



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.939
14 December 1957
ENGLISH

Twelfth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 14 December 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ABDOH

(Iran)

Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States /66/ (continued).

Statements were made in the general debate on the item by:

Mr. Sik	(Hungary)
Mr. Shaha	(Nepal)
Mr. Gunewardene	(Ceylon)
Mr. Champassak	(Laos)
Mr. Sastroamidjojo	(Indonesia)
Mr. Urquia	(El Salvador)
Mr. Jawad	(Iraq)
Mr. Gebre-Egzy	(Ethiopia)
Mr. de la Colina	(Mexico)
Mr. Kitahara	(Japan)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.939. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 66

DECLARATION CONCERNING THE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OF STATES (A/3673; A/C.1/L.198)
(continued)

Mr. SIK (Hungary): In the night meeting of this Committee the day before yesterday, we felt that a new opportunity had been created for the United Nations to find a way to a better understanding and to take effective action to liberate the people of the world from the fear of an all-embracing catastrophe. The representative of Burma emphatically pointed out the only real perspective of the present and future generations of man, which is given in the Soviet proposal, by drawing the attention of this Committee to the evident fact that there is no alternative to coexistence.

The point is either the great Powers will be able to lay down the principles and conditions of peaceful coexistence and respect them or humanity will continue to live in a constant nightmare of a tremendous cataclysm. The fact is evident that there is no alternative to coexistence -- that is to say, there is no alternative to the coexistence of peoples having different ideologies or social, political and economic systems.

The Soviet initiative, together with the interventions of those who have realized the inevitability of accepting existing coexistence, have created a new opportunity for the United Nations to develop and intensify its activities to maintain peace. The very origin of the existence of the United Nations is an indication of the validity of the principle of coexistence. The great Powers, after having defeated the forces of Hitler, decided by a common will to establish this Organization in order to help nations and peoples to live together as good neighbours. Those Powers which decided to bring the United Nations into being already had different social systems in their own countries.

The basic idea behind the Charter of the United Nations is the peaceful coexistence of Member States with different social systems. Those who fought together against the dangers of Hitlerite militarism and were successful in defending the future of mankind wanted to remain together in time of peace in order to promote in friendly co-operation the welfare of all nations.

(Mr. Sik, Hungary)

All discussions and all resolutions in Assemblies of the United Nations should reflect the basic idea of coexistence that was the chief motivation in establishing this Organization. Without the idea of peaceful coexistence the Charter could not have been drafted and the United Nations could not have assembled. If this idea is so much a part and parcel of the cornerstone of our Organization, then why is it necessary to make a new declaration expressing the principle of coexistence? It is necessary because some of us seem to have forgotten the very raison d'être of the United Nations and act in such a way inside and outside this Organization as if the idea of coexistence had not been recognized as a guiding principle for international policies in elaborating the great perspectives of the United Nations.

Even yesterday the representative of the United States gave the impression that he thought the idea of coexistence might come from somewhere outside the deliberations of the United Nations. On many occasions during recent years representatives of the United States have acted in meetings of the United Nations as if they had the right to use this Organization as an instrument against nations and Governments that have systems differing from those of the United States. It is rather interesting that the representatives of the United States and of the United Kingdom have expressed their acknowledgement of the mildness of the statement made by the Soviet delegation but they immediately reintroduced into the debate the old slogans of the "cold war".

It is to be regretted that the delegation of the United States finds it difficult to feel the necessary confidence to respect the idea of coexistence of nations with different economic, social and political systems. Mr. Lodge made clear his difficulties in that respect in his speech yesterday. He wanted to justify his mistrust basically by quotations taken out of statements by Marxist ideologists and politicians as to the future changes in social and economic systems. Just because we have firm confidence in the future development of the economic and social relations of all societies, we never interfere in the internal affairs of other States. We do not question what Mr. Lodge believes about ideologies and what his hopes are as to the future systems of human society, but we disapprove when he defends such political activities that have the intention of interfering in the internal affairs of other States.

During the past few years we have witnessed such activities on the part of his Government. We remember statements made by representatives of his Government regarding European people's democracies and the People's Republic of China, expressing the intention to change the political structure of these countries. Before the meeting of the Heads of Government in Geneva in 1955, the general tone of such statements was rather militaristic. After the Geneva Conference they introduced the slogan of peaceful change and hopes that through the media of propaganda and subversive activities they might reach their goals. Recently they have reverted to military slogans, and we have again and again heard about projects of new bases for atomic weapons and the stepping up of war preparations.

(Mr. Sik, Hungary)

The expression of such intentions is obviously indicative of a rejection of the idea of coexistence. It means the denial of the basic idea of the existence of the United Nations.

Mr. Lodge wanted to avoid all responsibility for the "cold war" by pointing out that his Government has no Press, no radio. But, if the United States Government were really ready to accept the idea of peaceful coexistence, we should have heard appeals to the United States Press and radio against their constant misrepresentation of certain countries, and for the sake of such information activities as correspond to the moral attitude of peaceful coexistence. We have never heard any such appeals from representatives of the United States Government. If they had taken the policy of coexistence seriously, they would certainly have found ways of discrediting the harmful activities of such agencies as the broadcasting system of the Voice of America or that of the so-called Radio Free Europe. We have never heard any official statements by the United States Government which would have attempted to safeguard world opinion against the distortions and warlike propaganda of these agencies. During the events in Hungary last year, the so-called Radio Free Europe acted as a channel of a military headquarters; it even gave military instructions to its allies in Hungary, how to fight, where to fight, and what kind of weapons to use in this fight. Agencies in the United States are collecting funds for the activities of this radio station, and we have never heard on the part of the United States Government any sign of protest against all this. Such a situation may give the impression that these activities have the blessing of official quarters. We may even be authorized to suppose such approval as far as the United States Information Service is concerned. It is not a so-called private agency; it is an official organ of the United States authorities. To give only one instance: in Calcutta, India, the show windows of the United States Information Service have pictures and descriptions, tendentiously selected, regarding the events in Hungary last year.

(Mr. Sik, Hungary)

We have to praise the Government of India for the freedom it gives to information agencies, but we cannot praise the United States Information Service for the licence it makes out of that freedom. One never finds anywhere any information agency of any socialist country, operating either at home or abroad, which considers it its task, or even its main task, to spread information, even hostile propaganda, about another country.

The representative of the United States himself was under the influence of misrepresentation when he spoke yesterday about the problem of elections in Hungary. He quoted a passage from Prime Minister Kadar and then went on to state that nothing had happened in Hungary in respect of elections. Had his information services been operating well, he would have told this Committee that in the middle of November the inhabitants of Budapest, who make up one-fifth of the total population of Hungary, elected new members to the municipal councils and to the district councils. Ninety-three per cent of the citizens of Budapest exercised their right to vote, and the overwhelming majority of them backed the Government's policy.

Not only its favourable attitude towards certain propaganda organs but also its attitude towards subversive forces indicates that the policy of the United States Government does not, or at least does not always, apply principles of peaceful coexistence. Uprooted groups of political emigrés who came, for instance, from Eastern European countries, are finding support from the Government of the United States. The assistance given such groups shows the political trends of United States circles which run counter to the principles of peaceful coexistence.

The very fact that reactionary forces all over the world are basing their hopes upon the policy of the United States is a clear indication that the United States Government is trying to find an alternative to peaceful coexistence. We experienced this in the tragic events in Hungary last year.

What Mr. Lodge and the representative of the United Kingdom said yesterday about events in Hungary shows, once again, that they regret the failure of the counter-revolution in Hungary. By representing such an attitude they give the impression that they would have preferred the Hungarian people to suffer an all-embracing civil war and to be a source of European war, to say the least. Everyone knows that we in Hungary were at the brink of a cruel civil war --

(Mr. Sik, Hungary)

on the threshold of a bellum omnium contra omnes and under the shadow of a war against a neighbouring country. Not only the existence of a political system but the existence of a nation and that of peace were at stake. Those who realized this great danger and asked for the help of the Soviet Union saved the life of the Hungarian people and contributed to safeguarding Central Europe from the imminent danger of a new war. The same reason necessitates the presence of the Soviet armed forces in Hungary as long as United States forces remain in Western Europe.

The proposals made by the Soviet delegation when presenting the draft resolution under discussion are of such a character as to open the way for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, because they are designed to facilitate the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Europe. It is up to the United States Government whether these proposals are accepted or not.

If the truth underlined by the delegation of Burma in stating that there is no alternative to coexistence is unanimously agreed upon, then the twelfth session of the General Assembly will be of historic importance.

On the basis of such an agreement this Assembly may promulgate a powerful peace declaration which, on the one hand, will influence the foreign policy of the Governments by its moral appeal and, on the other, will show peoples of the world that they are no longer living under the tremendous shadow of a possible world catastrophe.

The Hungarian delegation strongly hopes that, in accordance with the draft resolution presented by the Soviet delegation, such an agreement may be found as the result of this debate, in which the principles of peaceful coexistence have been given powerful expression.

To conclude, I should like to illustrate how my Government is seeking to strengthen Hungary's relations with other countries according to the principles of **peaceful coexistence**. The lack of time prevents me from going into detail. Therefore I only wish to say that our cultural and economic relations with countries of East and West are growing stronger and stronger each day. Just this year we have signed new trade and cultural agreements, also with States which have systems different from ours. We shall continue our efforts to expand contacts with all countries which apply in their policies the principles of

(Mr. Sik, Hungary)

peaceful coexistence of peoples living under different social systems. We hope that the result of this debate will contribute to lessening the present world tension and that there will be in the future even greater possibilities for international contacts, both cultural and economic.

Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): We welcome this occasion for the debate on the concept of peaceful coexistence because it has been, in our time, a subject of great interest and urgency for the whole world, and also because the discussions and deliberations on the question might enable the twelfth session, which has unfortunately failed to fulfil the high expectations of the peoples of the world with regard to disarmament, at least to end on a note of hope for the future.

My delegation fully endorses the substance of the draft declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States, tabled by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and contained in document A/3673, while we certainly regret the cold war undertones of the explanatory memorandum accompanying the request for the inscription of this item, which, in our opinion, tend to make difficult a general agreement, even on such an important and uncontroversial subject as this. My Government has already subscribed to the five principles, and the self-same principles form the basis of the agreement we have recently concluded with the People's Republic of China. In my humble submission, there is nothing in the five principles which is not already enshrined in the United Nations Charter, and, for that matter, in the Declaration on the Promotion of World Peace and Co-operation, which forms a part of the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference. As a matter of fact, some of these principles date further back in history. For example, respect for sovereignty was recognized even when the very concept of States as such was being evolved for the first time; respect for territorial integrity was mentioned in article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations itself; non-aggression was the theme of the General Treaty for the Renunciation of War, which is known as the Pact of Paris or the Kellogg-Briand Pact.

The Charter of the United Nations, while reiterating and reaffirming all the foregoing principles, clearly provides for non-interference in each other's internal affairs for any reasons, be they economic, political or ideological, and

it also provides in a way for "equality and mutual benefit" by mentioning as one of the purposes of the United Nations: "international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian nature." Even the principle of peaceful coexistence finds mention in the preamble of the Charter, when it expresses the determination of the peoples of the United Nations "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours," and that is exactly what, in our opinion, the principle of coexistence connotes.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

Coexistence has become an imperative and a practical necessity in this thermonuclear age. If we do not go forward towards peace and co-operation between all peoples, forward to the solution of basic national issues, which alone can bring about a feeling of security in the world, one of two things is likely to happen: nuclear war, with intercontinental ballistic missiles, against which no present defence would be adequate, or suspension between uneasy peace and world war, in a perpetual state of fear and tension. With the two great international power blocs -- the United States and its allies on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and its friends on the other -- eyeing each other with fear and hostility across a wide sea of misunderstanding, prejudices and resentments, peace is precariously balanced on a highly precipitous edge. Any error of judgement on the part of the policy makers of one or the other bloc is apt to plunge the world into a total holocaust.

I would like to pose this concept of peaceful coexistence as the only way out of the unpleasant realities that confront the world and toward the realization of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. The road to this goal can only lie through a dynamic and positive phase of peaceful coexistence as necessitated by the realities of the situation in the world today. The world today is divided into two blocs of countries with different political and social systems, with different philosophies of life, with different systems of values. However, from our point of view and from the point of view of human survival, the most important question is whether it will be possible for the countries so divided to "see through the blinding mist of misunderstanding and to climb the mounting wall of prejudice", as Dr. Radha Krishnan of India once put it. If both sides, so divided, will show patience and persistence in strengthening real efforts for peaceful coexistence, it might not be difficult for them finally to overcome the resentments, fears, suspicions and prejudices that unhappily vitiate their perspectives and outlook for relations at present and in the future.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

For the present, in our humble opinion, every advantage should be taken of opportunities for exchange of ideas and information, for exchange of cultural missions, for contact and negotiations between the East and the West, and, if possible, opportunities should be created for negotiations to settle the differences. In such a course of action alone lies our best hope for a peace that will be enduring and perhaps, therefore, enduring.

Turning to the question of the differences in ideologies and in systems of values, I think we can always learn a lesson from history in this respect. What is good in a system survives despite all attempts to crush it and despite all the odds that present themselves against it. Wars waged in the name of religion in the past bear this point out very clearly. Despite the hostility and antagonism between paganism and Christianity, between Protestantism and Catholicism and later between Christianity and Islam, all religions survive today. And nobody can deny that each of these religions in its own way contributed to the moral progress of humanity. All these conflicts waged in defence of certain religious and moral ideological values only point in the direction of the futility of wars and conflicts for that purpose and seem to reinforce the lesson that the spark of freedom, like hope, springs eternal in the human breast and cannot be stamped out by force or by fraud. Neither the fear of the Inquisition nor that of the fire and the stake could prevent the birth of Christianity. Long after the din and dusk of the battles for the prevalence of one or the other ideology had settled down, what was sound in the system survived and was retained or assimilated in a new form as the onward march of evolution proceeded. History illustrates very clearly the working of this law of evolution. The high sense of respect for fundamental human rights and the dignity of the individual that characterized Western democracy, and the sense of economic and social justice that the Soviet system emphasizes above everything else, are not, after all, irreconcilable ideas. It is the belief and hope in the eventual synthesis of what is good in both systems of values that can alone stimulate and sustain these patient and persistent efforts for peaceful coexistence to which I referred a few minutes ago. It is only on such an evolution and synthesis that the hopes of mankind for the future can rest. Such an attitude alone can engender a feeling

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

of healthy rivalry, holding out real prospects for a better world. It does not matter even if it turns out to be "competitive coexistence" in this sense.

At this stage, let me make a brief reference to the character and nature of the peaceful coexistence that my country has always practised with its neighbours, because I think it will provide a concrete illustration of the kind of synthesis about which I have just spoken. Situated, as my country is, between the two great land masses of Asian civilization, China on the north and India on the south, she has been a meeting ground of the cultures of both the north and the south and represents a unity of two distinct worlds of thought and civilization. Furthermore, may I suggest in all humility that as a small country we have been able to maintain a long and unbroken record of independence extending over a period of more than 3,000 years, despite the fact that during this period empires rose and fell on both sides of our border. Therefore, in the light of our own experience and history, we sincerely believe in practising tolerance and living together in peace with our immediate neighbours, as with other countries in the world. And, if I may say so, our faith in this principle alone has enabled us to survive as an independent nation through so many centuries, and we honestly feel that what has always helped us survive in our history will stand us in good stead even in this thermonuclear era and will hold good for others placed in a similar situation. Eventually, this might prove to be the basis for the survival of humanity itself, as things stand today.

My hopes are no higher than that accommodations and adjustments may be gradually brought about between the East and the West on a basis of mutual interest, tolerance and understanding, and certainly without sacrifice and surrender of real -- and I repeat it: real -- values by either side. I am not naive enough to think that the acceptance of the Five Principles in itself will lead to the solution of all international problems that unfortunately divide and bedevil the world today. I have always held that the declarations of these

HA/mtm

A/C.1/PV.939
14-15

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

principles of international conduct are not so important in themselves as in the actual manner of their observance and implementation in practice. But certainly our own experience as a nation makes us sincerely believe in the practice and value of tolerance and living together in peace, which may also be described as peaceful coexistence.

My delegation will be only too glad to vote for any resolution that might conduce to an atmosphere for peace in the world.

Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon): The subject under discussion is one to which my Government attaches the greatest significance in the present world conflict and I therefore crave the indulgence of the Committee while I make a few comments. Many delegations may feel that the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union will accomplish nothing. Other delegations may be of the opinion that the declaration is unnecessary in so far as its contents, in some way or another, are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Still others may be of the opinion, even if that opinion is not expressed in this Committee, that the draft resolution is a simple attempt to divert world opinion from the various problems with which this Organization has been faced and with which its Members have not been able to resolve, and the few will perhaps view it as composed of mere words denoting sanctimonious shibboleths and no more. As far as my delegation and Government are concerned, this declaration represents both a commentary on what has gone before and a pointer to what we hoped to achieve in the future and, above all, a vital reminder that there is very little time at our disposal in which to achieve it. It is in this light, and on this interpretation, that I propose to consider the draft resolution before us.

The United Nations Organization is now in the thirteenth year of its existence, and although it might not be a particularly auspicious time we would do well to take stock of what we have achieved over the years. On the positive side, there are many achievements to its credit. It has presided at the birth of many new States and has enabled the States to take their rightful place in the community of nations. It has succeeded in achieving a cessation of hostilities in many areas of the world, Indonesia, Kashmir, and the Balkans among them, and on two significant occasions in the troubled Middle East. Its forces have been used to repel aggression in Korea and at the same time have been employed, and are being employed, to preserve peace in the Middle East. I refer here to positive achievements in the political sphere. We all know, and I do not need to list them, the considerable achievements the United Nations has to its credit in the economic, social and humanitarian fields. And yet, when we have said all that, we should ask ourselves how far has this Organization achieved those noble objectives which are contained in the preamble of the United Nations

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

Charter? The preamble, which so stirred the hearts and minds of so many people and so many nations when it was first drawn up, today makes somewhat unpalatable reading -- unpalatable not because the ideals which are enshrined in it have lost their validity, but because as each session comes to a close we begin to wonder whether we are not in fact drifting further and further away from their realization.

Let us examine some of those ideals. We have resolved in the Charter "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours! Yet, not a day passes when we do not read of some specific border dispute or some event which marks the worsening of relations between nations. We have resolved to "unite our strength to maintain international peace and security", and yet the strength of so many nations is so often diverted to channels which can only lead to the disruption of international peace and security. We have resolved "to ensure by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest". And yet, how often have our principles been compromised, how frequently have such methods been left aside and how true it is today that armed force is being used not in the common interest but in the interest of a particular nation or group of nations. We have resolved "to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of peoples". And yet, while well over half of humanity lives in woeful poverty, the technical skill, the resources and the money which could be employed to the betterment of their lot is being dissipated in the manufacture of arms and machinery which can only lead to their wholesale destruction.

It is not my purpose to apportion blame for the situation as it exists today. In a sense, perhaps all nations, the big nations as well as the small, are responsible. For although many others are not responsible and have not participated in the senseless arms race or, in our opinion, the equally senseless formation of military blocs, we might have perhaps united much more determinedly to anticipate and help to prevent the events which have set them in motion. As I said, therefore, I do not wish to apportion responsibility, but I do most sincerely desire on behalf of my Government, and if I may on behalf of myself, to reiterate that unless we are prepared to live up to the ideals of the Organization in which many of us still have faith we shall move every more certainly and ever more surely

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

to the eventual destruction of all nations and the annihilation of mankind. Peaceful coexistence ceased to be a more slogan a long time ago. It is today a vital necessity. We have no choice. If we are interested in the existence of mankind we must devote all our energies to the peaceful coexistence of the States to which they belong.

All this may seem, on the face of it, a very obvious and self-evident proposition. There should be no single nation represented here which does not believe in the need for peaceful coexistence between nations. The need is more evident today when man, as a result of his ingenuity, and nations, because of their enormous resources, have succeeded in creating armaments and devices which longer imply the total destruction of cities alone but the destruction of entire nations and entire continents. If this was a consequence of mankind's instinct for self-preservation we could perhaps regard it as inevitable but what can be avoided is surely the atmosphere of suspicion, of distrust, and above all of fear which brings added impetus to the seemingly internal striving of nations to outdo each other in the creation of ever more powerful and infernal means of destruction. A great president of a great nation once remarked that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself, and if his words were true of the state of his nation as it existed at that time, how much more true it is today in relation to the entire world? For at the basis of the armaments race, at the basis of the establishment of military pacts, there is always fear. Whether this fear is groundless, whether it has any substance, is a matter which I do not wish to discuss, but what I do want to emphasize is this. The nations of the world can ill afford to spend their time and to devote their energies to explaining those fears and to justifying their suspicions. This is what has been happening since World War II, and this is what has vitiated every attempt to remove the cause of this fear. Too often the United Nations has been a forum for nations to ventilate their grievances, to justify their actions and to rationalize their policies. Too rarely has it served its original purpose, which is to unite for peace. Is it too late, I wonder, for us all to reverse this trend and to revert to those basic principles of the Charter to which our Governments are committed?

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

I know that this is an extremely difficult task. Nations are committed, on one way or another, to pursuing their national interests, and the Governments of nations can remain in power only if those national interests are not subordinated to other considerations. I realize too that it would be futile to expect every nation to look at every problem with the degree of objectivity and impartiality that such problems deserve. Not only do traditional rivalries die hard, but traditional alliances do likewise. Every nation has its commitments -- to its people, to its friends, and to the group to which it belongs, and there are commitments within those commitments. The more often one considers international problems the more often does the conclusion seem inescapable that there is no way out of the tangled web in which we find ourselves. There are no easy solutions, nor are we entitled to expect them, but what we all owe to the world, all the nations represented here, is the application of ceaseless effort to the search for solution, the application of as much energy to achieving them as we do to explaining our own causes and our own policies.

The draft declaration we are presently debating will not achieve the solutions which we all desire, but it can create a climate of trust and mutual confidence which will make their attainment easier. The principles it contains are not new, they are contained in the Charter in some form or another; they were incorporated in the final communique of the Asian-African Conference of Bandung and they have since served as a foundation on which many nations have conducted their relation. Our foreign policy is firmly based on the Bandung Declaration. We believe that the acceptance of these principles by the General Assembly will help greatly to reduce international tension and enlarge the area of international co-operation. In this connexion I want to make it quite clear, however, that my delegation does not subscribe to the explanatory memorandum attached to the Soviet draft resolution. There is much in it with which we disagree. Most of it is out of character with the resolution which it is intended to explain and I express my deep regret that the delegation of the Soviet Union thought fit to introduce an explanation smacking of cold war politics.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

My delegation would now like to indicate what we mean by these various principles. Mutual respect for one another's territorial integrity and sovereignty is a somewhat clearer interpretation of Article 2 of the Charter, which enjoins all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. It is a positive statement in that it implies not only a renunciation of the threat of force or the use of force, but a positive undertaking on the part of all States to respect the territorial integrity of one another. The fear of a nation for its territorial integrity is not always the result of aggressive threats of force. It may well be engendered by what may be termed defensive alliances that are built around it. However defensive such alliances may be in origin or in character, they hardly make for the peace and security of the nation which is surrounded by them.

The principle of non-aggression is clear enough, but there have been so many violations, particularly in recent years, of this principle that it would seem that nations have forgotten that they renounced the use of force when they signed the Charter. Its insertion in this declaration is therefore timely.

Non-intervention in one another's domestic affairs is another principle which has been observed more in the breach than otherwise. In some cases this intervention has been blatant; in other cases it has been more subtle but no less sinister in its purpose. As I have said before, I regard the purpose of the declaration as being conciliatory and intended to ease existing tensions. I shall not, therefore, cite the many examples of intervention in the domestic affairs of nations which have led to tensions not only in the country in which such interference takes place, but also between the countries which compete for the allegiance of such nations. This principle implies that any nation, however small it may be, should be permitted to develop in its own way, to adopt any social or political system which it values, and to do all this without outside interference. Surely a nation which is sovereign and independent is capable of deciding for itself the economic, political or ideological system which is best suited to the particular genius of its people.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

By equality and mutual benefit we mean the recognition that there should be freer contacts between peoples in the economic, commercial, social and cultural fields and the recognition at the same time that these contacts should be based on the equality of all peoples. In the economic field it implies economic co-operation as against economic domination. In the commercial field it means the elimination of artificial trade barriers and the development of international trade. In the social and cultural fields, it means the free exchange of ideas as against the imposition of a particular nation's ideas or cultural values on a smaller nation. In all this, the equality of States must be recognized, for it is only in the recognition of such equality that development can be truly beneficial.

Finally, there is peaceful coexistence. This, in a sense, is the cornerstone of all these principles, for the others depend for their realization on this, on the ability of nations to live together if they are not to die together, on the need for coexistence if we are not all to suffer co-extinction. Of course, coexistence is a fact today; we would not be here if it were not. But whether we have peaceful coexistence is another matter. As far as my own Government is concerned, we have peaceful relations with many countries in both the East and the West. But we must also recognize that the relation of other States are still governed by the attitudes acquired and the suspicions engendered during the bitterest days of the cold war. I regret to say that the end of the cold war is not yet in sight. Even in this debate, we have had abundant proof that a cold war is as hotly pursued as it used to be. I realize that these attitudes cannot be changed nor can these suspicions be swept aside by the mere adoption of this declaration, but it would indeed be tragic if a false sense of pride and prejudice were to stand in the way of its adoption. It would be tragic if nothing were done to heal the old sores which affect the peace of the world today.

My own Government is firmly committed to parliamentary democracy and the political and social institutions which this involves. But this has not stood in the way of our opening diplomatic and trade relations with countries with different systems of government. We have had, for instance, for the last four years a very successful trade pact with the People's Republic of China. We have entered into trade agreements with countries in Eastern Europe. These agreements have not, however, affected the very happy and far older relations which we have

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

had with the nations of the West in either the political or the commercial spheres. Of course, we are a small nation, and for this reason it may be argued that we need to be on friendly terms with all nations.

But it seems strange in the age of the thermonuclear bomb and the inter-continental ballistic missile to talk in terms of small nations and big nations, nations within military alliances and nations without. As far as we are concerned, there are nations which have it in their power to blow up the world and nations who are mercifully deficient in such power. It is for this latter group of nations, who will inevitably be the victims of such push-button warfare, to seek to develop better relations not only between them and the big Powers, but also through mediation and conciliation to bridge the gulf between the big Powers themselves, in other words, to create a real climate for the peaceful coexistence of nations.

A cold war has failed and failed miserably. It has resulted only in frayed nerves and increased tensions. A hot war is well nigh impossible, for it would not only destroy the parties engaged in this dangerous pastime, it would also destroy humanity itself. What, then, is left for us as rational human beings except to discover a modus vivendi based on human understanding? The declaration that we have before us provides such a basis of human understanding. We welcome it as it is not only timely, but an imperative need today if humanity is to survive. May we hope that the authors of the declaration, as well as those who have expressed doubts about its efficacy, will decide here and now to adhere firmly to the principles enunciated therein.

As a representative of a small country which cultivates friendly relations with all nations, with malice towards none, may I address a special appeal to the Governments of the United States and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on whose shoulders rests squarely the responsibility of maintaining peace in the world, to shed ancient prejudices and to sit down and work out a scheme of disarmament which would ensure peace in a trouble-torn world. May we usher in the brave new world, when nations are freed from fear, poverty and ignorance, when nuclear weapons are completely banned, and the energies of the times are harnessed to more fruitful purposes, towards the happiness and prosperity of the mass of humanity. May peace reign supreme. In that hope, with that prayer, we have great pleasure in supporting the draft resolution standing in the names of India, Sweden and Yugoslavia, three great nations whose peace-loving intentions are beyond question.

Mr. CHAMPASSAK (Laos) (interpretation from French): I must say frankly that the Laos delegation approached the debate on the question of peaceful coexistence with mixed feelings. On the one hand, we can only rejoice at seeing the principles which we have unflinchingly supported being proclaimed, but, on the other hand, we wondered whether this debate was really initiated for the purpose of bringing about a relaxation of mind and a better comprehension between States. The experience of so many other debates even here, where the noblest principles and the most respectful expressions of human faith in the reign of freedom, peace and justice have been voiced, has shown us that these have served as so many new Trojan horses designed to carry fire and sword into the very hearts of the adversary's defences.

(Mr. Champassak, Laos)

This leaves some questions as to the true motives which could have inspired the initiators of this debate. Nothing would be more dangerous than to let ourselves be caught in the trap of words and to give into the blandishments of verbal compromise, tending to forget that ultimately, as many other speakers have said, it is the will displayed by precise actions and concrete actions which makes for the advancement of peace far more than the adoption of new theoretical resolutions which will swell the already imposing pile of misleading unanimities.

In our statement, which will be a brief one, we shall draw a distinction between the level of principles, the level of practice and, finally, we shall formulate our opinions as to the two draft resolutions before us.

On the level of principles, we can only support unreservedly any formula which includes the five principles of peaceful coexistence because they constitute the foundation of the policy of good will in external affairs and tolerance in domestic affairs which inspires and presides over the policies of the royal Government of Laos.

As our Prime Minister, His Highness Prince Souvannah Pouma, declared, "our relations with foreign countries are based on the two-fold principle of the maintenance of peace in neutrality and respect for Pancha Sila and peaceful coexistence". May I add that in Pancha Sila -- that is, the five principles -- is embodied the very essence of our Buddhist religion, dominated as it is by the idea of tolerance which so profoundly inspires all our political philosophy.

This is the reason why we have given our wholehearted endorsement to the resolution of the Bandung Conference, which commands the unanimous support of the Afro-Asian world for the five great principles.

In this respect we should like to emphasize that they form a logical, co-ordinated whole, none of whose components can be eliminated lest one destroy the balance of the whole. A fortiori, one cannot, without distorting the scope and bearing of the whole, emphasize one of them and neglect the others.

Thus the principle of non-intervention, taken outside the context of the other principles, might imply a policy of nationalist isolation and introversion which would not be at all in keeping with the present reality of the world, all of whose parts seek more and more to come close to each other and to help each

(Mr. Champassak, Laos)

other, to complement each other. Taken literally and in isolation, the principle of non-intervention would run counter to the great movement of inter-penetration and inter-dependence which increasingly dominates international relations.

I come to the end of these theoretical parts by recalling that it is no accident that the principle of peaceful coexistence has been placed at the end of the enunciation of the five principles. It constitutes, in fact, the synthesis of the four others, of which it is the crown and the conclusive achievement. This is tantamount to saying that it cannot be validly or sincerely proclaimed without at the same time entailing the simultaneous action of the four others.

There can be no peaceful existence without mutual respect for the integrity and sovereignty of States, without a true renunciation of aggression, without a sincere policy of non-intervention, and without an effective economic co-operation, technical and cultural, between States.

Just as on the individual level the idea of freedom is indissolubly linked with the idea of social justice -- which would be in fact the meaning of a freedom by which the stronger would crush the weaker -- likewise on the level of States the five principles form an indissoluble whole. They can only be rejected or accepted as a whole. My country has made its choice and it has done so not only on the theoretical level, but also in the practical realm of action in the fields of domestic and external policy. My country, in fact, systematically maintains relations of good neighbourliness with all its neighbours, whatever their political regime, and we maintain friendly relations with all other States -- which in no way means that we do not maintain with some of these States relations which are particularly cordial; nor does it mean that we are prepared to abandon the bonds of traditional friendship which bind us, for example, with France, the United States and India. Neither does it mean that our political system is in any way merely the result of the various philosophies which inspire the Governments of our neighbours.

Our attachment to the very liberal formula of constitutional monarchy is only matched by a fierce resolve to defend it against all threats from wherever they may come.

(Mr. Champassak, Laos)

On the domestic plain, it is precisely because it is animated by a broad spirit of comprehension and tolerance that the Government of His Highness Prince Souvanna Phouma has just completed peacefully the reintegration within the national community of the elements of Pathet Lao that were inspired by an ideology different from that of the majority of Laotians. In his eagerness to reconstitute national unity, His Highness has succeeded in defining a policy of national reconciliation which commands the unanimous approval of our Parliament. This in no way suggests that my Government is at all prepared to tolerate the least attempt at internal subversion which would take advantage of its generous initiative. The Laotian people intend to remain the masters of their own destiny, and their vigilance in defending themselves against any subversive intervention will not be jeopardized.

This brings me to my conclusion, which will bear on the two draft resolutions before us.

I have already said that we are in full accord with the substance of the Soviet Union draft resolution, which only reproduces the terms of the Bandung resolution. But one first observation is required. Such a declaration is only conceivable if it stands for a will, for a common and genuine peace, but not if it is designed to accentuate divergences between certain States. However, a reading of the explanatory memorandum of the Soviet draft resolution leaves no doubts on that score. What is involved is, in fact, an operation in the realm of polemics, to which we wish to remain alien. On the other hand, it is here that, as far as the substance of the question is concerned, the five principles of peaceful coexistence are in practice already set forth in the Charter. The representative of Austria and a number of others have aptly brought out that point.

It is for these two reasons that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution presented by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia. It will do so all the more willingly since the sponsorship of these three States, so well known for the independence of mind which presides over their foreign policies, is the best token of the integrity, sincerity and validity of the solution which they have urged us to adopt.

Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): It is indeed gratifying for us to note that, after a little more than two years since Asia and Africa proclaimed at Bandung their adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence, today at this closing hour of the twelfth session of the General Assembly, so many representatives here have not only shown interest in that fundamental principle of peaceful coexistence, but have also contributed so many valuable thoughts to it.

What is the reason for this great interest? Is it merely because we are here to state the positions of our Governments in this matter? Naturally, we have to do so because we are representatives of our Governments. But I think that there are other motives for our great concern in the principles of peaceful coexistence.

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo,
Indonesia)

We believe that besides being representatives of our respective Governments, we also are consciously or unconsciously agents of other forces. We are interested in and concerned about the principles of peaceful coexistence because mighty forces are at work in our respective countries moving millions of people, creating a ferment in their minds, and passions and desire for a way out from the present troubled and almost unbearable state of affairs in the world. Indeed, there exists everywhere in the world today an irrepressible urge amongst the peoples all over the world for us not only to talk about the principle of peaceful coexistence, but to make it the unshakeable basis for world peace and international co-operation.

Therefore, in considering this item concerning the peaceful coexistence of States, we are dealing with a matter on which, at least in principle, there can be no divided opinion. Everyone wants peace, and peace in this world entails coexistence. It is therefore not because of any conflict of wants that we are considering this item -- and considering it with a sense of urgency -- but because of the tensions and fears abounding in the world that threaten to thwart the universal desire to preserve and perfect peaceful coexistence among all nations, large and small. Perhaps more than ever before, there is a general recognition of -- and I quote here from the preamble of the three-Power draft resolution:

"Considering the urgency and the importance of strengthening international peace and of developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States irrespective of their divergences or the relative stages and nature of their political, economic and social development,"

(A/C.1/L.198)

which corresponds, I think with the third paragraph of the Soviet draft resolution:

"Recognizing that the application of these principles in relations among all States would be of exceptional importance in reducing international tension and extending international co-operation,"

(A/3673, page 4)

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo,
Indonesia)

In turn, this is a reflection of the growing recognition of the interdependence of States in a shrinking world and the consequent need to promote regional co-operation as a basis for their spiritual and material survival. Yet, here we find a tragic paradox. The raison d'etre for such groupings, aside from the promotion of the political, economic and cultural well-being of the countries concerned, should be to uphold freedom in recognition of the legitimate rights of others and to further the development of world-wide co-operation. But, in the past decade, we have witnessed the formation of blocs whose main purpose is of quite a different nature. Arising as a reaction to the stresses and strains in the international community, they tended only to further aggravate those tensions against which they were reacting. Distrust breeds distrust, and this was the root of the two blocs that now face each other in opposition, barring rather than smoothing the way towards world-wide co-operation.

There may have been good reasons for distrust, but this cannot change the fact that such distrust was compounded rather than reduced by the formation of these two Power blocs. Seeing their survival in the obsolete terms of a balance of power rather than co-operation with each other, the emphasis was naturally on the accumulation of military strength, resulting in an arms race that threatens to have no geographical limitation and whose cost is such as to curtail the elimination of the danger of war caused by abject poverty still prevailing in large parts of the world.

And this is not all. Thinking in terms of military power and, at best, equating peaceful coexistence in terms of deterrent strength, led inevitably to a tendency to promote conformity or solidarity of thinking within each of the blocs to the detriment of finding solutions to differences between the two Power blocs or between a member of the Power bloc and a State outside the bloc. In other words, the tendency is towards trying to achieve a sort of bloc-thinking on international problems in the interest of maintaining bloc-solidarity and at the expense of vigorous and persistent efforts to find solutions to these problems. In line with this trend, which clearly is an expression of fear, negotiation as a means of removing differences or disputes is naturally distrusted and even abjured.

(Mr. Sastramidjojo,
Indonesia)

This then is the paralysing stalemate in which the world finds itself when fear, supported on a scaffold of strength and balance of power, is made the basis for preserving international peace. It is this dilemma that we face when considering the peaceful coexistence of States.

How can we grasp the horns of this dilemma and emerge safely from this stalemate of fear? I think that the Bandung Conference, to which so much reference has already been made, showed the way towards a more enlightened and fruitful relation between nations and peoples. For, if nothing else, Bandung gave to the world a message of respect for diversity alongside with the principle of seeking through combined efforts the peaceful solution of existing differences or disputes and of mutual co-operation for promoting the common good. In short, Bandung set out the two essentials for putting flesh and muscles on the skeleton of peaceful coexistence; that is, respect for diversity which is the prerequisite for progress and the birth of new ideas and ideals; and mutual co-operation in removing sources of friction and strengthening, through contacts and exchanges, international peace and security.

Indeed, peaceful coexistence does not mean merely the more or less negative aspect of "minding one's own business", but, and foremost, implies living together and helping one another to live. It is, in this respect, not without significance that the first of the five principles enunciated in the three-Power draft resolution is "mutual respect and benefit." The peaceful coexistence proclaimed by Bandung and spelled out in the ten principles is indeed not one of coexistence from fear on the basis of military strength and balance of power, but of coexistence on the basis of moral strength and belief in promoting political, economic and cultural co-operation, by widening the channels of communication and negotiation, in the interest of one's own security and the security and peace of mankind as a whole.

This is the kind of peaceful coexistence which we do not only urge States to declare but to practise in their relations with all nations in their own and the world's best interest. And we urge this not without some hope. There are indeed indications of an increasing awareness of the need to make renewed efforts to displace the present distrust and fear with confidence and goodwill towards each other, and to substitute thereby the hard but gratifying struggle for peace for the swift but deadly threat of a push-button nuclear war.

AP/mlw

A/C.1/PV.939
34-35

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo,
Indonesia)

I can cite no more respected and honoured person than the Nobel peace prize winner, former Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs and President of the seventh session of the General Assembly, Mr. Lester B. Pearson, who called upon the nations of the world to show imagination and initiative, determination and sacrifice in working for peace.

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo, Indonesia)

Warning against the rigidity of the "cold war", Mr. Pearons recently declared:

"What is needed is a new and vigorous determination to use every technique of discussion and negotiation that may be available; or, more important, that can be made available, for the solution of the tangled, frightening problems that divide today, in fear and hostility, the two power blocs and thereby endanger peace."

And he went on to state, and I think it is worthwhile to repeat here, that:

"The time has come for us to make a move, not only from strength, but from wisdom and from confidence in ourselves; to concentrate on the possibilities of agreement, rather than on the disagreements and failures, the evils and wrongs of the past.

"It would be folly to expect quick, easy or total solutions. It would be folly also to expect hostility and fears suddenly to vanish. But it is equal, or even greater, folly to do nothing; to sit back, answer missile with missile, insult with insult, ban with ban.

"That would be the complete bankruptcy of policy and diplomacy, and it would not make for peace."

This is not only an eloquent but also a reasoned and sane plea for peace. We must indeed make a determined move towards securing peace and removing the legitimate fears of peoples throughout the world. And of course the main responsibility for this rests with the two great nuclear Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, a responsibility which they share and share alike.

A few days ago, Premier Bulganin of the Soviet Union, in a letter to the President of the United States, set down certain proposals aimed at improving international relations. After some hesitation and doubts, it was announced that the Bulganin letter was under the most careful study by the United States State Department. At the same time, the titular head of the Democratic Party, Adlai E. Stevenson, urged the United States to "leave no stone unturned to reach settlements" and expressed the hope that the response to Mr. Bulganin's letter would be "affirmative in spirit."

We are aware that the submission of proposals by one side and the assurance by the other side that they will be given careful study do not constitute a

(Mr. Sastroamidjojo, Indonesia)

guarantee or even a promise of solutions. But they do constitute an acknowledgement by both sides of the seriousness of the present world situation and a desire on both sides to promote or, at least, not dismiss the possibility of contacts and an exchange of ideas that could lead to solutions of problems that plague international affairs. This already indicates a willingness to try to take the first steps away from the present stalemate and towards mutual understanding on at least some of the differences that divide these two Powers, which cannot be but a source of some comfort and hope to mankind.

In conclusion, I would again like to appeal to the two Power blocs to free themselves from thinking in terms of military strength and from the restrictive cords of fear, but, in the spirit of Bandung, to utilize their diverse gifts and resources in the common struggle to eradicate differences and promote political, economic and cultural co-operation for the benefit of all. Last night, the representative of Brazil quoted wise words from Mr. Pearson, and I will repeat them again. As Mr. Pearson of Canada so aptly stated:

"Let us not prepare for war like precocious giants and for peace like retarded pygmies."

Let us rather be retarded pygmies in regard to war and tackle the difficult struggle for peace, of living together co-operatively in friendship and with mutual understanding towards one another as precocious giants. And if peace needs giants the rewards of peaceful coexistence in this bountiful world of ours are gigantic indeed.

Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): We are discussing an item today on the very date set as the deadline for the Assembly. By forced marches in the First Committee yesterday and today, we have been dealing with the last item on our agenda, that of a Declaration Concerning the Peaceful Coexistence of States.

Notwithstanding the haste required by the fact that we only have a few hours to talk, the harvest of speeches has been abundant -- copious, I would say -- and exuberant; Not only because of the circumstances under which we find ourselves, but also because it is my habit, I shall endeavour to be positive and brief.

(Mr. Urquia, El Salvador)

When in the middle of September last we were notified of the letter coming from the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, distributed in document A/3673, in which he proposed the inclusion of this item in the provisional agenda for the twelfth regular session, as well as the explanatory memorandum appended, it seemed to us that this was merely intended to impress world public opinion and to try to win sympathy for the Moscow regime, dressing it in the robes of the true champion of the cause of peace, which was trying to set up in its international relations a policy of respect for the territorial sovereignty of States, a policy of non-aggression and non-intervention and so on; in other words, trying to set up a policy of peaceful coexistence in a world of frank friendship and fruitful co-operation.

If we must call a spade a spade -- and we have always endeavoured to do so -- we did not feel that this position was one that could be occupied by a regime which has violated all the terms of the Charter and all the principles of international law and international morals and which has not only committed an obvious aggression against Hungary and intervened in its internal affairs, thus showing the disrespect for Hungarian sovereignty and territorial integrity, but has also systematically refused to abide by the repeated appeals of this General Assembly which was seeking to redress the ills suffered by that martyred people.

As has many other delegations, my delegation could not forget that communism, through its theoreticians and its men of action, has always proclaimed that its final aims and its true goal is to extend its political and economic system throughout the entire world, utilizing peaceful means if possible and using non-peaceful means if this is necessary. And the Government at Moscow neither hides its will or desires in order to fulfil its plans for world domination, and they count on the help of time. "Time works for us," has been said repeatedly by Mr. Khrushchev.

If this be the case -- and it is difficult to deny it; I am sure that the representative of the Soviet Union will not attempt to deny it, neither Mr. Kuznetsov nor those who support his cause in this room -- then how can we interpret the efforts of the Kremlin to set up an international policy of peaceful coexistence of States other than as one more effort to gain time in their manoeuvres and preparations to increase their sphere of influence by peaceful means, in Europe, in the Middle East, in South-East Asia and wherever it may be feasible for them to do so, whilst at the same time perfecting and accumulating enormous amounts of nuclear weapons for the decisive moment of unleashing a new war.

From another point of view, my delegation felt it superfluous for the General Assembly to put forward a declaration which has already been included variously in different provisions of the great document signed at San Francisco and primarily in Chapter I of the Charter which outlines the purposes and principles of the United Nations, purposes and principles which, furthermore, have regulated relations between peoples of this hemisphere for many years before they became Members of the United Nations or members of the Organization of American States. The charter of the Organization of American States was later reaffirmed in different hemispheric conditions. However, a very careful consideration of the general situation in the world, the tone and tenor of many speeches we have heard in this debate, and the very many reasonable and prudent remarks made -- and upon which the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198) of the delegations of India, Sweden and Yugoslavia is based -- all of this, as well as our constant respect for the principles contained in that document, leads my delegation to believe that perhaps an appeal of this nature might not necessarily be a voice crying in the wilderness.

It is, after all, a reflection of the views of all nations and an appeal made to all nations, and it is especially addressed to the two great Powers which have the dubious privilege of being the most powerful in the world, to do all in their power to strengthen international peace, encourage friendly and co-operative relations between nations, and to solve their problems by peaceful means, in accordance with what is contained in the Charter and with what is contained in the declaration itself.

We felt that all this might not be useless or superfluous. As far as we are concerned, if such an appeal were formulated and, if possible, unanimously adopted by the General Assembly at the end of its twelfth regular session, it would have tremendous virtue. It would cement and crystallize in a few words the feelings of all those who have made constructive efforts to achieve solutions on disarmament, to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes that exist between certain Member States, and also to promote friendly assistance and co-operation between all nations. God will that, in this message of peace, broadcast to the world in these days when we commemorate the birth of Jesus Christ, there be a basis of truth and that these words will not be lost, as words often are, that they be not just clouds floating across the horizon which nobody notices and nobody marks.

Mr. JAWAD (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at a moment when I am moved by sentiments of deep distress provoked by the cruel news of the catastrophic earthquake which occurred in your country and which affected so many innocent people. My delegation, with feelings of sorrow, wishes to extend to the people of Iran its most sincere condolences.

It may be useful to recall that only during the last few years the term "peaceful coexistence" was added to the nomenclature of political science and international law. In the past, historians and authors on international law spoke of peace as distinct from war between nations or States. If terminology in the field of relations between nations could be taken as a guide to international institutional and conceptual developments, the new term of "peaceful coexistence" would indicate to future historians a certain definite phase in the evolution of ideas reflecting definite tendencies towards a departure from an age-old human practice which took the form of war.

It is extremely significant to note that the term "peaceful coexistence" came into current use only during the period which witnessed, first, the indulgence in a cold-war struggle between two ideological camps; secondly, the expansion and development of the United Nations as a machinery for peace, and thirdly, the rapid spread of the national liberation movements in many parts of the world and the achievement of independence by a number of nations.

Its significance stems from two quite distinct though interrelated recent historical currents. The first is the extremely important role assumed in the last few decades by science and technique, not only as factors in building up the very existence of individual nations, but also in the destructive potentialities which lie at hand if such science and technique were mobilized for war purposes. The second current, which has followed upon the first, is the widely spread movement for the promotion of international conditions and institutions favouring the maintenance of peace and the banishment of war in the relations of nations.

Thus the desire of the common people in all parts of the world to live peacefully, and their determination to support methods for settling disputes and differences through the intermediary of international institutions and agencies, especially the United Nations, mark beyond any doubt a step forward in the general conceptual advancement of humanity from the stage which prevailed in the period preceding the First World War.

Such evolution was imperative. The two world wars, and particularly the Second World War, have unmasked the real causes of modern wars, their destructive effects and their complete futility as means for solving international problems and disputes. The danger that a future war might lead to a complete destruction and annihilation of civilization and humanity is becoming increasingly evident in view of the far-reaching recent scientific discoveries, especially in physics.

It is therefore obvious that if the nations appear, in this period of their history, to be extremely conscious of the need to avoid and prevent the rupture of the peace, it is an indication of their awareness of the grave dangers involved in war and the existence of a desire to live together in peace and to attain higher levels of progress, irrespective of their material and cultural differences and their outlook on life.

It may be said in this connexion that although the desire to avoid war and to live in peace is manifest internationally, there have been occasions on which certain advanced nations resorted to the use of force for one reason or another. Such a situation does not only invalidate the arguments that the desire for peace has grown rapidly in recent years, to the extent of constituting an international

AM/gd

A/C.1/EV.939
44-45

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

force of considerable weight, but also weakens the confidence of the nations, particularly the small nations, in the possibilities of living peacefully as good neighbours.

Such conclusions are erroneous to a large degree. It is true that the world has witnessed and is still witnessing the use of force as an instrument of national policy. Nevertheless, the right of a State to do so has been denied and even condemned by a substantial sector of the public opinion in the State itself, as well as in the world at large.

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

A spontaneous reaction as such shows the degree of awareness of peoples of the dangers involved in war. But above all it shows that during the last ten years the propaganda coming from the opposing camps has led to the creation of an atmosphere more favourable for the growth of a movement for peace in the wide sense of the word.

It is essential to observe that the desire for peace is not manifest only in Europe where the scourge of war has been more evident, but also in all parts of the world. This post-war phenomenon has been more evident in some countries than in others depending on the level of social organization and political consciousness of the masses. But whatever its extent, the fact remains that it constitutes a factor in the political life of every nation.

There is no reason to doubt that peoples in big and small States, in advanced and under-developed countries, loathe war and cherish a sincere desire for peace. It would not be an exaggeration to say that in general small States and under-developed countries fear war much more than big and advanced countries. The reasons are obvious and do not require mentioning. It should be recalled, however, that such countries have always been the victims of the struggle between the advanced countries for sources of raw materials and markets.

The colonial system was and still is nothing but the consequence of the economic system which developed in the industrially advanced countries. This is a truism which requires no proof and no substantiation. It reflects an important historical fact, however, which throws light on the state of peace and war in modern times. Without entering into an historical discussion of the character of the trends in the relations of nations in modern times, it is safe to say that practically all wars which happened since the end of the eighteenth century, and particularly since the industrial revolution, were between European States and for the purpose of conquest. It could therefore be said that Europe had been the principal hotbed for wars. Wars waged outside the continent were either directly consequential on the rivalries inside Europe or a reaction thereto.

One conclusion can therefore be drawn from the state of conflict which dominated the development in the nineteenth century; that is, Europe was, by the character of the economic system prevailing therein, the centre of the world politically, financially, culturally and otherwise. Throughout the nineteenth

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

century, European States attempted to develop a world hegemony based on the Capitalist system of production. This hegemony, based on economic necessity and superiority of the system of production, resulted in two phenomena: first, the rise in Europe of fundamental political, economic, cultural and other ideals and their spread to other parts of the world; and secondly, the belief of Europeans that these fundamental ideals should be of universal application. In other words, Europeans believed that all mankind should be governed by the same rules of law that they believed in in order to attain essentially the same conception regarding economic and political progress and the rights of man. Thus, although Europeans were moved by the economic forces of the system they lived under, they pictured their role in history as eternally valid for all places and times. Their economic superiority gave birth to a complex of superiority in other fields of life.

Events have shown that the culture, ideology and Western organization of society are no longer unique and cannot be recognized as having a universal validity. Their position economically and culturally has been challenged in at least two respects. First, the Capitalist system of production has given rise to a collective or Socialistic system. Secondly, the awakening of the people in the subjugated territories shook the hegemony of the West. The first two decades of the twentieth century have ushered in a new era in human history, as well as a sharp struggle on both the economic and political fronts. In fact, the Western society found itself no longer on the offensive, but on the defensive as a new world emerged out of the nineteenth century. As one American writer put it:

"The one world which we have always taken for granted in our thinking has been succeeded by many worlds. We now live amidst these many worlds. They complete with one another, they coexist with one another. They trade with one another and, in varying degrees, they co-operate with one another."

The change from the world dominated by the Western society to several worlds has not been an easy process. The old world had to fight for the perpetuation of its conceptions and ideals. This fight has taken varied forms, of which there were principally two: first, between Europeans and colonial peoples; and secondly, between Capitalist and Socialist systems.

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

The Second World War was the last fight carried out within the camp of Western society under the impact of the old forces emanating from the nineteenth century economic system of production. It was a proof of the failure of the international machinery -- that is, the League of Nations -- to maintain peace under the Western system of relations between nations.

The forces which moved the West and Soviet Russia during the Second World War to promote a new machinery for peace were to a large extent born within the confines of the old system of relationships in the old world. But the United Nations was brought into existence to serve as a medium to bring into harmony the different worlds which were emerging during the inter and post-war periods, with their varied and sometimes contradictory political, economic and cultural conditions and aspirations. In other words, the United Nations had for its mission to create unity out of diversity.

Thus the United Nations became the centre of the hope for peace and of diplomacy, while old conceptions and practices lingered on. However, we note that the "brink of war" diplomacy is continuously followed within and outside the United Nations. This is a sign that old practices die hard, a fact which repeatedly led to aggression and the continuation of the policy of armaments. In order to provide for the success of the United Nations as an instrument of peace, it is the duty of its Members to realize the facts of the changing world, especially in the scientific field and in the field of national liberation. Science constitutes a danger if not utilized for peaceful purposes; while the suppression or obstruction of the national liberation movements are bound to lead to the perpetuation of the economic and political elements of war and the frustration of all hopes of human progress.

No one denies that the United Nations has been able to promote a certain degree of harmony between conflicting national interests and to avert the occurrence of war on a large scale. But it cannot be said that the United Nations has been able to promote profound convictions among its Members regarding the relationship between political and economic justice and peace. For example, although the Charter provides for a Trusteeship System and the right of peoples to self-determination, the implementation of the two concepts has been the subject of a twisting process in a manner more in harmony with colonial concepts than with justice and equality for all. The colonial system is fighting back

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

to perpetuate its presence on various grounds quite alien to the spirit and letter of the Charter and in contradiction to the requirements of the new era in human history. The discussions on these problems have sometimes been nothing but an intellectual exercise for the rationalization of a state of affairs which should be denied according to the Charter and international law.

The state of international tension existing in the world for the last ten years and acts of aggression, particularly against small and under-developed countries, are fraught with danger and cannot be rationalized under any moral or political system. This world situation has largely been hidden by censorship and obscured by tendentious propaganda. Nevertheless it should be admitted that the world is moving rapidly towards a realization of the facts, however ugly they are.

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

The small and under-developed countries have realized perhaps more than others the dangers facing them as a result of the conflicts of economic and ideological systems. Most of them have achieved a certain degree of independence and they are embarking on building up their political edifice on sound economic and social bases. They have no interests except to live in peace and to co-operate with the advanced countries on an equal footing. That is why a large number of the Asian-African countries met in Bandung in 1955 to proclaim their charter of coexistence, which requires no repetition here. For the peoples of these countries coexistence has no connotation of any ideological colour whatsoever. It could not be white or red, as these countries are at different levels of economic, social and political development. But it has one meaning: to live in peace and away from any foreign intervention on the pattern of the colonial days. These countries are in the grip of two revolutions -- internal and external. Internally, they wish to build up their economic and social structures on sound and up-to-date principles. Externally, they struggle to free themselves from the shackles of the past, whatever their nature or strength. In this way, when they speak of peaceful coexistence, they are thinking in dynamic terms. In fact, coexistence itself is a dynamic state of the human society, as it admits that, while living in peace, each society is continuously developing its own human and material potentialities and collaborating and competing with others for higher and better results for all.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that the supreme question of our present era is whether we can, by great effort of statesmanship, negotiate an alteration in our economic and conceptual systems to meet the requirements of the world, which is undergoing a radical change under the impact of science, and thus to avert a war of total destruction. The world we are living in is no longer the one born in the nineteenth century. It is a world which is rapidly changing in all respects, and it is even reaching for the moon. Realism, therefore, is the only way to avert catastrophes.

(Mr. Jawad, Iraq)

I should like to terminate by quoting the words of Mr. Walter Lippmann, who said:

"To dramatize the rapid changes in the past 100 years, we might say that through most of the nineteenth century the world capital was London. After the First World War, the world capitals were London and Washington. After the Second World War, the world capitals were Washington, Moscow and London. Now the world capitals are Washington, Moscow, London, Peking, New Delhi and, who knows, perhaps eventually also Cairo."

Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): The item before this Committee calls upon Member States to reaffirm their faith in the fundamentals of the Charter. That is the meaning of the item and the draft resolutions before this Committee, as far as the Ethiopian delegation is concerned. In the discussions concerning this item and the draft resolutions that go with it, many and various appraisals have been made. In the view of the Ethiopian delegation, all these appraisals or criticisms consist of two essentials. Firstly, it is said that the principles of the draft resolution are to be found already in the Charter and that there is no necessity to reaffirm one's determination to abide by them in a resolution of the General Assembly. Secondly, it is said that what is needed at the present time is not a simple declaration of principles to which everyone agrees but to act accordingly, that is to say, to show by deeds and acts one's determination to abide by these principles.

To the Ethiopian delegation, both criticisms are constructive but not compelling enough to lead Member States not to support the draft resolutions. With regard to the first criticism, the reaffirmation of belief in the principles now contained in the draft resolutions from time to time cannot be considered unnecessary, as they do no harm to anyone and may do much good to all Member States. With respect to the second criticism, it is constructive inasmuch as it indicates that such a reaffirmation of determination to abide by these principles should be accompanied by actual deeds. Thus it admits that, having regard to the enormous difficulties of our time, it is in the interests of all Member States to assert in a formal and solemn document the pledge undertaken in the Charter.

(Mr. Gebre-Egzy, Ethiopia)

Apart from these considerations, the principles contained in the draft resolutions have been adopted and thus reaffirmed by the Bandung Conference held in 1955.

It seems, therefore, appropriate to us that the great regions of the world represented here should unanimously renew their desire to live together in harmony and thus uphold the unity of their determination.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, first of all let me add my words of condolence to those expressed to you by the representative of Iraq. Mexicans can share the feelings of your people because unfortunately earthquakes are not unknown in my own country. I trust that the sad news received this morning from Iran will eventually turn out to be exaggerated.

The item that we are discussing is so closely linked with that of disarmament, upon which my delegation has expressed its point of view in great detail, that I believe that it is sufficient for me, in order to explain the position of Mexico, merely to repeat here some of the essentials expounded by the Foreign Minister of my country in the course of the general debate at the beginning of the twelfth regular session of the General Assembly.

Although the title of the item refers to the peaceful coexistence of States, it is very well known to us all that our basic concern is the peaceful coexistence of the great Powers, and especially of those great Powers at present having a monopoly over the devastating atomic and thermonuclear weapons. The reasons for our concern are obvious to all. They lie in the universal feeling of peoples and Governments that the old concept of victor and vanquished has now been swept aside and that a general conflagration today, when such weapons would be used, would cause an unprecedented hecatomb in the world, the ghastly consequences of which would equally affect humanity as a whole. In other words, there seems to be no escape from the dilemma of either living or dying together.

NR/mtm

A/C.1/EV.939
54-55

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

Therefore, even out of pure self-interest based upon the survival of their own people, the so-called super-Powers should do all they possibly can to practise tolerance and to coexist in peace as good neighbours in accordance with the exhortation contained in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations.

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

We are convinced that in order to achieve this it would be enough if the parties adjusted their conduct to the principles and purposes of the Charter itself, and in all good faith fulfil the obligations to which they committed themselves when ratifying the Charter. The wisdom and efficiency of the norms and criteria set forth in the Charter for the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security and for the promotion of friendly co-operation between States should have been sufficiently proved for them not only in the twelve years of existence of the United Nations but also in the longer and more fruitful experience gathered in regional organizations such as the Organization of American States, the main purposes and principles of which coincide, essentially speaking, with those of the United Nations and, in certain specific aspects, go even further than the Charter, especially in the categorical formulation of such subjects.

However, the fact that one might be able to say that the Charter includes everything dealing with fundamental criteria upon which relations between States must be based in order to ensure peaceful coexistence does not in any way mean that one overlooks the need for and timeliness of the General Assembly's emphatically reiterating every now and again those very purposes and principles of our Organization which the circumstances of the moment may have made it somewhat more urgent to fulfil. For such reiteration to be constructive it is, nevertheless, necessary that it shall be made unanimously if possible. In order to achieve such unanimity -- which we believe to be indispensable -- we should avoid principles being presented in such contexts as to lead to any objection or reservation on the part of one or many Member States.

The most feasible procedure, as the chairman of the Mexican delegation pointed out at one of the first plenary meetings of the present session of the Assembly, would be if the smaller nations and middle-sized nations, once again exercising their moderating and conciliating influence, were to take up the task of drafting the corresponding declaration. And that is why the Mexican delegation is extremely pleased to see the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198) submitted to the Committee by the representatives of India, Sweden and Yugoslavia, wherein all the essential ideas of the draft resolution (A/3673) originally submitted by the USSR delegation have been included. The three-Power draft

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

resolution, however, contains certain additional important concepts such as that of the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter and its incorporation in a text which, both in its letter and in its spirit, seems to be unexceptionable and most praiseworthy.

This joint draft declaration, generally speaking, is something in the nature of what was done regarding the disarmament question or, rather, what the Mexican delegation had suggested regarding disarmament when we submitted to the Committee that an appeal should be addressed to the great Powers.

What I have said so far explains the reasons for which my delegation will vote in favour -- very gladly, I would stress -- of the three-Power draft resolution which we trust and hope will receive the unanimous support of our Committee and, in due course, that of the plenary Assembly.

Mr. KITAHARA (Japan): This is not the first time an attempt is being made to adopt a resolution of a general character relating to the problem of reducing international tension and strengthening peace, and thereby reaffirming the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Falling within the same category, for instance, are the resolution (110 (II)) adopted by the second session of the General Assembly on "Measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war", and the resolution (190 (III)) adopted by the third session and containing an appeal to the great Powers to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace.

However, among the various resolutions for the maintenance of peace, perhaps the most representative one reaffirming the Charter of the United Nations was the resolution (290 (IV)) adopted by the fourth session of the Assembly and entitled "Essentials of peace". The resolution declared that the United Nations Charter, the most solemn pact of peace in history, had laid down basic principles necessary for an enduring peace; that disregard of those principles was primarily responsible for the continuance of international tension; and that it was urgently necessary for all Members to act in accordance with them. The Assembly called upon all nations to refrain from the threat or use of force contrary to the Charter and from any threat or act aimed at impairing the independence of any State or at fomenting civil strife, as well as to carry out in good faith their international agreements. All nations were asked to co-operate fully with the United Nations, to promote freedom for the peaceful expression of political

(Mr. Kitahara, Japan)

opposition, and to promote religious freedom and respect for other fundamental human rights. The Assembly called on all Members to join fully in United Nations work, and on the permanent members of the Security Council to broaden their co-operation and to exercise restraint in the use of the veto. Finally, it called for co-operation to attain international regulation of armaments and atomic energy.

So far as its title and its contents are concerned, there is nothing objectionable about this resolution. I am sure that if Japan had been a Member of the United Nations at that time we would not have hesitated to support it. But, reading the record of the debate on this resolution as it was conducted in this Committee and in the plenary Assembly, we had to note, with no little chagrin, the enormous amount of recriminations and counter-recriminations that characterized the discussions. This may well have been due to the fact that one of the great Powers which requested the inclusion in the agenda of the item on "The condemnation of the preparations for a new war and the conclusion of a five-Power pact for the strengthening of peace" had, in initially requesting adoption of the item, already singled out the other two great Powers as targets for condemnation. At any rate, the debate not only reflected the increasing tensions of the cold war but served to widen even more the confrontation between East and West.

(Mr. Kitahara, Japan)

It is indeed an irony that this resolution was adopted and that, before the convening of the next session of the General Assembly, the Korean war broke out. It seems to us a shining example of how a debate on a general resolution can be utilized for propaganda purposes and how little, if any, contribution it can make to the maintenance of peace.

Subsequently, the fifth session of the General Assembly adopted for inclusion in the agenda, also at the request of the Soviet Union, the item entitled, "Declaration on the removal of the threat of a new war and the strengthening of peace and security among the nations." But the General Assembly adopted a different resolution, entitled "Peace through deeds." It reflected the general feeling aroused among the Members by the experience of the Korean war that a mere declaration of principles was pointless and valueless and that what was essential and important for the maintenance of peace was a demonstration by deeds.

In fact, after the outbreak of the Korean conflict, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on "Uniting for peace" and established a Committee on Collective Measures, thus giving its earnest and sincere consideration to a concrete policy of suppressing aggression by the united strength of the Member States. At the same time, it refused to act on or reject such proposals as "Measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to strengthen peace and friendship among the nations." By such a stand, the General Assembly began to assume an attitude opposed to general declarations which had no practical value.

Meanwhile, in 1953, the Korean conflict was suspended by an armistice, and, with the holding of the Geneva Conference in 1954, the tensions of the cold war were to some extent relieved. The United Nations then, with an earnestness never before shown, directed its efforts towards the solution of a concrete problem -- the problem of disarmament -- as a practical means of relieving international tensions, far more meaningful as a contribution to peace than general declarations and slogans.

Yet, the disarmament negotiations, which aroused at one time a sense of hope that they were approaching some settlement, have been driven into the shoals by the declaration of the Soviet Union in the present session of the General Assembly that it will not participate in the Disarmament Commission as it is now composed.

(Mr. Kitahara, Japan)

It may sound presumptuous for a comparatively new Member of the United Nations to review an aspect of the history of this Organization before the many veteran representatives here who actually participated in the debate to which I have referred. I have done so to indicate, as we can say from experience, what can be the value or meaning or consequence of declarations of a general nature, put in the form of a resolution of the General Assembly.

In participating in this debate in the General Assembly, relating to the promotion of peaceful and friendly relations among States, my delegation cannot but refer to the problem of disarmament as a concrete and specific objective for constructive action. I particularly refer to Article 11 of the Charter of the United Nations, which states, in part:

"The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments...".

Unless the adoption of a political declaration here is definitely followed by concrete efforts to achieve progress in such a major area as disarmament, the declaration, lacking substance, would be no more than a dead letter.

In the view of my delegation, a political declaration such as we have before us and a programme of concrete disarmament are two sides of a single coin. They are both useful and indispensable for the maintenance of international peace and security. My delegation earnestly hopes that a political declaration agreed upon by the major Powers concerned and endorsed by all Member States of the United Nations will pave the way to a relaxation of tension in the world. It is also the sincere hope of my delegation that such a relaxation of tension would pave the way for progress in the disarmament negotiations. On the other hand, if we do not follow through our political declaration with deeds, and if we neglect our efforts toward the real achievement of disarmament programmes, the political declarations will be not only useless but also misleading. Here, indeed, is a real opportunity for nations, especially the major Powers, motivated by a genuine desire to contribute to peace, to show by deeds their honest intention to carry out the purposes of the declaration.

(Mr. Kitahara, Japan)

So long as the cold war tensions continue and no concrete effort is made to reduce them, the mere conclusion of a non-aggression treaty or an agreement for friendly co-operation, as recently suggested by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, can amount to no more than an empty gesture. What the situation calls for today is practical down-to-earth efforts to remove the causes of tension.

My delegation believes that settlement of the disarmament problem under the aegis of the United Nations offers a sure means to that end and will contribute immeasurably to the maintenance of peace.

The United Nations General Assembly must not be turned into a resolutions-manufacturing plant where the end product is the resolution and where, once a resolution is turned out, we can all go home and forget about it. Indeed, our responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security are too grave to permit such an attitude. Any resolution must carry with it the will and the intent to follow it up with concrete actions -- with deeds which will bring us closer to our objectives of peace and friendly relations among States. My delegation sincerely hopes that this Committee will be guided by this spirit in acting upon the item now before it. This is the only true way in which the General Assembly can keep the trust placed in it by the peoples of the world.

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAN

Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) (interpretation from French): May I be permitted to express the heartfelt thanks of my delegation to the representatives of Iraq and Mexico, as well as other colleagues, who have spoken to me personally and extended words of sympathy. I will, of course, transmit the expression of these feelings to my Government, and I am sure that the Government and people of Iran will value highly this mark of sympathy, which is the best evidence of international brotherhood.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.