify faith in its success. Although it may be taken for granted that none of the great Powers is actually bent on war, positive agreement among them may or may not be forthcoming. In practice it seems today fairly remote. Yet the world passionately wants peace and must exert every possible effort to achieve it. Its fate cannot be left to depend on the fortuitous chance of a five-Power agreement. If there is no unanimity between the few, then the majority of the many must take such action within the terms of the Charter as may prove possible and effective. Even then a five-Power accord would be an invaluable buttress for peace, but failing and pending such an accord, an alternative effort is imperative. In any case, nothing can absolve the great bulk of States, medium-sized and small, from their own share of responsibility for the effective maintenance of a world-wide system of collective security.

111. Outbreaks of aggression are unfortunately a feature of the post-war world. Invasion has occurred against Israel, and the Security Council failed to muster the requisite majority to check it. It happened in Korea, and this time the Security Council took action with the full approval of most States Members of the United Nations. In an hour of extreme emergency the United Nations has stood the test of action. But if the Security Council is again to be paralyzed by permanent deadlock, what is to happen to the authority of the United Nations? Is it to be discounted as a bulwark of peace until the great Powers reach an understanding? It would be a dark day indeed in the life of scores of nations—nay, in the life of humanity at large—if despair of United Nations capacity to protect the world against the calamity of war should ever enter men's hearts.

112. The dilemma is inescapable. Either a way must be found, free of hazards, to activate the United Nations

against aggression, or the world must look for other remedies, leaving the international Organization to decay through futility.

113. It is for this reason that the proposals adumbrated from this platform by the United States delegation [279th meeting] deserve very serious study. The only development which might render such study premature would be the renewal of full co-operation among the five great Powers and the proven capacity of the Security Council in its fully representative composition to deal swiftly and effectively with threats to the peace of the world.

114. To be fully effective, the United Nations must be complete. The present position, when a considerable number of independent and fully sovereign States find themselves outside this great framework of international discipline and responsibility, is unjust, anomalous and harmful. The delegation of Israel questions the wisdom of a course which, rather than admit certain States deemed undesirable, prefers to exclude a larger number of States which are by all counts fully qualified. In the present state of the world it is but natural that the schism prevailing inside the Organization should be reflected also among those seeking admission. The immediate inclusion of all eligible candidates would add no structural complexity to the United Nations, while the gain resulting from its completeness is patent.

115. The question of the representation of China is a most notable case in point. Much as Israel's conception of democracy may differ from that upheld by the new Chinese Government, for reasons similar to those adduced so cogently here by the representatives of India, Sweden [285th meeting], the Netherlands [281st meeting] and Pakistan [283rd meeting], Israel is among the sixteen States which have recognized this government. My delegation feels that it would be unwise for the United Nations, in disregard of compelling realities, artificially to bolster up a régime of the past, which has lost its hold on the territory and people it claims to represent. If the new régime in China is ready sincerely to uphold its obligations under the Charter, prospects of peace in Asia and throughout the world would be enhanced by its admission.

116. There is but one exception which my delegation must urge to the principle of universal participation in organized international society. That exception concerns Germany, east and west, as well as other countries where the régimes once allied to Nazism still prevail. The people of Israel, and Jews throughout the world, view with consternation and distress the progressive re-admission of Germany to the family of nations, with her revolting record intact, her guilt unexpiated and her heart unchanged.

117. Judging by all accounts, the evil spirit of Nazism still dominates the German mentality. The Press of the world reverberates with brazen declarations of unreformed and unrepenting wickedness on the part of the new apostles of the resurgent Nazi doctrine. The alarming reappearance of mass organizations, Nazi in spirit, is a salient feature of the situation. Beneath the new thin crust of apparent peacefulness, the fierce flames of old hatreds are still burning. Having exterminated the bulk of European Jewry and reduced the surviving remnant in Germany itself to an insignificant

number, the Nazis now vent their rage on the dead by desecration of cemeteries and destruction of tombstones.

118. The appeasement now practised in both parts of Germany outrages the sacred memory of countless martyrs, betrays the sacrifices sustained in the overthrow of Nazism and sows the seeds of new aggression, savagery and horror. The danger is now imminent that the only real beneficiary of the present world crisis will be the very country which by brutal violence provoked the last world war, forced the peace-loving peoples of the world to take up arms in defence of peace and democracy and was the direct cause of the establishment of the United Nations for the prevention of such calamities in the future.

119. The holocaust perpetrated by Germany in Europe may well serve as a marginal comment on the discussion of the grave problem of atomic energy. The atomic bomb is a fearful weapon, yet it did not need that device of wholesale annihilation of life to put to death in cold blood six million Jews—men, women and children—and an almost equal number of members of other enslaved peoples. Crematoria, gas chambers and even ordinary firing squads proved as effective instruments of mass extermination as the atomic weapon. There is no end to organized mass brutality and the infliction of suffering on innocent people that can go on unhindered during a war behind the front and inside barbed-wire fences.

120. The scourge to be adjured, condemned, outlawed, prevented, resisted and defeated is aggressive war. The use of the atomic weapon is but one hideous corollary of that basic evil. The effective outlawing and prevention of aggression by strict adherence to the Charter and determined action to ensure it should precede the prohibition of this and other instruments of mass destruction.

121. The crucial question remains, which will prove stronger—the forces which disrupt the world or the framework established for its unity? This question cannot be answered by words. It is a challenge both to our vision and to our practical statesmanship. Only our effective capacity to act in concert can meet it.

122. But the task is not merely that of swift reaction to aggression. The evil should be attacked at its roots. It is the sources of discontent, strife, rebellion and armed intervention that must be eliminated. Constructive endeavours are the radical remedy, while police action is a mere—though often indispensable—palliative. The evils to be fought and stamped out are poverty, disease and ignorance.

123. It has rightly been stressed during this debate that the real end of all our efforts is the well-being of the individual and of masses of individuals. The immense continents of Asia and Africa teem with hundreds of millions of human beings steeped in degradation and misery. The denial to them of the blessings of civilized life darkens the world's horizon with a grave and ever present menace. Even if the present world conflict were peacefully resolved, as long as glaring inequalities of wealth and knowledge remain perpetuated on a gigantic scale, the peace of the world will be in jeopardy. The removal, or at least the reduction, of these inequalities, is at once the most challenging and the most felicitous task of world statesmanship.

124. The harnessing of the United Nations to great projects of economic development and the utilization of the world's scientific and technological resources for the benefit of all is for the time being in its very inception. In his statesmanlike and imaginative memorandum, outlining a twenty years' programme for peace [A/1304], the Secretary-General clearly discerns the vital bearing of social and economic welfare on the prospects of international security. He portrays the United Nations not only as a barrier against aggression, but also as a positive instrument of economic emancipation and progress. In this direction lies the greatest positive promise of the United Nations for the future of mankind, first and foremost for the undeveloped, the under-developed and the economically and socially backward areas of the world.

125. For its part, the State of Israel, within its very limited capacity and with all too inadequate help from outside, has embarked upon an ambitious phase of reconstruction and rehabilitation. It has done so to consolidate its position and to fulfil its historic mission. As a result, the whole aspect of our country is changing under our very eyes. Our population has risen by 75 per cent within the last twenty-eight months. Masses of Jews, driven by misery and fear and drawn by the promise of freedom and dignity, are entering and settling down. Their very evacuation to Israel eliminates sources of weakness and danger to the Jewish people and the world. Large numbers of them are uplifted in the process from the depths of destitution and backwardness to greater productivity and civilized ways of life.

126. To render this possible, all the latent natural resources of the land are being developed at an accelerated pace, and the fruits of science and technology are vigorously applied. The country is shaking off its age-old lethargy and the people are advancing towards higher forms of living.

127. If our neighbours would heed the call of the Security Council and make peace with us, instead of confusing the issue by false charges and prolonging the plight of Arab refugees by delaying a settlement, our constructive endeavours could have merged with theirs for the benefit of the entire area of the Middle East. Be that as it may, what is being achieved, or at least attempted, in the field of development within the narrow confines of Israel, carried out single-handedly by one small State, could certainly be repeated on a vast scale by an international pooling of efforts wherever multitudes of people crave for better health, education and creative activity.

128. We are faced with a two-fold task. Firmness in dealing with aggression wherever and by whomever it may be committed, with bold foresight in attacking the twin human ills of poverty and ignorance, should be the watchwords of the United Nations. There can be no real progress without peace. There can be no permanent peace without progress. The attainment of both is the essence of the international Organization. The two are united in the hope of mankind.

129. Mr. GONZALEZ (Venezuela) (*translated from Spanish*): In the annual report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization<sup>7</sup> which, together

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 1.*

with the report of the Security Council,<sup>8</sup> forms the main basis for this general debate, two points are remarkable above all others.

130. The first is the failure of the great Powers, victors in the Second World War, in their efforts to achieve an understanding concerning the peace treaties with the defeated countries. If no remedy is found for this adverse situation, it will continue to affect the Organization's work in the future as it has affected it up to now.

131. The second is the action undertaken by the United Nations to redress the situation in Korea and restore peace.

132. In circumstances like the present, it would perhaps be advisable to exercise the privilege of saying nothing. When problems are so delicate, when passions and suspicions have become so acute, one unfortunate expression or a mistaken intention is sufficient to widen differences. Yet the matters before the Assembly are of such a nature that my delegation considers it the bounden duty of Members of the United Nations to set forth clearly their views on the general progress of the Organization.

133. The opinion is very generally held that the condition of the world, as this Assembly meets, is more alarming than at any other time since 1945. Both the retiring President of the Assembly, General Romulo, and Mr. Entezam, who is now so competently presiding over our deliberations, drew attention to that fact in their speeches on the opening day of this session.

134. For some, the movement towards universality of the United Nations is making slow progress, since there are many States whose desire to become Members has, for perfectly well-known reasons, not yet been satisfied. For others, the spirit of San Francisco has foundered, and, with it, the work which it inspired. From all quarters the weakness of the United Nations is criticized. The example of the League of Nations is frequently recalled.

135. Allow me to say that I do not altogether share this tendency to pessimism. It is true that the examination of the report of the Secretary-General, as well as those of some other principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations, shows once more the disproportion existing between the variety and effectiveness of the Organization's work in what are known as technical questions and the very meagre results obtained in political questions.

136. The principles of the Charter express the aspirations of all men of good will: peace, justice, security, equality of the large and small nations; their aim is "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights. . . , to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom".

137. The authors of the Charter, while enunciating these principles, realized that the world was neither static nor immovable, and contemplated the coming into play of dynamic forces, at times opposed to existing forces, as well as the means for solving, in a spirit of co-operation and harmony, the problems which such forces might bring in their wake.

138. But a great deal of time is required for noble ideas to bear fruit and penetrate the minds of men and peoples. Anyone who has learnt how many centuries it took to establish and consolidate the rules of law which today give stability to relations between individuals and are almost universally respected, must agree that an augury of better times is provided by the progress already achieved in the international sphere in the regulation of relations between States in accordance with principles which, until very recently, pertained only to the realm of doctrinal speculation.

139. In spite of great difficulties, the United Nations has progressed, slowly but surely, towards the achievement of those purposes. We are convinced that if the Organization did not exist, the world would be abandoned to absolute chaos. And this is not mere idealism. I make so bold as to call it realism, since we may recall the incontrovertible and repeated fact that each apparent failure of a universal international body is succeeded by an even greater effort to recreate it in a better and more dynamic form.

140. Those who maintain that the United Nations is suffering from the same ills which brought the League of Nations to disaster should reflect on what happened between 1931 and 1939. In those years, the League dealt with—or was required to deal with—a series of aggressions committed against Manchuria, Ethiopia, China, Czechoslovakia and many other countries. The ineffectiveness of the League in regard to those questions should be compared with the attitude adopted by the United Nations in the questions of Greece, Palestine, India-Pakistan, Indonesia and Korea.

141. In all these questions the United Nations provided the means for restoring peace and, in the case of Korea, for repelling aggression. We hope that, once peace has been achieved, the United Nations will in addition take adequate measures to pacify men's minds and promote an atmosphere of justice under a free régime.

142. It was precisely this determined attitude on the part of the Security Council in the case of Korea and the support given by an overwhelming majority of Member States which caused hope to revive even in the most sceptical and silenced the Organization's detractors.

143. Still there are some who say that the most serious situation confronting us is not so much the problem of restoring peace in Korea as the unwillingness of one member of the Security Council, which enjoys the privilege of the veto, to accept the position taken by the Council, and by fifty-three of the fifty-nine Member States of the United Nations, with regard to the armed action of the North Korean authorities against the Republic of Korea, a State which had been established by the United Nations and which functioned under its aegis.

144. The fact is the more obvious since, for a time, the Security Council acted as it should, that is, it took adequate and concrete measures to repel aggression, in keeping with the Charter and the interpretation placed on it and on the events by the majority.

145. Owing to the circumstances attending the case of Korea, the action of the Council since 1 August last

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 2.



has revealed once again its organic weakness and revealed in all its magnitude the perils to which the Venezuelan delegation, among others, referred in San Francisco when it accepted the voting formula in the Security Council as proposed by the great Powers. At that time the delegation of Venezuela spoke on these lines: We are voting in favour of the Yalta text not reluctantly but without enthusiasm. At all events, it appears necessary, in the present circumstances, in the first stage of the international Organization we are creating. It is, however, our ardent hope that in the not too distant future it will be possible to give greater flexibility to the procedure established by the Charter and that progress will be made towards a system under which a single member will not be able to obstruct the Council and which will at the same time be more in accordance with democratic principles. For this purpose amendments to the Charter should be facilitated.

146. The requirement indicated by the delegation of Venezuela in San Francisco became obvious as soon as the Security Council began to function, since in its work the Council has been handicapped by the systematic obstruction on the part of one of its members of any majority decision which that member considered as conflicting with its interests, of whatever nature, including the interests of mere propaganda.

147. Apparently it is we small Powers that are most concerned in opposing right to force, since our very existence depends on the check which respect for the international standard should place on the sweeping expansionist force of the great Powers.

148. I say "apparently" because the example of what happened to Germany and Japan, which were great Powers until they unleashed the Second World War, should be borne in mind by those States which base their conduct not on respect for right but on the use of force.

149. On that account, we cannot conceive that any State with the most elementary instinct of self-preservation could be interested in the collapse of the United Nations, or what is worse, in making it inopera-

tive, in undermining its existence. And for that reason also, when the Organization's collapse is predicted in some quarters, it is the duty of all of us, by strengthening the effectiveness of its machinery, to affirm our faith in it and in its principles, not only on account of what it may accomplish but because of what in certain political and, of course, in technical matters it has already accomplished.

150. Before summarizing my country's position on the present international situation, my delegation wishes to express the satisfaction with which it has followed the efforts of the Secretary-General of the Organization, as explained in the introduction to his report, to end the impasse which the United Nations has reached in some of its vital activities.

151. Venezuela, in the face of the aggression upon the Republic of Korea, has already stated its position and reaffirms it here. It condemns aggression and it firmly believes that the authority of the United Nations will restore the rule of law in that part of the world. Venezuela has taken concrete action in the matter; it has made contributions of an economic nature, to assist, in so far as it is capable, in repelling the aggression, as I had the honour to inform the Secretary-General a few days ago.

152. In this hour of crisis, in which the world Organization is for the first time opposing an act of armed aggression and applying the measures authorized under Chapter VII of the Charter, Venezuela is convinced that it is the inescapable duty of the Members of the United Nations to strengthen, both morally and legally, the authority of the Organization.

153. Finally, Venezuela believes that the resolutions duly adopted by the Assembly should guide the work of the other principal and subsidiary organs, in particular the Security Council, so that the Council may take effective action as provided for in Article 24 of the United Nations Charter.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*