

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**EIGHTH SESSION**

**Official Records**



**442nd  
PLENARY MEETING**

**Wednesday, 23 September 1953,  
at 3 p.m.**

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

	Page
General debate [continued] .....	
Speeches by Mr. Toriello Garrido (Guatemala), Mr. Jooste (Union of South Africa), Mr. Trujillo (Ecuador), Mr. Deressa (Ethiopia) and Mr. Baranovsky (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)	99

**President: Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi PANDIT (India).**

**General debate [continued]**

**SPEECHES BY MR. TORIELLO GARRIDO (GUATEMALA), MR. JOOSTE (UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA), MR. TRUJILLO (ECUADOR), MR. DERESSA (ETHIOPIA) AND MR. BARANOVSKY (UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC)**

1. Mr. TORIELLO GARRIDO (Guatemala) (*translated from Spanish*): The Guatemalan delegation wishes to associate itself with the statements welcoming the election of Mrs. Pandit as President of the General Assembly. Apart from being a well-deserved tribute to India, her election is a triumph for woman in her struggle for her rightful place in solving the problems that afflict mankind.

2. The Guatemalan delegation is attending the eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly in the same spirit of sincerity and enthusiastic co-operation as it has shown in the United Nations since it was founded at San Francisco.

3. Guatemala is deeply concerned about the unrest and tension prevalent everywhere, about the threat that the many serious problems that afflict the world may lead to a new war with all its terrible implications for mankind. Guatemala, as a peace-loving country, which believes that man's ideals can only be fulfilled in a peaceful world, is watching most sympathetically the efforts of the United Nations to solve these grave problems and to re-establish throughout the world the harmony without which man cannot live at peace with his neighbours.

4. The Republic of Guatemala accordingly shared the deep and universal satisfaction at the cease-fire in Korea when the Armistice Agreement was signed with a view to establishing lasting peace in that much devastated area. We firmly believe that the coming political conference will achieve those objectives, and we therefore argued, at the end of the seventh session of the General Assembly, that a new approach must be adopted in seeking a formula which would respect the legitimate rights of all the countries directly interested in the peace of Asia and at the same time bring about the unification of Korea as a democratic State free from all foreign interference.

5. We should also welcome most enthusiastically any efforts which might be made to confine the use of atomic energy to the service of mankind rather than its destruction and to remove this serious threat to man's very existence in the world. Similarly, like many peoples of the world, we are also anxious that the gigantic expenditure on armaments should be used to improve the economic and social conditions of mankind, since the armament race and poverty have been and will continue to be sources of international friction, trouble and unrest.

6. One of the problems to which Guatemala attaches the greatest importance is the effective exercise and protection of human rights. My delegation wishes to express its serious concern about the undeniable and increasing suppression of democratic freedoms in the world. It must not be forgotten that it was in the defence of those freedoms that the nations joined together in the Second World War against the nazi-fascist system, based on the utter denial of the democratic freedoms of individuals and peoples.

7. For that reason we are appalled and concerned that, under new guises and often on the pretext of defending democracy, a real offensive is developing today against freedoms such as the freedoms of belief, thought and expression which are the very basis of human rights. The tragedy is that, by embarking on such a course, democracy is drawn into areas which hitherto have been confined to totalitarianism.

8. The existence and preservation of democratic freedoms are the basis of human progress and dignity and we are in duty bound to defend them. At the same time, my delegation has been most gratified to hear the statements made in this Assembly by the representatives of some great Powers on their efforts to co-operate in securing the effective implementation of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter throughout the world, so that, on the basis of those purposes and principles, the peoples could exercise the right to govern their own affairs according to their sovereign will. This implies recognition of the fundamental right of every people to achieve complete political and economic independence, so that they can develop their institutions freely and use their natural wealth to raise their standard of living to a level in keeping with human dignity.

9. The Guatemalan delegation welcomes these statements because it believes that efforts along these lines contribute to the attainment and consolidation of international peace and security. Nevertheless, my delegation must express its surprise and deep disappointment that, despite the fine programme so emphatically described in speeches, some Powers adopt a different approach, inconsistent with these statements, when a country, small in size but sovereign and worthy of

respect, endeavours to make these aspirations a reality within its own frontiers.

10. This is the case with Guatemala, a country of only 3 million inhabitants and with an under-developed economy, which is making efforts and sacrifices to achieve these purposes and a better living standard for its people, better use of its natural wealth and full economic development. It is astonishing that these efforts, far from receiving the promised co-operation, have been the target of a systematic, hostile and unfair campaign designed to prevent the country's complete liberation.

11. After the revolution of October 1944, Guatemala enacted legislation to safeguard human rights and to transform its economy for the benefit of its people. Among other legislation, the land reform Act seeks to ensure that the land is used to fulfil the social function of property; it applies only to areas that are not under cultivation. Many Guatemalans, and more especially some foreign companies, owned enormous idle estates. Seventy-eight per cent of the cultivable land was in the hands of two per cent of the population.

12. The sovereign right exercised by Guatemala in undertaking its own development and the United Nations principles which support and encourage that right have been opposed by the private interests of powerful foreign monopolies which, despite the injustice involved—and this is the serious aspect—seek the support of their governments. Guatemalan legislation and the measures to implement the country's economic development programme and to ensure its economic liberation, adopted in the exercise of the nation's sovereignty and in keeping with the rules of justice and equity, were naturally bound to interfere with the privileges enjoyed by foreign companies which were acquired in earlier times by outside pressure on dictatorial governments and under contracts that were very burdensome to the country. The excessive profits of these companies are obtained by the merciless exploitation of the land and the people.

13. These companies, which have succeeded by specious arguments in obtaining the support of their governments, have spared no effort in their attempts to destroy by every means, however discreditable, the Guatemalan revolution and the democratic government behind it. They have used slander and threats and have even resorted to what shows signs of becoming real economic aggression. All the powerful machinery of the media of information and publicity has been brought into action to spread tendentious reports that Guatemala and its government are "communist" and hostile to the Western Powers; the country has been called a satellite of the Soviet Union; in the most influential papers in the United States articles have appeared advocating an economic blockade against our people for having dared to limit the unjust privileges of the foreign monopolies operating in the country. There have even been shameless calls for intervention, which has been most categorically condemned on the American continent.

14. We are particularly grieved that one powerful government is echoing this campaign and exercising pressure on behalf of these investors, demanding privileged treatment for them as compared with Guatemalans. We are convinced that the interests of these investors are contrary to the legitimate and true in-

terests of their people and government, and that they are merely a cause of unnecessary friction between friendly States when they improperly resort to diplomatic protection to involve their government in the defence of an untenable cause.

15. The Guatemalan delegation wonders whether this attitude foreshadows a return to the tragic interventions of the past. Guatemala is only beginning the effective exercise of democracy in a country which has been the victim of relentless dictatorships and pitiless economic exploitation. Like any other country, Guatemala is jealous of its independence, its sovereignty and its dignity, and therefore is not and cannot be a satellite of the Soviet Union, the United States or any other Power. Guatemala's international policy, like its domestic policy, is not subject to that of any foreign Power. Guatemala has succeeded in maintaining and will always maintain absolute independence in expressing its views in international organizations, particularly in the United Nations, and is guided solely by its respect for democratic principles and its love of justice.

16. The Republic of Guatemala is not opposed to the investment of foreign capital in its territory. It asks only that foreign investors should honestly abide by the law of the land on an equal footing with Guatemalans. However, it categorically rejects any intervention of a colonial type, and the claim that foreign capital should enjoy privileges which the law does not confer on nationals. It has been repeatedly argued that investment of foreign capital is the panacea for the ills of the under-developed countries. But little attention has been given to the terms of such investments, and it is often forgotten that some of the investing companies are the main cause of the backwardness of the countries concerned. In many cases monopolistic investments have strangled the general development of countries where, as for example in Guatemala, they control the port facilities, the principal means of transport and communications, electricity and so on. These strategic factors of economic development are thus placed primarily at the disposal of foreign companies, in disregard of the general interests of the national economy, and the country's trade is subjected to the most arbitrary and unreasonable tariffs and practices.

17. We do not believe that, when the United Nations recommends the encouragement of foreign investment for the economic development of the under-developed countries, it takes investors like the United Fruit Company in Guatemala as a model; such investors have raised a wave of indignation in many Latin-American countries, whose wealth they have exploited for the exclusive benefit of their shareholders without even paying a fair share of taxes to the country concerned. The history of investment in bananas, oil, copper, tin, etc., in Latin America is very similar to the lamentable history of colonial exploitation in some parts of the world. Companies of this kind take everything for themselves; they suck dry the wealth of the soil, pay high taxes in their home countries and accumulate millions for a handful of shareholders who never know that their fat dividends are the fruit of the sweat and poverty of thousands of workers crushed by ignorance, sickness and hunger.

18. My delegation is absolutely certain that the United Nations cannot possibly be thinking of this kind of investment when it recommends that investment should be encouraged for the benefit of the under-developed

countries. Being convinced that this is so, Guatemala is gratified that the General Assembly is giving attention and special importance to the economic problems of the under-developed countries. It attaches great importance to the study and analysis of these problems, in which it will co-operate whole-heartedly. Guatemala expresses its firm hope that the efforts which are being made in some small countries to achieve economic independence will receive the co-operation of the United Nations and the respect of all Member States which have undertaken, under General Assembly resolution 626 (VII), not to impede, directly or indirectly, the use and exploitation of a country's natural resources for the benefit of its people.

19. I should now like to refer to a problem of another type. Guatemala has never been able to acquiesce in the mutilation of its territory, in the case of Belize, which, on historical, legal, economic, geographical and moral grounds, is an integral part of Guatemalan territory and is unlawfully occupied by a non-continental Power. The occupation of Belize by the United Kingdom is due only to the triumph of might over right, but the Government and people of Guatemala are confident that the United Kingdom will act in accordance with its traditional spirit of justice and agree to enter into friendly negotiations leading to a satisfactory solution of the problem, as the Guatemalan Government has repeatedly proposed in the last few years. From this rostrum, Guatemala repeats these friendly proposals to the United Kingdom Government.

20. In stating the foregoing, the Guatemalan delegation wishes to place on record that Guatemala renews its protest against the continued occupation of this territory which belongs to it and recalls the reservations which it has systematically formulated in the United Nations with regard to its rights.

21. The Guatemalan delegation also wishes to reaffirm its position with regard to the 200 million men and women who still do not enjoy self-government and whose destiny is in alien hands. The Government and people of Guatemala are fully convinced that the colonial era has gone for ever and that the continuance of these systems is anachronistic and contrary to the spirit of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Guatemala has consistently expressed the view that colonial systems must disappear from the face of the earth, since all people have the right to decide their own fate, which will not be possible until they are allowed to achieve political independence and until their full sovereignty is recognized. The fallacy that colonialism is a means of protecting defenceless peoples, civilizing savage peoples and teaching self-government, is a totally discredited myth.

22. We firmly trust that United Nations action for the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the non-self-governing peoples and of the peoples of the Trust Territories will make it possible to abolish colonialism and to give effect to the principle of the self-determination of peoples. Guatemala will therefore continue to support enthusiastically every measure to improve conditions in those territories with a view to their complete liberation.

23. Finally, the Guatemalan delegation wishes to take the opportunity of expressing its earnest hope that this eighth session of the General Assembly will strengthen

peace and international co-operation for the benefit of mankind.

24. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): As is customary and as is proper in the general debate, the many important statements made during the last few days from this rostrum have covered a wide range of subjects. This, as I say, is both customary and proper, for it is on this occasion every year that the more general aspects of world affairs, as well as this Organization's activities with regard to those affairs, can correctly and effectively be reviewed. The statements which we have heard have therefore, in the main, been in character with statements made in previous general debates, not in content but in the general scope of the ground covered. This does not, of course, detract from their importance, for these matters continue to be a source of great concern throughout the world.

25. The matters—the very important matters—dealt with by the different speakers may, I believe, all be related to our one major problem, namely, the achievement of peace and the establishment of security: a peace which will be real, and a security which will enable all mankind to live without the ever-present threat of war and the suffering which is attendant on modern armed conflict. This, indeed, has increasingly become the keynote of general debates, and is no less the keynote of the present debate.

26. The first speaker in the debate, the distinguished Secretary of State of the United States, dealt cogently with these matters, when he reminded this Assembly [434th meeting] of the many complex and dangerous problems which threaten peace and which continue to render security impossible of achievement. His was a solemn appeal—an appeal which was also taken up by a number of subsequent speakers—and it is the hope of my delegation that that appeal will be heeded, above all by those who, by their words and especially by their deeds, are responsible for the sorry state in which the world finds itself today.

27. We realize that the problems which exist, and which stand in the way of peace and security, are problems of the greatest magnitude, as well as of the greatest complexity. Yet it is our sincere belief that, with sincerity of purpose and a strong enough desire to achieve world peace, these problems can be resolved. The desire to achieve peace, we are told, is shared universally. But if peace is to be achieved, that desire must be reflected not only in the words but also in the deeds of all governments, more especially of all those governments which bear the primary responsibility for the achievement of this all-important objective of international endeavour.

28. I repeat, therefore, that it is the fervent hope also of my country that the words which we have heard from this rostrum will be heeded and that no country, no government, will, for whatever reason, persist in activities which continue to militate against the achievement of this goal.

29. I have said that, while differing in content, the general scope of the important statements we have heard are in character with similar statements in past years. This year, however, there has been a relatively new note discernible in the debate, a note which, in fact, is reflected also in our agenda. I refer to the many references made to, and the arguments for, a revision of the Charter of the United Nations. This



note, it is true, is not entirely new. It has been sounded in previous years. It is nevertheless one which has never before emerged so distinctly from our general debates.

30. There are good reasons for the statements which we have heard on this point. As has been pointed out, the date set in the Charter for consideration of its revision is drawing close. In 1955, this Organization will be called upon to consider whether or not, in the light of our experience since San Francisco, the Charter in its present form is adequate and, if not, in what way it must be revised or amended in order to render it adequate for the purposes for which the Organization was created.

31. This, however, is not the only reason why speakers have referred to the question of the revision of the Charter. There is, I would submit, abundant proof of a growing consciousness that the United Nations has not succeeded in bringing about those relations between nations which are essential if the high hopes of its founders are to be fully realized. Indeed, it is clear that there are many who fear that, unless the Charter is revised, this Organization may not survive.

32. Here it should be borne in mind that it is not only from speakers in this debate, and from what appears on our agenda, that we learn of a growing conviction that, if the United Nations is to function effectively, its Charter will have to be revised and its defects will have to be repaired. We need but read the Press and scrutinize reports of statements throughout the free world by statesmen and leaders in practically every walk of life to realize how generally this view is held, and how strongly it is supported. For never since San Francisco has the United Nations, or, more correctly, its capacity in world affairs, compelled wider and closer scrutiny than at the present moment. Much of what we hear and much of what we read is criticism, though not always criticism which is designed merely to condemn or to destroy. It is often constructive criticism, born of experience and inspired by loyalty to the cause of peace and a sincere belief that this Organization can be made to work efficiently.

33. It is true, as so many tell us, that there are defects in our Charter. For, while our founders built well at San Francisco, it is experience—and only experience—which could prove the adequacy or inadequacy of their work, and that this was appreciated at San Francisco is clear from the insertion in our Charter of Article 109.

34. Those responsible for the United Nations Charter were united in a common task to bring about a form of international collaboration and co-operation, through common membership of the United Nations, which would outlaw war as a means of settling international disputes and which would be conducive to an international climate in which mankind would be secure from armed attack. This has been, as history proves, the constant purpose of civilized man, given a new urgency by the horrors of the last world war, and thus, as we know, it became the main preoccupation of those assembled at San Francisco and, in consequence of their labours, the cornerstone of our Charter. Today it avowedly remains our primary objective—one which, we all admit, must be achieved if, as was indicated by Mr. Dulles, mankind itself is to survive. It was therefore for the preservation of peace and the establishment of security that the United Nations

was primarily created, and it is essentially for these purposes that the Organization continues to exist.

35. When, therefore, we reflect on the events since San Francisco and on the dangerous differences and tensions which continue to plague the world, it is no more than natural that the United Nations, as it now works, should be generally viewed with a growing sense of apprehension, also in the most responsible quarters.

36. It is true—and this cannot be over-emphasized—that the Organization has much to its credit: that in Palestine and in the Balkans its record has been reassuring, that in Korea its momentous achievement in crushing armed aggression is impressive. But all this cannot satisfy us or satisfy our critics when, in fact, experience tends to show that we are inadequately equipped to achieve, to at least a great degree, our primary purpose of ensuring a lasting peace and effective security, or when such success as we have achieved, and do achieve, cannot in all respects be ascribed to the efficient working of our Organization.

37. In Korea, for instance, the United Nations was enabled to resist aggression only because of a fortuitous circumstance, a fortuitous circumstance which enabled the Security Council to function constitutionally and therefore to function at all. For, as has so often been pointed out, had it not been for the deliberate absence of the Soviet Union representative, the veto would surely have been applied and the United Nations would once again have been prevented from acting in accordance with the dictates of the Charter—and this because of the will of only one of its Members.

38. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the debates in the United Nations have not always been a source of encouragement to those who undertook to expel the aggressor from South Korean soil. Nor can it be denied that the attitude adopted by some in these debates has often served to render the aggressor nations excessively intransigent in our protracted negotiations to bring an end to bloodshed and to bring peace to Korea. These negotiations are still proceeding, and this Organization's attitude and actions with regard thereto continue to be widely and closely scrutinized by all who sincerely look to the United Nations to play the part for which it was designed.

39. Defects in our Charter must therefore be repaired when the proper time for revision comes, in 1955. Among these defects we have, of course, the veto. Mr. Dulles referred to it specifically, to what he termed the dissatisfaction felt especially by the smaller nations at San Francisco with what they regarded as an excessive award of power to the permanent members of the Security Council. In my own country there was strong criticism at the time of this compromise, which, it was felt, would incapacitate the Security Council in the event of great-Power disagreement. There are no doubt other defects which will require reparation—when the time comes. My Government is therefore glad to see that steps are already being envisaged for looking searchingly into these matters and that early attention will therefore be given to this very important matter.

40. It is the view of my Government, however, that this task should be approached with the greatest circumspection and that, in attempting to assess the adequacy or inadequacy of existing Charter provisions, the greatest care should be exercised not to be led

astray by failures in the Organization which may not be due to Charter deficiencies but to what I might term functional mistakes. My Government believes that the present position is due not so much to defects in the Charter as to unhealthy practices which have developed in the Organization despite the provisions of the Charter in its present form. In other words, it believes that the position with which we have to contend today may well be the consequence not so much of defective Charter provisions as of the abuse of those provisions. Therefore those who would seek to evaluate the adequacy of existing Charter provisions in the light of practical results must be careful to determine, first of all, whether those provisions have ever been properly applied.

41. Take, for instance, the veto—a device which, few can deny, has proved to be inherently unsound and which should therefore be removed from the Charter. Yet even here, we must admit, it is the reckless abuse of this provision that has brought it into such serious disrepute. I believe that few, if any, of those present at San Francisco ever dreamt that the veto would be invoked in order to stultify the operations of the United Nations whenever a proposed action was displeasing to one of its great Members. Who could have foreseen, for instance, that the veto would be invoked to keep out of this Organization so many of the older and more experienced nations of the world which qualify for membership in every single respect, and without whose presence here this Organization cannot be expected to function as originally intended? It is therefore not only the inherent failings of the veto provision which have made it so objectionable, but also its improper use, its abuse.

42. There are other, perhaps better, examples of abuse. As the representative of the Union of South Africa, I automatically turn to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which, I submit, has been violated more consistently than any other provision.

43. There are, of course, many who regard this provision with distaste, as an unnecessary limitation on the authority of the Organization; who, because they seek to convert the Organization into a sovereign world parliament, would welcome the disappearance or removal from the Charter of this restrictive provision. Those who are thus inclined are of course entitled to their views and their aspirations, and can at the proper time endeavour to persuade their fellow members as to the wisdom of their aims.

44. As things stand today, however, there are spheres of national activity into which this Organization cannot legally intrude, where it is without competence. This was the clear injunction inscribed in Article 2, paragraph 7, and it was because of this injunction that the smaller countries found it possible to accept the Charter in its present form. This, despite repeated statements to the contrary, is clearly borne out not only by the explicit terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, but also by the documents of the San-Francisco Conference.

45. Yet the United Nations has, at the instance of a voting majority, consistently intervened in matters in which it is enjoined by the Charter not to intrude. This, surely, is improper action which is not due to defective Charter provisions but to the abuse of the Charter. The views of my Government on the subject have been stated often enough in the past. I may be

called upon to state them again on a more appropriate occasion. I shall therefore not pursue this point in my present statement. I must add, however, that my Government welcomes the growing evidence that this urge to intervene in the domestic affairs of Member States is causing widespread concern. This evidence comes from the most responsible sources, both inside and outside the Organization, and it would be well to heed the warnings of those who realize that, if the United Nations is to survive as an instrument of peace, this dangerous course of intervention in the domestic affairs of States will have to cease. Here I need but refer the Assembly to what was said recently by the United States representative, Mr. Lodge, in the General Committee [87th meeting], and since then, in the General Assembly [436th meeting], by the Minister for External Affairs of New Zealand, Mr. Webb.

46. The United Nations has been called a "town meeting of the world", where all those present seek to promote peace, international goodwill and co-operation. How often do those who attack the internal affairs of Member States seek to achieve these purposes? How often do they not seek to hurt and engender suspicion and hostility? How often do they not, despite the call for tolerance, seek to exploit the United Nations by exacerbating feelings instead of harmonizing differences? We need but read the records of the past few years to find abundant evidence of this, of how the affairs of Member States are misrepresented, sometimes deliberately, in order to justify these unwarranted attacks. In this connexion, may I add that I was impressed this morning [441st meeting] by the remarks which were made by Mr. Pearson, our former President, on this specific point.

47. There are other matters which require our urgent attention. Among these the most prominent is perhaps the need for economy, the need for restricting our operations in a manner which will not place membership of the United Nations and its specialized agencies beyond the financial capacity of Member States. The representative of Cuba spoke very eloquently on this point this morning. It should be recognized that the multiplicity of agencies, commissions, committees and other bodies is placing a burden on Members which they—or at least some of them—just cannot afford. Material costs are involved which countries like my own could often devote more justifiably to the immediate and essential welfare of their citizens. The large sums which we are called upon to contribute to maintain international organizations, very important as they are, often compel us to suspend progressive developments which the interests of our people need and demand. The appeal to place a limit on these costs is therefore urgent. I have in mind not only material costs. My country, as no doubt others, often finds it difficult to participate effectively in all the diversified international activities. Our qualified manpower is not as abundant as in the larger and more affluent countries.

48. Equally important is the difficulty of statesmen absenting themselves for long periods from their capitals where their attention may be more pressingly required. Here I have in mind, especially, the protracted nature of our Assembly sessions. I believe it is generally recognized that, for this Organization to operate as originally envisaged, it should also afford an opportunity for those who in their respective countries are responsible for policy to consult with each

other on matters of common concern. And what has been our experience? Has it been possible for foreign ministers and other cabinet members always to attend our sessions? This, I submit, is a matter which deserves close attention.

49. It is not, of course, the intention of my delegation to suggest that the United Nations and its agencies should be denied the opportunity of serving the more pressing needs of humanity. It is essential, if we are to live together in good neighbourliness, that we should help each other wherever we can. This precept is enshrined in our Charter and has inspired the actions of so many of our friends. My own country, I may say, is also endeavouring to do what it can. We are committed to co-operation aimed at the co-ordinated development of that region of the world of which it is a part.

50. The views which I have placed before the Assembly today are offered in a constructive spirit, and not in one of faultfinding or condemnation. The South African delegation subscribes to the view that the United Nations is capable of becoming our greatest and surest instrument of peace and security. It is our view, however, that this is only possible if the Organization is made to work—if it is rendered more efficient and effective than, in fact, it is today. And we maintain that this can be done.

51. I have drawn attention to certain difficulties which, as far as my Government is concerned, make it difficult always to participate fully in the work of the Organization. I have endeavoured to show that, however impatient we may be to press forward with the many tasks entrusted to the Organization, we should not undertake too much, for by doing so we may well be dissipating our energies and our resources. I have also tried to sound a note of warning, a warning that, in approaching the question of revising the Charter, we should not act precipitately, for it is our firm conviction that our failures are not always due to imperfections in the existing Charter; they are due also to unwise, and often unconstitutional, action. No matter how perfect the Charter, the United Nations will never function effectively unless our procedures also are healthy and unless we adhere scrupulously to the provisions of the Charter which was drawn up by our founders in San Francisco.

52. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): Last year the delegation of Ecuador pointed out the importance of the general debate at the beginning of General Assembly sessions; that debate serves to guide world opinion in regard to the great problems on the solution of which peace depends, and because it keeps alive men's confidence in the United Nations as the only instrument we have been able to create in our desire to prevent war and achieve a true understanding between States.

53. Despite great difficulties, a relative order is to some extent being achieved in the world. In the last year there has been little evidence to justify great optimism regarding the immediate success of the great enterprise undertaken by the United Nations. The great Powers have the last word: it is they who are responsible for the course of political events. This explains the anxiety with which we wait to hear the views of the Secretary of State of the United States, of the representative of the Soviet Union, of the representatives of the United Kingdom, France, China

and other Powers which, although they do not call themselves great, are so in fact. The first two have already spoken, and with their speeches have created the atmosphere in which the items on this session's agenda will be discussed in the Assembly and in the various Committees, providing us with a basis on which to estimate the likelihood of the successful outcome of our work.

54. The speech of the Secretary of State of the United States [*434th meeting*], delivered in a tone of calm and moderation, has been generally well received. Mr. Dulles discussed clearly and frankly all the problems which demand immediate solution in Europe and in Asia; he dealt courteously with his great adversary, pointing out a number of roads that would lead to a broad and generous understanding, without falling back on undignified appeasement, and maintaining firmly and inflexibly the defence of the basic principles of our culture. An international policy in this form, which is maintained on this moral level, rules out every kind of error and may be turned to good account if peace is genuinely desired by the Powers to which the Charter has given the difficult and complex duty of saving mankind from another war which might be the final chapter in man's history on earth.

55. We listened most attentively to the speech delivered before the Assembly on 21 September by Mr. Vyshinsky, the chairman of the delegation of the Soviet Union [*438th meeting*]. In spite of the dialectical resources with which he tried to adorn the arguments that have been so often repeated from this rostrum, Mr. Vyshinsky's speech disappointed the desire of many of us to find, this time, some indications of that goodwill which is necessary if we are to reconcile divergent points of view and to create a favourable atmosphere for the kind of efforts which can lead to concrete and fruitful solutions. His language was harsh and there was no change in his position; he continued to demand that all his proposals should be accepted, and rejected in stubborn fashion the generous approach of those who sincerely desire to create an atmosphere in which all the nations may live in peace. The veil of obscurity which he tried for the sake of confusion to draw over facts such as the North Korean aggression failed in its object. The historic responsibility for crimes against civilization cannot be avoided, whatever the ability and vigour of the defending advocate. Falsehood is always unmasked when a little time has elapsed, in the same way as light appears and moral sanction falls upon the guilty when we let common sense do its work.

56. So far we have not heard representatives of a large number of countries, but, judging by the statements we have already heard, it can be said that generally speaking there have already appeared within the United Nations three currents of opinion which group the Powers in opposing or neutral camps. This creates a new factor of confusion which impedes the proper functioning of this Organization; for the United Nations cannot tolerate such internal division without sacrificing its essential purpose, namely, the unity of all the countries which signed or acceded to the Charter. World public opinion is, however, already well informed after listening to the representatives who have so far spoken from this rostrum. It is already possible to see where the obstacles come from and which of the great Powers is responsible for the continuation



of the international tension that increasingly endangers the still weak structure which is preserving peace.

57. The friendly words of the supporters of democracy, which were intended to create an atmosphere favourable to effective negotiation, are proving useless; at this stage of the debate, and after many years of using the same tactics, the same arguments—always in the same words—it is useless for the other side to feign a love of peace which they do not possess, to proclaim a solidarity they do not practise and to speak of a people's democracy that is in reality a cruel autocracy of a totalitarian type.

58. Thus unfortunately we continue on our way on the edge of war, and, as events develop, we approach the tragic end of this ever-narrowing path to which we are confined by the clash of great interests and the far-off prospect of achieving a great ideal.

59. What part are we of the small nations to play in this debate between the great Powers? Why do we take part in it if we lack the military and economic resources which constitute strength and power, and which are frequently used for human destruction? What, then, is the purpose of our participation, if we are not able to effect the slightest alteration in the policies of the statesmen who are at the head of the great Powers? Shall we not perhaps be a dead weight at this time when all the material and immaterial factors which restrain the free play of instincts and passions, economies and philosophies, interests and ambitions are being thrown overboard?

60. I should like to make a modest attempt to answer these grave questions. The declaration of the Charter concerning the equality of all nations large and small does not in practice have the theoretical value which that instrument confers upon it. No one has been foolish enough to give the declaration an objective value greater than that assigned to it by reality. But it is sensible and true to say that small peoples such as my own have a cultural and human patrimony equal to that of the most powerful peoples of the world. Hence, when a matter of such grave importance as the maintenance of peace or the danger of war is being discussed, the small nations have the same rights as the great ones to voice their opinions in defence of those principles which constitute the cultural heritage of mankind.

61. At this time, every conflict has world dimensions and world repercussions. We are all, great and small, equally affected. The interdependence of politics and economics is characteristic of a world in which the countries have been brought closer together by the speeding up of communications, and in which the technical command of nature has placed at man's disposal means of mass destruction that can reach every corner of the earth. Even the idea of neutrality has been modified by this technical progress, and all peoples, great and small, are faced by the frightening and tragic possibility of universal destruction.

62. We realize indeed that we cannot expect to be heard with the same anxious attention and interest as those whose words are backed by the tremendous powers of total destruction. But we have behind our words a set of moral values and principles that form the basis of human culture, which it is necessary to defend.

63. In the particular case of my own country, there is a further reason why we wish to be heard; our

whole historical development has been determined by a fervent desire for peace, for the maintenance of the principles of law in international relations, and for justice based on law, liberty and respect for the dignity of the human person. In this debate we do not therefore aspire to the solution of great problems. We confine ourselves to defending legal and moral principles, to supporting resolutely and unflinchingly every measure for the maintenance of international order and security, without sacrificing justice, and to co-operating loyally in the development of measures to safeguard the dignity of man and to create a climate in which it is possible for men and women to live a decent life, free from fear and from want.

64. If, as a contemporary thinker has said, the word has a sacred mission, it is here that the purpose of that high and noble attribute of man should most appropriately be fulfilled. We small Powers have the satisfaction and the pride of using the word in order to contribute our grain of sand to the ideal edifice of universal peace. We can use it only to demonstrate that ideas are the attribute of all men and that in the intellectual field all have the same possibilities. If we can succeed in remaining in this field, and refrain from invading the field in which only the great may move, we shall be heard with respect, which is the most to which we who are backed exclusively by moral force can aspire.

65. My delegation has carefully examined the Secretary-General's annual report on the work of the Organization [A/2404]. It gives a commendably impartial account of our long labours, and succeeds in compressing in a short space the whole panorama of our discussions in committees and technical groups. Personnel policy, which was a matter of such concern to us last year, seems to have entered into a period of calm and effective collaboration. We look forward with interest to any suggestions that may be made to us concerning any new measures we should adopt.

66. The lessons of history have taught us that the chief cause of disturbances of the peace, whether national or international, is economic and social instability. The United Nations has sought to attack that cause vigorously, by co-ordinating international efforts to create economic and social stability. Before embarking on large-scale programmes for the solution of economic and social problems, the United Nations has sought to collect the fullest statistical data to provide a basis for preparatory analytical studies by experts. The economic development of under-developed areas has naturally had priority over other work, and it is desirable that it should continue to do so. Similarly, the progress attained in the solution of many technical problems in the fields of taxation, statistics, communications, transport and public finance is also worthy of note, as a triumph for modern methods of co-operation.

67. With the timely and understanding advice of the United Nations, my country has been able to enact an organic customs Act and a customs tariffs Act, completely remodelling our former system and enabling us to modernize services, the revenue from which represents a considerable proportion of our budget. The eminent statesman who heads the Government of my country is keenly interested in completely remodelling, again with the technical assistance of the United Nations, our taxation and public finance system; the work is proceeding smoothly and should be completed in 1954. I wish to take this opportunity to express my

Government's gratitude for the excellent co-operation afforded to it by all the experts sent by the United Nations and the specialized agencies in many departments of economic, social, health and educational work. We hope that such technical assistance to our country will continue and increase.

68. A serious symptom of the inequality between the incomes of the under-developed countries and those of the more developed countries is the growing social unrest which lends itself to exploitation by the Communists, with obvious danger to the public peace. There is an increasing tendency to emigrate from the countries of Latin America, especially to the United States, to obtain higher wages.

69. The efforts made in previous years to achieve some equality in the incomes of all the continents have been insufficient. The Assembly, like the Economic and Social Council, has given considerable attention to these problems, and to the problem of the relationship of prices in international trade. The Assembly should reinforce the decisions which it took on this subject at the last session, notably in resolution 623 (VII), recommending that governments should co-operate in establishing multilateral as well as bilateral international agreements or arrangements relating to individual primary commodities as well as to groups of primary commodities and manufactured goods, in order to ensure the stability of the prices of those commodities. In that connexion, we look forward with much interest to the report to be submitted by the committee of experts appointed by the Secretary-General, in accordance with that resolution, to advise on practical measures to ensure stable and equitable price relationships in international trade.

70. In its desire to have the proper agencies and adequate resources to finance economic development, the General Assembly asked the Economic and Social Council, on 21 December 1952 [*resolution 622 A (VII)*], to submit to it a detailed plan for establishing a special fund for grants-in-aid and for low-interest, long-term loans to under-developed countries, to assist them to finance non-self-liquidating projects which are basic to their economic development.

71. Pursuant to this request, the Economic and Social Council set up a committee of experts [*resolution 416 A (XIV)*] which has just submitted to it a detailed report [*E/2381*] containing recommendations on the fundamental problems of the structure, management and administration of the fund, its resources, policy and principles. The Economic and Social Council has also received the report [*E/2441*] of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on the proposal for setting up an international finance corporation to promote the financing of economically viable private enterprises. Both proposals, the proposal for setting up a United Nations special fund and the proposal for an international finance corporation, will be submitted to the Assembly for consideration in due course. My delegation considers that both are of vital importance to the development of our economies, and for that reason cannot fail to express its fears lest they might be rejected.

72. To defer action until such time as the international situation makes it possible to invite or advise the peoples of the more highly developed countries to invest their savings in such projects would not be very encouraging to the under-developed countries.

We trust that procrastination of this kind will be replaced by concrete and practicable solutions. Co-operation on a world scale in the development of resources is an essential requisite of peace which cannot be postponed to so distant a date, and surely means will be sought out to fulfil in a more practical and immediate way the urgent needs of economic development.

73. The United Nations Charter is an international legal document which imperfectly expresses the desire of the peoples to live in peace by establishing a basis on which States can live together in security, in an atmosphere of respect for international law which precludes violence and injustice.

74. The majority of States accepted the terms of the Charter at San Francisco because of the urgency of the need for reaching a compromise which would reconcile differences of opinion which might have delayed the solution of particular problems. We are certain, however, that none of the countries that signed it or subsequently acceded to it did so with the intention of committing themselves irrevocably to immutable provisions, or regarded the Charter as untouchable and not susceptible of improvement. That view would have been contrary to the concept of law as a body of rules arising out of the conditions of social life which change in time and in space. Only reactionary thinkers could today maintain that the laws governing relations among States are immutable and eternal, as did the old school of natural law. Thus the Charter had to be accepted as a flexible document, adapted to the circumstances of the time, but admitting of amendment to adjust it to new aspirations and ideals.

75. President Roosevelt, with his statesman's vision and genius, took advantage of the state of public opinion following the Second World War to carry forward the gigantic task of preparing the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and to convene the conference which was to discuss and approve them. Despite his death, the work was carried on with the sense of urgency which his determination had imparted. Perhaps if more time had passed before its creation, it would not have been possible to build this international centre where peoples of all races, languages, religions, philosophies and customs are learning to live together.

76. The Charter was the last expression of agreement and loyal understanding between the democratic Powers and the Soviet Union. In the circumstances which subsequently arose and which have brought us to the present state of international tension, it would have been impossible to create the United Nations Organization. Yet precisely because the Charter, born of suffering and of hope, was a compromise necessitated by circumstances, it could not be considered unchangeable, and provisions were included in Chapter XVIII allowing for the possibility of its amendment when experience demonstrated its imperfections.

77. Those imperfections are obvious. Serious omissions, disturbing inequalities, obscurities that lend themselves to misinterpretation, had to be accepted for the sake of the great common good, the taking of the first step on the long road which the United Nations had to follow. The request made by some countries, including Ecuador, at the last session of the General Assembly, for the amendment of the



Charter in the manner provided by the Charter, was motivated only by the laudable desire to perfect the Charter, to eliminate inequities and to adapt it to actual conditions in the modern world.

78. This being so, it is natural that we should prepare for the revision of the Charter by instructing a committee of experts to carry out a calm, detailed and scientific study of the matter, the results of which would be submitted to the governments of Member States for their comments and suggestions. The conference to amend the Charter which must be convened at the tenth session would thus have before it a scientifically prepared draft which would provide a basis for discussion. If any other method were used, proceedings would be complicated by the submission of a variety of drafts prepared without prior consultation with Member States and without their co-operation, which would impede the work of revision.

79. We cannot understand the position of the USSR representative, Mr. Vyshinsky, in violently condemning the timely proposal on this matter which appears in the agenda of this session. He said that the revision of the Charter was intended to destroy the United Nations, to endanger peace and to transform the Organization into an agency of one of the great Powers. There is no excuse for so frivolous and unjust a statement on the part of so eminent a lawyer, universally recognized in all branches of law, including that in which he won world fame as Public Prosecutor of the Soviet Union. There is no legal ground which could justify Mr. Vyshinsky's passionate and offensive diatribe, in which he made the insulting insinuation that those who advocate revision of the Charter do so in order to destroy the United Nations, or, which is worse, to transform it into an appendage of the United States Department of State.

80. In this, as in all questions he dealt with in his statement during the general debate, Mr. Vyshinsky merely expressed his stubborn determination not to accept any solution other than that put forward by the Soviet Union and the so-called peoples' democracies, which he also calls, with a regularity which borders on irony, "peace-loving peoples". He showed a curiously conservative outlook in asserting that legal rules were eternal and immutable, and an imperialistic spirit in refusing to accept any point of view other than his own.

81. The tenacious and violent opposition of the Soviet Union cannot block our progress in this great undertaking, for no one knows what the future may hold. My Government pledges itself now to work zealously for the revision of the Charter, overcoming all obstacles to the improvement of this international instrument. It rejects the insulting charge that any attempt to revise the Charter tends to transform the United Nations into an agency of one of the great Powers. On the contrary, in favouring revision, it is our just and reasonable desire to destroy the anti-democratic device of the right of veto of the five great Powers, which is inconsistent with the equality of States in international law and has served merely to undermine the foundation and structure of the world organization.

82. The Soviet Union's very unfriendly response to the friendly appeal made by the United States to strengthen peace, its violent opposition to efforts to find a formula to end the cold war, which is one of the great obstacles to the economic development of many

peoples, the diatribe and insult with which it greets the invitations extended to it, must be interpreted as meaning that it is closing all doors to a reasonable understanding and that we are condemned to continue the armaments race, the cold war and the verbal battles which are weakening the fabric of peace and bringing us dangerously nearer to that tragic destiny which may destroy the patient work of centuries in a few hours.

83. We refuse to accept that tragic destiny as a solution of mankind's problems, and, despite the allegations of those engaged in a struggle for world domination, we believe that truth must triumph if it is defended unequivocally and with the proper weapons.

84. Events seem to be proving that there can be no peaceful coexistence between a State of a totalitarian, materialistic and communistic type and a State of a democratic, idealistic and individualistic type. It is impossible because, theoretical statements to the contrary notwithstanding, the *raison d'être* of the first is the destruction of the other. Cold war, sabotage, guerrilla warfare and the disruptive activities of the communist parties within the democratic States are the preliminary steps for softening up, to use the military term, the terrain selected for the final attack.

85. The democracies can best defend themselves by making it impossible for the enemy to attain his objective within their frontiers. Democracy, as a system, has a weapon denied to totalitarianism: freedom. Through it, the democratic States can recognize their mistakes, correct them and make their social, economic and political systems better and more equitable. Consequently, democracy will strive ever harder to raise the standard of living of the peoples, to teach them to defend their freedom against the threat of a cruel and totalitarian communism, to help them to uphold their right to live, think and work as they wish, and to ensure respect for the human person, his honour and his religion.

86. It is natural that the democracies should wish to reduce armaments and to apply all their human and economic resources to social improvements. But while bearing in mind that ultimate objective, they cannot hand themselves over defenceless to the machinations of those who seek their destruction. Accordingly, they have to enable their peoples to combat those who offer them an illusory material happiness, which is worth nothing since it must be bought at the price of the horrible slavery which transforms the individual into a chattel of the State.

87. Just as technical discoveries and scientific advances necessitate a basic change in military tactics, so achievements in social and economic organization bring with them a need for a new pattern in politics. The emperors of ancient Rome offered the people bread and circuses; the rulers of the Middle Ages offered their serfs bread and eternal salvation; the French Revolution offered the new classes eager to exercise their rights liberty, equality and fraternity. But those times are past, and social needs require that statesmen should direct their policies towards the welfare of the group as well as to the freedom of the individual. The social questions of housing, health, protection against unemployment, social security, education without discrimination, are the pressing problems of the day.

88. If the statesmen upon whose shoulders rests the burden of directing the destinies of the democratic States adopt the political concepts required by the times in which we live, they will find their arsenals strengthened with new weapons to protect democratic ideals; at the same time, they will find their leadership buttressed by the determination of healthy and civilized peoples convinced that the defence of their way of life is the defence of their own freedom, lives and wealth, and not the lives and wealth of people who remain in the rear after having exploited and sacrificed them.

89. If it is absurd to hope for an understanding, as the negative position of Mr. Vyshinsky seems to indicate, the democracies must prepare to defend themselves by strengthening themselves, not only militarily, but also by satisfying the moral and material needs of their peoples. The cold war will be won by those who succeed in winning the confidence and support of the people, by those who have greater faith, tenacity and strength in upholding their ideals as well as greater courage in defending them. If the democracies prove themselves equal to their historic task, if they become more and more convinced that only by co-operation and social service can they attain greater justice, if they become imbued with the people's desire for freedom and succeed in eradicating old prejudices, the communist horde will have no target for its propaganda and the iron curtain will crumble, saving the world from the pagan barbarism which once again threatens it.

90. I do not wish to conclude without making a reference in passing—as the Cuban representative did this morning [441st meeting]—to the view expressed by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, in his speech to Parliament on foreign affairs last week. If Press reports reflect his thinking accurately, it would appear that Mr. Nehru takes a sadly mistaken view of the Latin-American countries when he speaks of their negative position regarding India's participation in the political conference on the unification of Korea.

91. With due respect to the Prime Minister of India, I wish to assure him that Ecuador—the only Latin-American country for which I am authorized to speak—is keenly interested in all world problems and tries to support what seems fair and reasonable, without obeying instructions from any Power. With respect to India's participation in the political conference on Korea, my Government sincerely believed that, in the circumstances, it was preferable that the United Nations should be represented in the manner which Ecuador approved by its affirmative vote. The exclusion of India should in no way be interpreted as an unfriendly act or failure to appreciate the value of that country which my Government respects and which I personally particularly admire.

92. Mr. Nehru should not be surprised that some proposals are defeated or carried in the United Nations General Assembly by the votes of the Latin-American countries. The peoples of Latin America, with their similar cultural and historical background, the same language and political orientation, tend spontaneously, whether they consult each other or not, to have a spiritual unity—which explains the similarity in their conduct. I am sure that no Latin-American statesman would be surprised if a problem affecting America which was being considered by the General Assembly were settled as a result of the support of the Arab or Asian Powers. The linguistic, religious or cultural

bonds among them, or at least the community of interests, would naturally lead them to favour the same resolutions, with or without prior consultation among themselves. I find it really incomprehensible in a statesman of the stature of Mr. Nehru that his feelings, perhaps provoked by his natural reaction to his country's exclusion from such an important political meeting, should have made him express himself in a manner inconsistent with the traditional calm and tranquillity of the men of his race and culture to whom the mystery of the inner life has been revealed in all its sublimity.

93. My delegation was highly gratified by the election of Mrs. Pandit, chairman of the Indian delegation, as President of this Assembly. Her ability, intelligence and energy in conducting our debates—qualities which only confirm what we already knew about her—will vindicate her brilliant reputation and will enhance the prestige of woman in the world. Her successful diplomatic career is the reward for a life of abnegation and sacrifice in the cause of the freedom and greatness of India, for whose ancient culture and humanity we have the deepest admiration.

94. Mr. DERESSA (Ethiopia): My Government believes that since the last session of the General Assembly much progress has been made towards improving the world situation. At this eighth session we find grounds for optimism. We believe, too, that in spite of the controversy which still persists in many fields, the peoples of the world can take heart and look forward to achieving real peace through the mechanism of the United Nations. But, while Ethiopia believes that there are grounds for optimism, we see clearly that there are no grounds for complacency. On the contrary, we believe that efforts in certain fields must be redoubled before it is too late. The orientation of this eighth session, the direction it takes, the matters to which major attention and the will to succeed are applied will, we believe, be decisive for the state of our world for some time. For this reason I desire at this time to point out the matters which Ethiopia believes are of paramount importance and therefore deserve our most earnest efforts.

95. In the first place, my delegation hopes that the present impasse with respect to disarmament will be resolved. The appalling waste, the dismal direction given to science and invention, and the tension created by the process of arming, must be eliminated in order to avoid irretrievable losses in the progress thus far made by civilization. We note with satisfaction that the Disarmament Commission, in its most recent report [DC/32], soon to be discussed here, has expressed the hope that it can look forward to continuing its work in an atmosphere made more propitious by recent international events. Ethiopia hopes that the General Assembly's consideration of that report will give new impetus to the work of the Commission so that a method of disarmament will be agreed upon.

96. Secondly, my Government earnestly hopes that problems arising from so-called racial differences will be speedily solved. Ethiopia believes in the equality of all human races. We refuse to believe that, half way through the twentieth century, there is no basis upon which people of different races can live together amicably.

97. Thirdly, my delegation believes that it is essential to world peace that this eighth session of the General



Assembly should continue on the road of promoting independence for people of territories now under foreign rule. The responsibility and ultimate aim of all administration in all such territories must be to lead the people thereof to self-rule. The guides to be followed in applying this principle are, first, the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants, secondly, the economic conditions of the country and the possibility of independent existence, and, thirdly, the maintenance of international peace and security.

98. Last, but by all odds the most important, my delegation believes that this eighth session should give increased support to the technical assistance programme and to schemes for the economic development of the under-developed countries. We believe that these matters are thoroughly tied up with the problem of collective security, for, unless economic development is brought to the countries with low standards of living, there can be no collective security in the political field. Indeed, we think that economic development and the resultant improvement of the standard of living of peoples now on subsistence levels are the conditions necessary to peace, the *sine qua non* of peace through collective action.

99. Not all wars are traceable to personal ambition for power or to a national desire to spread an ideology. Much of the unrest today, particularly in the Middle East, Asia and Africa, is economic in origin. I think no one will deny this. And not all the pledges in the world to the doctrine of collective security, even the splendid precedent of Korea, will be sufficient to quiet such unrest. But if through United Nations effort—through collective action, if you please—the natural resources of the now under-developed countries can be put into production and the people aided in freeing themselves from the fear of want, then collective security in the political field will become an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace.

100. Here I must reiterate my country's devotion to the principle of collective security. We note with heartfelt satisfaction the results of the negotiations at Panmunjom. We rejoice to see that, for the first time in history, collective security has been tested and proved effective. Ethiopia is proud of the part its Emperor, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, has played in the development of this doctrine. Although our country was once a victim of the failure of this doctrine, this time we contributed both treasure and troops to aid in stopping an aggressive war.

101. The world has learned a great deal about the principle of collective security since the end of the First World War, but our progress is still too limited. It is high time that we advanced, and I believe that the most promising fields in which the doctrine may be extended and made more effective are that of technical co-operation and that which I have already mentioned, namely, the economic development of under-developed areas. We have given too little attention to such programmes. We have been too preoccupied with political problems. Ethiopia submits that the United Nations should turn collectively to the economic problem of developing natural resources where development has lagged.

102. The General Assembly has before it three schemes for promoting economic development. I refer to the proposal for establishing a special fund for grants-in-aid and low-interest long-term loans, the

proposal for the establishment of an international finance corporation, and the proposal to expand the present programme of technical assistance. This is not the time to discuss these proposals in detail. In principle, however, my delegation urges that these schemes should be supported—more, they should be the dominating passion of this eighth session.

103. Ethiopia applauds the proposal that savings from disarmament should be devoted to economic development. But while we applaud, we must caution the General Assembly not to put the cart before the horse. Political animosities which cause nations to arm will not pass away until a measure of economic development is achieved. Should we not, therefore, proceed boldly to create the conditions under which political problems can be solved, to start the motion that will facilitate disarmament? We believe that the obvious obstacles in the path of such programmes can be surmounted with a little boldness.

104. There is still time to do this, but we must get on with it before we find that our efforts have been "too little and too late".

105. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has begun its eighth session with a consideration of general international problems. The international situation has always directly affected the activity of the United Nations. It has determined the political atmosphere at every session of the General Assembly and decided the direction of its work and the nature of its decisions. Our first duty, therefore, as we proceed to examine important international questions, is to make a correct appraisal of the international situation that has evolved.

106. In recent years, relations among certain States have developed abnormally. After discarding the policy of friendly settlement of international questions by agreement which had united the efforts of the Allies during the war and in the first post-war years, aggressive circles in the United States and a number of other countries substituted for it the policy of the armaments race, military preparations and the cold war, in other words, a policy which leads to a new world war. An expression of this policy so inimical to the cause of peace was the creation of the North Atlantic bloc of aggressive States, the formation of which has greatly advanced the preparations for war. The aggressive policy of the cold war created a dangerous tension in international relations, the result of which was the war in Korea.

107. Mindful of the real threat of a new world war resulting from the increased activity of the international forces of aggression, the Soviet Union has drawn the proper conclusions from the existing international situation. In pursuance of its policy of peace, the Soviet Union has endeavoured with determination and persistence to avert the threat of a world war, and is taking all necessary measures to that end. In recent years, the USSR delegation to the United Nations has introduced a number of proposals aimed at strengthening peace and international security. At the same time, the Soviet Union has adopted a number of essential defence measures which were necessary in the interests of strengthening peace and its own security.

108. True to its unalterable policy of seeking the peaceful solution of international questions, the Soviet Union from the very first day of the Korean war came



out in support of the immediate cessation of hostilities. It is well known how perseveringly the USSR delegation endeavoured to persuade the Organization to take urgent and effective action to that end. At the end of last year, the concern of the USSR that the war in Korea should be halted and its readiness to co-operate in the task of bringing hostilities to a close was emphasized once again in Stalin's reply to *The New York Times* correspondent. The Soviet Union therefore supported the generous initiative of the Chinese People's Republic and the Korean People's Democratic Republic aimed at removing the obstacles to the negotiations at Panmunjom. The result was the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of the Armistice Agreement.

109. The successful conclusion of the negotiations and the signing of the Armistice Agreement in Korea was welcomed by the peoples of the whole world as an important international event. It aroused the hope that the signing of the agreement might lead to a peaceful settlement in the Far East and the strengthening of peace throughout the world. The conclusion of the Armistice Agreement in Korea constitutes a serious defeat for the policy of using force in international relations. It is a victory for the principle of the peaceful solution of outstanding controversial international questions. This victory has quite properly been attributed to the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union, and its efforts to relax international tension.

110. Basing its foreign policy on the possibility—which is unquestionable—that the socialist and capitalist systems can coexist over a long period of time and can engage in peaceful competition, the Soviet Union is prepared to co-operate with all countries which desire such co-operation. The relations of the Soviet Union with the countries of the capitalist world, based, as they have been, on the development of business relations and on respect for mutual interests, has convincingly shown that this policy of peaceful coexistence meets the vital interests not only of the Soviet Union but of all other countries. In pursuing this policy, the Soviet Union has convincingly and incontrovertibly proved that today there are no controversial or outstanding questions which cannot be settled peacefully by agreement between the States concerned.

111. The USSR Government's latest notes on the German and Austrian questions and the recent talks between the USSR Government and the Government of the German Democratic Republic are evidence of the Soviet Union's active and unremitting struggle in defence of peace and for the further relaxing of international tension. This is also shown by the Soviet Union's successful attempts to improve relations with neighbouring countries and re-establish normal relations with a number of other States. Especially significant are the Soviet Union's successes in strengthening its close collaboration and friendship with the Chinese People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic and the peoples' democracies. This persistent, purposeful foreign policy of the Soviet Union has already produced positive results. The change which has occurred in the international climate may serve as evidence of this.

112. After a prolonged period of mounting tension, now for the first time in the post-war years a certain *détente* in the international atmosphere has become

noticeable. A more substantial relaxation of international tension is now possible. Nations are becoming more and more convinced that there are no insuperable obstacles to international collaboration, that any international disputes or outstanding questions may be solved by peaceful settlement without the use of armed force.

113. There are serious obstacles, however, to the restoration of normal international relations, obstacles created by the policy of the aggressive circles in the United States and other countries linked to the North Atlantic bloc. In these countries there are small but influential groups which either openly oppose the settlement of outstanding international questions or, more commonly, express themselves in favour of discussing these questions while at the same time continuing in practice to carry out the "policy of strength", the strategy of the cold war and the ever-increasing intensification of the armaments race. It is, of course, impossible to disregard the fact that even highly responsible representatives of the United States Government are trying to play this political and diplomatic game.

114. It is not difficult to find proof of this if one examines the facts. Speaking in the General Assembly, the United States Secretary of State declared [434th meeting] that the United States had come to the eighth session with the determination, as he put it, "to use for peace and justice the opportunities which this Organization provides". That statement suggested that Mr. Dulles intended to unfold before the Assembly a programme of specific measures which the United States Government intended to carry out with the aim of improving the international situation and restoring normal relations with other countries.

115. It is apposite in this connexion to recall that, shortly before Mr. Dulles' speech, the American propaganda machine sought to prepare public opinion for precisely such a development by publicizing in advance the Secretary of State's forthcoming speech as a United States Government programme embracing a wide range of questions with which the present tension in international relations is connected. It would, however, be in vain to seek in Mr. Dulles' speech even the slightest hint that the United States intends to heed the universal desire of the peoples for peace, to put an end to the cold war and to the armaments race. On the contrary, Mr. Dulles' whole speech was couched in the form of demands of some kind addressed to the Soviet Union in connexion with every question he touched upon, even though he was dealing with the major international problems which had not yet been settled. At the same time, as the Soviet Press and the foreign Press correctly observed, Mr. Dulles studiously avoided saying when the United States would at long last make its promised contribution to the task of settling controversial international questions. Mr. Dulles' speech shows irrefutably that statements by representatives of United States ruling circles concerning the allegedly peace-loving tendencies of United States foreign policy must be dealt with very cautiously and that the bankrupt "get tough" policy, the "policy of strength", continues to be the political line of these circles.

116. Evidence of this is to be found, in particular, in that part of Mr. Dulles' speech where he sings the praises of the "community defence" system. Mr. Dulles repeated the favourite claims of United States propaganda, namely, that the aggressive plans of the North

Atlantic bloc are only measures of self defence, "counter-measures", he called them. He asserted, for example, that a so-called "community defence" system made it possible for small countries to escape the menace of aggression and that the system could not be used for purposes of aggression. Mr. Dulles called these "community measures" the "enlightened way" to implement the Charter of the United Nations.

117. Developing this idea, Mr. Dulles further said that the military force of several countries united for military purposes offered less danger of aggression than that of a single country, which can be used "at the dictation of one government alone, sometimes of one man alone". This assertion of Mr. Dulles is completely groundless. It is contrary to logic and historical facts. According to Mr. Dulles, the military force of the Netherlands, for example, or of El Salvador, which can be committed to battle at the will "of one government alone", constitutes a greater threat to peace than the combined military might of fifteen States headed by a Power like the United States, which has a tremendous military potential and armed forces composed of millions of men. In the light of the recent aggression against the Korean People's Democratic Republic unleashed by the North Atlantic bloc, such assertions are, to say the least, unconvincing.

118. As for the argument that a community defence system cannot be used for purposes of aggression, history knows of a number of cases where, under the guise of alliances formed to achieve peaceful and defensive purposes, aggressive States united to carry out their expansionist plans. Can it be said perhaps that the Holy Alliance, created after the fall of Napoleon I's Empire, in order, as the act of alliance said, that the parties thereto should "lend each other aid and assistance", was not an aggressive combination which instigated war in Europe and supported by force the frontier changes imposed upon the countries of Europe? Was not the Second World War the result of the creation of a bloc of aggressive States known as the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis, which also concealed its rapacious plans behind the pretext of mutual defence requirements?

119. What can there be behind Mr. Dulles' praise of the "community defence" system if not an attempt to justify the existence of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc, which people in Western European countries are ceasing to believe is necessary? We are further convinced of this by the fact that only recently, before another audience and on another subject, Mr. Dulles sought hard to obtain increased appropriations for the arming of the Western European countries, using every possible argument to prove that the North Atlantic bloc must be preserved.

120. Mr. Dulles' speech in the General Assembly convincingly proves that the ruling circles in the United States do not intend to promote a relaxation of international tension and do not propose, at least for the present, to bring about more normal international relations. United States ruling circles show no inclination to reckon with realities. They refuse to recognize the fact that the cold war is arousing increasing resistance among the masses, and that even among the leading circles of Western European countries there is a growing desire to put an end to the cold war and to return to normal international relations. Reflecting this mood, the prominent British Labour Party member, Mr. Wilson, recently wrote in an article in *Reynolds News*

that the cold war was oppressing the world and had long constricted national and international horizons. Nevertheless, the ruling circles in the United States, far from renouncing this policy, which is incompatible with normal relations between countries, are, on the contrary, endeavouring, as the representative of Indonesia quite rightly pointed out in his statement [437th meeting], to transform the cold war into a permanent basis for foreign policy.

121. If international relations are to continue on this unhealthy basis, they can seriously damage the cause of peace, and all this abnormal policy can do is to prepare the way for further military conflicts. The danger that the cold-war strategy may culminate in precisely this way can be seen from numerous facts showing that the armaments race is being intensified in a number of countries and that, with the increased production of atomic weapons, it has now reached proportions which make it particularly dangerous for peace.

122. Despite the conclusion of the armistice in Korea and the prospect of a peaceful settlement of the Korean question, the United States and, under its influence, a number of other countries, far from reducing their armed forces, are, on the contrary, increasing the size of their forces in foreign territories and continuing to expand their network of military, air and naval bases. New links are being added to the chain of United States military bases which now stretch from Japan across the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans to the countries of western and northern Europe. At the present time, a strategic construction programme is being carried out by the United States in many areas of the globe, but particular attention is given to the erection of military bases in regions and territories which are especially suitable as springboards for an attack on the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

123. These extensive aggressive undertakings by the United States in foreign territories were modestly described by Mr. Dulles as "sometimes" involving "the placing of military forces from one country in another country", but in actual fact these far-reaching plans of military strategy cannot be so camouflaged. Clear evidence of this is afforded by the treaty between the United States and Japan and likewise by the agreements with Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek. The agreement with Syngman Rhee, moreover, is in direct contradiction with statements to the effect that the United States is ready to withdraw its troops from Korea; this fact clearly reveals the aggressive nature of such agreements.

124. Aggressive circles in the United States are especially concerned in the revival of German and Japanese imperialism. The reason for this interest in Germany and Japan was revealed by none other than Mr. Dulles, when he declared that those two countries constituted two key positions in the military disposition of forces against the Soviet Union.

125. In the present serious international situation, it is especially important, indeed essential, to take effective and practical measures to reduce tension in international relations and to remove the danger of a new world war. The Soviet Union has constantly made great efforts in the United Nations to thwart by diplomatic means the irresponsible plans of the aggressive circles in the United States, which seek to precipitate another world war. However, all these efforts to induce the Organization to adopt decisions which could reduce



the existing international tension and restore normal relations between States have been without success. These efforts have invariably encountered the opposition of the ruling circles in the United States and a number of other countries, which have obstinately prevented the adoption of decisions which might restrain aggressors.

126. At the present session of the General Assembly [438th meeting], the Soviet delegation has introduced fresh proposals concerning "measures to avert the threat of a new world war and to reduce tension in international relations". There can be little doubt that these proposals will be received with great interest and sympathy by all sincere opponents of war, by all who hold that the cold war and the "get tough" policy, which created and are now maintaining the present international tension, must be eliminated and replaced by normal relations between States. The adoption of these proposals is dictated by the interests of the nations of the world, by the very circumstances which have arisen in international relations, and by the tension which must be relaxed immediately.

127. Some representatives who have spoken here have alluded to the fact that the proposals of the Soviet Union repeat in part proposals submitted by the Soviet delegation at previous sessions of the General Assembly. Those representatives, it would seem, completely fail to realize that, given the special character of the present time, circumstances and conditions, such measures are particularly necessary, despite the fact that a number of representatives in the United Nations are clearly dissatisfied at the efforts which are being made to relax international tension. This dissatisfaction emanates from certain aggressive circles which are committed to war, which are interested in war speculation and in the spread of the war psychosis which they have themselves engendered.

128. In a number of countries an important factor in the efforts being made to maintain and even to expand the military programmes which make the armaments race possible is the extraction by the giant monopolies of the greatest possible profits from the armaments race and the militarization of the economy. These profits, increasing as a result of the continuing feverish armaments race, have rapidly attained fantastic proportions, far beyond the level of the profits not only of the period of the Second World War but even of the last two or three years.

129. Those who maintain that the Soviet Union proposals contain nothing new are merely trying to conceal their determination to avoid any decisions which might help to lower the temperature of the international atmosphere and maintain peace.

130. The first proposal in the Soviet draft resolution [A/2485/Rev.1] is for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and of all other types of weapons of mass destruction, and for the establishment of strict international control to ensure observance of that prohibition. Linked with that is another proposal for the reduction of the armed forces of the five permanent members of the Security Council by one-third, and a recommendation for the calling of an international conference for the carrying out by all States of the reduction of armaments.

131. These proposals of the USSR delegation are exceptionally timely because the countries which are members of the North Atlantic bloc—that purely

military organization created to carry out aggressive plans against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies—are endeavouring to wreck the efforts of the Soviet Union to bring about a relaxation of international tension. The question of the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the establishment of strict international control to ensure observance of that prohibition is particularly to be singled out.

132. As before, the ruling circles in the United States reject all proposals aimed at establishing genuine international control, and would substitute for it the so-called "effective system" of international control which, as we have repeatedly shown, is absolutely unsuitable. The worthlessness of the control plan which the ruling circles in the United States obstinately refuse to relinquish is especially evident now that the Soviet Union has mastered the secret not only of the atomic weapon but of the hydrogen weapon also. Early this year the American Press rightly described this United States control plan, which is known as the Baruch plan, as a dead formula. Nevertheless, some of those who make United States foreign policy continue to cling to this dead formula.

133. The Soviet Union is again raising the question of prohibiting atomic and hydrogen weapons in the firm belief that its proposals will be correctly understood and supported by the General Assembly.

134. It has been argued in the General Assembly that it is useless to re-examine proposals for a one-third reduction of the armaments of the five permanent members of the Security Council, since there exists a Disarmament Commission which has not yet examined proposals previously submitted to it on this question. In our view, these arguments are unfounded. The fact that the Disarmament Commission was unable to make any headway during the whole of last year is clear evidence that General Assembly resolution 502 (VI), on which the Commission's work is based, stems from a wrong theory concerning the reduction of armaments and armed forces. The defect of this theory resides in the fact that the so-called gradual disclosure and verification of armaments by stages cannot ensure a real reduction of armaments, since it makes it possible to conceal the most secret types of weapons and to avoid their disclosure and verification. The proposals for the reduction of armaments and armed forces introduced by the Soviet Union at the present session provide a solid foundation for resuming discussion of this most urgent and important question and place the discussion itself on a practical basis.

135. We have already pointed out that the uninterrupted arms race is accompanied by an expansion of the network of military bases of some States in the territories of other States, resulting in a virtual military occupation of these countries and the undermining of their national sovereignty. Such a situation cannot be regarded as normal. It must be put to a stop immediately. That is the object of the USSR delegation's proposals recommending that the Security Council should take steps to ensure the immediate elimination of military bases in the territories of other States.

136. The international atmosphere is poisoned by the propaganda which is being conducted by a number of States with a view to inciting enmity and hatred among nations and preparing a new world war. Such activity, which prejudices the cause of peace and heightens international tension, is incompatible with normal



relations between States, and, as the Soviet draft resolution proposes, must without question be stopped as being contrary to the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations.

137. The peoples of the world cannot be satisfied with declarations about readiness "to explore ways to end the present tension", when these are not followed by practical steps aimed at achieving a genuine relaxation of tension. They demand that the obstacles to the settlement of all controversial questions should be removed and the way opened to achieving agreement on those questions. The proposals of the Soviet Union fully meet these demands. They can serve as a starting point for carrying out effective measures to end the cold war and the armaments race and to restore normal

relations between States. The adoption of the Soviet proposals would facilitate the settlement of controversial questions and create favourable conditions for a genuine relaxation of international tension.

138. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR unreservedly endorses and supports the new peace proposals of the Soviet Union and calls on all the delegations of the countries participating in the present session, and through them on the governments of those countries, to support those proposals. The Government of the Ukrainian SSR will do everything in its power to assist in putting these peace proposals of the Soviet Union into effect.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*