

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

PLENARY MEETING

SEVENTH SESSION

Friday, 5 December 1952, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Question of the adoption by the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions of Spanish as a working language: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2283) (<i>continued</i>) | 323 |
| Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2286) | 326 |
| Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: reports of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/2257) and the Fifth Committee (A/2281) | 330 |
| The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of the Union of South Africa: reports of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/2276) and the Fifth Committee (A/2282) | 331 |
| Use of the citation "Died for the United Nations" in respect to persons who, in certain circumstances, are killed in the service of the United Nations .. | 336 |

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

Question of the adoption by the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions of Spanish as a working language: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2283) (*continued*)

[Agenda item 62]

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly voted at this morning's meeting on the draft resolution contained in the report of the Fifth Committee. We shall now continue with the explanation of votes.
2. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation voted against the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly concerning the adoption of Spanish as a working language in the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions, for the reasons which I shall state.
3. The USSR delegation can well understand the desire of the Latin-American delegations that Spanish should be a working language in the Economic and Social Council and its commissions on an equal footing with English and French. The Soviet people have a feeling of friendship towards the peoples of the Latin-American countries and a deep respect for their language and culture. We have always sympathized with the representatives of the Latin-American countries in their desire to be able to read all the documents of the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions in their native language. The

question arises, however, why Russian should not also be a working language of the Council and its commissions. Why should the Soviet people be denied the opportunity to read United Nations documents in their native language?

4. The delegation of the Soviet Union believes that the question of the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Economic and Social Council and its commissions is inseparable from that of the use on equal terms of the Russian language in the United Nations and its organs, and that the two questions must be considered together.

5. The great historical role of the Russian people in the development of the world's culture and science is well known. People throughout the world are greatly attracted by the Russian language and desire to know and to understand that language, which all the Slav peoples can read and speak. The Soviet Union, where 200 million people speak Russian, was one of the founders of the United Nations. All the documents outlining the basic structure of the Organization and all the historical decisions taken at the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences were written in Russian, among other languages. As we know, Russian and English were the working languages at those conferences.

6. The USSR delegation believes that there is every justification for adopting Russian along with Spanish as a working language of the United Nations and its

organs. In the discussion of the question, however, there has been discrimination against the Russian language, which the USSR delegation cannot countenance. For this reason, unfortunately, the USSR delegation was compelled to vote against the draft resolution which provided for the adoption only of Spanish as a working language of the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions.

7. The USSR delegation reserves the right to revert to the question of the adoption of Russian as a working language in the United Nations and its organs at the eighth session of the General Assembly.

8. Mr. CUSANO (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to preface the explanation of its vote—after listening to the last speech of this morning, when we adjourned on a note of sympathetic support for our Spanish language, expressed in English—with a reading of what in our opinion constitutes a triumph on the part of this Assembly, namely the resolution we have just adopted:

"The General Assembly

"Endorses the opinion of the Economic and Social Council that Spanish be adopted as a working language of the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions."

After such a vote, only one explanation remains, particularly in view of the excellent report presented by the Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, the Australian representative.

9. My delegation was one of the sponsors of this item, and, through some of our representatives in the Fifth Committee, was zealous, enthusiastic and eloquent in the defence of this legitimate aspiration. I must express my delegation's gratitude to those who, although they speak other languages and know no Spanish, voted for it in a magnificent gesture of understanding. They have understood the inmost feelings of Latin America, have entered into our spirit and have rightly apprehended all that the Spanish language means to our peoples. It may safely be said that Spanish is in our very blood. Differing views of democracy and social life and differing philosophies may have divided us into nearly a score of new nations. We may differ in size and strength; nature may have divided us, placing some of our peoples high in the clouds and snow of the mountain ranges, others in the plains, the pampas and the savannah; in the tropics and in the freezing cold; by ocean and by river; in the forests and on the plains. We may be divided by the colour of our skins, by different racial strains and by regional accents. But, above these apparent differences, Latin America possesses a common denominator for all its peoples—its language. For us, our language is synonymous with gallantry and courage. It was in Spanish that our continent was discovered, and in Spanish that Queen Isabella of Spain sold her jewels to make possible the great adventure.

10. Spanish was the language of the conquest and it was in Spanish that we achieved our independence. Spanish was the language of Simón Bolívar, José de San Martín, Sucre, O'Higgins and Páez. It was in Spanish that José Artigas, the father of our nation, spoke of Uruguay and, in his instructions of 1813 to the Uruguayan deputies, produced one of the basic

charters of American democracy, to which the Government of the United States paid tribute more than a hundred years ago. It was in Spanish that José Martí wrote the beautiful and profound pages inspired by his genius, and it was in Spanish that he died, fighting for his country's independence in one of the noblest and most heroic acts of self-sacrifice known to history. Spain, which bequeathed on us the legacy of its race, elevated the Spanish language by its warriors, its artists, its poets, its writers and its heroic people. Hernán Cortés, Pizarro and Gonzalo de Córdoba were Spaniards. The incomparable architectural gems left to posterity by Juan de Herrera were the work of a Spaniard, Spaniards, too, were Lope de Vega and Calderón de la Barca, Quevedo and Rojas. It was the Spanish genius and the Spanish language that enabled Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra to bequeath to eternity *Don Quixote*, that image of man with his dreams, his ideals and his misadventures. Spanish was the language of the painters Velásquez and Murillo, Goya and Ribera. The poetry of Santa Teresa de Jesús and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz was Spanish. Spanish was the language of Rubén Darío, of Amado Nervo, of Herrera y Reissig, of Gabriela Mistral. Liberators, philosophers, poets and scientists hear in their language the message of their race. But that is not all. The lands of America were well suited to immigrants, who came from all parts of the world to people the fertile lands, to raise homes, found families and lose themselves in this gigantic melting-pot of new peoples. The great instrument of adaptation was the language, through which they became one with the nation and the law. All the children of the immigrants spoke Spanish and, by virtue of the common language, if not by blood, they too were Latin American.

11. Can anyone be surprised, then, that in this Assembly of Nations, where almost one-third of the present members speak Spanish, there should be such a vigorous defence of our right—which does not exclude the rights of others—to work and act in our own language? If in Latin America our language gives us a feeling of solidarity and makes us brothers, why should not this feeling—which is one of unity and not of anarchy—be transplanted intact in the United Nations? There has been talk of the expense entailed by the introduction of Spanish. But, since, according to the Preamble of the Charter, the aim of the United Nations is "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small", why not accept this insignificant additional burden in return for what it will mean to allow the Latin-American peoples, large and small, to speak their own language and make their maximum contribution towards the greatness of the United Nations? Moreover, by so doing we shall ensure that the universal message of our Organization, this perennial message which embodies the efforts of men of every race and creed, and of every philosophical, political and social complexion, towards universal peace and the social, economic and cultural advancement of all peoples, shall be directly accessible to the Spanish-speaking nations.

12. My delegation warmly applauds the Fifth Committee's decision to submit its draft resolution, and the subsequent decision of the General Assembly, which

this morning adopted a resolution of such tremendous importance. Amidst the many vicissitudes of 1952, I make so bold as to reiterate my conviction that the adoption of Spanish, as provided in this resolution, represents an auspicious and fruitful step forward in the history of the United Nations.

13. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Norway for an explanation of his vote.

14. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway): My delegation voted against the draft resolution that has been passed here today, and we regret its adoption, not primarily on financial grounds, although when we look at the total cost of the translation and printing into the different languages, we may look with some anxiety towards the future. We have also heard, both in the discussion in the General Assembly today and in the Fifth Committee, the very well-founded claim of other nations to have their languages adopted as a working language. We heard the claim for Russian, and Russian is spoken and understood by more persons in the world today than is Spanish. We heard the desire of the Arab countries to have Arabic introduced as a working language. We may add to them—and it was mentioned in committee—the great *lingua franca* of India, Urdu, one of the languages understood by hundreds of millions of people.

15. We do not believe that we have made a step in the right direction by the resolution that has been adopted here. That is why we voted against it. At a time when the world needs unification more than anything else, we start on the road of fragmentation. At a time when it is more necessary than at any other episode in our history to make nations understand each other and to make nations sympathize with each other, we support the idea that every group of nations should be within the curtain of their own language, and stay there.

16. Spanish is already, and rightly so, one of the privileged languages, spoken by a large number of representatives and spoken in the most enthusiastic and convincing way. It is possible to get any document of the Economic and Social Council in Spanish. I speak for one of the linguistically under-privileged nations. We are under-privileged in the meaning that we cannot speak our own language in the General Assembly or in the functional committees or in the subsidiary bodies. But, in another way, we are greatly privileged, because we are forced by the very nature of things to study and understand other languages. In my country, English, French and German are obligatory in the higher schools, Italian and Spanish in all the business schools and Russian in the military schools. You see, ignorance is a privilege of the great Powers, small nations cannot afford to be ignorant. It is only those who can understand, who can read and who can think in other languages who are really able to understand the mentality of which that language is the expression.

17. It was very interesting when we heard the discussion here to remember that, in the initial stage of our Organization, in the Executive Committee of the Preparatory Commission, one of the most distinguished representatives of Latin America, known by everyone in this Assembly, Mr. Padilla Nervo, launched the idea which was supported by some of us in the Fifth Com-

mittee, that the best way to get shorter sessions of the General Assembly would be to prevent any representative from speaking his own language. That would do more than any other means to shorten the length of our sessions, and it might help the representatives to understand the other representatives in a more reasonable way. It would rid us of that temptation towards eruptions of oratory which is such a natural temptation to any representative speaking his own beautiful language.

18. We are moving today on a wave of exaggerated nationalism, which has found one expression in this desire to have one's own language spoken here, and in all the tens of thousands of superfluous documents translated into a number of languages; probably only those who are members of the Fifth Committee are aware that we still have a backlog of more than 28,000 pages that have to be translated into Spanish and into Chinese. We have tens of thousands of pages that have to be translated into Spanish, and we may have tens of thousands of pages that will have to be translated into Russian, into Arabic and into other languages.

19. We firmly believe that only by supporting the idea of UNESCO, to encourage the study of other languages, can we move forward in the direction of a broader understanding. I am tempted to remind my Spanish colleagues, whose culture I admire as much as anyone, that Bolivar and Sucre have been among the teachers of the intellectual youth of my country and of many other countries. I should like to make it clear to them that it is with no lack of sympathy for their privileged language, but it is out of consideration for certain general principles that we feel it would have been much better if we had adopted one language or two languages, and we have always been willing in the international organizations to take that attitude. I fear that the idea that we should translate and use as working languages all those that are spoken by the other Member States of this Organization, or by millions of individuals in other countries, tempting and beautiful as that idea might seem, would not give us any greater understanding of each other and of the way in which our minds are working. I should like to remind my Spanish colleagues of the fact that one of the great teachers of the modern world, Unamuno, studied Danish in order to be able to read the Danish philosopher, Kierkegaard, in his own language, and because he felt and stated the conviction that only by being able to understand the Scandinavian languages could he fully grasp the importance of the modern writing, modern play writing or modern philosophy. That is the right kind of linguistic idealism, which we gladly acknowledge and which we fully support.

20. I take it that the decision we have made here today will not in any way be used as an argument to introduce any language which may be supported by a number of representatives as an official or a working language.

21. I can give the assurance that we in the northern countries have no desire to demand that our language shall be introduced as a working language. We consider it a privilege to be able to and to be forced to study the other languages that are used here. And, if I may say so in all modesty, if representatives of the small nations have played so prominent a part in

international developments—more prominent than corresponds to the size of their populations or the number of votes they have had in international bodies—it is because they have been able to understand the languages and to be the interpreters between representatives of various nations who did not understand each other's languages. We ought to derive a certain wisdom from that example. Nobody will refute it. Everybody will acknowledge that it is so.

22. I hope that it will also be so in the future, because the task of the small nations in this Assembly and in this Organization should be to cement the whole structure, which they can do better than those who believe only in sticking to their own language and in being enclosed within its walls, behind "iron curtains", of which we speak so often. The small nations that have no temptation to do such a thing will continue to have the task of cementing the structure and of making it possible for those on different sides of the language barrier to understand each other, to sympathize with each other and to co-operate with each other for the benefit of all.

23. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): The Lebanese delegation is extremely glad Spanish has been adopted as a working language of the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions. My delegation supported this proposal, as in 1948 it supported the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the General Assembly [*resolution 247 (III)*]. This decision seems to us to be fully justified and we regard it with great satisfaction.

24. From an international point of view, the decision is justified not only because many Members of our Organization use that language, but also because of the great contribution which the Latin-American delegations are constantly making to all phases of the work of the United Nations, and in particular to its social, economic, cultural and humanitarian efforts.

25. As Arabs, we welcome the introduction of Spanish in the United Nations, because Spanish represents something that is not unfamiliar to us, something with which we have profound ties of friendship. When a Spanish-speaking representative speaks in that language, we feel that he is expressing better and more appropriately traditions, thoughts, principles and values and a manner of seeing, living, acting and reacting, which are not only familiar to us but are also an important part of our cultural and humanitarian heritage. Another factor which is by no means negligible is that the entry of Spanish into the United Nations means to some extent the entry of Arabic, for many Spanish words and expressions are derived from that language.

26. Lastly, from the purely Lebanese point of view, we are glad that our Spanish-speaking friends have realized one of their fondest aspirations, for, in addition to the bonds of friendship which unite Lebanon with all the Spanish-speaking countries, there is the further consideration that Spanish is the language not only of these friendly peoples, but is also used by hundreds of thousands of Lebanese emigrants who live among those peoples and are today very probably celebrating with them this victory just won by the Spanish language, a language which our Lebanese emi-

grants have adopted and in which they think and speak and love.

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Fifth Committee (A/2286)

[Agenda item 46]

Mr. Brennan (Australia), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2286).

27. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it two draft resolutions under this item. First, there is the draft resolution proposed by the Fifth Committee (A/2286). Secondly, there is a draft resolution proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union (A/L.122). It was agreed this morning—and possibly I should mention this for the benefit of members of the Assembly who were not present then—that in connexion with this item, and items 22 and 66 which will follow, there would be no discussion and that explanations of vote would be limited to seven minutes.

28. Three delegations have asked to explain their votes on these draft resolutions. There has been no indication whether they wish to speak before or after the vote. Possibly we can proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions and then explanations can be given.

29. We shall vote first on the draft resolution presented by the Fifth Committee (A/2286).

The draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

30. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the USSR draft resolution (A/L.122).

The draft resolution was rejected by 43 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

31. Mr. WILEY (United States of America): I appreciate this opportunity to explain the vote of the United States on the report of the Fifth Committee on contributions for 1953. This is a matter of some importance and significance. In the Fifth Committee, I attempted to make it clear that the reduction of my Government's share of the regular expenses of the United Nations to a one-third ceiling was a matter of considerable concern to my Government. This is evident from the fact that for two successive years the Congress of the United States has passed laws which place restrictions on our representatives in international organizations with regard to assessed financial commitments of the United States in excess of one-third of the total assessment. My statements in the Fifth Committee, urging action to implement this principle, were made with these legal limitations in mind, and bearing in mind also the conviction of the United States delegation.

32. At several sessions of the General Assembly, the United States delegation has stated the case for the one-third ceiling with, I believe, clarity, sincerity and earnestness. It has attempted, as I have attempted at this year's session, to make it abundantly clear that my Government regards this question as one of principle, and not of money. In other words, no government should be obliged, in our opinion, to pay more than one-third of the running expenses of this Or-

ganization. The Congress of the United States, of which I am privileged to be a member, has so stated. That is why today I could not vote in favour of the resolution.

33. I reminded representatives in the Fifth Committee of the various contributions which my Government had freely made to the total undertakings of the United Nations and its related agencies. These contributions have reached a total of \$580 million since 1946—a total which does not and cannot take into account the thousands of American lives and the thousands of millions of dollars being spent by my Government in support of the United Nations principles in Korea. I mention these considerations not in any attempt to claim credit, but in an effort to underscore again the fact that my Government is primarily concerned in the principle at issue.

34. We believe that it is vitally important to the United Nations that it should not be dependent financially upon any Member State for more than one-third of its regular income. There has been always a rule in my own life—and I am sure this rule is demonstrable in the lives of all representatives here—that if one puts something into a business or a project, one gets something out of it; if one tries to get by without putting anything into it, one does not usually get anything out of it. We believe that in an international organization composed of sixty sovereign States with equal privileges and responsibilities, there should be more equality in contributions. I am talking about the upkeep of the Organization, not about these other contributions, about which my Government has been so generous, running as high as 70 per cent in some instances—an average of about 50 per cent of the total. We believe that contrary conditions militate against the best long-term interests of the United Nations.

35. I want to make it clear that my delegation is in favour of the United Nations. We believe that there are great things ahead for the United Nations provided the engineers of the Organization run it properly; and we, the representatives of sixty nations, are the engineers. The finest machinery in the world in the hands of poor engineers will soon be ruined. The United Nations is the hope of all thinking people, and it is the duty of each Member nation to demonstrate its interest by playing its part in the maintenance of the Organization.

36. I shall not repeat the many reasons why I believe it would have been both wise and just for the General Assembly to have approved the draft resolution submitted by my delegation. Our proposal would have fixed the share of the largest contributor at one-third as of 1 January 1953. Since this draft resolution did not find favour with the majority of the Fifth Committee, I had no alternative but to abstain in the vote on the proposal to establish the ceiling at one-third for 1954.

37. My delegation also abstained in the vote in the Fifth Committee on the resolution adopting the report of the Committee on Contributions. In any event, I believe that it is manifest, as the representative of Norway pointed out in committee, that any commitment of the United States to contribute more than 33⅓ per cent is based on the provisions of the Charter and not on the vote of the United States delegation.

I might add, parenthetically, that the representative of Norway, Mr. Hambro, always says something that is worth listening to, and he did that just a few moments ago at this meeting. I think he is possibly the only representative here who also represented his country at the League of Nations. He has had experience through the years that has been of great value to this Organization, and I hope that he will long be with us.

38. I should like to close with a reference to the efforts of the Canadian and other delegations to obtain agreement in the Fifth Committee on the resolution which we have considered today. While this agreement is not entirely satisfactory to my Government in the circumstances, it does constitute a firm step forward in that, for the first time, it gives definite assurance that the ceiling principle will be implemented finally on 1 January 1954. This in itself is gratifying, and those who collaborated in their efforts to achieve this result are entitled to the appreciation of all of those who have the best interests of the United Nations at heart.

39. To sum up, I hope that the General Assembly will accept the assurance of my delegation that my Government will continue to do its part in support of this Organization. It has faith that here will be developed a basis for harmony and international co-operation to the end that eventually we shall find a way to solve our differences and to achieve a lasting peace. I also hope that representatives will understand that our abstention on the vote was dictated by a spirit of co-operation. Since I could not vote in favour of the report, I did the next best thing and abstained. I did so because I recognize that there is much that is good in the report and because I appreciate the goodwill which lies behind the assurance in the matter of the application of the ceiling principle in 1954. I have every evidence that there is goodwill in this body; I have seen people smile today whom I have never seen smile before. It is my fervent wish that this example of give-and-take, this proof of a willingness to come at least part of the way towards accommodating different points of view, will spur us on towards greater accomplishments in the settlement of the major problems which confront us.

40. Mr. SHTOKALO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Fifth Committee has submitted for the approval of the General Assembly a draft scale of assessments for the apportionment of expenses of the United Nations for 1953. This scale provides for an increase of 24.5 per cent in the Soviet Union contribution, 25.4 per cent in the contribution of the Ukrainian SSR and 26.4 per cent in that of the Byelorussian SSR, in spite of the fact that the contributions of those three countries were increased by over 40 per cent in 1952 and by 10 per cent in 1951.

41. In recommending such a considerable increase in the contributions payable to the United Nations by the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR, the Fifth Committee and the Committee on Contributions have ignored the well-known decisions taken by the General Assembly at its first session [*resolution 14 (I)*], laying down the following criteria to be used in assessing the contributions of the various

States to the United Nations: "(a) comparative income per head of population; (b) temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War; (c) the ability of Members to secure foreign currency."¹

42. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR deplors the gross violation by the Fifth Committee of this General Assembly decision. It considers that the General Assembly should have rejected the 1953 scale of assessments submitted by the Fifth Committee and should have instructed the Committee on Contributions to revise the assessment scales recommended for the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR with a view to reducing them to the 1950 level.

43. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR declares that neither the Committee on Contributions nor the Fifth Committee had any justification for increasing the assessment scales for the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR.

44. Indeed, if the criterion of the dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War is taken into consideration, it has to be pointed out that during the Second World War the USSR suffered immense material losses and damage amounting in all to over 500 thousand million dollars. It must also be noted that the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR were among the Soviet Republics which suffered most from the enemy invasion. Suffice it to say that over 250 thousand million roubles worth of material damage was done to the Ukrainian SSR alone. The USSR is still spending large sums of money in the restoration of the country's economy, shattered during the German occupation. This circumstance, however, was completely ignored by the Committee on Contributions and the Fifth Committee when, for the third time in three years, they recommended to the General Assembly that the contributions of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR should be increased without taking into account the damage and loss sustained by the USSR as a result of the Second World War.

45. Finally, the third criterion laid down by the General Assembly—the ability of Members to secure foreign currency—is also an important factor in assessing the contributions payable by the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR to the United Nations.

46. The Fifth Committee has recommended increases mainly in the contributions payable by countries against which the United States and certain other countries obedient to it are conducting a policy of discrimination in regard to foreign trade, which is, of course, the main source of foreign currencies, thus making it more difficult for the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR to secure the United States dollars necessary to cover their contributions to the United Nations.

47. In assessing contributions for the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR, the Fifth Committee cannot—nor has it any right to—disregard this factor, that is, the difficulties put in the way of the USSR's efforts to secure foreign currency.

48. It must likewise be pointed out that the Fifth Committee's recommendation to the General Assembly to increase the contributions of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR for 1953, is absolutely contrary to the basic rule of work of the Committee on Contributions, as confirmed in 1950 by the General Assembly on the report of the Fifth Committee, which provides that "no change either upwards or downwards of more than 10 per cent in any one year should be proposed in the percentage contribution of any country".² Hence the Fifth Committee's recommendation that the contributions of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR for 1953 should be increased is wrong and contrary to the basic provisions of the General Assembly's decision [*resolution 582 (VI)*] whereby the Committee on Contributions was to have reviewed in 1952 the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations.

49. In view of these facts, and in particular the last two, that is to say, the damage and loss suffered by the USSR as a result of the Second World War and its difficulty in securing foreign currency, it must be admitted that the decision of the Committee on Contributions to increase the contributions of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR is both unfair and unjustifiable. In the light of the foregoing, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that the "normal times" referred to in General Assembly resolution 238A (III), of 18 November 1948, have not yet come, when the scale of contributions of the various Member States should be reviewed.

50. It is a striking fact that Member States obedient to the United States are trying, like the United States, in the Fifth Committee, in the Committee on Contributions and in the General Assembly, to achieve a systematic reduction in the United States contributions to the United Nations, in spite of the fact that, unlike other countries, the United States is not faced with the problem of securing foreign currency for its contribution to the United Nations, since contributions are paid in its national currency, that is to say, in United States dollars.

51. As we know, the United States national income increases from year to year, while it is spared the need to spend thousands of millions of dollars on restoring the damage caused by the two world wars, as is the case of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Byelorussian SSR.

52. Thus none of the criteria for assessing apportionments laid down by the Assembly in 1946 justifies a reduction in United States contributions. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the United States has a considerable advantage over other Member States, in that the United Nations expenses are for the most part incurred in the United States. The salaries paid out to the enormous United Nations staff are spent almost entirely in the United States. As most of the staff are United States citizens, a considerable amount of the funds of the United Nations has to be paid out to United States citizens. It should also be remembered that the United Nations pays the United States large sums in taxes for the United States citizens in its

¹ See *Report of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations*, chap. IX, sect. 2, para. 13.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 13*, para. 12.

employ. Over \$1,600,000 were paid out in taxes in 1952 alone. The United Nations was obliged to reimburse this sum to the United States out of the contributions of the other Member States.

53. It is therefore clear that the Fifth Committee's recommendation to reduce the United States contribution to the United Nations is unjustified and contrary to the principles laid down by the General Assembly for the assessment of the contributions of the various Member States to the United Nations budget.

54. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers that the General Assembly should not have approved the Fifth Committee's recommendations for a review of the scale of assessments, for their adoption is totally unjustifiable. These recommendations which are contrary to General Assembly resolution 582 (IV), on the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the United Nations expenses for 1953, should therefore have been rejected.

55. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR fully supports the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.122], providing that the Committee on Contributions should review the scale of assessments at the present session of the General Assembly, with a view to establishing the percentage contributions of the USSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR and Poland for 1953 at the level adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1950. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR therefore voted in favour of that draft resolution.

56. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): The Polish delegation wishes to draw the General Assembly's attention to the unjust manner in which the scale of assessments has been established. Our delegation gave its views on this subject in detail during the debate in the Fifth Committee.

57. The Committee on Contributions has been systematically trying, since 1950, to raise Poland's assessment to a disproportionate extent.

58. Moreover, these continual increases in assessments concern not only Poland but also several other countries, namely, the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR and Czechoslovakia. The choice of the countries whose assessments are continually being raised is obviously determined by a purely political bias. According to the proposals of the Committee on Contributions, the assessments of the countries just mentioned will be almost 100 per cent higher in 1953 than in 1950. It is significant that, during the same period, that is, since 1949, the committee has constantly lowered the United States assessment.

59. The Committee on Contributions did not take into consideration the fact that Poland has had to repair the enormous damage to its economic system resulting from occupation by the Germans, its territory having been overrun several times; nor did it consider that the people of Poland had and still have to invest much of their national income in enterprises designed to repair the economic, social and cultural destruction suffered during the war and to make up for the backward conditions which had existed for centuries before the war.

60. I would remind you that the war and the occupation resulted in the destruction of about 20,000 factories and industrial establishments, including the most important ones. The basic industries were destroyed to the extent of 50 to 60 per cent. More than half a million rural dwellings and about 300,000 urban dwellings were reduced to ruins. Warsaw, which before the war had 1,350,000 inhabitants, was at the end of the war nothing more than an immense heap of rubble. The speed and energy with which the capital is being reconstructed is known to the whole world, but imposes a tremendous strain on our national economy.

61. But while Poland, like the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, was suffering under the yoke of the German invader and sacrificing millions of lives in the fight against the enemy, American industry and capital were accumulating millions of dollars in dividends from war profits and war orders. Now the United States enjoys a privileged position within the United Nations. It is the only country which pays its contribution in its own currency, whereas many European countries have difficulty in obtaining dollars because of the discriminatory policies of the United States. The presence of the United Nations Headquarters in New York is a fresh source of foreign exchange for the United States and an additional source of revenue for the United States Treasury. This revenue is derived not only from indirect taxes, but also from the direct taxes paid by the United States members of the Secretariat. Those taxes are reimbursed to the staff members by the financial services of the Secretariat, and are thus a direct levy on the Member States. This is no trifle, since the budget estimates for this purpose for next year amount to \$1,660,000.

62. Because of what has just been said, the Polish delegation was unable to accept the proposed scale of contributions for 1953 submitted by the Committee on Contributions, and voted for the USSR delegation's proposal that the situation in the financial year 1950 should be taken as the basis for computing the scale of assessments.

63. General ROMULO (Philippines): The representative of the Philippines in the Fifth Committee fully explained my Government's position as regards the item before us.

64. I have been instructed by my Government to emphasize and make part of the record of this discussion paragraph 10 of the report of the Fifth Committee [A/2286], which reads as follows:

"The representative of the Philippines acknowledged the fact that his country had experienced a measure of economic recovery, but maintained that the large increase recommended in its assessment—in fact the largest recommended by the Committee on Contributions for 1953—was not justified by the actual position. The Philippines economy was relatively under-developed, had suffered heavy war damage, and was feeling the general dollar shortage as acutely as most other Member States. His delegation would vote against the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions but, if they were adopted, he expressed the hope that, in reviewing the scale in 1953, the Committee would allow for his country's true economic position by reducing its assessment."

Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa: reports of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2257) and the Fifth Committee (A/2281)

[Agenda item 22]

Mr. Salazar (Dominican Republic), Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, presented the report of that committee (A/2257).

65. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly also has before it the report of the Fifth Committee (A/2281) on the financial implications of the draft resolution proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

66. I have been asked at this point to raise the question of the status of this particular draft resolution under rule 84 of the rules of procedure, which deals with those subjects which require a two-thirds majority. The General Assembly, of course, under rule 85, will decide itself on questions of this kind. But the practice in respect of the treatment of this item at previous sessions has been to consider this as an item of importance and one requiring a two-thirds majority. Unless any delegation raises the question, I shall assume that the same treatment should be accorded this item at the present session of the General Assembly.

67. It should also be noted that, under paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution attached to this report there is to be established a good offices commission, and the number of members to be nominated by the President and the names of those members have been left blank. I assume, then, if no member of the General Assembly proposes at this time that this number be specified in the draft resolution, that it is to be presumed that the composition of the commission, including the number of its members—assuming this draft resolution is adopted—is left to the decision of the President. But I should not like there to be any doubt on that point.

68. Then, before we decide on this draft resolution, I might call attention to paragraph 5, which reads: "*Decides to include the item in the agenda of the next regular session of the General Assembly*". I would assume that there has been an omission here, that is, that the word "provisional" should be put before the word "agenda", because under rule 13 of our rules of procedure it seems clear that all we can do is to recommend items for inclusion in the provisional agenda of the succeeding session of the General Assembly, that General Assembly, of course, having the right at the time to determine its own agenda finally. However, I have no desire—indeed, no right—to suggest any kind of change in a draft resolution. Therefore I should like to know if there is any objection by any delegation to the inclusion of the word "provisional" before the word "agenda" in paragraph 5, and naturally no change will be made unless the General Assembly itself so decides. I see that there is none.

The change in wording in paragraph 5 of the resolution was adopted.

69. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2257). A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Uruguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Against: Union of South Africa.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The result of the vote was 41 votes in favour, 1 against and 15 abstentions. The draft resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

70. Mr. RAO (India): I should like to make a brief statement on behalf of the Indian delegation on the resolution which has just been adopted.

71. I feel sure that the General Assembly will appreciate what the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee has sought to do in this resolution. It is, once again, a conciliatory approach to the Union of South Africa by which it is hoped that the parties can be brought together to resolve their present difficulties. My delegation, however, is bound to say that what is in the minds of all of us—the continuous disregard by the Union of South Africa of previous resolutions of the General Assembly—is not calculated either to advance the prestige or the purposes of the United Nations or to increase the confidence of the peoples of the world in this Organization. The General Assembly—and, indeed, the whole world—is aware of the grave deterioration of the situation in South Africa, and this has become a part of the much larger issue which has developed into a sharp racial conflict. We cannot but be conscious of the serious implications for the continent of Africa and of the challenge it offers the ideals and the foundations of this Organization. Even at this stage, my delegation ventures to hope that the Union of South Africa will respond to the overwhelming desire of this Assembly. It is in that spirit that this draft resolution was submitted and has just been voted upon in the Assembly.

72. My delegation seeks negotiation, conciliation and a peaceful settlement. We shall persevere in this, and we shall continue to hope that the conscience of the world, awakened by this issue, will find an echo in the Union of South Africa. From the very beginning, our struggle in South Africa, initiated by Mahatma Gandhi, has been based on the idea that the heart and the mind of South Africa must be converted. To this hope and endeavour, my delegation feels there can be no end.

73. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): The position of the delegation and of the Government of the Union of South Africa has been fully explained in the discussions which have taken place both in the

Assembly and in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. I had hoped that it would not be necessary to add anything to what we have already said. I believe that our position has been stated as clearly as it possibly could be stated.

74. However, the statement that we have just heard makes it necessary for my delegation again to speak very briefly on this matter. We have consistently explained that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter denies this Organization the right to intervene in a matter which is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of my Government. The matter with which this resolution deals is undeniably such a domestic matter.

75. Secondly, Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter also states clearly that there is nothing contained in the Charter which shall require Members to submit such domestic matters to settlement under the Charter. I have stated clearly that, having taken the stand which my Government has taken, my Government is not prepared to settle this matter under the Charter. This is not so because we have no desire to settle the matter. My Government is desirous of settling it. The delegation of India knows that all it has to do is to come along and discuss the matter outside this Organization and divorced from any resolutions taken in this Organization. I do not have to remind them of the standing offer of the Government of the Union of South Africa. They are aware of it, and I believe that all of the Members of this Organization are also aware of it.

The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa: reports of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2276) and the Fifth Committee (A/2282)

[Agenda item 66]

Mr. Salazar (Dominican Republic), Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2276), and then spoke as follows:

76. Mr. SALAZAR (Dominican Republic), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (translated from Spanish): Draft resolution A, which was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions, is based on a joint draft resolution submitted by Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Egypt, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Yemen. Under that draft resolution, the General Assembly would establish a commission to study the racial situation in the Union of South Africa in the light of the purpose and principles of the Charter, with due regard to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, as well as of Article 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, Article 13, paragraph 1, Article 55 c and Article 56 of the Charter, and the resolutions of the United Nations on racial persecution and discrimination; the committee would report its conclusions to the General Assembly at its eighth session. I should point out that the membership of the commission is not specified in any of the paragraphs of the operative part of draft resolution A. I should like to draw attention, in this connexion, to the Indian representative's suggestion, which is mentioned in paragraph 16 of the report, that the commission

should be composed of three persons selected by the President of the Assembly from a panel of names to be submitted to him by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

77. Draft resolution B was adopted by 20 votes to 7, with 32 abstentions, and is based on a joint draft resolution submitted by Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. As you will see, this draft resolution deals with the question of race conflict in more general terms than does draft resolution A. Under the operative part, the General Assembly would declare that, in a multi-racial society, harmony and respect for human rights and freedoms and the peaceful development of a unified community are best assured when patterns of legislation and practice are directed towards ensuring equality before the law of all persons regardless of race, creed or colour, and when economic, social, cultural and political participation of all racial groups is on a basis of equality. It also affirms that governmental policies of Member States which are not directed towards these goals, but which are designed to perpetuate or increase discrimination, are inconsistent with the pledges of the Members under Article 56 of the Charter. Finally, it solemnly calls upon all Member States to bring their policies into conformity with their obligation under the Charter to promote the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

78. These are the results of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's discussion of the very delicate problem of race conflict in the Union of South Africa. It is my privilege, as Rapporteur, to recommend, on behalf of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, that the Assembly should adopt draft resolutions A and B, which are reproduced in the report of that committee.

79. The PRESIDENT: Under this item, the Assembly also has before it the report of the Fifth Committee (A/2282), giving the financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. In addition, a motion has been introduced by the delegation of the Union of South Africa (A/L.124), under rule 80 of the rules of procedure. Under that rule, the motion of the representative of the Union of South Africa on the competence of the General Assembly to adopt the proposals which appear in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee must be voted on first. Depending on the result of the vote on that motion, action will be taken on the draft resolutions in the report.

80. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): I am intervening to introduce a motion [A/L.124] under rule 80 of our rules of procedure. This motion has been circulated and I shall read it.

"The General Assembly,

"Having regard to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter,

"Finds that it is unable to adopt the proposals on the item entitled 'The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa' contained in the Rapporteur's report of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, dated 2 December 1952 (A/2276)."

81. It will be recalled that the South African delegation argued in the Assembly, when the agenda was under consideration [381st meeting], and in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee when the present item was before it, that the General Assembly is not competent to consider the item at all, that is, that the Assembly is debarred by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, from discussing it or in any way considering it. To this contention my Government adheres.

82. It will be noted, however, that our present motion is related solely to the two draft resolutions recommended in the Rapporteur's report. It is confined, therefore, to the adoption of draft resolutions, and does not refer to discussion or to consideration. I should perhaps explain here that the restricted nature of our motion is due to the wording of the rule under which it is being moved and the stages through which the matter has already passed. It must be clearly understood, therefore, that the present wording and nature of the motion is without prejudice to my Government's contention that discussion and consideration also constitute intervention—that form of intervention which is prohibited by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. I would repeat, however, that the motion which I am now introducing is restricted—for the reasons I have indicated—to the adoption of the two draft resolutions put forward in the Rapporteur's report. Therefore, if my motion is rejected, the consequence will be that the Assembly will claim to be competent not only to discuss and consider matters of essentially domestic concern, but also to adopt resolutions with regard to such domestic matters.

83. I have no intention of restating our arguments on the question of competence. They are on record, and I believe those present here are familiar with them. Nor is it my intention to discuss the contents of the two draft resolutions presently before us. My delegation asserts that any resolution relating to the present item, whatever its nature, would be a contravention of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. On the other hand, our present motion is related to the two specific draft resolutions recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, and I might therefore refer, very briefly, to their contents.

84. Allow me to refer, first of all, to the draft resolution which was originally sponsored by the delegations of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. Now, it is true, of course, that this draft resolution seeks to set out a general statement of principles which do not refer specifically to the Union of South Africa. I submit, however, that it does, by implication, seek to criticize and, in fact, condemn the policies of the South African Government. Moreover, it emanates from a discussion and the consideration of South Africa's domestic affairs and is therefore, in the view of my Government, unconstitutional. It is the assertion, consequently, of my delegation that the resolution constitutes intervention in the sense in which that word is used in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

85. The other draft resolution, which was originally sponsored by India and seventeen other delegations, goes even further. It seeks to initiate specific action with regard to our domestic affairs. In paragraph 1 of the operative part, it contains a proposal for the establishment of a commission which is to concern it-

self with the affairs which fall within the domestic jurisdiction of my Government. And I do not believe that anyone can seriously contend that this does not constitute that form of intervention which is explicitly prohibited by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

86. I do not think that the Assembly will fail to realize that by adopting this draft resolution—that is, the proposal to establish a commission which will concern itself with our domestic affairs—the Assembly will be guilty of a specific act of intervention, and that it will be creating a precedent which will enable it, in future, not only to discuss and consider the domestic affairs of Member countries, which in our view it is not competent to do, but also to take specific action with regard to such affairs. The seriousness of this proposal will therefore be obvious to all representatives present here this afternoon.

87. I do not have to say any more. I would now ask the Assembly to reflect very seriously on the action it is about to take and, as the final authority in this Organization, to make it clear, by the adoption of our motion, that it will not violate the Charter by denying to the Union of South Africa, or to any other Member State, the protection which was solemnly inscribed in Article 2, paragraph 7.

88. I ask the President, also, that when a vote is taken on our motion, it should be taken by roll-call.

89. The PRESIDENT: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote is taken, I shall put these three questions now to the Assembly, and the first question is the motion of the representative of the Union of South Africa (A/L.124) under rule 80, on the question of competence. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

China, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: France, Luxembourg, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium.

Against: China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Greece, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Canada.

The motion was rejected by 43 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

90. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the draft resolutions included in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/2276). These two draft resolutions should, of course, be voted on separately.

91. One delegation, Mexico, has asked permission to explain its vote between the voting on draft resolution A and draft resolution B. I assume that the Assembly would be glad to give that delegation that courtesy.

92. I think I should also revert to the question which I raised on the previous item on the agenda, the status of these draft resolutions under rules 84 and 84A of the rules procedure, namely, that they are questions of importance under rule 84.

93. We shall now vote on draft resolution A. A separate vote has been requested on paragraphs 1 and 4 of the operative part of the draft resolution. A roll-call vote has been requested on paragraph 1 and subsequently on the draft resolution as a whole. Unless there is a request for a separate vote on the other paragraphs of the draft resolution, I should suggest that we vote first on the two paragraphs on which a separate roll-call vote has been requested. However, it would be simpler if we disposed of the preamble before we vote on paragraph 1. No roll-call vote has been requested on the preamble, and we shall now vote on the preamble.

The result of the vote was 40 in favour, 1 against and 15 abstentions.

The preamble was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

94. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on paragraph 1. I would call the attention of the Assembly to the omission from this paragraph of the membership of the commission, which would have to be decided later if the paragraph were adopted. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India.

Against: Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Greece, Iceland.

Abstaining: Paraguay, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia.

The result of the vote was 35 in favour, 17 against and 7 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

95. The PRESIDENT: The request for a separate vote on paragraph 4 of the operative part of draft resolution A has been withdrawn, so that, if the Assembly desires, we may proceed to vote on paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 together.

It was so decided.

96. The PRESIDENT: There is the same omission of the word "provisional" before the word "agenda" in paragraph 4 as occurred in the other draft resolution. If there is no objection, the word will be included in the final text if this draft resolution is adopted by the Assembly.

The change in wording in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was adopted.

97. The PRESIDENT: As has been agreed, we shall now vote on paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 together.

The result of the vote was 38 in favour, 3 against and 19 abstentions.

The paragraphs were adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

98. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution A as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt.

Against: Union of South Africa.

Abstaining: France, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic.

The result of the vote was 35 in favour, 1 against and 23 abstentions.

Draft resolution A as a whole was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

99. Mr. QUINTANILLA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): I shall be very brief. There are two draft resolutions before us: draft resolution A, which we have just adopted, and draft resolution B, which is to be put to the vote in a moment.

100. The first is a specific draft resolution dealing with a concrete case, the situation in the Union of South Africa. The second, as the Rapporteur said, is of a general nature and is an admirable statement of principle in regard to racial discrimination.

101. The wording of the two resolutions raises a minor technical difficulty, in our opinion. The preamble of draft resolution B is identical with three of the paragraphs of the preamble of draft resolution A. My delegation considers that the second and third paragraphs of the preambles of both drafts are suitable for inclusion in either, since they do not refer to a specific situation. On the other hand, the first paragraph of the preamble which has already been adopted in draft resolution A is, in our opinion, wholly unnecessary in the second of the texts before us, which is why we voted against it in committee. It is in fact a technical error.

102. My delegation will request a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution B and will vote against it. It believes that the inclusion of a paragraph referring to a specific situation in a

draft resolution so noble and so lofty in sentiment detracts from its value, the more so because there is no connexion between the operative part of draft resolution B (that is, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, which begin as follows: "Declares that in a multi-racial society harmony and..."; "Affirms that governmental policies of Member States..."; "Solemnly calls upon all Member States...") and the limitation in the first paragraph of the preamble, which refers to the situation in a single country as if that were the only country with which we were concerned. My delegation, for the reasons I have just stated, will therefore vote for the draft resolution, but will vote against the first paragraph of the preamble, which refers to the situation in the Union of South Africa.

103. I should like to thank the President for permitting me to explain my vote before the draft resolution is put to the vote, and to request a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble.

104. The PRESIDENT: A request has been made for a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution B.

The result of the vote was 25 in favour, 10 against and 18 abstentions.

The paragraph was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

105. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: El Salvador, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark.

Against: Union of South Africa.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

The result of the vote was 24 in favour, 1 against and 34 abstentions.

Draft resolution B as a whole was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

106. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom): I should like to explain the votes of my delegation on these resolutions. We have repeatedly made clear our view that the placing of this item on the agenda and all discussion of the substance of it have been entirely out of order, and a few moments ago we once more cast our vote in this sense on the proposal that was submitted by the representative of the Union of South Africa holding that the discussion of the substance of this

matter was outside the competence of the United Nations.

107. The United Kingdom did not, during the proceedings in committee, express any opinion upon the merits of the substantive draft resolutions and abstained from voting upon them. We refused to identify ourselves in any way with the discussion on the substance of the matter or with the draft resolutions arising from it.

108. In accordance with that view, we abstained when draft resolution B was put to the vote, although we agree with the broad statement of principles underlying that resolution. Paragraph 1 of the operative part of resolution B echoes the beliefs and aims which animate my Government and its policy in all those areas—those large areas—of the world for which it is responsible. I refer to the words:

"... in a multi-racial society harmony and respect for human rights and freedoms and the peaceful development of a unified community are best assured when patterns of legislation and practice are directed towards ensuring equality before the law of all persons regardless of race, creed or colour, and when economic, social, cultural and political participation of all racial groups is on a basis of equality."

This ideal, an advancement on a real partnership between races, is one which my country is already pursuing and intends to continue to pursue. But resolution B arises out of a discussion which my delegation considers to be outside the competence of the General Assembly, and therefore we abstained from the vote upon that resolution.

109. For the same reasons, we abstained on draft resolution A as a whole and abstained in the votes on the various parts except in regard to paragraph 1 of the operative part, establishing a commission to study the racial situation in South Africa. The United Kingdom delegation considers that its vote against this paragraph followed naturally from its vote upon the question of competence. Even if the General Assembly has some right to discuss this matter in general—which we deny—this paragraph involves so obvious an intervention in the domestic affairs of a Member State and so clear a violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, that we had to vote against it. We registered this vote not in any attempt to obstruct the will of the majority of the delegations here represented, but in what we believed to be the true interests of the United Nations. I would remind the Assembly of the words of Mr. Eden, spoken from this rostrum on 11 November of this year—and I think it will be agreed that there is no warmer or more loyal supporter of this Organization anywhere in the world than the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom. He said this:

"If we attempt to stretch the meaning of the Charter and extend the areas in which the United Nations has jurisdiction, we run grave risks—unless we carry all our fellow Members with us—of weakening the very structure of the United Nations" [393rd meeting, para. 53].

I think that that feeling of anxiety was represented in the large vote against that paragraph of resolution A.

110. I do not believe that these risks to the Organization are appreciated by all delegations, but I do assure

them that they constitute a very real danger to the United Nations, and I could only wish that those risks and that danger were better understood.

111. Mr. LACOSTE (France) (*translated from French*): When the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of the General Assembly considered our agenda item entitled "The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Union of South Africa", the French delegation stated its view that that question fell essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa. Accordingly, the French delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted on 12 November by the delegation of the Union of South Africa affirming that the United Nations had no competence in the matter. In the final vote which was taken in the matter today, the French delegation maintained the position it had taken in committee.

112. Moreover, my delegation considered that the adoption of the draft resolution submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee by a group of eighteen States, providing in particular for the establishment of a commission to study the racial situation in the Union of South Africa and to submit conclusions to the General Assembly at its eighth session, would constitute interference by the United Nations in a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of one of its Members. Accordingly, the French delegation abstained from voting on each of the parts of the eighteen-Power draft resolution and on the text as a whole, making it clear that its abstention reflected its feeling that the United Nations was incompetent in the matter in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

113. The position of the French delegation on this question of competence has not undergone any change. The delegation, however, has changed its vote on a point which it considers essential. While in the preliminary stage of the Assembly's work, as represented by discussion in committee, the French delegation deemed it appropriate and sufficient to indicate its opinion on the lack of competence of the United Nations to consider the questions at issue by abstaining on all parts of the draft submitted by the eighteen States, it considered it necessary to express its views more definitely at a time when the General Assembly itself was about to adopt a very important position, which would be at least as significant in principle as in its application.

114. Prior to the vote in committee on 20 November, my delegation had taken pains to explain that its abstention did not apply to the substance of the question. Today, it made that position crystal clear once again: it is a position which is fully consistent with the traditional doctrine and the constant practice of France in the matter of non-discrimination on grounds of race. France does not propose to compromise one jot on a principle to which it had steadfastly adhered long before the United Nations saw the light of day and which had been a guiding principle of its policy and its actions long before the principle itself was inscribed in the United Nations Charter.

115. It was this reservation on the very essence of the question, as much as its convictions concerning the competence of the United Nations to deal with it, that

the French delegation wished to affirm by its decision to abstain from the vote on the parts and on the whole of the four-Power draft resolution, as well as on the parts and on the whole of the eighteen-Power draft. It is the same reservation which the French delegation has sought once again to indicate in its vote today on the two drafts submitted by the committee, after expressing it in its vote on all the paragraphs save one. That paragraph is paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution A, calling for the establishment of a commission to study the matter and submit its conclusions to our next session.

116. At a time when the Assembly was about to take a final decision in this matter—a decision vested with all the authority which must accompany the expression of the collective thought and will of a body bearing the name of the United Nations General Assembly—it seemed to the French delegation that the abstention by which it indicated its basic position in this matter in the preliminary stages of the debate was no longer adequate. The reservation indicated in the study phase must be followed by an affirmative position at the stage of decision. The French delegation considers that in establishing the study commission to which I have just referred, and in assigning it the terms of reference set forth in paragraph 1 of the operative part of draft resolution A, the Assembly would go beyond the limits set by the Charter on its activities and initiatives and impinge on a matter which the authors of the Charter intended to reserve for the sovereignty of States Members of the United Nations.

117. The policy practised by the government of any Member State towards its own nationals, within its own frontiers, is an intrinsic part of the sovereign rights reserved for the jurisdiction of each State and jealously safeguarded against even the best intentioned incursions by the organized collectivity of the other members of the international community. By committing one violation of those rights, no matter how important the particular case may be, the United Nations collectively commits a breach of the Charter and at the same time endangers the security of each Member.

118. None of us can disregard that inescapable consequence nor pretend momentarily to forget it to satisfy a particular concern. No matter how essential the isolated stake in a given question may appear to some of us, our Assembly cannot allow itself to lose sight of the more general and higher stake involved in the final paragraph of Chapter I of the Charter. In international society as well as in national societies, certain rights of the individual must be respected. This is one of the conditions of the harmonious community life which is the ideal and the goal of the United Nations. To defend the individual rights recognized as belonging to its Members is to defend the United Nations itself. That is why the French delegation abstained in the vote on all the paragraphs of the eighteen-Power draft resolution, with the exception of the first paragraph of the operative part, and abstained on the text as a whole. That is why the French delegation voted against paragraph 1 of the operative part of that draft and why it regrets the fact that the Assembly has adopted it, by so close a vote.

119. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of India for an explanation of vote.

120. Mrs. PANDIT (India): My delegation abstained on draft resolution B because in our opinion it did not have a direct bearing on the issue of race conflict in South Africa. It expressed general sentiments which are fine and with which we are in complete agreement, but it does not adequately provide a solution for the problem with which the world is faced today.

121. The other draft resolution before us, on which the General Assembly has just voted, is for many delegations, including my own, of vital interest and importance. It raises issues which, if evaded at this juncture, would create a situation not only in Africa but throughout the world of the gravest consequence to peace. This General Assembly cannot shut its eyes to the fact that in Africa today there is an ever-growing intensification of the policy of racial discrimination through all the channels open to a government. We are familiar in the United Nations with the plea for the protection of minorities, but here is a case of the suppression of the right of an overwhelming majority by a small minority which has managed to retain all the resources of the State in its hands and does not hesitate to utilize them. Human rights and fundamental freedoms are being denied to this vast majority, plainly on the grounds of race and colour.

122. This Organization must make up its mind that wherever the principles and the purposes of the Charter are defiantly challenged, every one of the Member nations must promptly rally round in vindication of these principles and purpose. Let us not forget that it was the failure to stand up for such principles at the right time that produced the world wars. An imperative duty is placed on us, who represent the coloured races of mankind, to remind this General Assembly that Africa and Asia are on the march and they will no longer accept the indignities imposed on them in the name of a white civilization. The demand today is for a human civilization based on the universal standards of the Charter. For this reason, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A.

123. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Union of South Africa has asked to be allowed to make a short statement to explain the attitude his Government will take with regard to the resolution which the General Assembly has just adopted. If there is no objection, I shall call upon the representative of the Union of South Africa for a short statement.

124. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): I shall confine myself to just a few words, and I shall not endeavour to reply to some of the extravagant statements to which we have just listened from the representative of India. The South African delegation has made it clear throughout the various debates on the present item that the Government of the Union of South Africa must insist on the guarantee which was inscribed in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, against any intervention in matters which fall essentially within its domestic jurisdiction. We have also asserted all along that the present item deals with such matters of essentially domestic concern and that the adoption of any resolution on the substance of the item would therefore constitute an intervention in my country's domestic affairs.

125. The Assembly had before it two such draft resolutions and my delegation voted against them. However, they have now been adopted by the Assembly, a fact which my Government can only deplore. By adopting these resolutions, the Assembly has not only denied to the Government of the Union of South Africa its rights under the Charter, but has clearly established a precedent in consequence of which it will in future seek to intervene by discussion and the adoption of resolutions in any matter of purely domestic concern.

126. It is in these circumstances that I have been instructed to state that my Government will continue to claim the protection inscribed in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, and that it must therefore regard any resolution emanating from a discussion on or the consideration of the present item as *ultra vires* and, therefore, as null and void.

Use of the citation "Died for the United Nations" in respect to persons who, in certain circumstances, are killed in the service of the United Nations

[Agenda item 59]

127. The PRESIDENT: This is one of the items which the Assembly decided to consider directly in plenary session without reference to a Committee. Debate on this item is therefore in order. The Assembly has before it a draft resolution submitted by the French delegation (A/L.121 and Corr.1).

128. Mr. BOURGES-MAUNOURY (France) (*translated from French*): In proposing that the General Assembly should declare those who, in certain circumstances, are killed in the service of the United Nations to have "died for the United Nations", the French delegation's only thought has been to pay a last tribute to all who have laid down their lives in a cause which is that of all the nations signatories to the Charter which are represented here—the cause of peace.

129. Our proposal, contrary to what some people here have unhappily and mistakenly alleged, before even acquainting themselves with it, has no ulterior political motive. It reflects no wish to serve any purpose other than that which is to be seen from the very wording of the draft resolution, that of paying a tribute internationally, as it were, and quite impartially, to those who die in the service of our international Organization in order to ensure the victory of the Charter's main aim, as defined in its preamble, of maintaining international peace and security.

130. Most of those who are now laying down their lives in the defence of this aim are falling in Korea, it is true. But the French delegation has by no means envisaged only the case of those now fighting under the United Nations flag. Its draft resolution is intended to have a general application, not only to the present, but also to the past and the future. The action of the United Nations extends throughout the entire world; it has not been confined to the Korean peninsula. In these troubled times that have come in the wake of an almost universal war there have, alas, been many other parts of the globe where the United Nations has had to strive to relieve situations likely to start conflicts. Men have fallen in Greece, in Palestine and perhaps elsewhere, and they deserve that their memory

shall be honoured and that the lasting recollection of their glorious death shall serve as an example and a lesson to those whose faith in the cause of peace might waver.

131. In the particular case of persons serving in Korea, the Assembly has already decided, by resolution 483 (V) of 12 December 1950, to create a decoration to symbolize the valour of personnel participating in operations conducted on behalf of the United Nations, but surely those whose valour in that cause cost them their lives also have the right to a gesture in their memory.

132. In France, as perhaps in other countries, public opinion felt this need so strongly during the First World War, in which more than 1,500,000 Frenchmen died defending the freedoms now enshrined in the Charter, that in 1915 our legislation made it possible to honour their memory for all time by the inscription, in the registrar's records and on the innumerable war-memorials which perpetuate that honour in our smallest villages, of the words "Died for France". Those who conceived such a gesture and those who have contributed to it by engraving the names of our dead everywhere in stone hoped that the immensity of these losses in human life would serve as a lesson for the future and would stay the hand of war mongers. It was not in our country, but elsewhere, that that memory should have been evoked. We have had to defend ourselves against further aggression.

133. The French delegation is not now proposing that the Assembly should adopt measures so far-reaching in their application as the provisions of our national legislation. It knows that many other countries which have not had to experience the hardships of invasion have neither customs nor legislation corresponding to ours. Accordingly, we are not asking the General Assembly to adopt any concrete measures. We have also been careful not to impose upon the Secretariat a burden which would, alas, have become a very heavy one—one has only to think now of the numbers of those who are dying every day in the service of the United Nations. Lastly, we have felt that, in a matter in which the very deepest sentiments of many families, and thus all that is dearest in national traditions, are involved, it would not have been fitting to bind any government in any way, even if only morally, with regard to the conclusions each country may draw from the draft resolution we are submitting.

134. We merely wish that the United Nations, through the Secretary-General, should indicate for each occasion in the past, the present and—it is to be feared—the future, those actions or missions undertaken by the United Nations to repel aggression, to halt hostilities or to remedy a dispute or a situation likely to deteriorate to the point of hostilities, which entitle those who, in the course of such actions or missions, lose their lives in the common cause of maintaining peace, to be declared to have "died for the United Nations".

135. "Died for the United Nations"—we have the feeling that with those few words we are closing a phase in the history of mankind; and, although they have a tragic ring, they none the less reflect a new hope. In days gone by, men have died for just causes. They have offered their lives and sacrificed their personal

happiness just as unselfishly. But today, for the first time, they are dying for a peaceful world organization. They are sacrificing themselves for more than their homes and their country; for the first time the human community alone kindles and nourishes the heroism of men resolved to build a better world. From now on, children, on opening their history books, will find something other than the echo of conquests and insatiable national ambition. In these words, "Died for the United Nations", they will find the first echo of the human community's unanimous will to defend its faith in itself. It is no doubt bitter to see a new hope written for the first time on a tomb; but it is for us to make of these words a final boundary between the world of yesterday and the world of tomorrow. All those who read them—parents, wives and children—will know that the human community has thus contracted a debt towards them which it will nevermore be able to forget or deny.

136. Through its proposal, France has wished to pay a tribute to the soldiers of our ideal; but it has also wished in this solemn manner to set a seal upon our commitment and our determination to defend a future in which aggression will be as inconceivable as the human sacrifices of the past are now. The day will come when men will no longer fall for the cause of the United Nations, but will live for it in peace and fraternity. France asks that, when you vote on the use of this citation in respect of all those who die in order that our existence may be justified, who die for the end of war and for the triumph of peace, you should ratify this promise and honour those who believed and believe in our work.

137. Mr. KYROU (Greece): The proposal to use the citation "Died for the United Nations" in respect to persons who, in certain circumstances, are killed in the service of the United Nations, is one of those generous initiatives to which France, for centuries, has accustomed the world.

138. It is indeed an established practice in many countries to enshrine in the mind of the living the memory of those who have toiled and fallen for a noble cause. First and foremost among such causes is the defence of a national heritage and, what is even more important, the defence of our common civilization.

139. The draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the French delegation acquires its full significance in the first paragraph of the operative part, if we reflect that it contains no reference to a particular national cause, but to the over-all cause of the United Nations to which everyone here is pledged.

140. Each Member State can, of course, take appropriate measures in order to honour the memory of those of its citizens who have fought and died for the ideals and purposes embodied in our Charter. Yet, as is stated in the explanatory memorandum regarding the item under consideration [A/2145/Rev.1], "the tribute would rest on a firmer legal basis and would carry greater prestige if it were the outcome of a United Nations decision and rendered by that Organization".

141. It is only natural that the sponsor of the draft resolution has in mind primarily those participating in

the noblest enterprise of the United Nations. For some eighteen months now the foundations of the collective security system have been threatened. On the success or failure of this enterprise depends, to a large extent, what the world of tomorrow will be. The citation "Died for the United Nations" will perpetuate in the history of our Organization the memory of the main architects of a better future. In the words of the sponsor of this item, the distinction, "Died for the United Nations" can also be awarded to "those entrusted by the United Nations with missions as mediators or observers in connexion either with measures of pacification or efforts to settle a dispute or a situation and to prevent them from degenerating into hostilities".

142. Particularly with regard to my country, I wish to recall to the General Assembly that the question of the threat to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece has been on its agenda. It was thanks to the exertions of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans that the United Nations was kept informed of the true nature of that much abused Greek question. The periodic reports of that committee shed a clear light on the case. The wholehearted devotion of the members of the committee in the discharge of their international duties, frequently in dangerous conditions, did not escape its toll of casualties. I take this opportunity to pay a ringing tribute to the memory of Lieutenant-Colonel William Good of the United Kingdom, who was killed on duty on 17 February 1949. I wish also to pay deserved homage to Colonel Darnell of the United States, Colonel Fielding of the United Kingdom, Lieutenant-Colonel Georges Maury and Lieutenant-Colonel René Guillochon, both of France, who were wounded in the performance of their duty.

143. The unqualified support which my delegation gives today to the French proposal is, I submit, also a reflection of our gratitude for the outstanding services rendered to the United Nations and to my country by these gallant men. In honouring men like these, the Organization will honour itself.

144. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): In signing the Charter, Members of the United Nations solemnly undertook clear obligations:

"To maintain international peace and security, and, to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

145. As events since the establishment of the United Nations have shown, it is sometimes necessary to take action in order to realize these fundamental aims of our Organization. However high and unselfish these aims may be, they cannot by themselves achieve the desired end; they must be backed by proper deeds.

146. As we all know, since our Organization was established, many people have laid down their lives in action or on missions on behalf of the United Nations and in connexion with the maintenance of international peace and security, the prevention or termination of hostilities, or the suppression of aggression.

147. The draft resolution before the General Assembly merely asks that these acts of sacrifice should

be recognized by the simple but meaningful phrase: "Died for the United Nations". The phrase is meaningful because it is only if the supreme sacrifice is made when needed that the United Nations objective of maintaining international peace and security can be attained.

148. In almost every State, in different ways, acts of sacrifice are recognized. It is therefore most fitting that the United Nations, also, should recognize the supreme act of sacrifice in the cause of international peace and security.

149. In expressing my delegation's full and wholehearted support of the draft resolution before us, I would appeal to the General Assembly to adopt it unanimously.

150. Mrs. SAMPSON (United States of America): It is with reverence that I speak on behalf of the United States to support the draft resolution presented to the General Assembly by the delegation of France. It is indeed fitting that a tribute to those who have died for the United Nations should be proposed by the great French Republic, whose traditions of liberty and human progress are renowned throughout the world.

151. The draft resolution now before the Assembly would confer a mark of honour on those who have lost their lives in the cause of the United Nations and of peace.

152. In thinking of this proposal, our minds and hearts turn to Korea. It was there that the United Nations met the challenge of aggression in the first collective action in history by an international organization. The Republic of Korea is the child of the United Nations. This Organization gave it life. When the Republic was wantonly attacked by communist force, bent on crushing out the beginnings of liberty with the iron heel of totalitarianism, the United Nations had to make a decision. Would it resist, or would it yield to the plans of those who had calculated on easy conquest? The answer was impressive. Fifty-three States joined in the decision to defend the Republic of Korea. Under Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, sixteen Members of the United Nations have sent units of their armed forces to repel the attack in Korea. The aggression was turned back, and it has been made clear to the aggressors that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest. The cost has been heavy.

153. In adopting the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of France, we should not be wiping out the debt owed to those who have sacrificed their lives so that there might be peace in the world; we should only be acknowledging the debt. We need to do more. In defining that something more, I can think of no better words than those of a great President of the United States, who spoke in the midst of our own Civil War. He, too, wished to honour men who had given their lives, and he wished to tell his countrymen how they, the living, could begin to repay their debt to these men.

"It is", he said, "for us rather to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honoured dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of

devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

154. For the General Assembly, this should be a day of rededication to the ideals set down in the United Nations Charter. With the will to accomplish, the nations can move forward in the achievement of the Charter goals. As peoples gain confidence in collective security for attaining world peace, the human energies of all nations can be directed ever increasingly towards the realization of man's creative possibilities.

155. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom): I have listened with emotion—as, I am sure, we all have listened—to the eloquent statements which have been made in support of the draft resolution before us. That draft resolution does so much credit to the country which submitted it. We have reached this item on our agenda at the end of a long day, but I am sure that none of us grudges one moment of the time which we devote to it. In a few words, I should like to support the draft resolution.

156. When we think of the instances in which the United Nations has taken action to maintain international peace and security and to resist aggression, we naturally turn our thoughts, as did the last speaker, to Korea. The achievements there, the efforts and sacrifices which have been made, far surpass anything previously undertaken by this Organization—or, indeed, anything undertaken by any international organization in the world's history.

157. Special distinctions have been provided for the soldiers defending the United Nations cause in Korea, but the draft resolution before us would add a further mark of appreciation for those who unfortunately lose their lives in this conflict.

158. We think primarily of Korea, but our admiration for the forces should not make us forget those other fields of United Nations endeavour and the missions in which men in the service of the United Nations have made similar sacrifices. Other speakers have referred to this.

159. Some there are whose names will certainly not be forgotten. I need only mention Count Bernadotte as one outstanding example. His devotion to the cause of peace in Palestine has won him an enduring place in history. But there are others, whose names are less well known, who have died in the service of this Organization—in Palestine, in Kashmir and in the Balkans. I would thank the representative of Greece for his gracious tribute to my countrymen who fell in his area of the world.

160. The services of such men should not be forgotten and should not go unrecorded. It has long been the custom of mankind to honour those who have died for their country in defence of their homes and in defence of their loved ones. Now we are trying here in this Organization to sustain the rule of law not merely in national entities but in the wider field of international affairs. We aim at a world community and at a wider loyalty and, unless we can succeed in this great endeavour, then the prospects for humanity are indeed dim. It is fitting that we should pay a tribute to those who work and die for the world community as a whole, and the devotion and sacrifices of

those servants of the United Nations whom we propose to honour are both a proof of the spirit which should animate it all and a contribution to the establishment of a peaceful world, which we all so ardently desire. I support this draft resolution.

161. The Marquis DU PARC (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The French representative has clearly explained to us his country's aim in proposing that the Secretary-General should be authorized to award the citation "Died for the United Nations" in respect of those who are killed in the course of an action in connexion with the maintenance of peace or the suppression of aggression. We understand that, as the French Government sees it, there is absolutely no question of deciding the practical details, and we shall therefore not discuss them here. It is merely a matter of paying a tribute to those who have fallen in the service of the United Nations in certain circumstances to be determined.

162. Of course, none of us would wish to withhold recognition from those who have dedicated themselves to the cause of international understanding and peace. Such dedication can take many forms, starting with the most usual one, that of devoting time, talent and work to the common cause; but it can reach no higher pitch than that of making the final sacrifice, the sacrifice of one's life. In this last case, what could be fairer than to recognize—in the simplest words—the simple truth?

163. The Belgian delegation does not hesitate to support the proposal put forward by France. Our delegation considers—as the French representative has just said in other words—that it is for the United Nations to determine the circumstances in which it means to state that a man has laid down his life for the cause and the ideal to which it is dedicated.

164. The Belgian delegation also approves the wide scope the French delegation wishes to give to its proposal, which would include the present, the past and the future, wherever the United Nations must strive to remedy situations likely to breed conflicts, as was the case in Indonesia, Kashmir and Palestine, and as is now the case in Korea.

165. Lastly, the Belgian delegation believes that the United Nations will be honouring itself by paying a solemn tribute to those who have died in the defence of its ideal of peace and, as the representative of France has said, by recognizing the heroism of men resolved to build a better world. These are men who, for the first time, are dying for a peaceful organization which embraces the whole world, and their sacrifice transcends their country.

166. For these reasons, the Belgian delegation feels that the decision before us should be taken, not individually by each of the governments represented in the United Nations, but by the whole community of the nations that are here met together.

167. Mr. ROBERTS (Union of South Africa): The South African delegation is grateful for this opportunity of making its humble and reverent contribution to the posthumous recognition of those servants of the cause of humanity who have laid down their lives for their fellow men.

168. When, a little over two years ago, the United Nations went to war in Korea—in this, its first great challenge to collective security—the Government of the Union of South Africa was amongst those who responded to the call for armed assistance. We did so in support of our obligations as we saw them under the Charter and in the same spirit which time and again in the past has impelled us to make available our material resources and to offer up the flower of our youth on the altar of our common ideals.

169. History will honourably record the grim struggle of that devoted army which has so effectively demonstrated on the battlefields of Korea under the banner of the United Nations that armed aggression can and must be resisted whenever and wherever it occurs. It is appropriate that the United Nations should by this modest gesture pay tribute to those who have made the supreme sacrifice under its flag and in defence of its ideals. Indeed, it would be a reflection upon this Organization if it did not so honour them.

170. If I may borrow the silver tongue of Mr. Archibald MacLeish:

“We cheat ourselves in cheating worth of wonder.

“Not the unwilling dead,

“But we who leave the praise unsaid, are plundered.”

171. For these reasons we whole-heartedly support the proposal of France that the Secretary-General should be empowered to confer the citation “Died for the United Nations” on persons who, in certain circumstances, have given up their lives in the service of the Organization, whether in Korea or anywhere else.

172. Mr. SOURDIS (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): The Colombian delegation could not fail to share the sentiments stirred up in the Assembly by the generous proposal submitted just now by the representative of France, that country of goodness and of

high ideals. As he told us, the proposal is of a general character in that it pays tribute to all who have fallen in the service of the United Nations throughout the world. But the fact that it is submitted at this time gives it more immediate significance and forces us to turn our thoughts to Korea, where, every day, soldiers are dying for the United Nations. For the first time in history, brave men are fighting, not under the flag of a country seeking imperialist ends or to serve the ambitions of individual Powers; the soldiers in Korea are fighting under a universal flag. Perhaps never before has the statement of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, been so appropriate: “Never has so much been owed by so many to so few.” The fate and fortune of the troops fighting in Korea under the United Nations may determine the fate and fortune of the whole world. That is why the war is so important and why the simple tribute which it is proposed to pay them is so important and so proper. Many Colombians have died for the United Nations, and I should like to take this opportunity of paying a heart-felt tribute to the memory of them all.

173. The proposal before us has two-fold significance: it is both a tribute and an example. It is a tribute paid to all those fighting for world peace and an example to all those who may be called upon to render similar service.

174. In respectfully asking the Assembly to adopt this proposal, I would suggest to representatives that we should lift up our hearts to Divine Providence to ask pardon and grace for those who every day offer their lives in the cause of world peace.

175. The PRESIDENT: As no other member wishes to speak, the Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.121 and Corr.1.

The draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 5.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.