

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**280th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 21 September 1950, at 3 p.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	35
Speeches by Mr. Jamali (Iraq), Sir Carl Berendsen (New Zealand), Mr. Spender (Australia), Mr. Carias (Honduras), Mr. Gonzalez Arevalo (Guatemala) and Mr. Kanellopoulos (Greece)	

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

General debate (*continued*)

SPEECHES BY MR. JAMALI (IRAQ), SIR CARL BERENDSEN (NEW ZEALAND), MR. SPENDER (AUSTRALIA), MR. CARIAS (HONDURAS), MR. GONZALEZ AREVALO (GUATEMALA) AND MR. KANELLOPOULOS (GREECE)

1. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq): Five years ago, when we met in San Francisco and drafted the United Nations Charter, we thought we were "united" nations. The tragic truth is that we meet here today not as united but as disunited nations. We are divided into camps. The chasm between the two camps has grown wider and wider since the cold war was waged, and now the cold war has led to open conflict in Korea. As a result, many human lives are being lost and the shadow of another world war is hanging over our heads.

2. Great sums of money are being spent by all nations of the world, not on reconstruction and development, but on the most deadly weapons of war. Fear of war, uncertainty about the future and lack of confidence prevail everywhere. The United Nations, which is the only hope of mankind to preserve peace based upon justice and to promote mutual understanding among nations, is greatly handicapped. It is true that freedom-loving peoples were heartened when aggression in Korea was promptly and effectively met by the Security Council, but it is now clear that promptness of action was due to the absence of one permanent member of the Security Council. What will the Security Council do if a new aggression is launched in another corner of the earth? It is certainly paralysed so long as the great Powers are divided and so long as the veto is exercised.

3. This question of the veto, which has been discussed during the last two or three years, has made many well-wishers of the United Nations despair, and unless something is done to bring the big Powers to a common ground, and unless they get together and agree on the most fundamental principles of the Charter, this Organization is doomed. But we must be determined to make

it live and work in the true spirit of the Charter. Once we lose hope of this possibility we must frankly face the eventuality of a third world war which might lead to total destruction. Let us sincerely hope that such an eventuality will never arise and that at the eleventh hour humanity is removed from the brink of a catastrophe. But to achieve that there are several prerequisites, of which I shall enumerate seven.

4. First, we must reaffirm our allegiance to the United Nations Charter in deed as well as in word. We must renew our faith in personal liberty, human dignity, the value and importance of the individual, sincerity and openness in dealings between men and between nations, prosperity for all, and peace based on mutual trust.

5. Second, to achieve the aforementioned aims we must arrive at an ideological truce based on mutual toleration. We must disarm the propaganda machinery which claims all science and truth for one camp and denounces the other camp as the enemy of humanity which needs to be destroyed. To achieve this, an agreement must be reached that all walls and curtains between nations must be torn down. Failing that, and recognizing that the world has in fact been divided into two camps which can live side by side in peace, mutual guarantees must be given that no camp shall penetrate or infiltrate into the other. Thus, the cold war must stop.

6. Third, a new determination should be made to denounce aggression from whatever quarter it comes and wherever it is committed. To solve problems by aggression does not pay with modern tools of warfare. Aggression begets aggression, and therefore it is not the road to peace and stability in the world. The United Nations in general, and the Security Council in particular, should deal with aggression from whatever source it comes without favouritism or relaxation. My delegation, while commending the efficacy and justice of meeting aggression in Korea, wonders why the Security Council did not and does not act with similar

promptness and efficacy in cases of aggression in Palestine.

7. The world has certainly heard of the inhuman and brutal treatment recently meted out to about a hundred Arabs of Palestine who went to harvest their crops in areas occupied by the Jews. They were beaten, their bones were fractured and their nails torn out. Many of them were disfigured and taken blindfolded to the desert and left there to walk back on foot to Jordan, many of them dying of thirst, hunger and fatigue.

8. The world certainly has heard of the machine-gunning by a Jewish fighter plane of a Lebanese plane carrying pilgrims from Jerusalem to Beirut, killing and wounding several pilgrims, amongst them United States citizens. Could that be guaranteeing free and safe access to the Holy Places of Palestine? It is important to note that the pilot of the plane was a French citizen and not a Lebanese.

9. The world must have heard of the thousands of Arabs who have been driven away from their homes in Palestine during the past few months under the fire of Jewish arms, in order to give their homes to the new Jewish immigrants.

10. The world must have heard of Jewish army encroachments on Lebanese, Egyptian and Jordanian borders, killing and looting innocent Arab inhabitants. As far as we know, the Jews are still in Jordanian territory.

11. These are examples of aggression the total of which certainly shows a state of unrest and threat to the peace. Yet the Security Council has shown no zeal in dealing with this aggression. We submit that if world peace is to be achieved, aggression must be equally and vigorously stemmed, whether it be in Korea, Palestine, Greece or in any other part of the world. To be active and effective in one part of the world and neglectful in another does not make the United Nations a dependable instrument for maintaining world peace and order. If the United Nations is to be effective, the democratic way of procedure must prevail. Every nation, whether large or small, must yield to the will of the majority. The right of veto must be abolished if we are to avoid the paralysis of the Security Council, and hence the paralysis of the whole Organization.

12. The doors of the United Nations must be open to all peace-loving nations. Ceylon, the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain and many other states must find their seats amongst us.

13. The General Assembly has tried to find ways and means of getting around the veto. A permanent committee was established. Several other devices were mentioned yesterday by the head of the United States delegation to make the General Assembly do what the Security Council, not paralysed by a veto, is supposed to do. All these devices will be sympathetically studied. But why not amend the Charter and remove the veto, now that experience has proved that it paralyses this Organization? One of the best ways to get the United Nations out of its present impasse would be to abolish the right of veto in the Security Council.

14. Another important requisite for keeping world peace and making the United Nations efficient is to provide means for enforcing its decisions—at least by resorting to the application of Article 41 of the Charter.

If we are to guarantee world peace, the decisions of the General Assembly, which represent the will of the majority, must be respected and enforced.

15. The people of Iraq are particularly concerned about the neglect in the implementation of any United Nations decision on Palestine which has any bearing on Arab rights there. The Jewish authorities in Palestine, while paying lip service to the United Nations, have never carried out a single decision of the General Assembly or the Security Council which did not suit their interests. The plight of nearly a million Arab refugees in Palestine is an eloquent example. In spite of successive United Nations decisions to let the Arab refugees return to their homes and to compensate those who chose not to return, the Jewish authorities have flagrantly flouted the will of the Organization. Nay, since the United Nations decision was first made, they have added tens of thousands of new Arab refugees to the mass.

16. The case of Jerusalem is another glaring example. Notwithstanding the successive United Nations resolutions of 1947 [181 (II)], 1948 [194 (III)] and 1949 [303 (IV)], to the effect that the area of Jerusalem should constitute a *corpus separatum* and that it should be governed by the United Nations, the Jewish authorities have consistently flouted those decisions. The Arabs are legitimately entitled to ask this question: if the United Nations could act swiftly and effectively in Korea, why can it not do so in Palestine? Can the United Nations have a clear conscience when nearly one million Arabs are homeless and destitute and without adequate food, hygienic requirements and social and moral integration?

17. We believe that, if the United Nations is to be effective, it must see to it that its decisions are carried out and respected. We believe that to resort to Article 41 of the Charter is quite adequate and effective in many cases—Palestine being one such case. The Jewish authorities often speak of peace in Palestine. But what kind of peace do they desire? Certainly not a peace based on United Nations decisions or on human rights, but, rather, a peace which deprives the Arabs of their legitimate and natural rights and which satisfies the interests and ambitions of the Jews. The Jewish authorities clamour for direct negotiations with the Arab States, but they want negotiations based on denying and ignoring the successive resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

18. They deny to the Arabs article 13, paragraph 2, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which reads: "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

19. Certainly the United Nations cannot afford to let the situation in Palestine drag in the way in which it has been dragging if the prestige and efficacy of the Organization in dealing with world affairs is to be maintained. United Nations decisions must be made to work if we are to have a United Nations Organization and if we are to have world peace.

20. Another prerequisite for world peace is the abolition of racial prejudice and discrimination wherever it exists, and the liberation of all politically conscious and freedom-loving peoples of the earth. Vast peoples still under colonial rule await their salvation and freedom. Many nations have attained their independence through

this channel. The historic events of the attainment of independence by India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia, have been marked by the happy conclusion of their struggle for freedom and by statesmanship on both sides.

21. In North Africa there are Arab nations which have achieved a marked degree of political consciousness and which are undergoing hardships in the attainment of this goal. A curtain now separates the world from news of this struggle. While the people express their wish for freedom by legitimate means, the French authorities do their best to thwart their activities, which sometimes leads to bloodshed on a vast scale. The world cannot, in the long run, remain silent with regard to this state of affairs. It is our sincere hope that France, the champion of the principles of liberty, fraternity and equality, whose friendship my country cherishes, will see to it that the people of North Africa—who have shown a marked degree of political and national consciousness, and who are not inferior in that respect to many nations which have already achieved their freedom—are allowed to attain their own independence. My delegation was deeply gratified by the decision taken at the last session with regard to Libya, and sincerely hopes that no obstacles are being placed in the way of that country's achieving its unity and independence.

22. There is no doubt that the spirit of the Charter demands the liberation of all mankind, and that unless this liberation is achieved in progressive and peaceful ways it leads to strife and bloodshed and, hence, becomes a threat to world peace. World peace demands that the liberation movement should be accelerated and not retarded.

23. The most crucial problem facing mankind today is, undoubtedly, the economic one. The fact is that, in this age of science and plenty, there are hundreds of millions of human beings who are under-nourished, some of them being on the verge of starvation. This makes the achievement of political stability and peace within each nation and between nations a difficult problem. To meet the situation one ideology—desperate and losing hope—preaches revolution; another ideology preaches peaceful and progressive social and economic reforms. And still another ideology, supported by a small minority of die-hards, holds that certain men are entitled by birth-right to become lords and the rest slaves. Fortunately, that class of men is becoming extinct.

24. There remain two paths for human development. One is that of revolution, and the other is the path of evolution. Revolution is certainly contrary to the spirit of the United Nations Charter for it breeds class hatred and class discrimination. It uses violence and subversion as methods of achieving social ends. It believes in the theory that the end justifies the means. This is morally wrong. One must use decent means to achieve noble ends.

25. The United Nations way is the way of evolution. It should strive to make the peoples of the earth share the advantages of modern science and techniques. The programme of technical assistance, which is being prepared by the United Nations, is a step in the right direction. But, in many cases, it is not enough. Technical assistance without financial assistance may prove futile. We feel that an arrangement like the Marshall Plan should

be set up for the Middle East after Europe, and aid should then move eastward, along with technical assistance, so that, in less than a generation, the whole world may benefit from the advantages of modern science and techniques.

26. If we would only decide to have peace and stop arming, if some of the thousands of millions of dollars being spent on armament could be diverted to the development of the under-developed countries, one of the greatest causes of war would be removed from the world. Guidance rather than exploitation should be the rule in helping the under-developed countries. Self-help and local initiative should be greatly encouraged by the United Nations. It is in this spirit and along these lines that we can hope to achieve peace.

27. In conclusion, I wish to summarize the seven points I have discussed. Those points are:

28. To reaffirm our adherence to the United Nations Charter and its basic principles, in deed as well as in word;

29. To declare an ideological truce based upon mutual tolerance;

30. To meet aggression, from whatever source, collectively and with great efficacy;

31. To revise the Charter and abolish the rule of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council;

32. To provide means and take measures to enforce United Nations decisions;

33. To liberate politically conscious and freedom-loving peoples from foreign yoke and to abolish racial discrimination;

34. To aid, financially and technically, the under-developed countries.

35. These are the basic needs for the survival of the United Nations, and we may very well describe them as the seven pillars of peace. These are not idealistic dreams, but realistic facts derived from reflection on the bitter experiences of the post-war years. If we, small nations and big nations, have the will to implement these points, and I hope we have, we can achieve peace and prosperity for all mankind through the United Nations.

36. Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand): Before I embark on the submissions which I hope to make to the General Assembly, may I ask the President's indulgence for two very brief preliminary observations.

37. In the first place, I want to pay my tribute and that of my country to the memory of the distinguished statesman who was one of the authors of our Charter. Jan Smuts was a great man, a wise man, a good man, and the world is the poorer for his passing. As our New Zealand Maoris put it, drawing their imagery from the great trees of the forest, "Another *totara* has fallen". Such is life, such is death.

38. Secondly, I wish to tender to the President my warmest felicitations on his election to a post which must be amongst the most onerous and responsible which the world has to offer today. I am altogether sure, and I am certain that the Assembly is altogether sure, that he will not only maintain the high traditions established by his distinguished predecessors, but will add

lustre to his own name, to the name of his great country, and to this Assembly.

39. It has become the practice at these sessions of the General Assembly for representatives to come to this rostrum, in the course of the general debate, to expound and expand upon the merits and the successes—all of them real, all of them incontestable—of the United Nations. I have nothing to say against this practice, commendable and laudable at the proper time. Wholeheartedly my government and my country support any and every endeavour that tends, even in the smallest degree, towards an increase in human welfare or in human happiness; and there is a great temptation, to which I am just as susceptible as any other representative, to dwell upon the progress already achieved and the vital importance of the United Nations to the world. But I intend to resist that temptation. To follow such a course in the present circumstances, I suggest with all earnestness, would be nothing more than whistling in the dark, pretending to ourselves that all is well when all is not well, or that all will be well when all will not be well unless, by our own forethought, by our own exertions, by our own sacrifices, we see to it that all must be well.

40. This is, of all times, a time for a clear and honest survey of the crisis with which this Organization and the whole free world are menaced. There is no room now in our councils for those who shut their eyes to the facts because the facts are unpleasant—who, with their heads buried in the sand, pretend that realities do not exist because they will not see them.

41. The facts of today are stark and inescapable. There is a great crisis in the affairs of man. It could be the greatest crisis in history which confronts us today. Let us face it as serious and sober men, conscious alike of our responsibilities and the magnitude of our past and of our peril. Let us never lose sight of the fact that the successes of the United Nations, however high their value to mankind—and I would be among the first to laud them—are secondary only, and that all that has been achieved will fall to the ground unless the United Nations has greater success than its predecessor the League of Nations, and succeeds in its one essential function of preserving the peace of the world. Let us see to it that history does not record this session of the General Assembly as fiddling while Korea burned.

42. There can be little doubt as to what is indeed happening in the world today. Surely it is clear to every thinking man and woman, wherever men and women have free access to the facts, that what mankind is facing today, not for the first time or perhaps the hundredth time in man's chequered history, is a determined and menacing attack on liberty, on order and on justice, another attempt to impose upon an agonized world the yoke of servitude which it was confidently hoped man was escaping for all time. There is, of course, nothing new in this, even to us who live today. We defeated and survived one such attempt, gravely menacing in its threat, a quarter of a century ago, and it is but a short five years since another terrifying attack on civilization was beaten back at incalculable cost in blood, in agony and in treasure.

43. The only thing that is surprising is the recrudescence of the same threat—in a different shape, in a dif-

ferent guise, but the same threat—within such a short period. What we are to decide at this session of the General Assembly is nothing less than this: whether this great Organization, in its present form or in such altered form as it may be possible to achieve, can justify the hopes entrusted to it by mankind. That is the question.

44. The United Nations is facing its first real test as an instrument of collective security, and upon how it meets that test depend not only the lives and happiness of men and women throughout the world as far as the mind can reach, but indeed, in very truth, the fate of civilization itself.

45. Can anyone still doubt that there are vast and powerful forces in the world today deterred by no moral considerations, who will not shrink from embarking even on a world war if and when they think it is to their advantage? If there be any lingering, reluctant doubts in the minds of those who perhaps cannot yet convince themselves of the existence of evil, that the world does today face a tremendous raid, an organized and long-planned attack on all that is right, all that is good and helpful for the future, then surely the performance of the Security Council in the month of August must have been decisive proof of evil intention.

46. What is one to say, what can anyone say, of the fantastic allegation by the Soviet Union that it was the South Koreans who committed aggression and the North Koreans, from the very first moment in occupation of South Korean territory, who were the victims? It is preposterous, monstrous, and so palpably far from the truth as to be indicative of nothing but bad faith and painfully reminiscent of the Nazi technique with which we had become so familiar in the 1930's. The freedom-loving world has given its judgment on this flagrant aggression. This judgment was contained in the resolutions of the Security Council,¹ endorsed as they have been by fifty-three Members of this Organization and by the indignant voices of men and women the free world over.

47. What then, we must ask ourselves—and we must ask ourselves at this meeting—are we to do? What is it that lies within our power to do to uphold and defend this moral judgment of mankind? That leads me to a point upon which I have in the past frequently addressed this Assembly, and to which, in present circumstances, I make no apology at all for returning. There have been vast numbers of good, honest people who have held the view that the peace of this world can be maintained by words alone, that goodwill and good intentions are enough, and that to avoid war and the risk of war it is sufficient if right-thinking men and women behave sensibly and decently, if we all declare our love of peace and our determination to keep it, if whenever disputes arise we immediately agree to meet around a table and discuss matters, if we would but seek agreement. Then, these simple people say, war will not arise.

48. That, of course, is nonsense—childish nonsense and most dangerous nonsense. Just as it takes two to make a quarrel, it takes two to make an agreement.

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

What, I ask, are we to do with people who will not accept any settlement except on terms that mean loss of liberty, if not of life, to all who disagree? And if agreement is interpreted by one party as equivalent to surrender, then who is for agreement? It would be a barren and bitter agreement that abandoned freedom, human rights and human dignity. And who can seek agreement with an antagonist who indicates by every act his contempt for agreement? Could there possibly have been a more consistent, more determined effort to apply reason and to avoid force than in this very case of Korea? Ever since the problem arose there have been patient, continuous, insistent attempts on the one side to find a solution by reasonable discussions, and equally consistent refusal by the other to discuss the matter in any way or on any terms except those laid down by that side. The matter has been before the United Nations, before this General Assembly, many, many times, and on every single occasion the General Assembly has attached major importance to the aspect of conciliation, discussion and adjustment.

49. Time and time again all concerned were urged to come together to discuss and agree upon the best solution for everyone. A United Nations commission, designed for just that purpose, was established by the General Assembly and has constantly and all the time been available in Korea to both sides for discussion and mediation. To those, if any there be, who still hanker after mediation, conciliation, discussion, I say that all these have been offered and urged during all the years that this dispute has existed. They have consistently and contemptuously been refused, and at this point there is no case whatever to be made for conciliation now that open and armed aggression has occurred. Discussion was the last thing that one side wanted. Aggression and oppression were the objectives of these people. And what is the use of talking of reason to people who will not listen to reason but who worship only power?

50. It is worth while to pause here and note that despite the fond and pathetic belief of so many that reason and good intentions are enough in this world, this was not the basis upon which the United Nations was established. Those who believe that words and words alone are adequate to keep the peace were not among the authors of the Charter of this Organization, which is based on the conviction—obviously and demonstrably and inescapably the conviction, if one looks either to the history of the past or the menace of the future—that words are not enough, that if we wish to maintain peace throughout the world we must police and enforce that peace. Indeed, the proposition is so simple that one wonders how any could ever have doubted this regrettable but obvious necessity.

51. Peace and order cannot be preserved by words alone. Peace and order cannot be preserved without force, even in the most civilized communities in the world. Crime and disorder cannot be restrained in New York or in Washington or in London or in Ottawa, or even in Moscow, without force. Although as one grows older, one becomes more and more impervious to surprise, I am constantly astonished that those who so stridently and, in my view, so stupidly renounce the necessity for force in restraining international crime have never adopted or, indeed, suggested the parallel course of renouncing it in municipal or national affairs,

in the relations of men with men. In fact, as we all very well know, the very basis of law and order, even in the most civilized communities in the world today, is force. Each good citizen accepts, and gladly accepts, the fact that the rights of every human being are maintained and his duties enforced by the forcible action of the state to which he belongs.

52. Similarly, there can be no permanent peace throughout the world unless the same principles are made to apply to the nations which are members of our international community as have been found essential for the maintenance of peace and order and justice among individual human beings. And these are three: firstly, a means of establishing and amending the law which is to apply; secondly, a judicial process for interpreting and applying that law; and thirdly—and this is the point of my remarks—an effective, automatic and inescapable means of enforcing that law.

53. The first law for international conduct which must be implemented is the law already established outlawing war as an instrument of national policy. You will not attain that international peace for which the hearts of all good citizens yearn, until you have instituted in the international arena an effective means by which lawless force will always be met and defeated by lawful force. It is as simple as that, and the organization contemplated by our Charter was intended to achieve that very purpose. Why then did it fail to do so? Obviously—and I regret once more having to return very briefly to an aspect which I have laboured from this rostrum on many occasions—because of the veto. The plain and simple fact is that while you can have your choice between a one-Power veto, on the one hand, which preserves your sovereignty, or alternatively, on the other hand, an effective system of collective security, you cannot have both. The two are mutually exclusive and contradictory.

54. There never has been nor does there exist today any more enthusiastic supporter of the principles of the United Nations than New Zealand. My Government and I myself, in season and out of season, have expounded those principles; I have affirmed their validity and necessity and urged the devoted support of this Organization on all within reach of my modest voice. But I have never attempted to hide my belief that while there is very much that the United Nations, even with its present limitations, can do to improve the lot of mankind, it cannot, while hamstrung by the veto, hope effectively to carry out the primary object for which it was established: to preserve and, if necessary, enforce the peace of the world. I think that after much soul-searching and second thought there is a very wide and general agreement with that statement of the position, and the recent action of the Security Council calling upon all Members of the United Nations actively and by force to repel aggression in South Korea has been received by right-thinking people almost with a sense of relief, as bringing into the transactions of the United Nations a sense of reality which many felt had been lacking in the past.

55. If there were any validity in the criticism that I and many others have been making as to the stultifying effect of the veto, how then, people are entitled to ask and they are asking, did this come about? The answer is perfectly simple. It came about by accident. The

Soviet Union, for a totally extraneous reason, chose to absent itself from the Security Council and continued so to absent itself until that Council had passed its entirely laudable and justified resolution and consequently had brought into play, to the limit and extent that they could be brought into play, the very central provisions of the Charter. The forcible repression of aggression flows indeed from the very heart of our Organization as the very core and centre of the Charter.

56. What do I mean when I make the reservation that the Organization has brought those provisions into play so far as the circumstances allowed? I mean this: that it was intended in San Francisco that the United Nations should have at its instant disposal to meet just such situations as this, just such treacherous attacks as are characteristic of the actions of any aggressor, an armed force belonging to the United Nations, at the disposal of the United Nations, ready and able to meet any aggressor on behalf of the United Nations anywhere, at any time.

57. Then why has such a force not been prepared in the five years of the Organization's existence? The answer again is: because of the veto, because one of the five permanent members of the Security Council—of course, always the same one—was determined not to permit the principles laid down at San Francisco to be applied. What, in effect, it amounts to is this: that, by a combination of circumstances quite unexpected and quite unlikely to be repeated, the Security Council has by chance been enabled to play its contemplated part as the guardian of world peace—though with inescapable restrictions which add incalculably to the difficulty of its task—and today lawless force is at last being resisted by lawful force. But let us bear this fact in mind—it may become in the highest degree pertinent in the near future: had it not been for the fact that the Soviet Union, for devious and extraneous purposes of its own, had voluntarily absented itself from the Security Council, that Council could have done none of the things that it has done; none of the resolutions on Korea could have been adopted over the Soviet Union veto. The fact that the system is now operating, even to the extent it is, does not prove that the United Nations can act effectively under the Charter as it exists at present. It does prove something, but something quite significantly different: it proves that the Security Council can act if the Soviet Union is absent.

58. This is indeed an imperfect world; in parts it is a wicked world. I am one of those who believe that the problem we have to solve is essentially a moral problem, that if we do not solve this problem upon the moral plane we shall not solve it at all. With every other decent man and woman in this world, I deplore—it is to me a matter of constant heart-searching—the fact that, in our combined effort to resist and defeat the wrong, innocent people are suffering, bleeding, dying. I wish that that were not the price we must pay for order and decency and justice in this world. But, in the upward progress of the human race from the mire to the empyrean, it appears to be inevitable that suffering on this earth, so far as our limited understanding enables us to see, should fall, without apparent reason, on the just and the unjust, the innocent and the guilty. And who are we, men of years speaking in a situation of comparative safety, to urge that others should fight in

Korea—and wherever else the need may arise—even though the fight is, as undoubtedly it is, for right and justice? I am painfully conscious of the fact that, throughout history, it has been the old people who have urged the young to fight, to suffer, to die. But I have no doubt at all as to the clarity and the inevitability of the line of thought which tells me that it is not only right and proper but vital that the right should be defended and the wrong defeated, even if this involves, as involve it must, hardship, suffering and misery to many. The dilemma is there, and is plain for all to see. Each must choose his course according to his conscience. For myself I have no doubts. I say that it was good that the Security Council, by the accident of the absence of the Soviet Union, was able to do its duty. I congratulate the members of the Security Council on their courage and their determination, on the rapidity with which they acted, and, in particular, I extend to this great Republic, whose guests we are today, my very warm appreciation, and that of my country, for the wise, courageous and instant lead that it gave to the world of freedom.

59. The United States has proved to all who care to hear that it is still possible for a great Power at once and unerringly to choose the path of honour, the path of right—at once to set its feet upon that path with faith and in the confident knowledge that it will be supported by countless millions who hold the same ideals, the same beliefs. And the immediate response of the United Kingdom—indeed, of so many nations of the free world—has proved that there is indeed hope for mankind and for the eternal principles of right and justice. Our special gratitude—and let us not forget it for one moment—is due to those United States combat troops who, in South Korea, have held the ramparts of civilization against overwhelming odds.

60. To me the fact that action has been taken as it has, is the most encouraging thing that has happened in my lifetime. Of course, the road has been and will be hard. Of course, the United Nations was not ready because the Soviet Union, by its veto, saw to it that it could not be ready. Of course, the United States was not ready. Nor were any of the nations of the British Commonwealth or of any other freedom-loving country, because to us aggression is abhorrent and unthinkable, and because we have preferred—with much greater credit to our hearts than to our heads—to devote our resources to increasing amenities for our people rather than to meeting a threat which seemed to us to be so grotesquely evil as to be incredible. We know better now.

61. The aggressor chose—as he always will choose—his time and place. He enjoyed the initial advantage of any aggressor, which is enormous and which, perhaps, grows more so as weapons—the lethal effect of which is global and, apparently, unlimited—become available to the evildoers as well as to the guardians of good. But the step we have taken is a fundamental step. We have now accepted the necessity of armed and collective resistance to aggression, and we have brought to this body that sense of stern reality which it has so often lacked in the past.

62. I do not profess to foresee with any certainty the outcome of this great adventure on behalf of right and law and the decency of man. But I do see with complete

clarity that it had to be undertaken if we were not to make a farce of the Charter, to betray our manhood and to surrender our hope for the future. And I see this also—that having once put our hands to the plough we must inevitably continue right to the end of the furrow, however stony and however intractable the ground. Having once undertaken to vindicate the majesty of the law, to defeat by armed force an armed attack on peace, we must not falter. We must see this thing through to the end.

63. There must be no appeasement of the evildoer, no temporizing with the international criminal, no weakening of our present high resolve by well-meant but dangerous and impracticable proposals to talk things over with those who are flaunting the will of mankind. There is no bridge between good and evil, no middle ground between right and wrong, and it is surely clear that, having named the aggressor—and having rightly named the aggressor—having taken up arms against this gross infringement of international law and order, we would not be justified, morally or logically, to enter into discussions or negotiations of any kind whatsoever with the international criminal—indeed we cannot afford to do so—until he is back whence he came.

64. One realizes the superficial attraction of pleas for conciliation, for discussion, for negotiation, for getting round a table, for sweet reasonableness in every way, but, surely, there comes a time when the usefulness of words and reason is past. Nobody suggests, nobody can suggest, the wisdom of negotiations between the victim of a hold-up and his attacker. Nobody suggests a round table conference with a burglar, especially when the burglar is caught redhanded in the act. Nobody suggests discussions with a criminal in mid-crime. It would be condoning, indeed encouraging crime, if we were stupid enough to enter into negotiations with the international aggressor before justice and law have been vindicated by his expulsion from the country he has attacked and invaded.

65. Indeed, as I see it, one certain way of ensuring the inevitability of world conflict would be to show weakness or hesitation at this critical moment in world history. It has been said recently by a member of the United States delegation—and I hope I am quoting him correctly, because I am in full concurrence with what I believe he said—that, if we make ourselves strong enough, quickly enough, we may escape a third world war.

66. Nobody can, and, indeed, I think nobody does deny the dangers of the situation with which we are at present confronted. Nobody can doubt that there is grave peril, either as the direct result of this Korean incident or for more general and fundamental reasons, that we will find ourselves embroiled in a world conflict. It will not be of our seeking. It will be forced upon us. If it comes to us, it will come to us as it came in Korea—as defenders against attack and in no other way.

67. It has been truly said, that, today, the road of peace is the road of courage. War is dreadful; defeat is worse, and slavery is worse. If we waver, if our hearts grow faint at the prospect of what may lie in store for us, I believe we are lost. It may well be that the United Nations has nothing to offer and the world nothing to expect but “blood and toil, tears and sweat”.

It may be so, but, a few short years ago, the nations of the British Commonwealth, standing alone against a then triumphant aggressor, faced just that prospect with stern courage and fought their way through. We may, indeed, all be called upon to do the same today. And if we falter now, if we temporize now, if we appease now, peace, in my opinion, is lost and, with it, human dignity and human freedom as far ahead as man can see. One cries with Patrick Henry: “Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?” Yet, from the affirmative aspect, no honest man can promise success if we do hold fast, if we do fight it out on this line, if it takes all summer or many summers and many winters, too.

68. I do not profess, I cannot profess, to see the outcome of this struggle. It is, and it can be, known only to God. But I will assert with all possible conviction that the risk and the suffering to be expected in resisting evil and aggression by force of arms, grave and heart-rending as they are, are less—demonstrably, infinitely less—than would result from letting things drift. If we do not make this fight, if we do not win this fight, we will all suffer—every one of us—and the suffering will not be confined to this generation, because, as the lights of liberty go out throughout the world, so die all the hopes we cherish for the generations to come. If—and God forbid—we should fail, liberty will disappear from the earth, not for the first time, and the rights and dignities of man will be submerged. But, if we should fail, we are no worse off than if we had not made this noble attempt—and we shall have proved ourselves to be men, and not pawns.

69. But why should we fail? Our cause is just, our resources are immeasurable, our hearts are strong. Normally, we may expect to emerge from this test of man's ability to protect freedom and human rights as a co-operating group of nations banded together for just that purpose. Let us not throw away the ground which we shall have gained. Let us—for our own safety, for the preservation of liberty and justice in this world—maintain that co-operation, strengthen it, keep it ever ready to meet any further attack. If we do not do this, the progress towards lasting peace that, with God's help, we shall have made will be lost.

70. This is a time for all Members of the United Nations to recollect that those international rights which every nation in this world claims postulate correlative international duties; that—put in its simplest form—we cannot claim, as all peace-loving nations should be entitled to claim, armed assistance from others in resisting attack unless, for our own part, we are each prepared whole-heartedly to assist others in similar cases.

71. My own small country has always been in the forefront of those who acknowledge their international duties. New Zealanders have died all over the world in defence of human rights and human liberties—and my country did not delay a day in announcing itself and its intentions in respect of the aggression upon South Korea. From the very beginning, New Zealand aligned itself with the United States, the United Kingdom and so many other Members of the United Nations in support of the stand that was properly and promptly taken in this matter by the Security Council, and at once two ships of the Royal New Zealand Navy were dispatched to join the United Nations forces operating

under General MacArthur. But, like most of the democracies at the end of the second World War, we had thrown away our sword and our shield. And although we quickly decided to send ground troops to fight shoulder to shoulder with the initial forces provided by the United States, the implementation of that decision, in our case and in every other case, as the aggressor knew, must necessarily be a matter of time. It will be our most earnest endeavour to provide those forces with the least possible delay consistent with justice to the men who are being trained to fight and to those alongside whom they will be fighting.

72. When we in New Zealand accepted the Charter of the United Nations — with all its imperfections — we pledged ourselves to collective resistance to armed attack. We have honoured that pledge, as we shall always honour our pledges. We know there are many, very many, Members of the United Nations who will take the same view, and we are confident that their numbers will grow as the situation becomes clearer and the necessities more obvious.

73. With all the agonizing aspects of the struggle in which we are engaged, the doubts and perplexities that confront us, the well grounded apprehensions that worse perhaps is yet to come, it has been of inestimable advantage to all the free countries and all the free peoples of the world that this flagrant attack on South Korea has awakened us — every man and every woman on every street in every city of every free country in the world — to the peril which confronts us and the plots with which we are beset.

74. Gone — now and I hope for all time — is the complacent belief which has benumbed us all in the years that the locust has just eaten, that so long as men will on the whole try to do well, we will be safe from armed aggression. Gone from our time, and until we can establish an effective system of collective security, is the short-sighted and superficial philosophy that because we won the last war there will never be another war, and that we can accordingly dispense with the forces we gathered together at such peril and at such expense in money and in human anguish. Surely we have learned the lesson that we must never again deprive ourselves of the means of defending our people and our way of life until we have in full and effective operation the organization for this purpose which has been the aim of mankind for centuries past.

75. Here and now is the test of the United Nations, the test of the will and the ability of man to manage man's affairs in such a way that men and women everywhere and their children to come may live their lives with dignity, in happiness, as God meant them to live their lives, free of this constant, ever-present threat from the forces of evil. This is our chance to banish war even if — and the anomaly is inescapable — by war itself. This is our opportunity to achieve man's age-long dream of a peaceful world. This is the road, the road we are climbing at present. Long and steep and arduous as it is, it is the only road to the goal. Let us hold together and let us hold fast because if we do not hold fast there will be nothing left to hold.

76. Mr. SPENDER (Australia): It is inevitable that when representatives of nations come to this rostrum their minds go back to the foundations of the Charter, the beliefs of those who framed the Charter

and of the millions of people who applauded it. Our minds go back to the fact that we believed in those days that all the nations which subscribed to the Charter would indeed attempt to carry it out. But five years have established, unfortunately, how ill-founded this hope was.

77. Today we are obliged to face the fact that one of the most important assumptions on which the United Nations was planned and has attempted to operate, has been proved false by actual experience. The whole conception of the United Nations, and the procedures laid down for its operations, depend on the Member States being determined, in the words of the Preamble of the Charter, "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours," and to unite their strength "to maintain international peace and security".

78. This has not up to the present been the policy and action of the USSR, either within the United Nations or outside. If we are facing today the greatest crisis of the modern world it is because, I regret to say, the Soviet Union has used its position as one of the permanent members of the Security Council to obstruct the efforts which the vast majority of the United Nations are making to unite their strength to maintain international peace and security. Far from practising tolerance and living in peace as good neighbours, the rulers of the Soviet Union — and I emphasize "the rulers" — have embarked upon a policy of imperialist expansion; not, it is true, through the political absorption of more territories belonging to other States, but usually by assisting efforts to overthrow the legally constituted governments of different countries and to replace them by governments that are subservient to Moscow. We have seen this process successfully applied in Eastern Europe, and we know that it is being tried in many other parts of the world. It is this consistent policy of the rulers of the Soviet Union that has sapped the faith of the ordinary man in the United Nations and has raised again the frightful spectre of world war. So long as this policy continues, it is in the view of the Australian delegation, futile, and even dangerous, for us to pretend that the United Nations can maintain the peace of the world solely through procedures that were adopted in the belief that all Member States were determined to carry out loyally their obligations under the Charter. We are forced, by the present policy of the rulers of the Soviet Union, to approach the problem of security in the knowledge that there are, within the United Nations itself, nations which are working or have at least, up to the present, been working against the Organization and seeking to destroy its effectiveness as an instrument of security.

79. It is true that the Soviet Union talks a great deal about the fight for peace, and that in many countries communist parties organize so-called peace campaigns and collect signatures for a so-called peace appeal. It is true that on many occasions, as indeed the leader of its delegation did yesterday [279th meeting], it has proclaimed and proclaimed again its desire for peace. But what constructive action has the Soviet Union taken in the past few years, in the years since together with them we fought for survival, to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes or to assist the United Nations to check aggression?

80. It affords me no satisfaction, but is indeed a cause of real regret, to be compelled to record that time after time the Soviet Union has misused its privileged position as one of the permanent members of the Security Council, to veto action, as my colleague from New Zealand said, which the majority of members considered necessary in the interests of peace. Attempts to reach international agreement for the control of atomic energy, for the reduction of conventional armaments and for the lessening of tension in the Balkans, have all met with obstruction from the Soviet group.

81. Indeed, we have today nations represented in this hall who, judged by their past actions, have been trying not to make the Organization work in accordance with the Charter but to prevent it from functioning effectively and to use it not for the maintenance of peace in the world but for the destruction of other governments represented in this General Assembly which do not subscribe to their own views. The records of the last five years show it: the continual obstruction of all efforts to conclude a treaty of peace with Austria, the blockade of Berlin, the obstruction and opposition to every move to stop aggression and bring about peace in Korea, are only three examples of a melancholy list. If this is not the true situation, it is for the Soviet Union representative here to convince us that it is not. Let him tell us what his delegation has done or is doing today to secure co-operation and to maintain peace in the world.

82. Mr. Vyshinsky must not be surprised if we from Australia are not over-impressed by his protestations of peace and the proposals he put forward yesterday for the reduction of armaments [A/1376]. After all, it is very easy for a nation that has built up massive armed forces, bigger perhaps than anything the world has ever seen, to propose to nations which have not taken the same line that each should reduce its forces by a third. We live in a real world, and such a proposal could only recommend itself to those who had stepped out of the world in which we live into a realm of academic discussion. The world should take note of this. It should also take note of the fact that Mr. Vyshinsky did not suggest that his country should disarm completely. No, he was desirous of keeping the great advantage which war production and war organization have achieved for his country today. If everyone desired peace and their protestations could be relied upon, there would be no need for anyone to have an army except for police purposes. Let me say this to Mr. Vyshinsky: if his country desires peace, the surest way to secure it is to break down the barriers which keep our peoples apart. It is not without significance that such proposals have been put up whilst at the same time they have been belied by the course of action that the Soviet Union has pursued. And we ask ourselves this question: does the bear speak now with the voice of a dove, or is it really a dove that is speaking?

83. We in Australia are a pragmatic people. We are less impressed by declarations and propaganda than by actions. As the people in our country have followed with growing anxiety the course of international events, it has become more and more difficult for them to accept the assurances of Soviet Union spokesmen that the rulers of their country are devoted to the cause of peace. Whatever we think of Soviet Union spokesmen, how-

ever, it is the belief of all Australians that the people of the USSR desire peace just as our people do.

84. We, on our side, do not for a moment accept the view that it is not possible for those who hold the Soviet Union creed and those who believe as we do, to live beside one another in peace and work together. We believe that in the present and in the future, as in the past, it is possible for states to live and work together in peace although their fundamental views on religion, politics and economics may be completely different. We, as people from British stock, do not speak without experience. We have had in the past, and have no doubt that we will have in the future, the most loyal co-operation from men of faiths entirely the opposite of our own, and in times of stress we have found that men of opposite political views could work together. We believe that if it is possible inside a country it is possible between countries.

85. From what I have said I believe that we can propound four basic propositions, which I think is necessary if we are going to understand the problems that confront us. The first proposition is that experience has proved false, at least to date, one of the fundamental assumptions on which the United Nations is based. The question is: will the future change our opinion? The assumption is that all the Member States are equally determined to preserve peace and security. Australia believes whole-heartedly in the purposes and principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations, and by providing forces in Korea it has shown that it is prepared to stand up for those purposes and principles. The majority of the other Members of the United Nations have also demonstrated that they too are loyal to the Charter. But if they are to be judged by their actions, the Soviet Union and the countries which are tightly bound to it have shown little if any regard for the solemn declaration to which they pledged their word five years ago.

86. Up to the present, accordingly, we cannot approach our problem on the assumption that the Soviet Union's main objective in the United Nations is to preserve the peace. Up to now the United Nations has presented to the world a picture not of co-operation among all its Member States but of a persistent conflict between the Soviet Union and associated countries, on the one hand, and the vast majority of the Members of the Organization on the other. Instead of the one world we looked for, there have been two worlds, and one so far has refused to co-operate with the other except upon its own terms.

87. This conflict has divided Europe and Asia in such a way as to prevent instead of assist the establishment of peace and stability throughout the world. There is no free passage of persons and ideas from one side of the iron curtain to the other and none of that constant contact which exists on the Western side of the curtain and which, I believe, goes so far and is so valuable in removing doubts and misunderstandings. Or, perhaps, it is truer to say that there is no circulation from the West to the East for we in the West, in spite of the attitude of the East, do not prevent its inhabitants from coming across to see how we live and how we think. Rather it is their own governments which prevent them. Are they afraid that their people would see our way of life or hear our ideas? Are they afraid that they should dis-

cover that there is a healthier, happier existence beyond their iron curtain? These are questions which they frankly ought to answer.

88. So the new-laid foundations of the United Nations have been undermined and the early promise of co-operation of all nations in the practical task of improving human welfare has failed. One of the most striking features of the United Nations at the present time is the failure of the Soviet Union and its associated communist countries to co-operate with the other Members in the constructive work of this Organization and its specialized agencies to improve, for example, economic and social conditions throughout the world.

89. The Soviet Union has resigned from the World Health Organization, although it has become commonplace that disease knows no frontiers. The Soviet Union has never participated in the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization, although we know that the majority of the world's population is under-nourished and that the most urgent task in economic development today is to increase the world's food production. The Soviet Union does not yet contribute to the expanded programme of technical assistance for economic development set up by resolution 200 (III) of the General Assembly. One can only conclude that the absence of the Soviet Union from these joint enterprises of the United Nations has reflected the unwillingness of the Soviet Union—and I use the words of the Preamble of the Charter, to which the Soviet Union pledged its word—"to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples". Is there any ground to believe, despite Mr. Vyshinsky's protestations, that the Soviet Union really desires—and I quote from Article 1 of the Charter—"to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all"? For our part, speaking for Australia, we shall want more than words, for nations can be judged only by their actions.

90. When we consider the record of the Soviet Union and the course of its foreign policy since the war, we are bound to ask ourselves—and we have the right to ask the Soviet Union—what are the purposes which it is seeking to achieve through its membership in the United Nations.

91. The second proposition that I advance is that I believe firmly that this conflict between the communist countries, led by the Soviet Union, and the other Members of the Organization is not inevitable, that it is possible for countries with different political and economic systems to live side by side in peace and to co-operate with each other in the positive task of maintaining security and progress for all peoples of the world. This principle is implicit in the Charter itself, and we attach great importance to it. It will bear repetition again to assert that we and the States which see the situation in the same way as we do find it possible to work with States whose ideas on religion and politics and economics are different from our own. The Soviet Union and its satellites, on the other hand, appear from their actions to insist that co-operation is possible only if we are prepared to surrender our ideals.

92. My third proposition is that it is within the power of the rulers of the Soviet Union to change the whole situation within the United Nations as well as the whole world outlook. The tremendous choice, affecting as it will the lives of millions of people everywhere in the world, lies with them. The course they have pursued to date, if pursued to its end, can only have consequences which everyone in this Assembly knows only too well. But there is nothing to prevent them from changing their course if it is peace they desire and returning to co-operation with all the other nations of the world. If they really desire peace all that we can say is that, somewhere along the line, they took the wrong turning and they have been on the wrong road ever since.

93. Full co-operation is still possible if the Soviet Union will accept the responsibilities inherent in membership of the United Nations and substitute for its present policy one of friendly association with other nations; if it will accept the point of view that, although our basic ideas on domestic policy may be different, that fact should not prevent us from working together for one purpose, which the Soviet Union spokesmen say is a purpose to which they are dedicated: that of peace. What is it that prevents them? Nothing that any of us does. Let the Soviet Union state clearly what it is. Let it say why it is it quarantines its own people away from other peoples of the world, as if we or they were diseased. Why does it prevent the free interchange of information and knowledge and the movement of the peoples? Why should it continue to keep its own people in a national strait-jacket?

94. If the Soviet Union seeks peace let it state clearly what it is it fears. Does it not believe it possible for communist countries to co-operate with countries that have a different economic system? I can assure the Soviet Union that if it is genuine and sincere in putting forward a programme which is not a specious but a real one, which is consistent with the maintenance of the national integrity of each of us, and which is consistent with our right to develop our own countries in our own way, it will not find us lacking in responsiveness to a new approach once—and I repeat, once—we are satisfied of its sincerity. A new road would, in those circumstances, be opened up, a road to peace and better living conditions for all men and women everywhere throughout the world, a road along which Australia and all other nations here would, I hope, be prepared to march.

95. At the 277th meeting, when we were discussing the problem of Chinese representation in the Assembly, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR made the outrageous suggestion that Australia was opposed to the admission to the United Nations of countries having a different economic system from its own. He gave to the Assembly, I regret to say, a flagrantly false account of the views that I had expressed on behalf of my Government only a few minutes earlier. I said in my speech on that occasion that Australia believed it was an essential condition of membership that a government should desire to use its membership in the United Nations to promote international peace; and I said that we were not convinced that the Chinese Communist Government had this purpose in view in seeking to enter the Organization. I at no time said that the economic system which the Chinese communists favoured was any obstacle to

membership or any barrier to co-operation with the other Members of the Organization. Nor, indeed, did I say anything even remotely resembling it. It is this kind of distorted argument which is confusing an already confused and anxious world. It is this kind of false and pernicious verbal distortion that is destroying steadily our hopes of peace. By all means let us speak our minds frankly and fearlessly, but let us not make mutual understanding more difficult by misrepresenting each others' statements for the purposes of debate or of scoring a point of propaganda. The principle of co-operation among nations, as I have said, is implicit in our Charter, and if we did not believe it we from Australia would have no place in the Assembly.

96. Australia has no quarrel with communist China because it is communist. We would be able to co-operate with communist China if it were prepared to behave like a truly sovereign state and to follow independently—and I repeat independently—a policy of tolerance and good neighbourliness, in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter. Communist China should by now have realized that its recognition or its admission to the United Nations have both been prejudiced by its ill-inspired actions and words in recent months. What, I ask, could be less calculated to facilitate its wider international recognition than the intransigent course that has been followed by communist China? What less auspicious approach could be made to the United Nations by a prospective Member than the official statements of the Peking Government attacking the present action of the United Nations to check aggression in Korea? Nor could the provocative language used by the Chinese communists in their past references to the United Nations be expected to produce a warm welcome from this Assembly. But the past must not be allowed to determine the future.

97. Communist China has its destiny in its own hands. It can subordinate itself to the rulers of the Soviet Union or it can pursue an independent course, and be prepared to deal with all nations on an equal basis of international law and respect. It must choose its own course of action. If there is forthcoming a substantial, real endeavour that it is prepared to co-operate genuinely with us and other nations in the maintenance of peace and in the other tasks of the United Nations, the whole question of its admission to the Organization can be considered in an entirely new light. We all desire to have the great Chinese people as partners in the constructive work of the United Nations.

98. This, indeed, is equally true of the Soviet Union and the other communist countries. The choice is theirs. If they feel that it is impossible for them, in view of the difference between their economic system and ours, to co-operate with us in the preservation of international peace through the United Nations, they will no doubt continue the policy they have so far pursued of obstructing the work of the Organization and, by their attitude, force the other Members of the United Nations to adopt a policy based on the assumption of a continuously hostile attitude on the part of the Soviet group. On the other hand, the rulers of the USSR can, if they wish, alter the whole situation and make the United Nations an effective instrument for international peace. If the Soviet Union believes, as we do, that it is possible for countries with different economic

systems "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours" let it say so now, so that we may together in this Assembly seek to work out a way of co-operating. Here again, being a practical people, Australians would expect more than mere protestations. We would expect to look for practical steps by the Soviet Union to join with us in putting an end to the aggression against Korea. We would expect the Soviet Union to abandon her present policy of obstruction in the Security Council. We would expect the Soviet Union and other communist countries to turn their energies towards the great constructive tasks which the United Nations and the specialized agencies are undertaking in the economic and social fields. We would expect the Soviet Union to join with us in facilitating the economic development of under-developed countries and to withdraw her support from those who are trying to exploit the economic and political difficulties of less fortunate countries than our own.

99. If only the Soviet Union will join with us in the tasks to which we are all equally committed by the Charter of the United Nations, we can together not only remove fear of war but also lay the foundations of a new era of peaceful progress for the whole world. This grave and tremendous choice lies, as I have said, with the rulers of the Soviet Union. If they are unable or unwilling to interpret the obligations of membership in the United Nations in this light, we shall be forced to draw the inescapable conclusions from the situation with which we are confronted.

100. And so my fourth proposition emerges, which is this: that, in the absence of such a change in Soviet policy—and I do not accept Mr. Vyshinsky's speech of yesterday as establishing such a change—the free nations of the world must go ahead working together on a more realistic basis.

101. Those Member States—the vast majority—which are determined to make the Organization an effective instrument for security and international co-operation, must proceed along that path irrespective of the attitude of the Soviet Union. Those of us who believe in what we hold to be a democratic way of life must be prepared to defend our point of view and be ready to come to the assistance of those who are of the same view and find themselves attacked.

102. This is no time to mince words but to face facts, and the facts are stark; they are as I have stated them. If the Soviet Union is determined to maintain to the end the attitude which has in the past placed such difficulties in the way of international co-operation, then this Assembly must chart the future course of the United Nations, and the peace-loving countries must formulate their policies in the light of that situation. They must be prepared to resist aggression on every front. It is from this point of view that my Government will consider carefully the proposals which the United States Government has put forward.

103. In the absence of sincere participation by the communist countries in the work of the United Nations, which so far has not been forthcoming, but if it were would open the door to a new era of peace and progress, the most pressing need is a new and more effective policy for security against aggression. We must begin by strengthening the capacity of the

United Nations themselves to discourage and check aggression wherever it may arise. We must explore the possibility of modifying the procedures of the General Assembly to ensure that the military and industrial resources of the peace-loving countries can be mobilized promptly to keep the peace in the face of aggression. We must see to it that the machinery and procedures of the United Nations are adjusted to the problem of achieving the fundamental aims and spirit of the Charter, even if one or more nations within the Organization attempt to obstruct the working of the machinery set up by it.

104. We must further face the fact that the failure of any substantial group of Members to support the Organization in this task throws upon all other Members an additional burden, that of making supplementary arrangements consistent with the Charter to carry out its principles in cases where there is effective obstruction within the Organization to the action which the vast majority of the Members believe to be necessary to arrest and prevent aggression. We have, I believe, an important example of such supplementary measures in the form of the regional arrangements under the North Atlantic Treaty. It is the view of the Australian Government that, in the existing circumstances, this method of approach should also be developed in other areas of the world, and the nations which value the free way of life must band themselves together to protect it. This course does not in any way indicate a departure from the Charter. Nothing in the Charter precludes the existence of such regional arrangements in dealing with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action. Whatever regional security arrangements are made will be solely for the maintenance of international peace and security.

105. Every such organization must of course be effective; it must be the means and it must have the means to defend its members and to help to defend others. The peace-loving nations must be so organized and prepared as to discourage any repetition of the Korean incident. This means that they must have at their disposal forces sufficiently strong so that no State will venture to attack a neighbour, for fear of the heavy retribution that would follow. This means a far greater measure of preparation than anything we have had up to date. We must never allow events to occur again as they occurred in Korea, where weak but brave forces had to meet the sudden attack of a strong and prepared enemy determined to overrun a weaker neighbour. We must in short be ready to resist aggression wherever it lifts its head.

106. We are no doubt all reluctant to assume the economic burdens which such a policy entails, but security cannot be purchased for nothing. The costs of maintaining peace will be small against the terrible costs of world conflict.

107. But we must do more than merely plan to prevent or meet aggression. We must help one another to become stronger economically and socially. We should organize a system of assistance for other nations less advanced than we are, either politically or economically, to help them along the road to the realization of their full independence and prosperity. It is not our intention to neglect the present conditions in any of the

countries still to some extent under-developed politically, socially or economically. We desire to make every effort to assist them at their request to reach a higher standard of living and to do that as quickly as possible. All of us, however, must share in this task, but let us also be sure that our own house is in order. We must seek to iron out gross social injustices wherever they may exist in any country of the world. Let us pluck the beam out of our own eye before looking for the mote in our brother's eye.

108. Although our most pressing need is for a fresh approach to the problem of security along the lines I have indicated, it must be accompanied by continued efforts through the United Nations to achieve the other objectives of the Charter, which include the promotion of higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic progress and development. I believe, further, that these two must go hand in hand: our military security and our plans to help other nations throughout the world economically, politically and socially.

109. This economic and social co-operation has a very special bearing upon the prospects of the new nations in Asia that have recently secured their independence. All of these new nations are wrestling with grave economic problems and will require assistance from stronger and wealthier countries if they are to maintain their independence and satisfy the legitimate aspirations of their own people. The United Nations has an enormous contribution to make to the economic development and the political integrity of Asia.

110. Indeed, the needs of the region are so great that the programmes of the United Nations must be supplemented by regional plans for economic and technical assistance, such as that now being worked out for South-East Asia by the members of the British Commonwealth. Assistance must be given only when it is sought; it must be given without any strings, and it must be governed by the two principles of respect for the political sovereignty of the assisted country and respect for its economic independence. In all such plans, whether or not under the auspices of the United Nations, our objective is only to assist the new nations to find their own feet. We do not expect them, as the Soviet Union does, to adopt our forms of economic and political organization. They are independent nations and must be free to choose their own institutions; and some of the ideas which are very important for us, such as those of free enterprise and democracy, may still convey little meaning to millions of starving people in Asia. Our task is to assist and encourage them in their struggle for nationhood and to welcome them on terms of equality into the family of nations.

111. The courses of action that I have urged in this statement are not prompted by any hostility to the Soviet Union or countries associated with it. We have no desire to force our political and economic systems on them. How they live and how they govern themselves are matters for them to decide. All we ask is that they should allow other people the same right. In particular, we in Australia desire nothing but friendship with the people and government of China, provided they are prepared to co-operate with us on terms of equality and follow the usual conventional lines of international conduct.

112. Let us not forget that the United Nations is, above all, an organization not of nations so much as of peoples. Our Charter begins with the words, "We the peoples of the United Nations . . . have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims". I believe we should make a renewed attempt to bring the activities of the United Nations and the problems of the world before the peoples of all Member States by a special campaign, sponsored by this Organization. We have no reason to hide our light under a bushel, and we must find practical means of getting the facts to the human beings behind the leaders — the leaders who too often do not lead, but rather mislead the people on all these matters.

113. I have no hesitation in standing here and speaking the way I have because the country which I represent, Australia, cannot be accused by anyone of having imperialistic aims or desiring war. It desires peace so that mankind may use its great ingenuity to broaden the path of well-being everywhere in the world. But Australia is not prepared to purchase peace at any cost. We desire to make it known to the world that, although we are ready to work with any nations genuinely desirous of peace, each retaining its own ways of life, we are prepared, no matter what the cost, to oppose those who desire, through aggression, to destroy our way of life. The great majority of nations which have resisted aggression have survived. Those who have lain down under the threats of others have been destroyed.

114. But our task in this General Assembly is to combine our efforts to save our peoples, and particularly our youth, from the awful and final catastrophe of war. We know that if war comes it will bring devastation beyond the powers of imagination and that the unleashing of modern instruments of mass destruction would impose upon our own and the rising generation an indescribable burden of loss of life and human degradation. In such a war there would indeed be no victors. Civilization as we know it could well be destroyed. All the graver, therefore, is the responsibility that rests on every one of us to ensure that our presence here and our participation in the deliberations and decisions of the General Assembly make a positive contribution to the building of world peace.

115. Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) (*translated from Spanish*): It is indeed difficult to find words which do not reflect a false picture of the realities of the international situation at a time when we are faced with such agonizingly slow progress towards the recognition of high ideals in many parts of the world, when blind fanaticism makes a dogma of hate, when a feeling of ever deeper disillusionment, due to the obvious inability of statesmen to distinguish clearly between what is illusion and what is reality in the relations between nations, continues to spread throughout the world, when hope is submerged by unhappy pessimism and when it has become a general habit to voice dissatisfaction with everything we have without knowing what we really want.

116. Yet, these cataclysmal conditions are in themselves a call for action which none can ignore, and it once more becomes my duty therefore to repeat, on behalf of my Government, our devotion to the fundamental truths proclaimed in the United Nations Charter.

117. The lesson — so often repeated — to be drawn from the short and turbulent life of this world Organization clearly shows that we shall have to mitigate the harsh realities by means of a sustained effort of genuine goodwill if we are to succeed in building up a structure capable of ensuring progressive and rapid evolution and the application of legal measures in specific instances of aggression.

118. In this connexion, the delegation of Honduras will be prepared to examine any workable proposals designed to promote a more realistic and equitable procedure for co-ordinating and making use of the resources of Member States.

119. Perhaps, even at this late hour, those representatives who, without unnecessary academic speculations, make a point of considering the sufferings which occur simultaneously in this world grown smaller in size, may find an opportunity to aid in what history expects us to accomplish: to channel the creative anxieties and impulses of the masses, to cultivate human powers to their fullest extent and to raise the dignity of man.

120. It is universally believed that increasing scientific knowledge is directly related to the complexity of modern problems; we must therefore have a correspondingly tolerant intellectual attitude if we are to capture, by means of suitable social reforms, the stimulus of what is new or in a state of ceaseless change. This is the reason for our growing familiarity with a philosophy which is resolutely preparing to mitigate the stubborn conflict in which, while the physical sciences continually advance on the basis of earlier discoveries, philosophic thought is still marked by a rancorous struggle between discrepant conclusions which frustrate the creative impulses and which are the source of perplexities and intellectual doubt. This tendency of philosophy and of the applied sciences to complement each other is already finding forceful expression in the remarkable social gains due to various organs of the United Nations. Obviously the initial effort must in all cases be based on the central principle that political and economic relations transcend all other events, no matter how tragic they may be. The programme of technical assistance for the under-developed countries is an eloquent example of this principle. This vigorous and original experiment in practical international goodneighbourliness, like the Point Four programme, recognizes the axiom that poverty hides many virtues.

121. Therefore, although so many things are said here which are out of order, although colossal pedantry is so frequently heaped on the superfluous with the evident purpose of sowing confusion, and although at times there is so conspicuous a contrast between the wealth of good intentions and the barrenness of deeds, we must reject the spectacular but over-simplified charge that the absence of more tangible results is the prelude to all the misfortunes of the world. On the contrary, here we perceive the synthesis of a world of ideals, ambitions and heartaches; here we acquire the habit of higher loyalties. Our awareness of mortal danger and our desire to succeed add great emphasis to the urgent need to base our conduct on pure reason rather than on the fickle impulses of emotion.

122. With the world as the stage for its humanitarian action, it is far from easy to demonstrate convincingly

the capacity of the United Nations to work fruitfully for the progress of all peoples towards a life more in keeping with the dignity of the human person or to provide an opportunity for the development and use of new machinery for international administration, investigation and conciliation. But one need only enumerate some of the most outstanding accomplishments recorded in the Annual Report of our dynamic Secretary-General for the period 1 July 1949 to 30 June 1950: "The list . . . is . . . sufficient to demonstrate the continuing usefulness of the United Nations during the past twelve months in the face of the most crippling effects of the 'cold war' that the Organization has yet suffered".² The list mentions the independence of Libya, the creation of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, the increasing efforts to preserve the peace in Kashmir, the satisfactory results in the maintenance of the armistice agreements in Palestine, the progressive pacification of Greece, the launching of the plans for technical assistance for economic development, the holding of the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of Resources, the preparation of a draft covenant on human rights, the progress made in the development of the trusteeship system and of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

123. One need only read the items on the agenda of this fifth session of the General Assembly to realize the grave responsibilities which rest on our shoulders. It is imperative therefore to maintain an atmosphere of complete tolerance, to take advantage of the most useful of our past experiences, to try to foresee what is to come and to restore the reasonable hopes which mankind has grown to cherish, if the principles and things that we are trying to preserve today are not to perish in endless misery and total collapse.

124. To conclude these far from optimistic remarks, I wish to emphasize that the co-operation of Honduras, although at present essentially of a purely moral nature, constitutes a strong appeal for continued vigorous support of our Organization and honest acceptance of inescapable realities. My country believes that it is still not too late to take advantage of this last great opportunity to reconcile our differences within the framework of a genuinely universal structure; it will be a difficult but honourable task, which may well result in the establishment of the rule of law throughout the world, complete economic readjustment and the recovery of spiritual harmony.

125. Mr. GONZALEZ AREVALO (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Guatemala attends the General Assembly once again, inspired by a profound faith in the principles and purposes of the United Nations, and by those same ideals and desire for co-operation which it entertained at the San Francisco Conference and at the previous sessions of the General Assembly.

126. The Government and the people of Guatemala are solid in their support of the United Nations, convinced as they are of its will and ability to maintain peace and security in the world, to prevent the triumph of arbitrary force and aggression in any part of the

world and to guarantee human rights and fundamental human freedoms in all latitudes and at all times. They are also firm in their conviction that only the will of the nations, co-ordinated under the auspices of the United Nations, will be able to free humanity from the scourge of war.

127. The Government and the people of Guatemala also have faith in the success of the United Nations in its attempt to raise the standard of human life in all spheres by co-ordinating the efforts of all nations. This is a most difficult task, upon which my Government is already engaged.

128. It has often come to pass that when a Government, interpreting the latent desire of its people for a betterment in the standard of living, calls upon capital and obliges it to contribute its share, the owners of capital feel that they have been wronged and direct all their economic power against the government which has dared to allow human misery to occupy its thoughts. It is then that the truth is deformed and the sensational newspapers overflow with falsehoods. Human misery and the distress of the peoples are fertile soil for the growth of extremist doctrines.

129. Fortified by these reasons and these convictions, the Republic of Guatemala has lent and will continue to lend its entire co-operation to the United Nations in its efforts to promote peace and security and the welfare of the human race.

130. I do not wish to tax the patience of this Assembly. But a moment ago a friend told me that the success of a speech lies in its brevity, that one must start loudly and end quietly, so as not to awaken those who have fallen asleep. I shall not take up the Assembly's time by reviewing the items on our agenda. Nevertheless it is my intention to state my Government's position clearly on some of the items which it considers of greater importance than others and at the same time make one or two observations with regard to those matters.

131. Korea: with regard to the aggression against the Republic of Korea—a State set up and organized with the aid of the United Nations—Guatemala fully supports the timely and vigorous resolutions of the Security Council and asserts its firm intention to co-operate fully and resolutely in giving effect to these resolutions and in the efforts of the United Nations to re-establish peace in Korea, even as the Guatemalan Government stated in its immediate reply to the communication from the Secretary-General³ informing it of the Council's decisions.

132. The Republic of Guatemala does not concur with the view held in certain quarters that the Security Council's action is illegal. Relying on the Charter and on the rules of procedure of the Security Council, we are firmly convinced that such decisions are legal since the anti-democratic privilege of the veto cannot be allowed to paralyse the work of the United Nations simply because one of the permanent members of the Council voluntarily absents itself from the meetings.

133. It has been clearly established that this privilege can paralyse the action of the Security Council only

² See *Official Records of the fifth session of the General Assembly*, Supplement No. 1 (A/1287), page xi.

³ See documents S/1544 and S/1581.

if one of the members entitled to exercise this right does so expressly by attending and casting a negative vote.

134. It has also been said that these resolutions are illegal because the accredited representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government who took part in the vote do not represent China, which is one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

135. Without going into the question of which delegation has a better right to represent China in the organs of the United Nations, Guatemala considers that the Council itself settled the question of China's representation by a vote which was entirely in accordance with its rules of procedure.

136. In view of these two facts, we reaffirm our conviction that the decisions taken by the Security Council at the extremely important meetings of last June and July are fully legal and binding. We rejoice in the fact that by taking these decisions the Security Council saved not merely the prestige but the very existence of the United Nations, for the June crisis put to a severe test the United Nations' ability to oppose armed aggression. We rejoice further that the United Nations is mastering this difficult situation with such ease; and as a token of admiration I ask the Assembly to applaud the soldiers of the United Nations who are bravely fighting in Korea.

137. I also beg the Assembly to rise and to observe a minute of silence for those who have fallen in Korea in defence of the principles of the United Nations.

The representatives stood in silence.

138. Human rights: the Guatemalan delegation will continue to give its support to the United Nations in any action likely to ensure effective protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, without distinction as to sex, race or colour, and to prevent violation thereof in any part of the world. The work of the United Nations in this most important field will be, beyond any doubt, its crowning glory.

139. Eritrea: Guatemala was a member of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea. Its delegation gave the closest consideration to this delicate matter in a completely objective and impartial spirit and, after taking the many complicated aspects into account, submitted its proposal for the independence of the territory following an agreed period of United Nations trusteeship, a proposal which was supported by the delegation of Pakistan. This proposal involves a question of principle, and does not infringe in any way rights or interests of any kind. It is also in conformity with the wishes of a considerable section of the territory's population and is in the best interests of the population as a whole. Thus, it is based on the soundest and firmest principles of the San Francisco Charter, providing as it does for the establishment in that part of Africa of a new democratic, sovereign and self-governing State. The delegation of Guatemala framed this proposal having regard to the interests of Ethiopia and its just claims to an adequate outlet to the sea. It felt, and still feels, that free and easy transit for Ethiopian products through Eritrean ports may be ensured by the conclusion of economic agreements between the States of Eritrea and Ethiopia, and by the establishment of free zones in the two Eritrean ports.

140. The Republic of Guatemala continues to maintain on this question the position outlined by its delegation in the Commission's report;⁴ it continues to believe that this resolution raises a question of cardinal importance involving the prestige of the United Nations, and represents the best solution for the future of that territory, the peace in East Africa and the well-being and prosperity of its inhabitants.

141. Jerusalem: As regards the problem of Jerusalem and the Holy Places, while deploring the failure to carry out a General Assembly resolution, Guatemala feels that intervening events have borne out the position taken by its delegation at the last session⁵ when it firmly opposed plans for the internationalization of the city of Jerusalem under pretext of protecting the Holy Places of three of the world's most important religions. Our delegation considered the proposal to be impracticable and pointed out certain other defects. The lengthy discussions of the Trusteeship Council have shown that internationalization in the form in which it was proposed in General Assembly resolution 303 (IV) is not practicable and we are now once again faced with the problem of providing for the protection of the Holy Places.

142. My delegation believes that there is no need for the establishment of complicated machinery for the internationalization of that Mediterranean city, and that the United Nations could adopt a special statute for the protection of the Holy Places ensuring completely free access to them while retaining direct responsibility for their protection with the assistance, if necessary, of the States directly concerned. These States would undoubtedly be ready and willing to lend their assistance in favour of a solution which, without hurting their interests, would provide an effective guarantee under the direct administration of the United Nations, which would set up an independent international authority.

143. Non-Self-Governing Territories: the Guatemalan delegation will also continue, as in previous years, to support any step which may tend to improve the political, economic, social and cultural conditions of peoples of territories which are still dependent or under the Trusteeship System. Guatemala does not believe that the colonial system is the best way to educate people or to guide them towards independence and self-government. We think, on the contrary, that the colonial period already belongs to history, and that the subjugation of some peoples to others can no longer be admitted in the world of today. The remnants of colonialism still remaining in some parts of the world are a source of disturbance and constant disputes.

144. Belize: with reference to this question, although incidentally, I should like to remind the Members of the United Nations that Guatemala still maintains her age-long claim to the territory of Belize, which is unjustly and illegally held by a European power, my Government still hopes that, in accordance with the principles which now prevail in world affairs, it may be possible to reach a fair and friendly understanding

⁴ See *Official Records of the fifth session of the General Assembly*, Supplement No. 8 (A/1285).

⁵ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly*, Plenary Meetings (274th plenary meeting).

with the Government holding the territory, in order to put an end to a controversy which affects the whole American continent.

145. South-West Africa: in relation to the matter of dependent territories, it is satisfactory to note that the opinion of the International Court of Justice on the case of South-West Africa,⁶ concurs with the argument upheld by the Guatemalan delegation at previous sessions of the General Assembly. My delegation hopes that, in view of this most valuable opinion from the highest international tribunal, a satisfactory solution to this delicate problem may be found at the present session so that the people of that territory may, as soon as possible, obtain the protection of the United Nations and enter upon a stage of effective preparation for self-government and independence.

146. New Members: it is also satisfactory to my delegation to find that another opinion of the International Court of Justice, namely, that referring to the admission of new Members,⁷ agrees with the opinion expressed by the Guatemalan delegation at previous sessions of the Assembly, in the sense that an applicant State cannot be asked to fulfil any requirement or condition above or beyond those clearly established in Article 4 of the Charter. My delegation will continue to insist that the above mentioned Article 4 should be strictly applied in an objective manner in the admission of new Members.

147. Spain: with regard to items 2 and 10 included in the supplementary list of items for the agenda [A/1332] which show a marked inclination to open the doors of the United Nations to the regime maintained by General Francisco Franco in Spain, I must clearly and firmly re-state Guatemala's position on this matter.

148. The Franco regime was emphatically repudiated by the United Nations as early as the San Francisco Conference. It has always been considered as the last stronghold of the nazi-fascist forces which threatened the world in 1939, and the direct creation of the war criminals Hitler and Mussolini, who brought about the largest wholesale slaughter ever suffered by mankind. A change of attitude by the United Nations at this time in favour of the Franco regime would be a heavy blow to democratic ideals and a negation of the lofty principles in whose defence so much blood was shed and such great sacrifices made. We request that these items which are favourable to the Falangist movement in Spain should be removed from the agenda of the fifth session of the General Assembly as, in the present circumstances, any decision which might be taken to mitigate or to supersede previous decisions could serve only to rob the United Nations of its prestige and to bring about a state of inconsistency between the principles of the Charter and its application.

149. Reservations to agreements: Finally I should like to make some comments on item 57 of the provisional agenda [A/1293] referring to reservations to multilateral conventions. There is a new tendency to place difficulties in the way of including reservations

in multilateral conventions and to make such reservations nugatory by demanding general acceptance of them by the other contracting States.

150. My delegation cannot accept this principle: reservations to multilateral conventions are sovereign acts of the States making them, and so long as these reservations do not constitute a change of substance in such conventions they cannot be subject to the wishes of the other contracting States.

151. The special reservations made by each State should not be a subject for discussion or for voting in an international organization, and even less should they be subject to acceptance or rejection by the other contracting parties. Naturally, any State can object to or refuse to accept a reservation made by a given State; nevertheless the argument which would deny the force and even the existence of such reservations, unless they are accepted by all the contracting States, is in itself a repudiation of the legitimate right of States to safeguard important interests that might be prejudiced by the general tenor of the text, or even more simply it is a repudiation of the desire to maintain a policy or rules of domestic legislation an amendment of which is not thought opportune.

152. For these reasons, my delegation will oppose the adoption of any resolution which may tend to weaken the essential nature of reservations or to prevent States directly or indirectly from exercising their right to make them.

153. Legal sovereignty and equality are the basis of the existence of States. The great States are in duty bound to respect these two principles and the small States to fight for their maintenance. The harmony and the conviction of the United Nations require this.

154. In conclusion, the Guatemalan delegation desires to express its earnest wish that the work of this fifth session of the General Assembly may be crowned with success. The whole world is watching proceedings in this Assembly hall and is hoping earnestly that the tragic portents looming on the horizon may not be fulfilled.

155. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before calling upon the last speaker on the list, I would like to say that I fully understand the noble sentiments which prompted the Guatemalan representative to invite the members of the Assembly to stand and observe one minute's silence. Thus, I was the first to rise and to invite the Assembly to do likewise. I did not wish to raise any procedural objections, because the question was too important, perhaps too much one of sentiment. But I should like to draw the members' attention to the fact that in the future such invitations should be made only by the President.

156. Mr. KANELLOPOULOS (Greece): This year Greece presents itself before the United Nations General Assembly with the feeling that it has decisively fulfilled its duties towards peace.

157. Greece presents itself as a victorious democracy which, after a hard struggle of ten years against totalitarianism of every kind and colour, has entered into a period of peace and of complete internal normality and reconstruction.

158. During the year which separates us from the last General Assembly, the critical and delicate geograph-

⁶ See *International Status of South-West Africa, Order of December 30th, 1949: I.C.J. Reports 1949, page 270.*

⁷ See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Article 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports, page 57.*

ical sector which God and history have entrusted to the Greek nation has not occupied this world Organization with problems of an immediate critical nature. There is, however, one exception, and that is the problem which, unfortunately, remains unsolved and which substantially does not concern Greece alone, but the moral order of the whole world. I refer to the return of the Greek children forcibly abducted from their homes and still undergoing the inhuman totalitarian distortion of their soul and spirit.

159. The attention of all of us today is directed to another sector: the Far East. It is directed to the gallant sacrifices of the military forces of the United Nations in defence of the freedom of Korea.

160. For all who have ever believed, as we in Greece have believed, in the possibility of a practical application of collective security throughout the world, this moment is intensely moving. It suffices to compare the long and fruitless discussions in the League of Nations in similar circumstances to the rapidity with which the United Nations decided to intervene in Korea, for us to be convinced that it is possible for collective security to enter upon the path of practical application. If, in order to secure this possibility, modifications are required in the United Nations Charter, these modifications must be made as soon as possible so as to create a stable, legal and moral framework within which collective security will function not only to oppose aggression on the march, but also to discourage the potential enemies of peace.

161. Greece, of course, has had the opportunity of experiencing, on the moral level, the good results of the actions of the United Nations. The United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans set up by our Organization contributed, at a time when public opinion, even in the great western democracies, had fallen into the trap of falsehood and defamation, to restoring, in the eyes of all men of good faith, the truth as regards the tragedy which Greece was undergoing. But the confidence of world opinion in the United Nations had been shaken, as was evidenced by, among other things, the speeches made during the fourth session of the General Assembly. Recognition was given to the effective action of the Organization on the economic and social level—and here let me express our special gratitude to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund—but many had begun to doubt its ability to fulfil its principal mission, which is to secure peace, but not peace alone, peace with justice. Peace is the great blessing towards which the hearts of all men are turned, but peace has value only when the price at which it is bought is not the abandonment of justice.

162. At Munich, where peace was bought by the confirmation of violence and injustice, peace was not even temporarily secured. The immediate and active repudiation of violence constitutes the most positive and the greatest guarantee of peace. That is why the intervention of the United Nations in Korea, which moreover proved that there exists a decisive world leadership, today raises the hopes and the confidence of all peoples really devoted to peace.

163. However, the satisfaction which we feel must not be allowed to obscure our vision and cover up the difficulties which we still have to overcome. There is still much to be done in order to stabilize the confidence

of the world in our Organization, so that we may all acquire the certainty that a nation which falls victim to unjust aggression can rely with assurance upon the immediate manifestation of human solidarity, which today is coming to the rescue of Korean freedom. A way must be found for the swifter mobilization of the forces of resistance. We shall have to accept heavier sacrifices. In this spirit we have been gratified to hear the proposals of the United States delegation [A/1377] and we hope that the General Assembly will study these in a constructive manner. We must also find means—and this, I submit, is most important, most essential—to bring a greater pressure of moral severity to bear against all forms of propaganda which falsify the truth and present the heroes who are giving by the sacrifice of their blood a noble example to future generations, as hired tools of imperialistic and capitalistic policy. Greece is a country which has deeply suffered from this sly and deceitful propaganda, now being turned on the defenders of Korea.

164. A few days ago a letter written by John McCormick, an American soldier, was published in the Press. It was addressed to his children and he wrote it a short time before he fell on the field of honour in Korea. In it he said:

“I want you both to know that I'd be with you if I could, but there are a lot of bad men in the world and if they were allowed to do what they wanted to do, little girls like you wouldn't be allowed to go to church on Sunday or able to go to the school you wanted to.”

165. These are the words of a morally clean and free man, a man with the simple, time-hallowed feelings of honour, affection, pride and self-respect. A citizen of ancient Athens would have written in the same spirit.

166. Is it, I ask you, possible, is it right, for us to allow without protest that men of the superb moral calibre of John McCormick should be branded as imperialists? No. We have to take a decisive stand in opposing the propaganda of falsehood which presents totalitarianism as democracy, tyranny as freedom, John McCormick as an imperialist and the so-called Stockholm Appeal as an appeal for peace.

167. Greece, inspired by the true spirit of democracy, a spirit which is clear and unyielding, and which cannot be swayed by the propaganda of falsehood, considers it its duty to respond with the willingness of a deep historic consciousness to the invitation of the United Nations, and now has a brigade of her troops ready to participate in the Korean struggle.

168. We have not for one moment allowed ourselves to think that because for ten years Greece has been fighting and undergoing great sacrifices, she is absolved from once more performing her duty. We believe that the sacrifices of the past do not exempt anyone from the obligations of the future. On the contrary, they make their fulfilment even more imperative. Moreover, the fact that the Korean struggle is taking place at the antipodes of Greece—not even this can be allowed to influence our decision. The Greek nation feels that its boundaries coincide with the boundaries of freedom itself. And the Greek nation also knows that its fate is not prescribed by definite geographical dimensions. For all peoples, geographical dimensions are today

world-wide; the geographical conditioning of life and death is uniform. Time and space are one for all. And above all conscience is one and the same for the free men and women of the world.

169. Mohamed SALAH-EL-DIN Bey (Egypt): I wish to speak on a point of order. I propose that the General Assembly suspend its meeting of 22 September 1950. The reason for this proposal is that tomorrow is the beginning of the Moslem holiday of *Kourban Bairam*.

170. For the reason that ten of the delegations here represent Moslem countries, the Egyptian delegation puts this proposal forward.

171. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The representative of Egypt has proposed that there

should be no meeting of the General Assembly tomorrow morning. This proposal comes under rule 77 of the rules of procedure and I shall therefore put it to the vote.

The Egyptian proposal was adopted by 33 votes to none.

172. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The next meeting of the General Assembly will thus be held next Saturday, 23 September at 10:45 a.m.

173. The General Committee will meet tomorrow, 22 September, at 10:45 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6:10 p.m.