

Kingdom, France and Germany in 1939, Mr. Ordonneau pointed out that in fact those two States which were said to have negotiated with Germany had declared war on that country on 3 September 1939 in order to come to the defence of Poland. The Soviet Union which was claiming to be the bulwark of European defence against Germany, had that time signed a non-aggression pact with Germany and at the end of September 1939 had entered into an understanding with that country regarding a new partition of Poland and the absorption of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia into the USSR.

47. Mr. ANDREN (Sweden) said that the real and permanent item on the agenda of the Committee was to make the United Nations a reality in words, in spirit and in deed. While Sweden took no part in the cold war, his delegation felt that if humanity were to be spared new and worse ordeals, an endeavour must be made to obtain at least a cease-fire as a first step towards that peace which all longed for. He did not think that the discussion had constituted any further steps on that road to peace. It had been a new expression of the constant disagreement between the USSR and the western Democracies. All differences, difficulties and accusations had been revived.

48. While he did not wish to add fuel to the discussion, he wished to refer to some of the aspects which made the present position problematical and difficult. The clever and dangerous propaganda poisoning the atmosphere of the political world made it difficult for truth to emerge, and solemn words of earnest statesmen were very often not trusted. There was some reason for doubt and misapprehension. Referring to the statement made a few days previously by the USSR representative, to the effect that there was nothing to fear from the Soviet Union, Mr. Andren said that under ordinary circumstances and especially in the previous century such words would have been of the greatest importance. The present time had heard too many well sounding assurances with bitter consequences, however, and had seen non-aggression pacts leading to aggression as well as friendship treaties constituting the first step towards war. If Soviet policy had shown the same good natured temper as the Foreign Minister of that country had demonstrated in his statement, the position would not be so serious. Mr. Vyshinsky had a task of the utmost importance in the future of the world

to make that temper a true expression of the foreign policy of his country. With the exception of those flashes of good humour in Mr. Vyshinsky's speech, there were very few reasons for optimism. The representatives of the Eastern Powers had in reality made no admission as to the facts and had not opened any road towards a compromise.

49. Mr. Andren said that what was needed was not new peace resolutions. There already was the solemn Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. What was needed was perhaps not even a re-dressed balance of power but a new balance of mind. He could not support the USSR draft resolution since his delegation could not believe that a declaration accusing one side of warmongering was a step in the right direction. It seemed more like another weapon in the cold war propaganda, even if hidden behind words of peace and understanding. The peoples of the world wanted peace with a maximum of sovereignty, with free co-operation, with a practical consideration of each other's interests and of each other's points of view. The draft resolution submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom on the other hand, while it did not provide a solution to the difficulties and differences, nevertheless indicated the principles necessary for an enduring peace, in the form of a solemn declaration with the Charter as a background. His delegation would therefore vote for that draft resolution in the hope that it would be an appeal to the conscience of all peoples and would remind everyone responsible for the fate of mankind of the essentials and fundamentals most urgently needed to obtain peace and good will.

50. Mr. MANULSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), quoting the text of the passage of Mr. Chauvel's speech (326th meeting) that the representative of France had accused his delegation of distorting, said that, while he did not know whether Mr. Chauvel had participated in the resistance movement, the language used by the latter was clearly reminiscent of that of the Vichyites rather than that used by the French people of the resistance.

51. Mr. ORDONNEAU (France) did not think that the language used by the French delegation required any description. Much had happened since the time of the resistance.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 23 November 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Condemnation of the preparations for a new war and conclusion of a five-Power pact for the strengthening of peace (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN read the list of speakers and declared the list closed, though without prejudice to the right of representatives to answer charges made against their own countries.

2. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon), referring to Tolstoy's masterpiece *War and Peace*, said he thought

it was fitting that the United Nations should consider the problem of war and peace in connexion with Mr. Vyshinsky's proposal. The insistence of the USSR delegation to deal with that question was absolutely justified, for unless peace was assured, the work of the United Nations would go up in smoke.

3. Analysing the provisions of the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/996), he pointed out that his country would not be consulted on the preparation of the pact between the five great Powers,

for it was the great Powers which bore the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace. But the USSR representative was asking all Members of the United Nations to decide by their vote what action should be taken in the matter. War and peace were indeed problems which no Member could evade, and therefore the eventual vote should be approached most seriously.

4. The representative of the USSR had complained that the United States and the United Kingdom were preparing for war and that the policy of the ruling classes of those countries was to unleash a new conflict, whereas the USSR was seeking peace, offering, as proof of that contention, the olive branch represented by the five-Power pact proposed by Mr. Vyshinsky. That proposal by the USSR delegation was a tragic joke. The non-communist world, however decadent it might be, had not yet reached the stage of degeneracy in which truth was confounded with falsehood. Everybody knew that the non-communist world was on the defensive, and that communism had been attacking it since its emergence more than one hundred years beforehand in the name of a full-fledged philosophy of war and revolution.

5. Analysing communist doctrines of war and revolution, he pointed out that peace pre-supposed mutual trust. Rightly or wrongly, the non-communist world was convinced that communism in general, and the Soviet Union in particular, did not wish peace, that every peace offensive on the part of the Soviet Union was just a phase in a general war plan. That conviction was based on a study of communist philosophy which was closely linked to the action undertaken by the Communist Parties or States.

6. An examination of classical Marxism and its orthodox Soviet interpretation revealed four fundamental theses with respect to revolution: (a) Marxism was essentially a revolutionary doctrine; (b) the revolutionary conversion of the bourgeoisie structure into a proletarian society could only be achieved by the violent overthrow of existing régimes and by the violent seizure of power; (c) the success of a communist revolution in one or more countries would only be complete when it made possible the victory of the revolution in all countries; and (d) though the victory of the communist revolution was an inevitable consequence of the very nature of the capitalist system in its final stage, that inevitable result could and should be accelerated by human effort.

7. The revolutionary character of communism was a consequence of the Marxist dialectical conception of reality. From that dialectical metaphysics, it followed that the communist movement was necessarily dynamic and militant. That revolutionary spirit was well conveyed in the *Communist Manifesto* which began with the words: "A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism", and ended with the battle-cry: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of the world, unite!"

8. The revolutionary aspect of communism had been confirmed by Lenin, and later by Stalin, who, in his *Problems of Leninism*, said that the merit of Lenin was his understanding of Marxism as essentially revolutionary, and his rescuing of Marxist revolutionism from the misinterpretation given of it by the pacifists and the opportunist leaders of the Second International.

9. A revolutionary movement or teaching might merely advocate a radical transformation of society, like, for example, the teachings of Christ. A revolutionary movement might also conceive that change as only possible through the violent overthrow of the ruling classes and the forcible seizure of power: such was the case with communism. Marx had written in 1871, that the precondition of any real people's revolution was not to transfer the bureaucratic and military machinery from one hand to the other, but to break it up. And Lenin had added, later, that the replacement of the bourgeois State by the proletarian State was impossible without a revolution.

10. Several corollaries followed from that thesis: first, the communists were antagonistic to reform, or more exactly, as Stalin had written: "The revolutionary will accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal work with illegal work, to intensify, under its cover, the illegal work for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie." Moreover, the communist was dissatisfied with parliamentary opposition and legal measures for the transformation of the bourgeois society into a proletarian one. In that connexion, Stalin had written that under capitalism the fundamental problems of the working class were solved by force by general strikes and by insurrection. Furthermore, the proletarian revolution must not wait until the proletariat constituted a majority in a country, but should take advantage of any favourable situation to hasten the final result. Finally, the proletariat must ally itself with all revolutionary elements, so as further to hasten the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

11. The third thesis of Marxism in respect of revolution was that it aimed at being world-wide in its scope and required, at each stage of its progress, appropriate strategies. Stalin, following in that the teaching of Marx and Lenin, said that the communist revolution must hasten the victory of the proletariat in every country. At the current stage of the communist revolution, the appropriate strategy, according to Stalin, was to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. The main forces of the revolution were the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country and the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. The main reserves were the semi-proletariat and small-peasant masses in the developed countries, and the liberation movement in the colonies and Non-Self-Governing Territories. In his previously mentioned book, Stalin had said that it was the task of the communist leaders to make intelligent use of all those reserves to strengthen the revolution, adding that the conditions for victory were: (a) the concentration of the main forces of the revolution at the enemy's most vulnerable spot at the decisive moment; and (b) the selection of the moment for that action.

12. The fourth thesis of the communist theory of revolution was that that revolution was not merely inevitable but could be accelerated by human effort. Marxism was not merely a scientific theory, it was also a call for action. Lenin had pointed out that the root of the whole of Marx's and Engel's teaching was in showing the masses that violent revolution was inevitable. Stalin had added that the Party must stand at the head of the working class, must lead the prole-

tariat and not follow in its wake. Thus, it was clear that the leaders of communism felt they had a mission to fulfil, that they must call for revolution and not merely limit themselves to predicting that revolution was inevitable.

13. The communists claimed that the cause of war was to be sought in the capitalist system itself. In that connexion, it must be noted that the communist doctrine of revolution was still more disturbing than imperialist rivalries and wars. Those, who elevated revolution into a creed based on science, could certainly not claim to be the sole defenders of peace. The class war was no less savage and fierce than the war of nation against nation. Once peace and harmony had been disturbed within a community, they were more difficult to restore than peace between States.

14. In view of the communist doctrine of revolution, it was not surprising that the non-communist world was seeking to protect itself, and that it regarded the olive-branch offered to the world by the Soviet Union delegation as only a temporary tactic imposed by the situation of international relations. There was indeed a particular form of communism, which constituted a threat *sui generis* to peace and security, namely the provocation and support of communist movements in countries which were not communist.

15. The Lebanese representative pointed out that it was not with pleasure that he had been forced to conclude that the non-communist world must protect itself against possible communist aggression, external or internal, for his country was on good terms with the USSR and obviously desired nothing more than to be at peace with that great nation. He would rejoice if Mr. Vyshinsky could refute the conclusion that modern communism was militant and revolutionary.

16. The real question was not how war could be prevented. The world was already in a state of conflict and unrest. The question was rather how to achieve real understanding and whether peace was really possible when dialectical materialism postulated the inevitability of war and conflict.

17. One must first consider whether the communist revolution was not perhaps capable of doing away with all the injustices of the past, the exploitation of man by man, together with the material and social causes of misery, and whether the ends of that revolution did not justify the means. Mr. C. Malik said he personally denied that a good end in itself justified a bad means; but still the Soviet Union had done away with the Czarist autocracy, and, in thirty years, had set one-sixth of the globe on the path of industrialization; it had abolished all signs of social and economic discrimination; it had thrown itself passionately into the socialist experiment paying particular attention to the welfare of children and attempting to create equality for all by encouraging individual talent; and it had brought about a new harmony between peoples of diverse national, racial and cultural stocks. The world would always be indebted to the Red Army and to its leader Generalissimo Stalin for having freed it from the threat of hitlerism. Those undoubted achievements had, however, been achieved at the price of very heavy human and spiritual sacrifices. One must therefore consider whether the results of which communism could be justly proud, justified all the sacrifices which it rendered necessary.

18. The outlook of communism was determined by its fundamental materialism. Man was conceived as a purely material being whose spiritual and inward experiences could be reduced to the movement of the matter of which he was constituted. The dignity of man, which the classical and Christian tradition saw as emanating from man's status of having been created in God's image, was replaced in the communist philosophy by the status of man as a part of a greater whole, determined by his contribution to the production of material goods. Stalin had called man "the most precious capital".

19. Religion, which was for the West the response of many to the divine presence, was conceived by the communists as a product of the economic structure of society. The deepest stirrings of the human soul in the presence of divine glory and love which had characterized Western philosophy and culture were regarded by the communists as nothing more than superstitions propagated by exploiters for the doping of the exploited. In their eyes, religion was "the opium of the people". Western thinkers had regarded ethics as rooted in the nature of man and in an absolute order of values based on the transcendent order of the divine. Communism on the contrary rejected the very conception of unconditional moral judgments and obligations. Lenin had stated that communist morality was wholly subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Mr. Vyshinsky, in his book *The Law of the Soviet State* had stated that the conduct of the Soviet citizen was dictated by the interests of the socialist revolution, by the interests of the people, and by the task of the triumphant consummation of communism.

20. According to the traditions of the West, the individual, though part of society, constituted a whole which could not be subordinated to the interests of society. It was on the grounds of that dual status of the human person that his rights and obligations could be harmonized with those of society. To communism, man existed only for society, and society existed for the production of material goods.

21. Western thinkers from Sophocles to the philosophers of the eighteenth century had conceived man as the subject of basic, inalienable rights. In the communist philosophy those rights were not recognized but granted conditionally; they were rejected in theory and trampled under foot in practice by the communist States.

22. The fundamental freedoms pertaining to the dignity of the human person, were tolerated by the communists to the extent to which they conformed to the strict requirements of the moment. Mr. Vyshinsky had stated in his book, referred to earlier, that the Soviet Union Government had explicitly excluded the non-labour classes from the enjoyment of the freedoms granted to the workers. Those freedoms were guaranteed upon the condition that they were utilized in the interest of the workers and to strengthen the socialistic social order.

23. The tragic fate of intellectuals, scientists, poets and musicians under communist rule was not surprising, as the dictatorship of the proletariat suffocated spontaneity and all dynamism. The spirit of man was annihilated by indoctrination and censorship. The totalitarian control by

the State of every source of independence and freedom was contrary to nature. No man who had drunk from the living waters of the Western Platonic-Christian tradition could accept that spiritual tyranny. The university, the Church, the family, natural law, the intimate circle of love and friendship, God and even, within limits, free economic activity were higher than the State. The State did not determine their proper limits, but was determined by them. The head of a State would have much to learn from the teachings of a scientist, a mother, a priest, a saint, a lover or a philosopher.

24. The metaphysics of communism envisaged matter as the only reality, whereas the spirit was an independent and superior reality. According to the communists, the attribute of that reality was change, although in truth there was a stable order of existence on which the mind could really rest. The communists did not admit that there was such a thing as truth, whereas objective truth did exist. They believed only in the existence of the immanent and temporal, whereas in fact there were transcendent norms. They did not believe in God; but God was the loving Father and the Creator of the world. They only believed in the philosophy of Democritus, Lucretius, Feuerbach and Marx; in truth that materialist tradition was absorbed by the more positive and concrete tradition from Plato and Aristotle to Hegel. The communists believed in the perfectibility of man by his own efforts; whereas his perversity could only be cured with the assistance of God. Lastly, they thought that man was made for society; in truth society only existed for man.

25. Despite the passion of the communists for social and economic justice, therefore, and despite the remarkable results achieved by the communist world it was nevertheless true that the philosophy of communism was materialistic, atheistic, dialectical relativist, immanent and totalitarian. Communist existence did not therefore justify the communist revolution, even if the end justified the means.

26. The representative of Lebanon pointed out that communism had fortunately not exhausted the Russian soul. Russian nineteenth-century literature reflected the mysterious depths of the Russian soul much more authentically than the monotonous true-to-party-line statements of the USSR representatives. If the representatives in the First Committee were thoroughly familiar with the works of Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, or Gorky, they would probably be in a better position to cope with the world situation. Fortunately, the Russian spirit as revealed in those authors was not dead; it was reflected even sometimes in the speeches of the Soviet representatives, when they referred to a Russian fable or proverb, or when they yielded to their deep humanity, boundless exuberance, playful imagination or sheer joy. Russian literature revealed the tragic sufferings of the Russian soul which seemed to have sought its salvation in sufferings for the world. There was not a trace of mediocrity or half-heartedness in the Russian soul. On the contrary, difficulties seemed to be a springboard rather than a hindrance. Russian literature still reflected those desires for human brotherhood and universalism, as well as the need for social justice and equality and for transformation of reality into something better.

There was a spiritual foundation in the Russian soul which made it possible for communism to be imposed upon it: the sense of communism and of love of one's fellow-being. The Russian soul was apocalyptic and prophetic. It revealed itself in a true religious consciousness which was completely opposed to materialism.

27. In any case, the Russian soul was complex and was not exhausted by communism. Whatever régime predominated in Russia, there was still a Russian problem because 250 million Slavs, with their vitality and culture, had enormous material wealth at their command. One had to reckon with the existence of Russia; consequently, the hope of peace was that the Russian soul might express its spiritual qualities and individualism.

28. Mr. C. Malik proceeded to say that a criticism of communism was easy because the doctrine was only a hundred years old and its application dated back only approximately thirty years. It was more difficult to elaborate a criticism of western civilization which was not based on a rigid and formal theory. The western system offered some repulsively materialistic characteristics, such as the spirit of gain, concupiscence, selfishness and unco-ordinated activities. Quality seemed obscured by quantity. Leadership in the West seemed incapable of coping with the difficulties of the era. At the same time, there seemed to be a bankruptcy of fundamental ideas. In such circumstances, communism was eagerly developing its own ideas, while the leaders of the West were not succeeding in satisfying the deep desires for friendship, understanding, truth and love.

29. The Western States would not serve the cause of peace by associating themselves with dark régimes under the pretext that it was easier not to disturb them. The more the people of the West were misled by their leaders, the more attractive would the watchwords of world revolution appear to them. It was not sufficient to reject communism. It was necessary, in addition, to reply to communism by spreading a spiritualized materialism which would endeavour to remove every trace of social injustice, without loss of the higher spiritual values.

30. Nor was it sufficient, in the twentieth century, to be happy and self-sufficient. If the leaders of the western States did not succeed in meeting the world-wide needs for truth, justice and security, leadership was bound to pass to others. It was not sufficient for them to ensure that order and prosperity prevailed in their own countries and to send technical assistance abroad; they must, above all, appeal to the mind. The challenge to civilization in the twentieth century was not only communism; the real issue was whether that civilization could return to its authentic sources by abandoning the worship of false idols. In any case, in spite of the weakness of the West, there was still hope because the University and Church were both free.

31. The pact proposed in the USSR draft resolution would not remove the prevailing mutual distrust. The world did not need new pacts, but a fundamental change in the relationship between the two opposed groups. The non-communistic world was fully awake to its dangers. Communism would deceive only itself if it thought that the western world was so decadent that it has lost all initiative.

32. Accordingly, it was to be hoped that the leaders of the Soviet Union would not pursue their policy of shutting in their country and isolating their people from the rest of the world. Every point of contact which still existed between the USSR and the rest of the world should be preserved and expanded. New points of contact ought to be sought. He was glad to be able to discuss that matter freely with the representatives of the USSR, but a change was also necessary so that true co-operation could be established in the realm of science and art.

33. It was to be hoped that the Soviet Union Government would allow the Russian people to assert again its spirituality and that the communists would abandon their doctrine of revolution and class struggle, without renouncing their desire for a better world. The non-communist world must feel at ease with the communists; therefore the communists must not be forever looking for the best opportunity to destroy it. It was also to be hoped that in the West a powerful spiritual movement would develop which would contribute to the welfare of mankind.

34. The only answer to communism lay in hope; if the western world could create that hope by eradicating poverty, exploitation and oppression, without resorting to oppression and dictatorship, communism would vanish and its spectre would disappear forever from the earth.

35. Mr. HENRÍQUEZ-UREÑA (Dominican Republic) said the Soviet Union draft resolution gave the impression that peace did not prevail, since that draft resolution postulated the need for an appeal for peace. That impression was strengthened by the fact that the draft resolution proposed by a pact outside the United Nations, which was tantamount to saying that the Organization was ineffective in that respect. It was true that there was no real peace, either from the technical point of view, since the treaties of peace had not been finally drawn up or ratified, or from the moral point of view, since the world was still living in anxiety. Peace could only prevail if all the peoples could live in freedom, without being subject to external pressures. If such pressures were exerted, they jeopardized moral, and sooner or later, material peace. It was claimed that apart from the advantages of independence there were in modern times those of interdependence; the answer to that was that all interdependence must be based on equality between the parties concerned. Some peoples were cut off from the rest by a kind of *cordon sanitaire* intended to protect them from ideological contagion. Yet the real danger lay not in ideas but in the use of force to impose them. The real division was between those who believed in the free discussion of ideas and those who were opposed to it.

36. In such an atmosphere of moral anxiety, the peoples formed themselves into coalitions and made ready for defence. That course offered the only safeguard for nations that were unwilling to allow themselves to be absorbed. Nevertheless, such treaties of mutual defence were being violently attacked, as witness the attacks on the republics of the New World. Yet the pact between those countries did no more than embody the will of the peoples of the Americas as it had been expressed for more than a century. The idea had been conceived by Bolivar in 1826. The creation

of the Pan American Union at the end of the nineteenth century had been a decisive step towards continental unity. The principle that a violation of the rights of one State was to be regarded as a violation of the rights of all the States on the continent had been clearly established as early as the Inter-American Conferences of 1936 and 1938, held at Buenos Aires and Lima respectively. Regulations had been laid down for its application at Rio de Janeiro in 1947. It was not, therefore, a matter of a convention concluded by chance, but the final crystallization of a historic principle. No objection could be raised against it since the Charter granted Members the right of self-defence. He wondered what genuine objection could be made to any pact of collective security covering nations belonging to some specific geographical region, as was the case of the North Atlantic Treaty, for example. Such pacts were all the more necessary because, technically, the world was still at war and was, in fact, at war from the moral point of view.

37. The two proposals before the Committee proved that for the time being the world climate was not propitious to international confidence. What the proposal of the Soviet Union regarded as factors opposed to peace were only the outward symptoms of a disturbance that had deep roots in the anxiety general throughout the world. Those outward symptoms were not the cause but the effect of that anxiety. The anxiety could only disappear, if all the peoples of the world could live in full freedom and decide their own future without being subjected to external pressure.

38. The joint draft resolution of the United States and the United Kingdom (A/C.1/549), by contrast, tackled the root of the matter by taking into account the fundamental causes of the existing uneasiness.

39. The Soviet Union proposal for a five-Power peace pact would represent a return to the time of Locarno and the Briand-Kellogg Pact. If all States had sustained the League of Nations in a genuine fight for peace, the war might have been avoided. The same was true of the current situation; if all States fulfilled their obligations under the Charter, international confidence would be restored, since the Charter was the grandest and most effective instrument ever created by man to preserve peace. Only the unanimous co-operation of all nations could bring peace, whatever might be said of the responsibility of the great Powers. The draft resolution for a peace pact in which those Powers only would participate gave the impression that an attempt was being made to reach an agreement regarding their respective vital interests and spheres of influence, with no thought for the sovereignty of the small nations. If, on the other hand, the small nations were to be free to accede to the five-Power pact, it would be tantamount to charging the United Nations with inefficiency and proclaiming that it had been impossible to achieve the purposes of the Charter.

40. The effectiveness of the United Nations was impaired above all by the fact that the Organization was not yet universal. To remedy that state of affairs, it was essential to admit all States which fulfilled the conditions prescribed in the Charter.

41. The joint draft resolution submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom was an appeal for the application of the principles of the

Charter. Such an appeal was not without point. The American Republics had for more than fifty years proclaimed in countless treaties and declarations those principles of international morality which had become axiomatic in the relations between their peoples. The repetition of a doctrine

lent it renewed force and vigour and that was the purpose of the joint draft resolution. The delegation of the Dominican Republic would therefore vote in favour of it.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 23 November 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Condemnation of the preparations for a new war and conclusion of a five-Power pact for the strengthening of peace (*continued*)

1. Mr. LONDOÑO Y LONDOÑO (Colombia) fully supported the views expressed by the representative of Lebanon at the previous meeting. Not only had the latter correctly analysed the existing situation in world politics but he had offered conclusions which, if accepted, might assist greatly in the promotion of peace. Mr. Londoño y Londoño therefore wished to confine his remarks to an elaboration of certain points in the statement of the Lebanese representative.
2. In the first place, he was very conscious of the limited role that a small nation must necessarily play in any attempt to solve a conflict between the great Powers. Nevertheless, the dispute, in which the United States and the Soviet Union were the principal opponents, was continuously becoming more acute and more threatening to world peace. The great Powers were indulging in what could only be described as a brawl in which both sides accused each other of preparing aggression. But neither had any intention of coming to blows. Clearly, it was up to the representatives of the small nations to point out that if both sides really desired peace, that could only be achieved through agreement. The representative of Lebanon had stated that the crux of the problem lay in the fact that the Government of the Soviet Union subscribed to a philosophy which regarded war as inevitable. Mr. Londoño y Londoño fully agreed with that statement and urged the representative of the Soviet Union to ponder over its implications and submit a reply.
3. Secondly, he criticized the head of the Soviet Union delegation for approaching the problem in the manner of a court lawyer who sought only to adduce concrete evidence to prove his opponents' guilt. Mr. Vyshinsky had referred to a whole series of acts and incidents in support of his contention that the United States and the United Kingdom were preparing aggression and had challenged other delegations to adduce similar concrete evidence to disprove his accusations. However, it was also necessary to consider whether the alleged offence was in fact possible or not. For instance, it was both a practical and a moral impossibility that Yugoslavia could be preparing for war against the Soviet Union. Not only was Yugoslavia so weak in comparison with its powerful neighbour that aggression on its part was a physical impossibility, but obviously even to entertain hostile intentions would make Yugoslavia's position insecure. The same argument

applied to the Western Powers. Clearly, they could not threaten the Soviet Union since they did not possess preponderant military strength. Mr. Londoño y Londoño said that he had travelled throughout the countries of the West and was convinced, not only that they had no aggressive intentions towards the Soviet Union but that they greatly feared the latter's military power. It was absurd to assert that the French Government or the French leaders, Mr. Moch and Mr. Bidault, desired war with the Soviet Union. Likewise, no one would believe for a moment that the United Kingdom was preparing aggression.

4. Among the evidence which he had adduced in support of his charges, Mr. Vyshinsky had cited (330th meeting) the discussion of military tactics in United States newspapers and the lectures on polar warfare in various United States military training schools. He had asserted that they could only relate to a possible war against the Soviet Union. But, as was well known, it was characteristic of the United States that all military plans were discussed publicly and there was nothing alarming in the discussions to which Mr. Vyshinsky had referred. It might be asked, with equal justice, for what purpose the Soviet Union still maintained an army reputed to number 4 million soldiers. Obviously, the only explanation for the continuance of national armies was the fact that, under existing conditions of international mistrust, only the presence of military power could assure national security. Certainly, every army considered plans aimed at covering all contingencies. Mr. Londoño y Londoño looked forward to the time when there would be sufficient confidence and co-operation among nations to permit the abolition of national armies. In the meantime, he thought it was quite possible for nations to be peace-loving and co-operative while maintaining their military strength. No State could be condemned as being aggressive simply because it did not reduce its armaments. An excellent example was that of Switzerland which maintained a defence force although there was no likelihood of war between that country and its neighbours.

5. The representative of Colombia was indignant at Mr. Vyshinsky's statement that the British Empire was crumbling and that the United Kingdom was learning to become a follower rather than a leader. He believed such statements were ungenerous in view of the past record of the United Kingdom in the Second World War and its present adaptation to the changed political situation in the world. There was nothing nobler in the modern world than that serene relinquishment of power.

6. Doubtless the purpose of the Soviet Union delegation in proposing the present item of the