



*Friday, 13 December 1957,
at 10.30 a.m.*

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 66:	
Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States (<i>continued</i>)	407

Chairman: Mr. Djalal ABDOH (Iran).

AGENDA ITEM 66

**Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of
States (A/3673, A/C.1/L.198) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. HAYMERLE (Austria) said that his delegation had carefully studied the two draft resolutions (A/3673 and A/C.1/L.198) before the Committee. They contained a number of guiding principles for future relations among States. While most of them had already been laid down in Article 1 paragraphs 1 and 2 and Article 2, paragraphs 1, 4 and 7, of the United Nations Charter and in General Assembly resolution 290 (IV), the Austrian delegation felt that the attention of the Governments of Member States should again be drawn to them. Peaceful co-operation was of vital importance in the divided world of today. Different opinions might exist about the meaning of the word "coexistence" but it was less essential to seek a definition of the term than to admit that coexistence was a fact. The question was not therefore whether to be for or against peaceful coexistence, but to seek ways and means to develop mutual relations.

2. The Austrian delegation felt certain that the United Nations could make a valuable contribution to the solution of that important question. There could be no doubt that international co-operation had to be based on certain principles, a fact of which the founders of the United Nations had been well aware. Two of those principles, set out in the Preamble of the Charter, were of basic importance; they concerned fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person. It was only on the basis of those two principles that a veritable peaceful coexistence was conceivable.

3. Recent Austrian history had demonstrated that positive results could be obtained in spite of all the difficulties. For ten years the Austrian people had increasingly demanded its independence. The political wisdom of the four great Powers and the co-operation of the Austrian Government had made the signing of the Austrian State Treaty possible. The positive consequences of that achievement were evident. What had until then been an area of instability in Central Europe had become a stable and economically healthy State. It had seemed at the time that the signature of the Austrian State Treaty had initiated a new era of peaceful co-operation conducive to the solution of other problems. Those hopes had unfortunately been frustrated by certain tragic events which had occurred in 1956. Nor had

agreement on the all-important disarmament question been reached at the current session of the General Assembly. That state of affairs emphasized the need for further efforts to achieve a constructive solution of existing international problems. The Austrian delegation hoped that the current debate would lead to an understanding which would be conducive to the improvement of the international climate.

4. As Mr. Figl, the Austrian Foreign Minister, had pointed out in his statement before the General Assembly on 25 September 1957 (687th plenary meeting), no country could be as keenly concerned in the relaxation of tension as Austria, situated as it was on the crossroads between East and West. The new international status of Austria gave it not only an opportunity but also the right to contribute its modest efforts towards the improvement of relations among States.

5. For all those reasons, the Austrian delegation was in agreement with the aim of the joint draft resolutions (A/C.1/L.198) which was to affirm once again at the current juncture the guiding principles for international relations as laid down in the Charter. It would support any efforts to achieve that goal.

6. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) paid a tribute to the delegation of India, whose initiative, together with that of Sweden and Yugoslavia, had considerably brightened the outlook for the current debate, which had given little promise of a harmonious outcome in September 1957 when the Soviet Union had submitted its explanatory memorandum and draft resolution (A/3673). The United States delegation warmly supported the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198) because it addressed itself seriously and without trick phrases to the subject before the Committee. The United States viewed that subject as simply the building of peaceful relations among States, based not on words alone but on peaceful behaviour.

7. There were times when peace and justice were well served by the reaffirmation of old principles in a new form. A series of declarations of principles had been issued since the United Nations Charter, which, for the States Members of the Organization, was a fundamental statement of the principles of international conduct. All that was required was for those principles to be fully carried out. The United States delegation considered that the three-Power draft resolution could have a good effect. While it was directed only to States, the call for peaceable behaviour would have to be heeded also by those Communist régimes which had so far been conspicuous for lawless behaviour. The Communist régime on the mainland of China had been maintained through violence. It had taken Tibet by force and had supported and fomented Communist rebellions or insurrections in neighbouring countries. It had engaged in war in Korea against the United Nations itself. That war had not yet been concluded but remained sus-

ended by an armistice. The North Korean and Viet-Minh régimes had likewise preyed upon their neighbours and sought to create international discord and confusion. He hoped that those régimes would be influenced by the views expressed in the three-Power draft resolution.

8. At the preceding meeting Mr. Kuznetsov, the representative of the Soviet Union, had made a statement containing a number of observations with which the United States agreed. He had spoken of scientific and technical contacts between States, something in which the United States had long believed and which it had sought to practise. It hoped that the Soviet Union would widen its co-operation with the rest of the world in the International Atomic Energy Agency and in the international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy to be held in 1958.

9. The representative of the Soviet Union had also spoken of extending economic aid in co-operation with other countries. The United States welcomed that idea. In particular, it supported the new economic and technical development programme of the United Nations which had just been adopted by the Second Committee at its 509th meeting.

10. Mr. Kuznetsov had also referred to disarmament. The United States sincerely hoped that the Soviet Union would retract its threat that it would not co-operate with the Disarmament Commission, so that the Commission could begin fruitful discussions. It could not be stated too often that the American people and the Government which they had freely chosen, wanted peace. He recalled the words which President Eisenhower had used in his statement to the General Assembly on 8 December 1953.^{1/}

11. Mr. Kuznetsov's speech had been milder than those delivered by Mr. Gromyko a few weeks earlier on the Syrian item and on the disarmament question. While the United States delegation welcomed the difference in tone, peace in the world could not be built simply on the mild tone of speeches; it had to be based on actions. There was really quite a gap between what Mr. Kuznetsov had said and what the Soviet Union did.

12. The representative of the Soviet Union had, for instance, deplored Press and radio propaganda which engendered feelings of distrust, suspicion and malevolence. Yet his country was the greatest single source of such propaganda and was also in the best position to stop it since it maintained a monopoly over both the Press and the radio.

13. Mr. Kuznetsov had complained of what he had called a gigantic race in the production of weapons of mass destruction, yet his country devoted a larger part of its energies to the armaments race than perhaps any other country in the world.

14. Mr. Kuznetsov had claimed that the Soviet Union had no classes or groups interested in seizing foreign territory and he had insisted that nobody could seek to demand privileges for himself in relation to any State to the detriment of the interests of other countries. Yet the Soviet Union, since 1939, had included within its own borders 264,000 square miles inhabited by over 24 million people including the entire nations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. It had arrogated to

itself the privilege of governing the affairs of other sovereign countries in a very large part of Eastern Europe.

15. Mr. Kuznetsov had complained of plans to restore the colonial régime in free countries. Yet Soviet imperialism had done just that in Eastern Europe during the previous decade and in Hungary only a year ago.

15. Mr. Kuznetsov had complained of a tendency to solve differences by means of force and by threats of force. That, however, was just what the Soviet Union had done in the case of Hungary and with respect to the twenty-two countries, including the United States, which it had threatened during 1957 with atomic devastation for having dared to join together in common defence against Soviet pressures.

17. Mr. Kuznetsov insisted that war propaganda must be stopped. Yet it was the Soviet Union which had prompted the main war scare of 1957, within the United Nations itself, when it had alleged that the United States was the master mind behind plans for an attack on Syria.

18. Mr. Kuznetsov complained of subversive acts and interference in internal affairs. Yet the Soviet Communist Party had taken the lead among Communist parties in Moscow on 21 November 1957 in issuing a communiqué which had given its agents the task of overthrowing the rule in non-Soviet countries by both peaceful and non-peaceful means.

19. Mr. Kuznetsov said that the clash of ideas was better than that of arms. But within the whole area which the Soviet Union dominated, no clash of ideas was permitted, except a few rulers at the top.

20. The United States representative cited those facts not in order to rake up the past but because he really would like to know to what extent the fine words which the Committee had heard at the preceding meeting were really true.

21. At the same meeting the Burmese representative had said that mistrust begot mistrust and that steps must be taken to eliminate fear. The United States delegation endorsed that idea but it would point out that the key lay in actions and not in words.

22. He would be delighted to be able to believe that one speech delivered at the United Nations on the eve of the meetings of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) meant that the trend which had been evident for forty years had been suddenly reversed. No one would be happier than the people and the Government of the United States to see that Soviet speech followed by a real change in Soviet behaviour.

23. He had thought that the phrase "peaceful co-existence" had first been used by Mr. Molotov when he had described the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939, which had freed Hitler for his attack on Poland and Western Europe, as being "in accord with our principle of co-existence". But further study had shown him that the idea had been developed long before that by Lenin and Stalin, who, while never renouncing their basic hostility to the non-communist world, had revised the doctrine of Karl Marx by saying that a communist country would necessarily have to coexist with non-communist countries for a certain period of time. That had been a mere adaptation of the communist revolutionary programme to the obvious facts.

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 470th meeting, para. 97.

24. In that connexion he quoted a speech made by Lenin in Moscow in 1920 and one made by Stalin in 1945. Only two months ago, in an interview with a *New York Times* correspondent, Mr. Khrushchev had made it clear that in the Soviet view "peaceful co-existence" was merely a phase in the Soviet Communist struggle for world conquest. It might well be asked what sort of philosophy it was which insisted on world conquest as an article of faith. The reply to that question might perhaps be found in the meaning of the terms "socialism" and "capitalism" as used by Soviet speakers.

25. The system of life in the Soviet Union, which the leaders of that country called "*sotsializm*" in Russian, could not be called "socialism" in the English, French or Spanish sense of the word. If *sotsializm* in Russian meant national socialism as practised in Germany in the late 1930's and early 1940's, all who prized human dignity must reject it. The French writer, Albert Camus, a Nobel Prize winner, in a recent statement which voiced the views of many intellectuals, workers and former Communists, had said that the Hungarian revolt had exploded the biggest lie of the century, a lie that tried to pass off a régime of police tyranny as a proletarian revolution. He had added that there could be no compromise with a régime of terror which had no more right to call itself socialism than the executioners of the Inquisition had had to call themselves Christians.

26. If, however, the word "*sotsializm*" meant social consciousness and social welfare, if it meant that the Government did certain things which the citizens could not do, or could not do as well, by themselves, if it meant a well-run programme to increase the people's share of the benefits from the total effort of the community, that was exactly what the United States stood for, believed in and had put into practice, as had many other non-Soviet countries.

27. If "capitalism" were used to mean the old-fashioned monopoly capitalism which had begun to disappear in the United States in 1905, when Theodore Roosevelt had set about "busting the trusts", the United States was against it and had laws against it which were vigorously enforced. There was compulsory competition in the United States, whereas the economy of the Soviet Union was governed by State monopolies.

28. If, on the other hand, the word "capitalism" was used to mean modern competitive capitalism under vigilant Government regulation, with profits for huge masses of people, that was one of the best systems of rapidly spreading and increasing the material well-being of people which the world had ever seen. That system, depending on efficient production, high wages, and expanding markets, was working successfully not only in the United States but in many other countries.

29. Mr. Khrushchev, however, did not hesitate to demand that capitalism should be destroyed. He called for the destruction of a system which enabled millions of people throughout the world to earn their living, bring up their children and provide for their old age. Mr. Lodge asked whether that could be called "peaceful coexistence".

30. If peaceful coexistence were considered in connexion with free elections, it was ironical to see that Soviet communism, which permitted no free elections, in its own empire, claimed for its agents the right to compete in free elections wherever they took place, in

the name of peaceful coexistence. Mr. Krishna Menon had told the General Assembly at its 703rd plenary meeting that a few months previously 120 million people had registered their opinion as to who should constitute the Parliament of India and that there were 193 million registered voters and fourteen opposition parties in India. Mr. Lodge asked, by way of contrast, what were the facts about free elections in the area controlled by the Soviet Union. In 1945, at the Potsdam Conference, during the discussion of free elections in the Balkan States which had been liberated from Hitler, Stalin had said that any freely elected government in those countries would be an anti-Soviet Government and that he could not allow that. Stalin's candour on that occasion had been matched by that of János Kádár on 15 November 1956 when he had said that the workers' power could be destroyed not only by bullets but also by ballots, and that his party might well be thoroughly defeated at the election. The election which he had feared, but which he had promised to hold, had never taken place.

31. The main conclusion was that the nations of the world must show some purpose to live together in peace. Mere coexistence while one side prepared to bury the other was not the answer. The world needed peaceful behaviour, true peace. The United Nations was a centre, in the words of the Charter, "for harmonizing the actions of nations". It had often fallen short of the goal, but that was no reason for despair. A new expression should be given to the hopes conceived twelve years previously by the peoples of the world; those peoples must not be disappointed.

32. In the opinion of the United States delegation, the draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.198) should be unanimously adopted and all countries should set about carrying it into effect.

33. Mr. PRICA (Yugoslavia) observed that the question of coexistence lay at the heart of the problem of peace. It was the question whether a solution would be found to the basic dilemma of the nuclear age: peace progress and plenty for all or collective suicide. It was the question whether countries would be capable of bringing their thinking and their policies into step with the swiftly moving realities of international life. Those realities included the trends towards unity, the diversity of levels of development and of social and political systems, and the stage reached in military technology which meant that differences could not be solved by other than peaceful means.

34. The present precarious coexistence in the world, which was divided into heavily armed camps, carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction and was very different from genuine peaceful coexistence. Peaceful coexistence was an active process; it was a dynamic process requiring constant practical efforts to settle issues, dispel misunderstandings, increase confidence, reduce armaments and settle the serious problems which lay at the root of present-day difficulties.

35. It was imperative and possible to increase confidence in international relations. Mistrust should no longer be an article of faith; the "other side" should no longer be regarded as the protagonist of ineluctably hostile and destructive tendencies. Conditions must be established which would permit the peaceful settlement of the basic issues that divided the world. There must

for example, be an end to the accumulation of weapons and the show of force. There should be an end of endeavours to extend military alliances; the current pattern of hostile military groupings should be replaced by a comprehensive system of collective security. The solution of problems should be sought through political means. It would be found through a reasonable adjustment of interests rather than by imposing conditions which would in effect amount to the unconditional surrender of the other side. Neither side could hope for a solution that would substantially affect the existing balance of forces.

36. Nevertheless, more was required to ensure co-existence as it was understood by the Yugoslav delegation. Coexistence called for co-operation in all forms, and particularly for economic co-operation, where an effort should be made to bridge the gap between the developed and the under-developed countries. Furthermore, genuine peaceful coexistence must of necessity include States with different political, economic and social systems. Those differences were not an insuperable obstacle. If there was to be coexistence, it would have to be between States whose patterns of social and political organization were vastly different. Such differences were a fact of present-day life and not an aberration of history. The future would show which system would stand up best to the test of time. It might well be that the differences would gradually become blurred. Countries must be permitted to develop along lines of their own choosing. Outside interference could only give rise to friction and endanger peace.

37. The divisions of the world had merely been aggravated by the tendency to identify political and social systems with political and military alignments. It was misleading to define them in terms of geography, whether political or military. It was no less misleading and even more dangerous, to equate the differences between the two systems with the opposition between the two blocs. Coexistence was not the coexistence of blocs or even of different social systems; it was the peaceful and active coexistence of all countries, irrespective of their social structure, of their size, or of the level of their development.

38. As a socialist country belonging to no particular bloc, Yugoslavia had endeavoured successfully to maintain friendly relations with all States. Its experience had strengthened its conviction that coexistence was not only imperative but also possible. The smaller countries were perhaps in a better position than others to exert the necessary influence to make coexistence a reality. The basic precepts of coexistence were clearly stated in the Charter. He hoped that the Committee would conclude its work by adopting a draft resolution setting forth the fundamental premises on which true peaceful coexistence could be established.

39. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia) regretted that a question of such paramount importance as peaceful coexistence had not been given the priority which it deserved and that it was being examined at the last moment, whereas the questions to which priority had been given, such as the prohibition of atomic weapons, the discontinuance of nuclear tests, and measures of collective security however important they might be, were simply means of achieving peaceful coexistence. That was the vital problem which must be examined in complete honesty, not as between friends or enemies, allies or adversaries, but as between members of the

human race dedicated to the arts of peace, progress and prosperity.

40. He pointed out that the concept of peaceful co-existence and the principles underlying it were deeply rooted in the Arab thinking, traditions and culture. At the Bandung Conference of 1955, Saudi Arabia had unequivocally supported that idea. Later, in many Arab policy declarations, it had reiterated its adherence to the idea and it was prepared at the current time to lend its support to any United Nations action to promote effective peaceful coexistence. But he thought that the principle should be defined as precisely as possible, as it embraced all aspects of international life. Peaceful coexistence permitted conflicting ideas and ideals, and divergent economic and social systems to exist side by side in rivalry. In relations between States, it was a factor in the maintenance of international peace and security. So, if genuinely applied, it was a principle which would secure the existence of all. But if it were misapplied, it could lead to the most tragic consequences. Peaceful coexistence should be based on legality, lawfulness and legitimacy, standards which must be maintained in order to prevent international anarchy. Only a legitimate situation could coexist with other situations.

41. Each and every ideology could not be allowed, in the interests of peaceful coexistence, to exist. There were warlike and aggressive ideologies, such as nazism and fascism, which had caused so much havoc and destruction. There could be no question of allowing such ideologies to coexist, under the protection of a principle, with peaceful ideologies designed to secure the happiness of mankind. The nazi and fascist ideologies had disappeared because they had rendered coexistence impossible. But there was another ideology which had brought the world to the brink of war; he was referring to Zionism. That movement, whose purpose was to gather in the Jews from the whole world to the Holy Land, endangered friendly relations between States, destroyed the loyalty of citizens to their countries, created anti-Semitism, displaced peaceful inhabitants from their homeland and aimed at expansion. Such an ideology should not be permitted to exist. Irregularities in international life were understandable, but an injustice could not be the basis for coexistence. The application of the principle of peaceful coexistence should be determined not by a *fait accompli*, but by the legitimacy of the situation. Without that there was no coexistence; there would be merely a negation of rightful existence.

42. He recalled that at the current time the partition of Germany, Korea and Palestine had led to the creation of States established against the legitimate interests of the people of the countries concerned. That was an intolerable situation which could not be allowed to continue in the name of the principle of peaceful coexistence. The peoples of those countries had an inherent right to restore the unity of their homeland and to emancipate it from alien occupation. Algeria was another case in point. He asked how there could be any peaceful coexistence with France when the people of Algeria were denied their independence.

43. The same applied to relations with the United Kingdom. That country was occupying vast areas to the east and south of the Arabian peninsula, and had been involved in a prolonged dispute with Saudi Arabia and Yemen, a dispute which had not been settled by the

normal pacific methods. Finally, there was the question of Palestine, where the situation was highly inflammable. The policy followed by the Western Powers during the past forty years had finally led to the partition of that country, to the creation of an alien State and to the expulsion of part of the people from their homeland. In those circumstances it was impossible that the Arab world should not be in conflict with the Western world, as peaceful coexistence meant the legitimate existence of all, within their legitimate rights.

44. Turning to the underlying considerations of the principle of coexistence, particularly the principles of non-aggression and respect for the territorial integrity of States, he said that, in general, the Arab States stood for those principles. Each of the eleven Arab States which were Member of the United Nations had been subjected to aggression and had fought for its independence. The Arab States harboured no aggressive designs and respected the territorial integrity of other States, but they could not tolerate any invasion of Arab territory. From the Atlantic Ocean on the west, to the Persian Gulf on the east, must be a land free from any foreign domination or occupation. Within that vast area, there were still pockets of imperialism and alien beach-heads. All that would have to be cleared away. Western imperialism and Zionist invasion must be eliminated in the interest of peace and as an implementation of the principles of non-aggression and the territorial integrity of States. Non-aggression was a principle which applied not to the present and future alone, but to the past as well. Aggression already committed was as intolerable as fresh aggression. Whatever the duration of aggression or invasion, it was none the less an injustice for which prescription was no redress.

45. With regard to the matter of neighbourly relations between States—a term which should not be interpreted in the strictly geographical sense—he thought that that concept, too, should be defined. There could be no talk of the rights and duties of States vis-à-vis States until the concept of a State had been precisely defined. He was not referring to changes of régime but to the birth of a State and its legitimacy that legitimacy being the only thing about the State that created rights and duties. A people legitimately established in its homeland was entitled to statehood, but a congregation of different groups of different nationalities, imported to a country which was not their own, was not. A State established under those conditions did not possess the attributes of statehood. Undoubtedly such a State was not covered by the Charter and could not invoke any resolution adopted by the General Assembly. His delegation wished to make it clear that in its view a declaration by the United Nations could apply only to States which were established legitimately on their own territory. A State established on the remains of another State and against the will of the people of that State, no matter how created, was a State outside the ambit of international law and devoid of the attributes of statehood; a State which declared that it now occupied only a part of its territory betrayed an expansionist policy incompatible with membership in the United Nations; finally, a State which opened its doors only to co-religionists had no place within a system of peaceful coexistence.

46. In conclusion, he said that his country stood for peaceful coexistence based upon justice, for it was

only through justice that the world could enter into an era of prosperity and human dignity, and could live in security and peace. Accordingly, he attached special importance to the forthcoming meeting of NATO, in which the President of the United States was to participate. It was to be hoped that that session would lay the foundation for genuine coexistence, not only for Europe, but for the world as a whole. Among the problems which would be discussed there, those of the Arab world were of great significance. The decisions taken with regard to the problems of the Middle East would determine the failure or success of the NATO meeting. The question of Algeria and the question of Palestine, that problem of all problems, should be solved, in accordance not with the *de facto* situations, but with the dictates of justice and fairness. In the best interests of peaceful coexistence, he wanted to make it abundantly clear that no NATO decision on the problems of the Middle East would ever lead to peace unless it satisfied the aspiration of the legitimate people of that area.

47. Mr. TSIANG (China) observed that the Saudi Arabian representative's speech had been remarkable and thought-provoking. A declaration of abstract principles did not automatically solve problems. The Saudi Arabian representative had been right in saying that there could be no coexistence with international injustice and aggression.

48. At the preceding meeting the representative of the Soviet Union had made a long statement about the Soviet conception of peace and peaceful coexistence. It was hard, however, among post-war events, to find an example of Soviet practice of peace and peaceful coexistence.

49. For thirty years China had tried not only to live in peace with the Soviet Union but also to co-operate with it. Those efforts had resulted, in August 1945, in a treaty of friendship between China and the Soviet Union. Immediately after its ratification, the Soviet army in Manchuria, a province of China, had transferred enormous quantities of munitions to the Chinese Communists.

50. It was also questionable whether the attitude of the Soviet Union to the Baltic States - Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania - could be described as peaceful coexistence.

51. The representative of the Soviet Union had said that what he called the "socialist States" based their foreign relations on the principles of recognition of and respect for the sovereignty of other States, equality, mutual benefit and peaceful co-operation. According to him, the striving for peace, progress and friendship among nations was inherent in the social nature of those countries, where no classes or groups were interested in seizing foreign territories, sources of raw materials or foreign markets.

52. The members of the Committee would certainly remember the debate which had taken place during the sixth session of the General Assembly, arising out of the complaint lodged by the Yugoslav delegation of hostile activities directed against Yugoslavia by the Government of the Soviet Union and the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Albania, Poland and Czechoslovakia. He regarded Yugoslavia as a genuinely socialist country and recalled the statement, made before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee at its 8th meeting, on 26 November 1951, by the Yugoslav repre-

sentative, on the relations between his country and the Soviet Union. The Yugoslav representative had given the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee information on the relations between the Soviet Union and the Eastern European States other than Yugoslavia. In conclusion, he had stated that those countries were in a state of utter subjection to the Soviet Union and that the Government of the Soviet Union had therefore been responsible for the hostility they had displayed towards Yugoslavia. If that was the kind of peaceful coexistence which the Soviet Union practised with a State which had accepted the Soviet type of socialism, he questioned whether better relations could be expected between the Soviet Union and the non-socialist countries.

53. He wondered whether the nature of the Soviet State had changed since 1951. At the preceding meeting Mr. Kuznetsov had said the system had remained unchanged since the revolution of 1917, and events in Hungary bore out his remark.

54. Peaceful coexistence was practised outside the Soviet orbit. The countries of Western Europe provided an illustration of it. They had confidence in one another and coexisted not only in peace but in friendship and to the benefit of all. The same was true of the American continent, where the atmosphere among the States was one of friendship and co-operation. Such examples proved that the Charter was not a Utopian document but that it expressed an idea which had been partially realized and which could therefore spread all over the world.

55. The development of the post-war world showed that the imperialism and colonialism of the Western European countries were disappearing. Many of the independent nations of Asia had once been colonies. The relationship of superior to inferior, founded on Western European control of African and Asian countries, was almost a thing of the past. Unfortunately, so far as the Soviet Union was concerned, the development had been in exactly the opposite direction. The Soviet Union had acquired a larger empire than that of Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great and Catherine the Great - and a harsher one, too.

56. There was only one obstacle to the realization of the Charter ideal of peaceful coexistence and that was the Soviet Union. The Committee was considering two draft resolutions couched in unexceptionable language. Those draft resolutions were almost unnecessary so far as the Western Powers were concerned, but in relation to the Soviet Union and in the light of those which the General Assembly had adopted on Hungary it seemed doubtful whether they would have any effect.

57. It could be argued that the adoption of a draft resolution such as that submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.198), even if it were ineffective, would do no harm since everybody loved peace and wanted peaceful coexistence. That, however, was how false hopes were aroused. At one stage between the two world wars statesmen had turned their attention from practical problems to idealistic dreams and phrase-making. Twelve years after the signature of the Briand-Kellogg Pact the war had broken out and nobody had thought of applying the Pact. Enthusiasm had distracted attention from the real happenings.

58. The Chinese delegation did not wish to be a party to such unfounded enthusiasm. The Charter principles

were good. If they were not put into practice, their repetition in a resolution would make no difference.

59. Mr. JARRING (Sweden) observed that the five principles contained in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/3673) appeared in various agreements or joint statements of previous years. Those principles constituted a programme to be observed by States which was in part moral, and in part related to international law. The programme, which had apparently attracted the support more particularly of certain Asian countries, had appeared in its current form for the first time in an agreement between India and China dated 29 April 1954. The Prime Minister of India had referred on various occasions to the *Pancha Shila*, the Indian expression for the five principles. At the Bandung Conference, in 1955, the twenty-nine participating States had adopted a ten-point programme, which included the five principles, although in a slightly different form.

60. Such moral and political lines of action, couched in general terms, appeared from time to time in international agreements of joint declarations. In that connexion he quoted examples of such principles from the Preamble, Article 1, paragraphs 1 and 2, and Article 2 of the Charter.

61. Only the third principle set forth in the Soviet draft resolution, which dealt with non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, seemed to be more far-reaching than the corresponding principle of the Charter, although it was completely in accordance with the spirit of the Charter, as were the other points of the draft. Obviously an aggressor State could not appeal to the principle of non-aggression in its defence against a third State which came to the assistance of the one which had been attacked.

62. He recalled that some European Governments had also expressed approval of the principles in question. In a joint statement issued during the visit of the Swedish Prime Minister to Moscow in April 1956, both countries had stressed their desire to contribute towards the development of peaceful coexistence between peoples on the basis of the principles of the Charter. Similarly the President of Yugoslavia had emphasized, in an article in *Foreign Affairs*, that peaceful coexistence must be founded on active co-operation between States on all questions of mutual interest and on the settlement of differences by pacific means. Marshal Tito had added that States, rather than interfering in the affairs of other States, should exchange the positive results which they had obtained and endeavour to raise the standards of living of each and promote progress in general. Such a conception of peaceful coexistence as a form of active co-operation between States was fully in conformity with the Charter. Sweden attached great importance to such co-operation between States of differing economic and social structures.

63. There was some doubt, however, whether the adoption by the United Nations of the five principles set forth in the USSR draft resolution, which were to be found expressed in different words in the Charter would really increase the prospects of their being applied. A proliferation of declarations of principle might lead to a reduction in their effects. The Swedish Government had no objection to the acceptance of the five principles known as *Pancha Shila* to supplement those which already appeared in the Charter or in the many relevant

resolutions, but it feared that the drafting of a declaration embodying those general principles might present some difficulties. The fifth principle, that of peaceful coexistence, which had played a great role in the political debates of the post-war world and had gained acceptance in the political vocabulary of many States, implied a recognition of the right of States to preserve their different political and ideological systems without interference from outside. If understood in that sense, it would be readily acceptable to all States.

64. In view of the difficulties, however, which would be encountered in formulating a clear definition of the notion of peaceful coexistence, and because of the fact that a resolution on that point could have real value only if it was acceptable to a large majority of Member States, especially those which bore the principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Swedish delegation, together with the delegations of India and Yugoslavia, had submitted a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198). He hoped that it would receive the support of all the members of the Committee.

65. Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria) said that consideration of the question of peaceful coexistence was most urgent because the clouds of war were gathered over the world and the arms race was still being feverishly pursued. The conditions necessary for a lasting peace, for which all peoples, weary of war, were longing, could only be established when there was understanding, tolerance and a spirit of co-operation. In order to achieve peace, States must work to make it into a reality by starting along the road to disarmament and by prohibiting test explosions and the use of nuclear weapons. The failure of the discussions on disarmament made the current debate even more urgent.

66. Coexistence should be active. It had significance only if it was linked with co-operation in all fields, with a better mutual understanding and an exchange of knowledge. Scientific and cultural progress, like peace, was indivisible. The International Geophysical Year was a good example of active coexistence. The International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, the Olympic Games and the meetings of artists and writers arranged by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and other organizations also showed the course which should be followed.

67. The only choice confronting the world was that between peaceful coexistence and a war of annihilation. The time had come to put an end to the old barbarian method of settling controversial questions by force of arms.

68. The Soviet Union, which had been the first socialist country in the world, had in the forty years of its existence unceasingly struggled for disarmament and consequently also for peace. In the League of Nations it had tirelessly fought a lone battle for disarmament and collective security. Certain Western countries had incited an aggressor to unleash a war against the Soviet Union, but he had preferred to strike first at the countries of Western Europe. After the Second World War the Soviet Union had been able, thanks to socialism, to restore its shattered economy and to become one of the world's leading Powers. During that time a number of European and Asian countries, having become free and independent, had also adopted

socialism. Those were today's champions of world peace, as was proved by the declaration of the representatives of the twelve socialist countries and by the Peace Manifesto recently published in Moscow on the anniversary of the October Revolution. That was in no way surprising, for the socialist countries abhorred war and regarded peace as the only means of assuring the prosperity of their peoples. They had no need to resort to war in order to gain markets and obtain the raw materials they needed. Instead of being in the hands of monopolies, which could only prosper by plundering the wealth of their opponents, power in those countries was in the hands of the working class, which was vitally interested in peace. The inhabitants of those States elected their representatives in full freedom. Elections would take place in Bulgaria in the immediate future and the entire people had joined in the electoral campaign preceding the free choice of their deputies to Parliament. It would be difficult for Mr. Lodge to say the same about the elections in his own country.

69. The socialist countries were opposed to all anti-human ideas, such as racism, chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism, which bred war. All those who had visited the socialist countries could bear witness to their love for peace. They were not, however, the only ones. Many other countries, freed from colonial oppression, had also become courageous champions of peace. They had met at Bandung and published a joint declaration, based on the famous Pancha Shila, stating the principles which should govern international relations. Those principles were the essence of the Soviet draft resolution (A/3673) and all countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom and France could subscribe to them.

70. The relations which the socialist countries had developed with a number of countries with different political systems showed that fruitful co-operation could be established regardless of differences in the structures of States. The ideological struggle in no way prevented the maintenance of good economic, diplomatic and cultural relations. That principle of peaceful coexistence between States with different political systems was the basis of the world peace movement, which was gaining more and more support.

71. The existence of two economic systems in no way justified the restrictions imposed by certain countries on international trade. Such measures were inconsistent with the laws which governed the economic and social development of peoples. Certain countries had already been forced to make concessions. That applied to France, the United Kingdom, Japan and other capitalist countries, which had eased the restrictions on trade with the People's Republic of China. Even in the United States that idea was gaining support. In 1956, trade between Western Europe and the socialist countries had increased by 70 per cent as compared with 1955. It was known that Western Europe suffered from a serious shortage of coal, oil and other sources of power. The needs could be met if close co-operation was established between East and West.

72. Some had contended that, according to Marxism-Leninism, no sincere and lasting coexistence was possible. It was Marxism-Leninism, however, that had evolved the principle of peaceful coexistence between the socialist countries and the capitalist countries. The public statements of Mr. Khrushchev and

the recent letters which Prime Minister Bulganin had addressed to President Eisenhower and to the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom, France and India, and the letter published on 13 December, 1957 which had been sent to all the Members of the United Nations, clearly showed that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries sincerely desired peace and were doing everything in their power to safeguard it.

73. Some theorists argued that coexistence was incompatible with the conviction that socialism would some day triumph throughout the world. Lenin had repeatedly stressed, however, that kindling a revolution from outside would be contrary to Marxism. Faith in the final triumph of socialism was based on a knowledge of the laws of social evolution. All socialists recognized that every country had the right to choose its own system. They could not be criticized for being convinced of the superiority of their system, just as nobody could be criticized for stating that a society based on slavery had given way to feudalism, which had in its turn been followed by capitalism. The socialists had never contended that coexistence might be hampered by the assertion that capitalism was superior and would live on forever. History would decide which was the system best suited to the needs of the peoples.

74. In speaking of the opponents of peaceful coexistence, the Bulgarian delegation did not mean the peoples of the Western countries but a few groups or circles interested in war and in the armaments race, which brought them huge profits. Those were the groups and circles that had formerly exploited colonies. Being unable to accept the fact that a number of countries had liberated themselves forever and had started along the road to socialism, they did everything in their power to overthrow the socialist system in the popular democracies by violence. The counter-revolutionary attempt in Hungary was an example of such action.

That small minority must be forced to submit to the will of the peoples, who demanded the end of the "cold war". It would indeed be in that minority's own interest.

75. The Balkans afforded an excellent example of peaceful coexistence. The Bulgarian Government, guided by the five principles set forth in the Soviet draft resolution, maintained excellent relations with Romania and Albania, was intensifying its contacts with Yugoslavia and was trying to establish good neighbourly relations with Greece and Turkey. For that reason it had warmly welcomed the proposal of the Romanian Government that a conference of the Prime Ministers of the Balkan countries should be called to study the question of consolidating peace in that region and the promotion of political, economic and cultural co-operation. Unfortunately that conference could not be held because of the refusal of certain Governments.

76. Some representatives had contended that there was no need for the United Nations to adopt a special text on coexistence because the principles on which it was based were already stated in the United Nations Charter. Considering, however, that the United Nations had not become a powerful instrument for safeguarding peace, that nothing had been done to bring about disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear weapons and that some countries still tried to use the United Nations for their own ends, there was a clear need for a document which would show to the peoples of the world that the United Nations wished to reaffirm the fundamental principles of co-operation and peaceful coexistence. The Bulgarian delegation vigorously supported the draft resolution on peaceful coexistence proposed by the Soviet Union and hoped that all delegations would vote in its favour.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.