

United Nations

Nations Unies UNRESTRICTED

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLEE  
GENERALE

A/FV 139  
23 September 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Real Distribution

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Third Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,  
on Thursday, 23 September 1948, at 10-30 a.m.

President: Dr. EVATT (AUSTRALIA)

Any corrections of the originals of speeches in this record should be submitted in writing, within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room 3015, Pavillon de tete, Aile Paris, Palais de Chaillot. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper, bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

(Interpretations of speeches will be replaced in the official records by full translations from the originals).

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the one hundred and thirty-ninth meeting of the General Assembly.

#### REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT: The Chairman of the Credentials Committee reports that the Committee has met and is prepared to present its first report.

The Chairman of the Credentials Committee, Mr. Tarasenko, the representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, will present the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

Mr. TARASENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (Interpretation from Russian): The Committee appointed by the General Assembly at its first plenary meeting on 21 September 1948 to examine the credentials of the representatives met in Conference Room 9 of the Palais de Chaillot at 11 a.m. on 22 September 1948.

The Committee consisted of the representatives of Brazil, Burma, Yemen, Iran, Canada, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, France, Sweden and Ecuador. The representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was elected Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee examined the documents submitted to the Secretariat with respect to fifty-eight delegations. The Committee found that the powers conferred upon the representatives of forty-six member States of the United Nations fully satisfied the requirements of Article 23 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The States concerned are the following: Australia, Argentina, Afghanistan, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Belgium, Burma, Brazil, Luxembourg, Venezuela, Haiti, Honduras, Greece, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Yemen, Iran, Iceland, Canada, China, Colombia, the Netherlands, Norway, Costa Rica, Cuba, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, El Salvador, Saudi Arabia, Siam, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Uruguay, the Philippines, France, Czechoslovakia, Chile, Sweden, Ethiopia, Yugoslavia and the Union of South Africa.

The representatives of the Governments of the following member States of the Organization have submitted provisional credentials, which were sent by cable: Bolivia, Guatemala, India, Iraq, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Syria, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Turkey and Ecuador.

The Committee will have an opportunity of examining, in the original, the credentials of the representatives of those Governments which have hitherto submitted provisional credentials. The Committee proposes that, until then, the representatives of those countries be authorised to take their seats with the same rights as all the other representatives.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has heard the report of the Credentials Committee and its proposal that, although certain credentials still have to be submitted, in the meantime the representatives of the countries concerned should be authorised to take their seats with the same rights as other representatives.

As there is no objection to the report, it is adopted.

**NOTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL UNDER ARTICLE 12, PARAGRAPH 2, OF THE CHARTER (document A/649)**

The PRESIDENT: This item consists of the formal presentation to the General Assembly of a notification. The relevant paragraph of the Charter reads as follows:

"The Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, shall notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and shall similarly notify the General Assembly, or the members of the United Nations if the General Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters."

Therefore, in accordance with that Article of the Charter, the Secretary-General has circulated to members the notification referred to. It is to be found in document A/649 and is before the General Assembly for its information.

**OPENING OF THE GENERAL DEBATE**

The PRESIDENT: General Romulo, representative of the Philippines, will address the General Assembly.

General ROMULO (Philippines): For the past several weeks the city of Berlin has been the focus of men's fears. Today, and for the duration of this session of the General Assembly, the city of Paris will be the centre of men's hopes. Our meeting coincides with a turning point in history. We are called upon to decide the momentous issues of our time; whether we shall have war or peace; whether man shall live in larger freedom or under increasing regimentation; whether the nations shall eventually unite into a single community of peoples under a world charter, or divide permanently into armed and hostile camps governed only by the predatory laws of the jungle.

These, in essence, are the problems that confront us. They involve the fate of every man, woman and child now living as well as of generations yet unborn. There is something supremely ironic and yet touching in the way by which events have persisted in demonstrating the world's need for the United Nations. Every international problem that has defied solution by individual states has come before us, as to a court of last appeal - the problems of atomic energy, Greece, Iran, Egypt, South Africa, Korea, Indonesia, Kashmir, Palestine, Czechoslovakia, the former Italian Colonies, and perhaps, before we adjourn, the gravest and most difficult problem of all, the quarrel of the great powers over Germany.

Inadequate as its efforts have often proved to be, hampered by indifference and sometimes by a deliberate intent to thwart its efforts, the United Nations yet remains as mankind's chief and perhaps its last hope for universal peace, freedom and security. It is an experience at once humbling and inspiring to realize that we represent at this moment the only force that can stand between the peoples of the world and the catastrophe that threatens to engulf them. May this thought guide and sustain us as we begin this crucial session of the General Assembly.

War is the great, the overriding problem before us. The danger is no longer remote or hypothetical. It is real, and it grows with every passing hour. War is on the march in Asia. It chafes angrily under the uneasy truce of Palestine, and stalks with iron tread the Continent of Europe. We meet under its shadow. We cannot ignore it, any more than we can ignore a time-bomb ticking away at our feet. Even as we deliberate here on the problem of peace, some of the great powers arm and gird for war.

We have no power to impose peace. But we do have the moral authority to demand it. I am sure that I speak not only for my own nation but for the people of every other country as well when I say that we do not want war, that we consider it to be neither necessary nor

inevitable, and that we believe the powers directly concerned can avert it if they will to do so.

We need no new formula for peace. We have one in our *cwa* Charter, in which we pledge;

"to live together in peace... to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest."

We have not only the formula, but the rules and the procedures to make it work. It is the resolution, the will to implement it, that is lacking.

The Philippine delegation calls upon the great powers to make a fresh and determined effort not only to resolve their present quarrels without recourse to arms, but to find some means whereby they could live in peace long enough to give mankind a chance to build, through the United Nations, stronger safeguards for the security and well-being of all. We make this plea for their sake as much as for ours. War will solve nothing; it can only destroy everything we value. Such is the destructive power of modern weapons that to lose the peace now is to risk losing all.

We, the small nations, for our part can help to avert war by pooling our strength and wielding our collective influence as a third force dedicated to the cause of peace. Less involved than the great powers in the snares of the grim struggle for the political and economic mastery of the world, we, the small nations, are in a better position to represent the true will and the real interests of mankind. We call upon them to close ranks and present a solid front against any attempt to undermine the peace.

The past three years have witnessed the growth, within the United Nations, of a healthy tendency on the part of the small countries to act in conformity with these objectives. The time has come, I believe, for them to assert themselves more completely, to oppose any scheme or manoeuvre which would serve the interests of any single state or group of states at the expense of others to act for the common good whenever the occasion demands or the opportunity should arise.

The conscience of the world deserves a stronger voice than has spoken for it during the past three years. Let the small nations, speaking in unison, be that voice. The mute millions, the common people of the world, expendable in war, forgotten in peace, cry out for a true and steadfast champion. Let the small nations, acting in concert, be the advocate of their cause and the guardian of their welfare.

The great powers, their hands tied by the inexorable demands of power politics, have been unable to make the peace. The sum total of their achievements is a political stalemate, a precarious balance between the possibility of peace and the prospect of war. It may be that the small nations using wisely their moral power, pitting all the weight of their combined influence against war, may yet tip the balance on the side of peace.

One of the saddest chapters in the United Nations record of the past more than three years is that which recounts the long and fruitless efforts to devise a universally acceptable formula for the organization of a United Nations police force, the regulation of armaments and the control of atomic energy. The Security Council, which is charged with the task of drawing up plans in these three vital fields, has admitted the futility of its endeavours up to the present time.

The absence of a United Nations police force has but recently resulted in a tragedy that has shocked the conscience of the world. This grievous incident has served to dramatize the danger that is inherent in a situation wherein the United Nations has assumed responsibility for resolving conflicts while possessing no real authority to implement its decisions. Yet this deficiency springs not from the Charter itself, since the latter provides measures for implementation as clearly and adequately as it sets forth functions and objectives. It springs rather from the habit of pursuing the line of least resistance leading to the partial and half-hearted application of our fundamental law; for, as it is easier to recommend a course of action than to resolve upon its execution, so has it been easier, for instance, to observe Article 39 than to apply Article 43 of the Charter.

On the question of atomic energy the stalemate is complete. The one Power which today is in full possession of the secret of the atomic bomb has generously agreed to surrender its monopoly on the sole condition that there must first be established a system of international inspection and control. This reasonable proposal, which is nothing less than a supreme renunciation, has met with a counter-proposal that all existing atomic weapons should first be outlawed and destroyed before any plan for establishing a control organ with limited powers of inspection is to be considered at all.

These two utterly contradictory proposals speak for themselves. In passing upon their respective merits, one is moved to make the candid observation that there is certainly a far greater measure of sincerity in that Power which, having the bomb, would stand to lose an enormous advantage under the terms of its own proposal to establish an international authority with adequate powers of inspection and control. On the other hand, the sincerity of any Power is open to grave doubt which, not being in possession of the bomb, desires merely to bind the hands of its possessor, while leaving its own free to discover the secret of its manufacture behind the screen of an international convention and an ineffectual system of control and inspection.

Negotiations are at a standstill. Are we prepared to admit total failure in this all-important phase of the United Nations' master-plan for peace?

We are told that no substantial progress can be achieved in the areas where there exist major conflicts of power unless a genuine political settlement is first reached between East and West. It is said, furthermore, that such a settlement can only be reached in an atmosphere of mutual confidence that will lend itself to honest and fruitful negotiations.

We move in a vicious circle which must be cut somewhere. We must make a fresh start. We must call upon the Great Powers to put resolutely behind them the dangerous methods of challenge and reprisal and to return to the saner methods of negotiation and compromise. If it seems ignoble to step down from the high plane of undeviating principle let it be remembered that agreement upon the humbler plane of negotiation has often in the past given the world long periods of relative stability. We need such a period now to enable us to lay the foundations of a just and durable peace.

Peace, as I have said, is our paramount concern. But the problem of peace is inseparable from the problem of freedom. And freedom, too, is under attack in many parts of the world -- sometimes openly and brutally by external forces, more often insidiously by the slow, corrosive action of internal decay.

To meet this dual danger, we must act promptly and decisively on two levels. We must deal uncompromisingly with every threat to or violation of freedom. At the same time, we must foster and carry through all the activities directed at the correction of the deep-seated social, economic and political maladjustments which make a mockery of the principles of liberty and equality. In the first category, I should give first importance to the problems of Indonesia, Greece, and Korea, and the questions concerning trust and non-self-governing territories. In the second category, I should include all the work of the Economic and Social Council, particularly in the field of human rights, freedom of information, genocide and the prevention of discrimination against minorities, the cultural and social welfare projects, the plans of the various economic commissions for regional economic development and the promotion of international trade.

The Economic and Social Council has done much useful work in laying the foundation for economic security, social stability and enduring peace. The criticism may be levelled against the Council.



that it is trying to do too much. But it may not be accused of inaction, or futility. Though it may well be necessary to trim the tropical proliferation of the activities of the Council in the hope of a more abundant harvest of results, it would be most unwise to try to reduce its authority or to otherwise hamper its operation and render it ineffectual.

The Economic and Social Council has demonstrated that social and economic security, without which freedom is illusory and peace can not long endure, are world problems which can be solved only by international action. Through the rapid progress of its labours, it has far out-paced the development of political stability in the world and thereby created a situation wherein the pattern of universal peace, prosperity and freedom is now virtually complete, even while the Great Powers are still debating whether to let humanity live or die.

Through the Human Rights Commission and the Conference on Freedom of Information, progress has been made in defining and enlarging the scope of the rights and freedom of man. The text of a proposed Declaration on Human Rights and the various conventions and resolutions guaranteeing freedom of information await final action by the General Assembly. They constitute a vital portion of the pattern of peace and freedom, to which I have referred, whose validity does not depend on the conflicts and prejudices of the moment. They call for immediate action, and, on no pretext whatever should they be made to await a prior political settlement.

Though fear and suspicion may tarry a while, the forward march of humanity towards freedom as an end desirable in itself must remain unimpeded.

Another bright page in the United Nations record of the past two years is that which deals with the evolution of the principle of trusteeship for the backward areas of the world. In the Trusteeship Council we have a body which has demonstrated its fidelity to a new revolutionary concept: the principle that the welfare of the inhabitants of the territories is the collective responsibility of the international community. The reports of the administering authorities have been examined and their policies subjected to the most rigorous scrutiny. Petitions from the inhabitants have been considered and visiting missions organized. The steady progress of the trusteeship system under the supervision of the Trusteeship Council indeed represents a high-water mark of political morality in the modern world.

I refer to this progress in terms of the highest praise, remembering that it has not been achieved without a struggle. The struggle that was begun in San Francisco still continues. One would suppose that a tendency to place all non-self-governing territories under the trusteeship system would be the logical consequence of the evolving principle and practice of trusteeship. But, as we are all aware, a reaction has begun to set in and there is now a contrary tendency to annex former mandates or to convert them into colonies.

The General Assembly has more than once categorically indicated its opposition to this regressive tendency and I feel certain that it will never encourage or permit such designs to prosper.

Many non-self-governing territories in Asia and the Far East today are torn by political turmoil and violence. The governments against which these risings are directed are under strong temptation to brand them all as foreign-inspired and thus discredit them and justify the ruthless use of force.

There is undoubtedly some truth in the accusation. To condemn them all on this account, however, would be an unfair and dangerous oversimplification. They nearly always are motivated by legitimate grievances or aspirations, including political independence and social and economic change, which could have been met by the institution of judicious reforms.

It is not an easy matter to apportion responsibility for these violent upheavals. Chapter XI of the Charter sets forth the pattern of just and enlightened treatment for the inhabitants of non-self-governing territories. To the extent that these peoples are wilfully denied

such treatment, the metropolitan powers must assume responsibility for the violence and for their defection from the democratic fold. But to the extent that these peoples may have allowed themselves to be misled by the illusory promises of an anti-democratic ideology and to become the tools of a foreign power seeking its own selfish ends, they alone are to blame for their tragic misfortunes.

The true goal of all dependent peoples is freedom and not enslavement by a new master.

The last war brought about a revolution in values. In the darkest days of the struggle, when it seemed as though the sun of freedom might go down to shine no more upon this earth, a new concept of the relations between men and among nations took shape. Confronted by a common danger, the peoples of the United Nations began to think and plan as the enemy's attacks had already forced them to act: on a global scale and in terms of the enduring welfare of mankind.

Greater and more significant than any military victory was this liberation and enlargement of the human spirit. The hour of travail that saw the death of millions and the devastation of wide areas of the world witnessed also the birth of new hope for a life of greater freedom and security for all peoples.

Idealism played its part in the creation of the United Nations. But the decisive factor was the realization that peace could no longer rest securely on the old foundations. A new order of international relations had to be established. Events demonstrated again and again that the requirements of peace, economic security, cultural progress, and social stability hold the nations in bonds of inter-dependence which political cleavage cannot sunder without disastrous consequences. Every international crisis, every act of aggression, every case of oppression or injustice but served to dramatize the need for a new order based upon enforceable world law.

This must remain our goal. If it seems remote and inaccessible at this hour, the fault lies not with our hearts but with the circumstances which for the moment have disturbed our vision and concealed it from view. All that humanity needs, all that it asks for, is that the ominous cloud be lifted, that it be given a little time to take its bearings and work out its own salvation, and the chance to live.

The General Assembly has not the power to grant this boon. But it has the moral authority to demand it of those that have the power to do so. Let us, therefore, in the course of our deliberations, make it unmistakably clear that this is our purpose who speak for peoples whose innermost desire is peace.

MW/kav

A/FY 139  
18-20

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Marshall, representative of the United States of America, will address the General Assembly.

Mr. MARSHALL (United States of America): We are particularly happy to meet here in Paris. France has, through the centuries, nourished the arts and sciences for the enrichment of all mankind and its citizens have striven persistently for expanding freedom for the individual. It is entirely fitting that this General Assembly, meeting in France which fired the hearts of men with the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789, should consider in 1948 the approval of a new Declaration of Human Rights for free men in a free world.

Not only is it appropriate that we should here re-affirm our respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms but that we should renew our determination to develop and protect those rights and freedoms. Freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of opinion and expression, freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, the right of a people to choose their own government, to take part in its work, and, if they become dissatisfied with it, to change it, the obligation of government to act through law -- these are some of the elements that combine to give dignity and worth to the individual.

The Charter of the United Nations reflects these concepts and expressly provides for the promotion and protection of the rights of man as well as for the rights of nations. This is no accident. For in the modern world the association of free men within a free state is based upon the obligation of citizens to respect the rights of their fellow citizens. And the association of free nations in a free world is based upon the obligation of all states to respect the rights of other nations.

Systematic and deliberate denials of basic human rights lie at the root of most of our troubles and threaten the work of the United Nations. It is not only fundamentally wrong that millions of men and women live in daily terror of secret police, subject to seizure, imprisonment or forced labour without just cause and without fair trial, but these wrongs have repercussions in the community of nations. Governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other nations and other people, and are likely to seek their objectives by coercion and force in the international field.

The maintenance of these rights and freedoms depends upon adherence to the abiding principles of justice and morality embodied in the rule of law. It will therefore always be true that those members of the United Nations which strive with sincerity of purpose to live by the Charter, and to conform to the principles of justice and law proclaimed by that Charter, will be those states which are genuinely dedicated to the preservation of the dignity and integrity of the individual.

Let this Third Regular Session of the General Assembly approve by an overwhelming majority the Declaration of Human Rights as a standard of conduct for all; and let us, as Members of the United Nations, conscious of our own shortcomings and imperfections, join our effort in good faith to live up to this high standard.

Our aspirations must take into account men's practical needs -- improved living and working conditions, better health, economic and social advancement for all, and the social responsibilities which these entail. The United Nations is pledged in the Charter to promote:

"higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development".

The Secretary-General has devoted a considerable part of his Annual Report to the nature of the progress thus far made in this field. It is evident from the record that we can be encouraged by what is being done. The United Nations is directly engaged in efforts to alleviate the social and economic disorder and destruction resulting from the war. The International Refugee Organization is giving assistance to displaced persons. The International Children's Emergency Fund is providing emergency aid to children and mothers over wide areas. As a part of the United Nations' efforts to increase productivity by applying new and advanced techniques, the Food and Agriculture Organization is broadening the use of improved seeds and fertilizers. The tuberculosis project jointly sponsored by the World Health Organization and the International Children's Emergency Fund represents another example of the constructive work of our Organization.

Through the United Nations we are seeking to combine our efforts to promote international trade, to solve the difficulties of foreign exchange, to facilitate the voluntary migration of peoples, and to increase the flow of information and ideas across national boundaries. The International Trade Organization Charter would establish procedures for expanding multilateral trade, with the goal of raising living standards and maintaining full employment. The conference on Freedom of Information and the Press was responsible for three conventions now before this Assembly which embody principles and procedures for expanding the exchange of information. It is our hope that the Assembly will give these conventions thoughtful and favourable consideration.

While the United Nations and its related agencies are increasingly helpful in the economic and social field, primary responsibility for improving standards of living will continue to rest with the governments and peoples themselves. International organizations can not take the place of national and personal effort, or of local initiative and individual imagination. International action can not replace self-help, nor can we move toward general cooperation without maximum mutual help among close neighbours.

The United Nations was not intended to preclude cooperative action among groups of states for common purposes consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It has been disappointing that efforts at economic recovery consistent with this concept have been actively opposed by some who seem to fear the return of stability and confidence. We must not be misled by those who, in the name of revolutionary slogans, would prevent reconstruction and recovery or hold out illusions of future well-being at the price of starvation and disorder today.

A year ago I expressed the view to the General Assembly that: "a supreme effort is required from us all if we are to succeed in breaking through the vicious circles of deepening political and economic crises".

I believe that most of us in this Organization have sought to make such an effort - and that this is beginning to bring results.

Despite the cooperative action of most nations to rebuild peace and well-being, tension during the past year has increased. The leaders of the other nations are creating a deep rift between their countries and the rest of the world community. We must not allow that rift to widen any further, and we must redouble our efforts to find a common ground. Let us go back to the Charter, to words that were solemnly written by the peoples of the United Nations while the tragedy of war was vividly stamped on their minds.

"We the peoples of the United Nations," says the Charter, are "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ... and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours."

Three years later, we are confronted with the need to save not only succeeding generations, but our own.

The first purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security, and to that end all Members are pledged to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

We are pledged to seek an accommodation by which different cultures, different laws, different social and economic structures and different political systems can exist side by side without violence, subversion or intimidation.

An elementary requirement is that international obligations be respected and that relations among states be based on mutual confidence, respect and tolerance. How can we establish among governments and peoples the confidence which is necessary to a just and stable peace and which is basic to the work of the United Nations? The need at this session of the General Assembly and in subsequent months is to achieve, or at least to move nearer, a settlement of the major issues which now confront us. For its part, the United States is prepared to seek in every possible way, in any appropriate forum a constructive and peaceful settlement of the political controversies which contribute to the present tension and uncertainty.

I do not wish to deal at this time with the details of any particular issue, but there are broad lines along which a just and equitable settlement of each of these questions might be reached. Some of these matters are on the agenda of the United Nations; others such as those dealing with the peace settlements, are to be dealt with in other forums. Nevertheless, whatever the forum, as Members of the United Nations, we are all subject to the principles of the Charter.

If we want to have peace we must settle the issues arising out of the last war. The Charter was written with the expectation that the solution of the problems before the United Nations would not be made more difficult by long delay in completing the peace settlements.

We should, therefore, make every effort to achieve an early and just peace settlement so that Japan and Germany may exist as democratic and peaceful nations, subject to safeguards against the revival of military or economic means of aggression, and so that they may in due course demonstrate their qualification for admission to membership in the United Nations. In Austria our aim is the restoration of its political and economic freedom within its 1937 frontiers, and its immediate admission as a Member of the United Nations.

Other questions affecting world peace are now before the United Nations, some of them before this General Assembly. We believe that the ends to be sought on these matters may be briefly summarized as follows:

A Palestine free from strife and the threat of strife, with both the Jews and Arabs assured the peaceful development envisaged by the



actions of the General Assembly and the Security Council; an early demobilization of armed forces to permit the return to conditions of peace and normal living in Palestine; the repatriation of refugees who wish to return and live in peace with their neighbours; economic aid to Jews and Arabs to restore and strengthen their economic well-being; the admission of Transjordan and Israel to membership in the United Nations.

A unified and independent Korea, accepted as a Member of the United Nations, acting under a constitution and a government selected by the Koreans themselves through free elections, and receiving the economic and political encouragement which it will need as it embarks upon its new life as a Korean nation.

A Greece made secure from aggressive and unlawful interference from without; ordering its political life by the democratic process and by respect for law; enabled to rebuild its economy and to provide its people the essentials of a decent life which they have been without for so long.

A negotiated settlement without further bloodshed in Indonesia, along the broad lines of the Renville Agreement, providing within a brief period both the sovereign independence sought by the peoples of Indonesia and continued co-operation between them and the people of the Netherlands.

Continuation of the mediation and negotiation between the great nations of India and Pakistan with respect to Kashmir, in order that the processes of peaceful settlement may bring to a conclusion an issue which has been charged with great dangers.

The early adoption of an international system for the control of atomic energy, providing for the elimination of atomic weapons from national armaments, for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only, and for safeguards to insure compliance by all nations with the necessary international measures of control.

Under adequate and dependable guaranty against violation, a progressive reduction in armaments as rapidly as the restoration of political confidence permits.

Other situations or problems might be mentioned, but if constructive steps are taken toward the settlement of those which have been indicated, new hope would arise among men and new confidence among the nations of the world. It will be readily seen that the above pattern is toward peace. No governments or peoples who work toward such ends can be held to be seeking war, or imperialist

expansion, or disorder and strife.

We have noted with particular interest the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the United Nations relating to the millions of people who are not yet fully self-governing. We are mindful of the obligations undertaken in the Charter for the political, economic and social development of these peoples. We believe that all possible assistance and encouragement should be given to them, to the end that they may play their full part in the family of nations, either as independent states or in freely chosen association with other states.

In our efforts toward political settlement we must continue to improve the functioning of the machinery of the United Nations. We hope that the Security Council will proceed to recommend during this session of the General Assembly the admission of additional new members. There are a number of fully qualified states, now awaiting admission, whose election has been supported by the United States but has been blocked for reasons not consistent with the Charter. The most recent applicant, Ceylon, one of the new states to emerge in Southern Asia, has been denied the membership to which it properly aspires.

The report of the Interim Committee on the problem of voting in the Security Council represents the first comprehensive study of this vital problem since San Francisco, and contains the views of an overwhelming majority of the members. The work of the Security Council would be greatly facilitated if the recommendations of the Interim Committee could be accepted by the members of the Council.

The Interim Committee itself has worked usefully and effectively during the past year and can continue to render an important service to the General Assembly. We hope that the General Assembly will agree to its continuation for another year in order to give us more experience before deciding whether it should become a permanent part of our Organization.

The United States joins in expressing great appreciation to those individuals who have served on United Nations missions during the past year, either as members of national delegations or of the Secretariat. These representatives in the field have served with courage and devotion to duty. Their service has been rendered under conditions of great hardship and personal danger. We have been given a particularly solemn reminder of these conditions by the tragic death of Count Folke Bernadotte and Colonel Serot at the hands of assassins. The people of the

United States join in tribute to the man who worked brilliantly and courageously as the United Nations Mediator in Palestine. We pay tribute also to those others who have lost their lives in the service of peace.

We believe that the General Assembly should give sympathetic consideration to the suggestions of the Secretary-General for the establishment of a small United Nations guard force to assist United Nations missions engaged in the pacific settlement of disputes. The fate of the Mediator in Palestine and the experience of the several commissions already working in the field have already demonstrated the need for such a group. This great world Organization should not send its servants on missions of peace without reasonable protection. The guards would be entirely distinct from the armed forces envisaged under Article 43 and would not carry out military operations. They could, however, perform important services in connection with United Nations missions abroad not only as guards but as observers and as communications and transportation personnel.

One of the principal purposes of the United Nations, according to Article 1, is "to be a centre for harmonising the actions of nations" in the attainment of the common ends set forth in the Charter. The problem of making and keeping the peace involves many governments and many peoples. On the issues which call for settlement, the large powers as well as the small must submit their policies to the judgment of the world community. For this purpose appropriate forums have been established for the adjustment of differences through the impartial opinions of the international society. This process has been seriously hampered by the refusal of a group of nations to participate in certain of the important commissions established by the General Assembly, such as the Balkan Commission, the Korean Commission, and the Interim Committee.

More important than this boycott, however, is the disturbing lack of co-operation which the United Nations has received in its efforts to resolve such questions as Korea and Greece and to bring about the international control of atomic energy. This persistent refusal of a small minority to contribute to the accomplishment of our agreed purposes is a matter of profound concern.

There is no plot among Members of this Organization to keep any nation or group of nations in a minority. The minority position is self-imposed. The record shows that there are no mechanical majorities at the disposal of any nation or group of nations. Majorities form quickly in support of the principles of the Charter. Nations consistently in the minority would be welcome among the ranks of the majority -- but not at the price of compromise on basic principle.

The United Nations has sought to promote the free exchange of ideas on a basis of full reciprocity. The effort is of the greatest political importance. Any government which by deliberate action cuts itself and its people off from the rest of the world becomes incapable of understanding the problems and policies of other governments and other peoples. It would be a tragic error if, because of such misunderstanding, the patience of others should be mistaken for weakness.

The United States does not wish to increase the existing tension. It is its wholehearted desire to alleviate that tension, but we will not compromise essential principles. We will under no circumstances barter away the rights and the freedoms of other peoples. We earnestly hope that all Members will find ways of contributing to the lessening of tensions and the promotion of peace with justice. The peoples of the earth are anxiously watching our efforts here. We must not disappoint them.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Modzelewski, representative of Poland, will address the General Assembly.

Mr. MODZELEWSKI (Poland) (Interpretation from French):

First of all on behalf of the Polish delegation I should like to thank the Government and the people of France, and also the people of Paris, for having made possible the meeting of the Third Regular Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris. I am convinced that our discussions will be favourably affected by the atmosphere of this city, with its splendid tradition in the struggle for liberty, which has known itself the consequences of Fascist aggression.

The report of the Secretary-General for the past year includes a very great number of problems. In the present statement the Polish delegation will take a certain position with respect to some of those problems, mainly those which in our view are of general interest in the cause of peace and for the development of the Organization.

Any objective observer must have been able to note the growth, during the period covered by the last report, of tendencies which threaten to jeopardise the authority of the United Nations. These tendencies find expression particularly in attempts to subordinate the Organization to the interests of a single power or a group of powers. And they also find expression in a lack of respect for decisions adopted by the United Nations in accordance with the Charter, as well as in attempts to modify the structure of the United Nations.

I have touched upon these problems from the very outset because I wish to stress that the Polish Government remains convinced of the need to reinforce and strengthen the prestige of the United Nations. Therefore, during this Session as during the past, we are determined to defend the Charter of the United Nations and to lend our support to any effort designed to achieve the purposes of the United Nations and to turn the Organization into an efficient instrument for the defence of peace throughout the world.

The Report of the Secretary-General makes it quite clear that the suspension of the activities of the Council of Foreign Ministers with regard to the German problem has been, directly or indirectly, the cause of all the deadlocks and of all the failures of the United Nations during the past year. Nevertheless the Report is silent about the true cause of this state of affairs, which is a direct consequence of the abandonment of the fundamental principles of co-operation which were set forth at the time when the United Nations was being established. Anyone who has

read the Report knows that for a good reason it does not deal with the substance of the problem -- since the problem of peace with Germany is not within the competence of the United Nations. It is, however, regrettable that the Secretariat contemplates the possibility of bringing this problem before the United Nations.

Permit the delegation of Poland, representing as it does a neighbour country of Germany and one which was the first victim of German aggression, to refer here in particular to this part of the Report of the Secretary-General. No doubt the German problem is of primary importance for the cause of peace in Europe and throughout the world. Everyone who desires a stable peace is therefore interested in the highest degree in finding a just and durable solution of the German problem.

The neighbours of Germany -- the direct neighbours of Germany -- are that much more interested in this problem. As for us, the representatives of Poland, we have been and we still are of the opinion that the settlement of the German problem will be just and equitable only if it is a result of an understanding among the four Powers represented in the Council of Foreign Ministers. We also hold the view that such a solution is possible. We have already expressed this conviction in the course of previous sessions.

Later on, and particularly in February of this year, we were confronted with the evident danger of a dismemberment of Germany as a result of the Frankfurt decisions which created a new German state called Bizonia. At that time, the Polish Government, concerned about this fact, took the initiative of calling a conference of three countries at Prague. The result of that Prague Conference was a warning against the dangers inherent in a settlement of the German problem in a separatist spirit, which is the very spirit espoused by the Western neighbours of Germany who were pushed on to that road by the interests of certain groups beyond the Atlantic. This warning was not heeded. Contrariwise, the London conversations placed the seal on the dismemberment of Germany and, from the very beginning, this caused an acute conflict in Berlin.

The Polish Government reacted to this policy by convoking a conference of eight interested powers in Warsaw. This was done in agreement with the Government of the USSR. This Conference elaborated a realistic programme for the peaceful settlement of the German problem. This is the only positive programme for peace with Germany which exists so far. It constitutes a further development of the peace programme of Potsdam.

As events have proved, the Warsaw decisions have not lost any of their timeliness. On the contrary, a new confirmation of their realism was given by the very need which arose of having the conversations of the four Powers which took place in Moscow. These facts persist despite that illusory airlift which is nothing but a sequel of the unilateral policy which resulted from the London decisions. Nobody can justify the economic absurdity of supplying coal to Berlin by way of an airlift. It is perfectly clear that those planes have taken more away from Berlin than they have brought into Berlin. No rational economic policy can justify the squandering of goods and, along the same lines, no one can justify the division of a city into separate sectors which have different economic systems, different monetary systems, and different administrative set-ups. Attempts of this kind are the deeds of those who are anxious not only to dismember Berlin, but who are anxious to dismember Germany as a whole, and who are not very much concerned with the problem of European peace.

Nevertheless, and in spite of everything, peace remains the great concern of the Polish delegation, and I am persuaded that it is the great concern of

all those who experienced the terrible aftermath of the last war. It is the concern of all those who do not want to see another war.

What then is the substance of the problem? We have always been persuaded that the implementation of the so-called European Reconstruction Plan will show its true meaning by itself, and today it has become clear for everybody that this Plan is designed, among other things, to achieve the reconstruction of Western Germany. This Plan is designed to create a vassal, a satellite Germany prepared to go on again upon the path of aggression. The encouragement of German revisionists in the Western zones, revisionists recruited from among former nazis, as well as the abandonment of the dismantling of German war factories, reparations, and the abandonment of denazification, are more and more proof of that same tendency. All this is designed to achieve one purpose. This purpose is to turn Western Germany into a vassal and obedient tool of its creators, a bastion of reaction and revisionism, which will be able to serve as a springboard for the warmongers who are attempting to implement their plan of world conquest. One might add that the same policy, in a slightly different form, is being pursued in Japan, and we might add that in several other countries fascists, or their side-kicks, have the support of war elements and Governmental elements.

This makes it clear that the decisions of the United Nations have been disregarded; decisions to the effect that warmongers should be condemned have been disregarded. The decisions that there should be no tolerance of warmongers have also been disregarded.

I think that the present Session will proceed to a thorough study of this problem, basing itself upon the only just principle, namely, that in order to work for peace one must not only condemn warmongers morally, but the General Assembly must go <sup>to</sup> the very roots of warmongering and it must categorically oppose such groups as are interested in war. In this direction, the United Nations could definitely do much more than it has done until now. For instance, would it not have been to the advantage of the activities of the United Nations if it would have shown more interest in the Congress of Intellectuals in Defense of Peace, which recently was held in the Polish City of Wroclaw? Should not the United Nations support, without hesitation, every real effort in the fight against war?

The last year has also brought a great disappointment for the United Nations as regards the implementation of the Resolution of 14 December 1946, in connection with disarmament, disarmament with respect to atomic weapons and with respect to other weapons. We are embarking upon this Session without any positive results in this field of such great importance, and what is even worse, we have to admit that even the first steps which were made for the purpose of disarmament, have been entirely abandoned. In fact, the Atomic



Energy Commission has suspended its work altogether. The Commission for Conventional Armaments has not yielded any results either. How can we explain these failures of the two Commissions? I think it is sufficient to look at the ever-growing estimates of armament expenditures in some states. It is sufficient to look at the ever-soaring profits of Wall Street bankers and brokers who have an interest in the munition industries. These figures explain the failures of the Commissions for Disarmament.

Our view, however, is that here, in this General Assembly, it is not such voices which must be decisive. The General Assembly must raise its own voice in order to drown out and silence the false and ingeniously produced alarms to the effect that war is inevitable. We hope, therefore, that our present Session will not only thoroughly examine the problem of disarmament, but that it will accept suitable and categorical recommendations in this field.

In connection with disarmament, or rather the failure of it, I do not want to refer in detail to what I said in the Assembly of last year, namely, that my country has reduced its military expenditure to nearly one-third of its pre-war estimates. We have been able to achieve this because we have based our policy not only on the necessity but also on the possibility and the likelihood of maintaining peace. Obviously, we have also been able to achieve this because we recognize the principle that different economic and social systems can co-exist side by side, and also because we do not wish to impose our own principles on any one else, although we are convinced that these principles are superior. It would be to the advantage of the authority of the United Nations if we adopted the same method for our present deliberations. It would also be an advantage for the United Nations if the Organization would confirm this principle, strongly and unequivocally, as the only right one. That it would be easier indeed to achieve the unanimity of the great Powers, which is still subjected to attack and sniping, and which still remains the cornerstone of the existence of the United Nations.

I shall now turn to some other issues which are mentioned in the Report of the Secretary-General.

I shall not deal especially with events in Asia which, apart from the state of war in Indonesia, have recently occurred in other areas where peoples hitherto oppressed, claim the right of self-determination due to them, and are raising their voice and demanding such self-determination. I shall, however, deal with such issues which were discussed at our previous Session.

The Greek problem was discussed from the very beginning of the existence of the United Nations. Already, at its initial stage, the Polish delegation held the view that the Greek people ought to be free to decide their fate for themselves.

We thought, and we still think, that foreign troops must be withdrawn from Greece and that outside intervention must cease. For three years bitter fighting has been going on in Greece. This fighting has been spreading devastation throughout the country, and it has destroyed thousands of human lives. Billions of pounds sterling and of dollars have been spent, but to no avail. The Greek nation does not want to accept the dictatorship which has been imposed upon it from outside and which is causing unrest on Greece's frontiers with her neighbours. The Greek people refuse to reconcile themselves with the cruel terror and the mass executions, and that is why there is no end to the fighting.

We have, therefore, been fully justified in refusing to participate in the Special Balkan Commission, and similarly we have been opposed to the discussion of its report here. We have done so because we refuse to support in any way the policy of intervention in favour of foreign, non-Greek interests. We maintain our view that only the withdrawal of British troops and the abandoning of American intervention can restore peace to Greece. The high command of the democratic forces has for a long time called for a just peace. This voice should find support in the United Nations, as its genuine and only purpose is the maintenance of peace.

The delegation of Poland has come to the United Nations with a proposal to put the issue of Franco Spain on the agenda of the present session. We have done so because the authority of the United Nations demands the most scrupulous execution of its decisions, taken in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. Unfortunately, the Resolutions of 12 December 1946 and of 17 November 1947 have not been carried out. Recently, there were even signs that some of the member States of the United Nations tried to strengthen the Fascist regime in Spain. This move, of course, is not unselfish. I could refer to many instances of infiltration into Spain, of an economic, political and military character, which render the danger spot created by the Fascist dictatorship of Franco even more acute.

The issue of peace is at stake. Fascism and its adventurers have always been a danger to peace. I hope that the present session will seriously consider measures designed to implement the United Nations' own decisions. These measures must lead to the removal of the remnants of Hitler's New Order, which collapsed in Europe with its military defeat, but whose traces remain a tragedy of the noble peace- and freedom-loving people of Spain.

The issue of Palestine was decided upon in a resolution of the Second Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. If, during the period under review, instead of paralyzing this decision, the United Nations had dealt with its implementation, this would have in effect contributed to its great success and strengthened its authority. Unfortunately, the defenders of selfish interests -- mostly oil interests -- using all sorts of designs, instead of implementing this resolution have attempted, and still attempt, to prevent the implementation of the decisions taken. That is why, up to the present time, there is no peace in Palestine -- no peace, although peace is so badly needed by Arabs and Jews alike.

And yet our resolution adopted last year has stood the test of life. No one can deny that the Jewish State of Israel has come into being, that it exists and that it shows proof of vitality. I believe that if the Jewish and Arab populations had been allowed to solve the problem themselves, they would have managed far better. Therefore, the present session of the General Assembly should not forget this and should not allow any deviation from the just road of a peaceful and final settlement of the Palestine problem, which should be crowned by the admission of the State of Israel into the United Nations.

May I now devote a few words to the economic and social work of our Organization.

In spite of the fact that the so-called Plan for European Reconstruction -- otherwise known as the Marshall Plan -- has come into operation outside the province of the United Nations and even contrary to the principles of the United Nations, the Report of the Secretary-General deals with it, and what is even more astonishing, for reasons unknown it deals with it in a positive way. We all know today that the Marshall Plan has above all a political character. Its economic premises have not been meant to reconstruct Europe. The inner contradictions of the Plan itself have already been exposed, producing, among other things, economic degradation instead of the promised prosperity.

Poland, as is known, has decided to remain outside the Marshall Plan. We did not want and do not want to share in the reconstruction of an aggressive Western Germany, dependent on the will of big finance bankers. We are for a democratization of Germany. The very fact of our rejection of the Marshall Plan has made it possible for us to establish and carry out our own Polish plan of reconstruction. All other European countries which did not accept the Marshall Plan are in a similar position. I think that this view will be shared by the representatives of a majority of the countries represented here.

In its direct implications, so obvious today, the Marshall Plan has divided Europe and attempts to divide the whole world into countries of different categories. For political purposes, it tries to regulate and to control the flow of trade between the United States and the so-called Marshall aid countries, as well as other countries. At the same time, it tries to gain complete control of trade between the Marshall Plan countries and other countries. It thus introduces everywhere a system of privileged and underprivileged countries, a system of goods admitted for exchange and of goods barred from exchange. Obviously, that kind of system, discriminating against one group of nations in favour of another, has nothing in common with the basic economic purposes of the United Nations or of its organs. We, on the other hand, hope to see economic exchange with all countries, whether they are situated in the East or in the West. But we want this exchange to be based on conditions of equality and respect for the sovereign rights of each of its participants.

This plan for division and discrimination has also influenced the activities of some of the bodies which are part of the United Nations. Fighting with great difficulties, the Economic Commission for Europe is attempting to increase the economic exchange between the so-called West and the so-called East of Europe. The same cannot be said about the International Bank for Reconstruction and the International Monetary Fund, which conduct their activities with far from objective methods and are becoming more and more the instruments of a financial policy in the hands of one single state.

What can I say about the Havana Charter of International Trade and Employment? It accepts as its basis abstract equality and grants on paper equal rights and equal duties to all countries, without taking into account their real needs and their real possibilities. Here discrimination finds its expression in theoretically equal rights given in the field of export and import to countries which do not possess any industry as well as to those which are highly industrialized. This is clearly advantageous for the great monopolies and trusts, which are obviously anxious to conquer all possible markets. In its practical application, however, this so-called equality would never permit industrially undeveloped countries to build up their own industry, and obviously would condemn them to foreign exploitation, thus forcing them to a state of economic, and consequently political, dependency. That is why the Polish Government did not sign the Charter of Havana.

The Report of the Secretary-General deals also with certain social issues. Poland takes part in almost the social agencies and organs of the United Nations. We do not take part in the International Refugee Organization, -however, and we have special reasons for not being a member of that Organization. This Organization, which was supposed to facilitate the return of refugees to their native countries, has, in fact, become a body reminiscent of an international labour market which supplies cheap manpower to all sorts of enterprises and entrepreneurs. True enough, the Organization has not been able to stop entirely the wave of repatriation, and in some cases it has been forced to use its funds for this purpose -- that is, to help repatriation. However, the Organization cannot be given credit for this activity. This activity has always been so ineffective and to such a small extent that it cannot be described as a characteristic feature of the Organization.

In fact, so far as the Polish refugees are concerned, I know that a great number of them still remain outside Poland. They are being driven to various places all over the world, and not seldom are forced to accept conditions of labour which amount to semi-slavery. When, after bitter experiences in foreign and far-off countries, they approach the International Refugee Organization with the request that they be enabled to return to their own country, they are told that they have to pay their own fare, although it is well known they can not afford it.

The delegation of Poland will submit to this General Assembly resolutions and proposals in this respect, and will raise the issue in all its implications, as this is linked with the problems of equal wages and equal conditions for domestic and foreign workers. Moreover, we believe that, while the principle of freedom of choice should be respected, refugees ought to be given the opportunity to return to their own countries, irrespective of where they may be. May I emphasize in this connection that the Government of Poland will never give up its right to take care of Polish refugees so long as they remain Polish citizens, wherever they may be.

When speaking of the problem of refugees, I cannot omit another problem. I have in mind the return home of tens of thousands of children who were forcibly taken away to Germany during the time of the Nazi occupation. These children were meant to be educated in the German spirit and become Germans. In spite of many efforts, the Polish Government has not hitherto succeeded in convincing the occupying

authorities in Western Germany that these tens of thousands of Polish children who still remain in Germany three years after the termination of hostilities, and in particular in the British zone, should be returned to their mothers. If the occupying authorities claim that the German foster parents forcibly imposed upon these children have become attached to them and refuse, therefore, to admit these children have been torn away from their mothers who are anxiously awaiting them in Poland, this is, indeed, a strangely conceived humanitarian attitude. I am raising this question in order to call attention to the fact that if such a situation is possible, and is being made into political issues, we cannot speak about the progress of the work of the United Nations in the field of social affairs.

Obviously it is a great thing to give assistance to children, which the Report of the Secretary-General mentions, but first of all one should return these children to their parents, and not tolerate the results of Hitlerite kidnapping. In the light of such facts, how can one make illusion to the noble human rights to which the Report refers.

May I now turn to issues which, although of an organizational nature, are of a great political significance. I have in mind the Resolution passed last year with regard to the so-called "Little Assembly". A year's experience of the work of this body, which is an illegal attempt to take over some of the functions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, has once more confirmed clearly to all of us that it was established contrary to the principles of the Charter and is entirely superfluous. It has also confirmed the fact that it leads to chaos and confusion to disregard the principles upon which our Organization is built. There is no other basis for peace but close co-operation between the great powers who are permanent members of the Security Council. It is, above all, the sovereign equality of all states members of the United Nations which calls for the support of the principle of unanimity so wrongly described as "the right of veto".

The delegation of Poland does not believe that it would serve any useful purpose to discuss this matter. After all, it would not be difficult to prove how much the principle of unanimity, as applied by the USSR, has helped the United Nations in evading mistakes which could have proved fatal in their results.

As we understand the matter, the period covered by the Report of the Secretary-General has again confirmed the righteousness of our attitude and of the reality of our hopes as linked with the activities of the United Nations. The United Nations can fulfil these hopes under one condition only: namely, the observance of the principles which form its

basis the sincere co-operation of all its members, based on the genuine will of peoples and their desires for peace, not upon selfish group interests. This condition means also the implementation of Resolutions adopted in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Charter of the United Nations. We hope that those who conceive the task of our Organization as we do will finally win against selfish and low interests. We trust that those who defend peace will prevail against those who preach adventure and war. With this hope, our delegation begins its work in the present session of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. El-Khouri, representative of Syria, will address the General Assembly.

Mr. EL-KHOURI (Syria): The agenda of this session of the General Assembly, as presented by the Secretariat, contains forty-eight items, besides a supplementary list of about twenty items. Other items may be submitted later. In the general discussion at this session it will not be possible for each delegation to deal with all these items, which are to be allotted to the respective main Committees, where ample time will be given to the representatives to express their views.

I have selected a few outstanding items on which I shall sketch my views very briefly, in doing so expressing the opinion of my delegation and my own views based on personal experiences in the sessions of the General Assembly and in the Security Council during these last years.

Already we have had four sessions in the United States of America and one in London. It was a happy idea to hold this session in Paris, among the liberty lovers and liberty promoters of the French people. In the bright atmosphere of this great capital we hope that this session will prove to be more fruitful than the preceding ones.

The essential objectives of the United Nations are the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security. The precedent of the League of Nations was seriously considered by the authors of the Charter in order to discover and avoid repeating the defects inherent in the Covenant of the League of Nations. It was discovered that the underlying defect lay in the inability of the League to implement its resolutions for eliminating war or preserving peace. It was presumed that this weakness emanated from the fact that the League of Nations had no armed force available to enforce its resolutions. To redress this shortcoming, Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations was drafted to include suitable machinery. This attitude is emphasized by Article 43 of the Charter which calls for the following:

"All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security."

This Article further states that:

"Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided."

The same Article continues:

"... agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes."

During the first two years, the Security Council worked on this problem with the help of the Military Staff Committee which was composed of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Council. It must be noted, however, that no concrete, nor even abstract, results have been produced by these efforts. This is primarily due to the disagreements among the permanent members. Because of these disagreements, the Security Council has been faced with serious situations with no more means of coping at its disposal than those which were at the disposal of the League of Nations.

Judging from the existing strained relations between the Great Powers,



it is now to be feared that the Security Council is doomed to remain impotent and helpless far into the foreseeable future, deprived of any adequate armed force with which to give effect to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. The effect of its activities will continue to be limited to mediation and conciliation within the limited scope of the peaceful settlement envisaged in Chapter VI of the Charter. It will continue to be supported solely by the moral weight of the prestige of the United Nations.

Under the existing conditions, the resolutions of the Security Council are doomed to remain, in some cases, inert and destined for oblivion. These include resolutions on several situations and disputes which have been ignored or disobeyed by the member states addressed. Measures of enforcement could not be taken either because a veto was exercised or other obstructions were placed in the way, or because of the lack of the means of execution.

The competence of the General Assembly, as defined in Articles 9 to 22 of the Charter, is limited to making recommendations. There is nothing in the text which would imply the imposition of these recommendations on the parties to whom they are addressed, nor is there any obligation of acceptance and application by the addressees. Declining to obey such recommendations does not imply violation of the Charter, nor does it involve sanctions of any kind. Sanctions are to be employed only in cases before the Security Council involving breaches of international peace or acts of aggression. Even then, the Charter restricted the power of enforcement in the Security Council -- not in the General Assembly. This was done with a view to reserving to the permanent members, by unanimous agreement, all sanctions and acts of enforcement. So no compulsory measure of any nature may be taken without being unanimously sponsored by the Big Five. This safeguard is only possible within the framework of the Security Council.

For this reason, we find that, in many instances in the past, recommendations of the General Assembly were not complied with. Such were the instances dealing with the Union of South Africa, with the Palestine problem, with the admission of certain nations to membership in the United Nations and several other issues which might be cited to illustrate the ineptness of recommendations by the General Assembly.

Some naive observers imagine that the General Assembly is a world government or a supreme court of justice empowered to legislate or hand out judgments. This is a wrong conception. The United Nations is only a group of nations united by an international treaty called the Charter. This treaty preserves untouched the sovereign

prerogatives of its signatories which may not be violated or ignored except with their consent. The only effective safeguard of the honest respect of this treaty is the good faith, fair play, justice and honour of its signatories together with the necessary justice in the recommendations which may be issued by the General Assembly or the Security Council.

The Charter may be violated in different ways. Some of these ways are internal. They fall within the scope of the domestic jurisdiction of the state. Some of them are of an external nature, and they fall within the provisions regarding the Security Council, as I have already stated.

The unanimity rule, which is described as the veto, was established in Article 27 of the Charter. The authors of the Charter at the San Francisco Conference considered it a necessary evil. At that time, we anticipated its evil effects on the activities of the Security Council, and we knew that the privilege might be abused, that it might actually sterilize the efforts of the Security Council. But we realized also, from the statements of the big Powers at that time, that this rule was a necessary prerequisite and condition for the birth of the Organization and its Charter.

We were told clearly, especially by one of the representatives of the United States, that the defeat of the veto would mean that we should be obliged to return to our respective countries empty-handed, without a charter. Appraising these alternatives, we chose to vote Article 27, together with Articles 108 and 109, which also make amendments to the Charter subject to the veto rule by any one of the Big Five. I must confess that at that time we did not anticipate that this privilege might, be abused to such a wide extent as to frustrate the essential objectives of the Organization and to create a deadlock in the conduct of its business as has been manifested during the last year in many important issues brought to the attention of the Security Council. Even before reaching the stage of voting in the Security Council the progress of work was brought to a standstill, as was the case in the discussions concerning atomic energy and conventional armaments, the application of Article 43 and the activities of the Military Staff Committee.

I shall not be divulging a secret when I state that the world now, including the United Nations, is divided into two hostile blocs. The conflict resulting from this division was manifest even in the first meeting of the General Committee on 25 April 1945 in San Francisco. The controversy continued, growing in sharpness and becoming more and more acrid, as was reflected in the activities in the Security Council which are now mostly at a standstill.

It may seem strange that only one of the big powers has practised its privilege of the veto, with the exception of one case only, while the other four have not resorted to this device. The western powers, however, never needed the veto to secure their objectives. They could always obtain the seven affirmative votes necessary for the adoption of their proposals. One cannot tell how the representative of the United States, for instance, would have acted if he had been in the position of the minority, as the representative of the USSR has always been. Would it not be likely for him in such circumstances to secure the objective of his government by means of the veto? As long as the Security Council is considered a political organ its members do not feel themselves bound by the principles of justice and international law. They do not consider themselves as impartial judges in a case which is presented to them.

It is to be noted that the USSR representative resorts to the use of the veto because he fails to get enough votes favouring his wish and has to see the wish of his opponents always prevail.

Unless this rivalry between the leading powers is stopped, the sublime expectations of the world concept cannot be realized. It is indeed distressing to see the wave of disappointment spreading over all

the world and the desired freedom from fear still far in the distance. Feelings of anxiety, despondency and even fright prevail. The world atmosphere is being saturated by this wave which is diffusing among all people a spirit of defeatism, encouraging war-mongering states, and leading to colossal preparations for a premeditated struggle on a gigantic scale. The small nations in the meantime have centred their hope on the United Nations. They look to the representatives of the peoples assembled at this session in the city of Paris, from whence the first spark of liberty and human rights was struck off. They implore a spirit of conciliation to dissipate that fear.

Instead of carrying out the intent of the Charter embodied in article 4, that membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states, we find it rather closed to them. It was closed to seven new applicants whose applications for membership were supported by nine votes out of eleven in the Security Council but were blocked by the veto; while five other applications failed to obtain the necessary seven affirmative votes. Thus, there are now twelve states whose applications were not favoured by the Security Council and whose admission to membership is not recommended to the General Assembly by the Security Council. We have succeeded, however, since the San Francisco conference, in admitting seven new states, making the total number of states Members of the United Nations now fifty-eight.

My delegation believes in opening the membership to all independent sovereign states whose independence and sovereignty within their defined borders are not contested or opposed by their neighbours and whose formation or creation is in conformity with the principles of international law, so that the United Nations may include all the rightful states of the world. It would be much easier for non-member states to give effect to Article 2, paragraph 6 of the Charter which enjoins that: "The Organization shall ensure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security." This task will be more difficult when states applying for membership have their applications rejected. It is to be hoped earnestly, therefore, that the General Assembly in this regular session will find its way to surmount the obstacles created in the Security Council, at least in the case of those applicants which receive the legal majority in the Security Council, and at the same time to make recommendations for favouring the principal of universality of membership whenever it is possible to do so.

MW/kav

A/PV 139  
68-70

It is unfair and unjust to disappoint sovereign states by denying them their aspiration to join this international organization, to participate in it, and to contribute to world peace and progress. The United Nations is not a monopoly for its founders. The principles and purposes of the United Nations are defined in the preamble the first chapter of the Charter, which covers and includes present and succeeding generations of mankind.

This pact advocates the right of every peace-loving nation to join and take part in the privileges and responsibilities of this organization. The General Assembly, in the Second part of its First Session, recommended to the Security Council that the Security Council should take steps to apply the provisions of Article 11 of the Charter for disarmament and the regulation of armaments with a view to saving the world from the heavy sacrifices and expenses entailed in preparations for war and to serve the fundamental principles of the United Nations, namely, preventing the resort to arms in international relations.

The Security Council took up this question from the beginning and has been working on it for the last two years without any concrete results. Instead of decreasing armaments - or at least freezing the present forces in their fearful magnitude - we find the big powers engaged in an armaments race, fortifying their military positions and multiplying their forces on an alarming scale.

The other member states are also influenced by the example of the great powers and are trying to make preparations for self defense as far as they can. It is to be regretted that the good peaceful intentions which led us when we laboured on the Charter, are now reversed and made void by the lack of confidence and the spirit of hostile competition adopted by the great powers, and which has brought about this dreadful deterioration in the world outlook.

Ninety-nine percent - and perhaps more - of the world's population abhor war and military manoeuvring. They are eager to see peace established and reigning over the whole world. This overwhelming majority of mankind appeal pitifully to the leaders of the world, and to the fashioners of world policy, to have compassion on them and prevent eventual global destruction. The leaders who were able to win a tremendous war should not fail to win the peace. We earnestly hope that this session will serve to realize this cherished aim.

One of the most important problems which has engaged the Organization during the last three years is that of the important development called atomic energy. We were in San Francisco when we first heard of the horrible effects of the terrifying bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima. We have been discussing this matter and trying to find a way out. In the Second Session, when we met in London early in 1946, the owners of atomic energy activities proposed to put it at the disposal of the United Nations, and a Commission was created which was called the Atomic Energy Commission. This Commission had at its disposal the assistance of all the experts and scientists specializing in this field.

Nevertheless, the result was disappointing. Three years, during which time hundreds of meetings were held and thousands of pages printed on detailed debates and discussions that took place among the members of the Commission, have been wasted. It is true that the majority of the Commission agreed on all the details of the convention or treaty to govern the objectives of the General Assembly's resolution for prohibiting the use of atomic bombs or other weapons adaptable to mass destruction. This majority was also agreed on the adequate safeguards that should be taken against the violation of the General Assembly's precepts by the proposal to create an international agency, but the minority of the Atomic Energy Commission was always adamant and would not agree with the resolutions adopted by the majority. The majority was composed of nine out of eleven members, and the minority was composed of two members of the eleven. The apparent point of disagreement was the insistence of the minority on advancing the prohibition convention before establishing the control system. The majority anticipated that if this procedure was adopted, the control system might never be achieved, owing to obstruction by the minority. It considered that the two instruments are inseparable and should appear and be put into effect concurrently.

There are other points of dispute on which no agreement has been reached such as the ownership of the plants, but the real motive for disagreement, and the real cause, is lack of confidence. As long as the big powers look upon one another as adversaries and rivals rather than allies, there can be no hope of a sound peace or dissipation of world anxiety.

The attitude of my delegation on this matter is that the Commission should continue its work to elaborate a draft treaty which will contain all the provisions of the prohibition and safeguards in its final form and submit it to the Security Council for the approbation of the Members of the Security Council. The Members of the Security Council will then be called upon to take their respective responsibilities in adopting or frustrating the course of the action. I hope that the General Assembly will find its way to adopt such a recommendation.

One of the paramount impediments to the speedy settlement of world problems subsequent to the last World War was the outstanding avidity for securing selfish interests in the occupied enemy territories rather than the interest and rights of the local peoples, and the selfish desires were covered by the avowal of certain

ideological objectives and doctrines of social order. The victors provisionally applied a device of partnership, and that was by dividing countries among themselves into zones of occupation, or zones of influence. They applied this device in Korea, in Germany, in Trieste, and in other places. The result of this device through partitioning countries of military value or strategic importance proved detrimental to the fundamental interests of the indigenous population and very dangerous to the political and economic relations between nations. They created centres of controversy and disputes which aggravated the situation. It is earnestly hoped that this deplorable jealousy among certain nations and that this unlawful desire for expansion will be eliminated from the political programmes of the great powers so as to hasten the conclusion of peace treaties with the principle former enemies on the basis of justice and equity, and so as to restore confidence and good faith among them. Only in this way can we substitute permanent peace for the present state of an uneasy truce.



The Palestine question was one of the most beclouded and most complicated to occupy the attention of both the General Assembly and the Security Council from April 1947 up to the present time. I am not going to deal with that question now, inasmuch as the item appears neither on ~~the~~ the provisional agenda nor on the supplementary agenda which has been distributed, but I shall do so when the item is opened for discussion on the agenda of the General Assembly. However, since the representative of the United States referred to that question this morning, I should merely like to remind him that no solution of any problem can be considered final unless it is a just and rightful solution.

The PRESIDENT: This meeting of the General Assembly will now be adjourned. The general debate will be resumed at the next meeting of the General Assembly, which will take place at three o'clock this afternoon. The members of the General Committee should be ready to resume their work at the conclusion of this afternoon's plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.53 p.m.