



Wednesday, 27 September 1950, at 3 p.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	141
Speeches by Mr. Wierblowski (Poland), Mr. King (Liberia), Mr. Kiselev (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Lange (Norway) and Mr. Pearson (Canada)	

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 9]

SPEECHES BY MR. WIERBLOWSKI (POLAND), MR. KING (LIBERIA), MR. KISELEV (BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC), MR. LANGE (NORWAY) AND MR. PEARSON (CANADA)

1. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): More than five years after its inception, our Organization is presented with a document which can, without exaggeration, be described as disturbing. This document, the annual report of the Secretary-General on the work of the United Nations, opens with the following sombre statement:

“My fifth annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the United Nations is written at a time of serious danger to the peace of the world and to the continued existence of the Organization.”¹

2. What has happened? How is it possible that in the space of five years the situation has developed to the point of causing us such grave anxiety for the future of the world and of mankind? How is it that, instead of having a more firmly established peace, we are today faced with events which threaten the security of nations and with acts which constitute a breach of the peace?

3. The Polish delegation has more than once drawn the attention of the United Nations to the true reasons for the growing international tension: it is the consequence of two political tendencies in the world. The principle that it is possible for countries with different structures, namely capitalism on the one hand and socialism on the other, to co-exist, to co-operate and to compete peaceably with one another has been repeatedly proclaimed and, what is much more important, has always been faithfully respected by the Soviet Union and the coun-

tries of the people's democracies. Despite this principle, almost immediately after the termination of the war, an offensive was launched against the socialist camp.

4. The two tendencies—-one, the desire for the peaceful co-existence of different régimes, and the other, constant aggressiveness against the socialist camp and peace—found clear expression in two statements which we heard at the very beginning of the general debate.

5. The address of the Secretary of State of the United States [279th meeting] was aggressive, full of unjustified attacks and invective. Most of the conclusions contained in that speech were intended to destroy the basic principles of our Charter. How different was the calm and reasoned statement of the USSR representative [279th meeting]. Rejecting Mr. Acheson's method of discussion, Mr. Vyshinsky once again gave evidence of the peaceful and constructive methods by which the Soviet Union proposes to approach the most complicated and dramatic international problems. Mr. Acheson's statement was just one more result of the post-war policy of the United States. Although the Secretary of State of the United States did not refer to things by their real name, his speech was of a piece with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Treaty.

6. Ostensibly a means to defend the United States against imaginary aggression, the Truman Doctrine has become an instrument of interference in the domestic affairs of States and peoples in all parts of the world. The United States intends to carry out this doctrine by building more and more strategic bases throughout the world. The Truman Doctrine is used to deprive States of their sovereign rights. The naval and air forces of the United States usurp the right to intervene in the territorial waters and in the air space of other States; its land forces enter foreign territories. The encirclement and occupation of Taiwan provide an example of this.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 1 (A/1287)*, page ix.

7. Under the guise of economic assistance to the war-devastated countries, the Marshall Plan is making the countries of Western Europe politically and economically subject to the selfish interests of the United States.

8. Under the pretext of defence against an imaginary danger, and following the pattern of the Anti-Comintern Pact of shameful memory, the North Atlantic Treaty is today openly used for preparations for war.

9. Incitement to war through the now exploded myth of a monopoly of the atomic bomb was accompanied by action to destroy the bases of international co-operation. In so far as efforts to deal with the consequences of the war are concerned, this policy had led to a breakdown in the Council of Foreign Ministers and to a deadlock in the organs of inter-allied control in Germany, Austria and Japan. In this way, the establishment of normal international relations, the conclusion of peace treaties and the withdrawal of occupation forces have been made impossible. This policy pursued and still pursues the object of giving the United States a free hand to act whenever and wherever it chooses.

10. One year ago, during the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Soviet Union proposed the conclusion of a five-Power pact to strengthen peace and at the same time called for condemnation of preparations for a new war.² Those proposals, which were warmly supported by the Polish delegation, revealed the true intentions of all those who constantly appeal for peace in order better to camouflage their policy of preparing for war. They rejected that peace proposal on the pretext that the United Nations Charter provided an adequate guarantee of peace and that the conclusion of additional treaties and conventions would therefore be superfluous.

11. A whole year has elapsed since then. The entire period since the fourth session of the General Assembly has been devoted to arming and preparing for a new war by the imperialist camp. We have witnessed the conclusion of new agreements concerning military bases, loans for armaments, unified commands and even the idea of a unified Western European army. We have seen that in all these cases the Charter was not an obstacle to the conclusion of agreements for the carrying out of plans which are manifestly in conflict with the spirit of the Charter. In the opinion of some people—the representative of Sweden for example—our Charter constituted an obstacle only to the conclusion of a truly pacific agreement which could have strengthened international co-operation and provided a solid basis for the further development of our Organization.

12. It is clear that, as a result of these manoeuvres, the international situation has become more serious and more confused in Asia as well as in Europe. Intervention in China having proved fruitless, Japan has become the springboard for American aggression in the Far East. Instead of witnessing the democratization of that country, we see the resurgence of Japanese militarism, the creation of a mercenary army and the liberation of war criminals.

13. In order to regain the positions which it had lost through the defeat in China, the United States pro-

ceeded to intervene by force in Korea, believing that it could easily gain control first of that country and subsequently of the other countries enumerated in President Truman's message of 27 June 1950. It has once again become apparent that a so-called government imposed on a people against its will can remain in power only with the protection of foreign bayonets. That was the fate of Chiang Kai-shek yesterday; that is the fate of Syngman Rhee today; and that will be the fate of their fellows tomorrow.

14. An attempt is being made to submerge the heroic resistance of the Korean people in a sea of blood. American bombs are pouring down on unarmed civilian populations, on towns and villages, on schools and hospitals and on the property of the population. The campaign against the Korean people is a campaign against the freedom of peoples and is intended to terrorize those nations which are seeking to free themselves from colonial exploitation and are struggling for their independence. Any one who knows history and understands the course of events realizes how futile it is to rely on the effectiveness of such a threat. Nations which are fighting for their freedom will never surrender. No nation has ever given up its hope of freedom under the threat of bombs and bullets.

15. Simultaneously with the events in Asia, the United States has tried to carry out its plans in other parts of the world. The recent conferences of the States belonging to the Atlantic bloc, held in London and New York, were characterized by tremendously increased armaments programmes and growing interference by the United States in the internal affairs of European countries.

16. Propaganda of hatred and of war against the countries in the camp of peace is becoming ever more intense in the countries of Western Europe; civil liberties are being curtailed and fascist movements are being encouraged in France, Italy and Belgium. Obviously the Un-American Activities Committee and the FBI provide an admirable example of such action. Workers' parties fighting in the cause of peace are persecuted, militant progressives are sentenced and an atmosphere is being created in which extreme reactionary elements are encouraged to make attempts on the lives of labour leaders.

17. In 1948, at its third session, the General Assembly approved the still imperfect Universal Declaration of Human Rights. France voted in favour of it. Yet, in violation of that Declaration and in violation of the United Nations Charter, hundreds of persons who distinguished themselves in France's struggle for freedom, heroes of the Resistance, have been and still are being deported in inhuman conditions; among those persons are Spaniards and Poles who wear French war decorations.

18. At the same time, the French authorities are protecting war criminals, traitors and former collaborators, who are kept out of the reach of justice. A few weeks ago, after refusing to extradite him to Poland, a French tribunal freed the well-known war criminal Bohun-Dobrowski, who had taken refuge in France. During the last war, this criminal was the chief of a gang which collaborated with the Gestapo and with the *Wehrmacht*; he murdered hundreds of Polish citizens, members of

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, 226th meeting.*

the Polish Resistance fighting against the nazis, Soviet soldiers and Jews who were hiding from the Gestapo.

19. In speaking of European problems, I should like to devote special attention to the situation in Germany, in view of Poland's vital interest in the question. Germany has become the scene of particularly intensive political activity by the United States.

20. In 1950, we have witnessed in Western Germany the further liquidation of the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam. Remilitarization and renazification of Western Germany have been the basic elements of United States policy. It has become clear to every observer that the preparations for remilitarization are following three lines: the Western Powers are making their own preparations on German territory; they are training a German army and strengthening the existing para-military organizations; and they are building up the German armament potential and heavy industry for the war needs of the Atlantic bloc.

21. The High Commissioner in the American Zone, Mr. McCloy, himself admitted not long ago that the American army in Germany had ceased to be an army of occupation. Its purpose now is to provide the so-called "defence" of Western Germany against the imaginary danger from the East. For the purpose of this "defence", most of the air fields of the former *Luftwaffe* have been retained and a whole series of new ones have been built, hundreds of acres of arable land being taken for the purpose. Bomber bases are also being built. Huge ammunition dumps are being built and underground depots left by the *Wehrmacht* brought back into use. There is a constantly increasing number of military training camps and of shooting ranges for the occupation forces. The military equipment of the occupation forces is being continually increased, for the same purpose. It could hardly be maintained that the 670 American tanks which were unloaded at Bremen between 6 December 1949 and 3 February 1950 are to be used for peaceful purposes.

22. The second step in these preparations is the formation of a German army. For this purpose the Western occupation authorities have for some time been using the services of war criminals, including those whose extradition was demanded by Poland. It suffices to quote the names of Generals Bach-Zelewski and Reinefahrt, who were responsible for the destruction of Warsaw. When we submitted our requests for extradition, we were told that General Reinefahrt was needed by the American authorities. It is now clear why and for what purpose these men were needed. War criminals and nazis form the core of the German mercenary army. All this is accompanied by the extension of the para-military organizations, in particular the German civilian labour organization. The police forces, which already total half a million men in the Western Zones, are being increased.

23. This whole policy has received the sanction of the three Ministers of Foreign Affairs who recently met in New York. The so-called Bonn Government has been illegally recognized as representing the German people. It has also been decided to place at its disposal military forces, which for the sake of appearances will wear police uniforms.

24. Representatives of some governments approved

these decisions regardless of the fact that they were against the vital interests of their own countries. The remilitarization of Western Germany is being accompanied by preparations for the reconstruction of the military potential of Germany and for a complete economic remilitarization. These, too, were approved by the three-Power conference in New York. Apart from the long-term policy aimed at setting up in Germany a big German-American armaments concern to cover both the German Ruhr and French Lorraine—a plan of which Mr. Schuman boasted only today—German industry is already working on military orders. Armour plating, tank engines, fuel for jet-planes, poison gases and high explosives are being manufactured; that is how the Western Powers implement the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam.

25. An important part in this plan has been allotted to mercenary units recruited from among those who found themselves in Germany as a result of the war and the occupation and were prevented from returning to their countries of origin. War criminals, quislings and traitors to their own countries are also being recruited — persons whom the Western occupation authorities, in violation of international obligations, are refusing to extradite to the countries where they would be summoned before the courts to answer for their crimes. Mercenaries of this type have a special mission. They are being trained and used for the despicable role of spies and saboteurs. These are men who are to be used under the command of mercenary generals, in fratricidal war.

26. How different is the situation in the Eastern part of Germany! The German Democratic Republic, from the very day of its foundation, has been building, on ruins and ashes, a new, peaceful and democratic Germany which is paving the way towards co-operation between the German nation and its neighbours. This new Germany is a peace-making factor in Europe.

27. The German Democratic Republic and Poland have established good-neighbourly relations and are developing a considerable volume of trade. On the basis of the Potsdam decisions, by mutual consent and in full consideration of our common interests, we fixed definitively the already established and existing frontier with the German people. The frontier on the Oder and the Western Neisse is the inviolable frontier of peace and its final delimitation, sanctioned by the Polish-German agreement of 6 July 1950, constitutes an outstanding contribution to peace and stability in Europe.

28. The whole camp of peace, of which Poland forms a part, is carrying out a positive policy with regard to Germany.

29. What have the creators of the Atlantic bloc to offer Europe in this respect? Their programme means more soldiers, more tanks, more bombers, an increase in chauvinism, hatred and unrest in Europe.

30. What is the meaning and the aim of the establishment of such an armed force and the putting into effect of remilitarization? The reply is to be found in the authoritative statement made by Mr. Schumacher, leader of the German Social Democrats. Scarcely a month ago he cynically stated: "The war must be conducted in such a way that the fighting will take place on the Vistula and the Niemen".

31. Thus Mr. Schumacher gave a clear reply to the question what was the aim of all these preparations. The aim is war. War against whom? Against Poland and against the Soviet Union. Where? On the soil of Poland and of the Soviet Union, for as we know the Vistula flows through the heart of Poland and the Niemen is in the Soviet Union.

32. The initiators of the new war are not particular in their choice of means. The Press and radio in their service make use of falsehoods and fables. They must believe in men's credulity, because their falsehoods were long ago denounced by history. Their falsehoods have even been spoken of here. The representatives of Australia, the Netherlands, Chile and other countries have referred to them. They attempted to frighten the General Assembly by raising the bogey of a conspiracy. They must have forgotten that that same method had already been used by the interventionists at the time of the October Revolution. At that time, the struggle of the peoples of Russia for their freedom was called a plot against mankind. History judged otherwise; it condemned the interventionists, entitling that chapter a conspiracy against the peoples of the Soviet Union. Today, events are following the same course. The newspapers periodically publish sensational headlines embodying new fables concerning conspiracies, the "fifth column" and the alleged manoeuvres of the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies against peace. Then, when these flagrant slanders are invalidated by facts, their authors, as a matter of form, publish a belated correction modestly hidden in the least conspicuous spot. Among many examples, it should suffice to quote the notorious document "M" of 1947, the authenticity of which even a British Minister did not hesitate to guarantee. In 1948, there was the Berlin affair; in 1949, the alleged concentration of troops on the Yugoslav frontiers; in 1950, we have had the slanderous statements concerning demonstrations by German youth in Berlin, and the no less slanderous reports regarding the People's Government of China.

33. Mr. Bevin also has spoken of this conspiracy [283rd meeting], using the word "satellite" in this very room. The word "satellite" has therefore been pronounced here by the representative of a government which, obviously acting under foreign pressure and against the interests of its own country, had ordered a curtailment of trade with the countries of Eastern Europe and with the People's Republic of China.

34. That word has been repeated today by Mr. Schuman, who, in his speech [286th meeting] frequently used the expression "supra-national", no doubt to hide the real dependence of his great and beautiful country on foreign States. The word he should have used was "supra-continental".

35. No one was surprised to see Mr. Kardelj, the representative of the Tito Government, join that company to please his protectors. Mr. Kardelj tried to imitate the tone and substance of the speech made by the United States representative, Mr. Acheson. He even went considerably further. The object of his slanders and invective against the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies was obvious: it was a loan to remedy the disastrous situation into which his government has dragged Yugoslavia and its people, who certainly deserve a better fate.

36. That is how we see the present situation and the causes that have led up to it.

37. All these events have clearly left their mark on the situation in the United Nations. We are able to record certain achievements in the five years of our Organization's existence, but we could and should have done much more. Unfortunately we have not solved the major problem of disarmament, nor that of the prohibition of the production and utilization of atomic weapons, nor so many other problems. Contrary to the principles of the Charter, the majority of Members of the United Nations has sanctioned intervention in the internal affairs of other States. In Greece, for example, such interference has been instrumental in imposing a régime of terror on the country. The Greek representative's words on freedom and democracy sounded like a cruel mockery. They were spoken by the representative of a government which maintains in its country the most cruel concentration camp in the world and which condemns to death tens and hundreds of Greek democrats, including many leaders of the working class.

38. Another example is the refusal to take any energetic action against the Franco régime, forcibly imposed on the Spanish people with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini. But at the same time as that refusal, items were being placed on the agenda that were aimed at patent intervention in the domestic affairs of States in which popular governments, called to power by the liberated peoples of those countries, had been constituted.

39. Can the refusal to admit to the United Nations representatives of the lawful Government of China be regarded as a contribution to world peace? Does the maintenance of the fiction that the emissaries of the Kuomintang represent the Chinese people strengthen our prestige and assist us in our work? The true representatives of the Chinese nation which, under the leadership of the heroic Mao Tse-tung, has achieved its freedom after a hard struggle, must take their place in our midst. Unfortunately from the very first day of our deliberations, the debate has shown that there are here reactionary dreamers, incorrigible die-hards who would like to arrest the wheel of history and alter the course of events.

40. Those very same people, or their predecessors in power, directed the intervention in 1918, 1919 and 1920 against the peoples of Russia liberated by the revolution. They too, had their Chang Kai-sheks; they too dispatched expeditionary forces and refused for many years to recognize the Government of the USSR. But they have learned nothing from all this. They still hope, as they did then, that they may be able to change the course of history. They forget the words of Metternich, the founder of the Holy Alliance of European absolutist reaction in the last century, the defender of the old order, who himself admitted that the march of events could not be altered, and that his only hope was to retard them.

41. A similar attempt to alter the course of history is the armed intervention in Korea, which is being carried out illegally under the banner of the United Nations. That was an obvious abuse of our Organization, since there was no valid decision of the Security Council in the matter, but only a private opinion regis-

tered by six of its members. Articles 23 and 27 of the Charter were violated and, on the basis of this private opinion, the whole machinery of the Organization was set in motion. It was proclaimed *urbi et orbi* that it was the United Nations which had decided to conduct an armed operation in Korea.

42. A situation has thus been created in which deadly bombing raids are being conducted under the flag of the United Nations. That will be a dark page in the record of the Organization. A considerable part of the responsibility rests on the Secretary-General, who allowed his authority to be used as an instrument of a policy which aims at subordinating this Organization to one Power. Instead of using his authority to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the Secretary-General unfortunately proved unequal to his task and failed to carry out the duties attaching to the office entrusted to him by the United Nations.

43. The report of the Secretary-General stresses the danger to peace. But does it indicate the real cause of the present state of affairs? Does it explain the real background of the present situation? Our Organization could have done more to strengthen peace. If the resolutions and decisions adopted in the course of the last five years had been respected and effectively implemented, there would be less tension today, and the Secretary-General could have presented a more positive report to the fifth session of the General Assembly. There can be no doubt that the Secretary-General failed to take adequate steps, within the limits of his competence, to ensure that the resolutions of the General Assembly aimed at strengthening peace were in fact implemented. For example, in 1947, the General Assembly adopted a resolution [110 (II)] condemning incitement to war. And yet, in the country where the United Nations has its headquarters, incitement to war and propaganda for a new war have become daily occurrences. Almost every day we hear some new threat of atomic bombardment. Only a few days ago, United States Senator Olin Johnston declared that he was tired of striped-trouser diplomacy, that war should be carried into the territory of the USSR and that there should be no hesitation in using the atomic bomb.

44. Such are the facts, and in what striking contrast with the speech of the Secretary of State of the United States!

45. Can the embargo on the export of machine tools to Eastern Europe by the United Kingdom, acting under United States pressure, be regarded as a sign of a policy of peace? Such a policy constitutes discrimination and is a flagrant violation of Article 55 of the Charter, which enjoins all Members of the United Nations to promote economic co-operation. It is a policy directed against the USSR, against the People's Republic of China and the other people's democracies, against those countries which made the greatest sacrifices during the last war, those which, through the heroic efforts of their people, are rebuilding their life out of the ruins and creating a system of social justice.

46. Those who adopt military budgets amounting to thousands of millions of dollars, those who pride themselves upon inventing ever new means of mass destruction, accuse us, who belong to the camp of peace, of preparing for war. That is an obvious lie and a slander.

In Poland, the country which I have the honour to represent here, the entire colossal effort of the people is directed towards peaceful reconstruction and the development of the country's economy.

47. While France and the United Kingdom are allotting about 10 per cent of their national income to armaments, Poland allocates to military expenditures only 3 per cent of its national income. In contrast to the budgets I have mentioned, and to that of the United States, 60 per cent of which is devoted to direct expenditure on armaments, the maintenance of armed forces takes only 8 per cent of the total budget of Poland.

48. We in Poland are working to increase the well-being of the masses and to put an end to the exploitation of man by man. That is our clear answer to the words of Mr. Acheson. The USSR is carrying out a colossal programme of construction and economic development. It offers disinterested assistance to other countries ravaged by the war. Since the days of the October Revolution, it has faithfully and steadfastly translated into deeds its policy of peace. The crusade which is being proclaimed against the USSR is the creation of governments that want war, and not of peoples, for the peoples want peace. They condemn aggression and war-mongering. And contrary to the tenets of the ruling circles of the Western countries, the two political systems — socialism and capitalism — can exist side by side, competing with each other in a peaceful way; they can develop economic co-operation and can, by a common effort, ensure peace. This is the very principle on which the Charter was based, the principle of ensuring peace by way of consultation, co-operation, understanding of and respect for mutual interests, accompanied by disarmament and economic co-operation.

49. In contrast to this principle, the idea of an armed peace has been propounded. It is not surprising that this idea was broached by Mr. Stikker, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, who represents a Government which has long endeavoured to impose such a peace upon the people of Indonesia.

50. We are surprised and disappointed, however, that Mr. Rómulo, former President of the General Assembly, should support this principle. And yet Mr. Rómulo speaks here in the name of the people of the Philippines, a people who only a short time ago enjoyed all the benefits of this type of peace in the form of military occupation of their country by the United States of America, an occupation of which they still feel the effects. This idea of an armed peace is the very negation of the principles of our Charter. It is an attempt to substitute the *Diktat* for international co-operation based on compromise. History knows of other attempts of the same nature, from the *Pax Romana* to the *pax Germanica*.

51. The peoples of the world have expressed their will, through the millions of signatures appended to the appeal for peace. The Stockholm Appeal is a powerful referendum on behalf of peace. It has united men of many continents and races, of different political creeds, religions and classes of society. It is strange that the Secretary-General makes no mention of this appeal in his report. Can he have failed to notice the millions of signatures appended to it by the peoples of

the Soviet Union, China, France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland and other nations? The United Nations Charter begins with the words: "We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . .". Such are the words of that great document in which the strivings of the peoples of the world are expressed. Today those peoples are faced with the danger of a new war and are writing a new page into the Charter. In their resolve to maintain peace, they demand that the first government to use the atomic weapon should be branded as a criminal.

52. The Assembly has before it the proposal submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union [A/1376]. In accordance with the traditional policy of peace which it has followed for thirty-three years, the USSR has asked us to vote in favour of a declaration which would avert the threat of a new war and strengthen peace and security among nations. This constructive policy is of great historical significance and affords the Assembly an opportunity to contribute to the easing of international tension and to the promotion of peaceful co-operation between nations. The proposal calls upon us to condemn propaganda in favour of a new war, to outlaw atomic weapons and to establish international control of atomic energy; it asks that the first government to use the atomic weapon or any other means of mass destruction should be condemned as a criminal; it calls upon the permanent members of the Security Council to conclude a pact for strengthening peace and to reduce their present armed forces by one-third.

53. The Polish delegation unreservedly supports the USSR proposal because it will serve to strengthen peace.

54. At the same time, I wish to emphasize that the Polish delegation has always given due attention to the substance of proposals submitted by other delegations and has considered them on their merits, from whatever source they originated. That will apply also to any parts of the proposals submitted by the United States which may help to ease international tension and are in conformity with the Charter. We shall take them into consideration and comment on them during the debate.

55. Our delegation comes to this Assembly with a mandate from the Polish people. This mandate has been expressed by eighteen million signatures to the peace appeal. We therefore represent the decisive will of the Polish people for peace.

56. We come here asking that an end should be put to all intrigues for a new war, that peace should be strengthened and that war-mongering should be made a crime punishable by all the United Nations. The fact that we are fighting for peace is a sign of our strength. We know that wars have always been lost and will always be lost by those who seek them against the wishes of the people. Victory lies where the people fight for their freedom and their independence. In defending peace, we are also defending the right of the peoples to self-determination, the principle that people should be free. We are defending progress and fighting against oppression.

57. The ideal for which the United Nations was established was the guarantee of the rights of nations and individuals. We therefore call upon the General Assembly and upon all those to whom the cause of

national freedom is dear and urge them to go to the very root of the evil, not to be moved by false slogans and not to betray the hopes of the people. War is not inevitable and we can prevent it. The mighty voice of the peoples of the whole world calls to us to protect them against the devastation and horror of a new war and demands that we should preserve the peace.

58. Mr. KING (Liberia): In view of the very lengthy agenda that has been presented to us, several items of which are undoubtedly of grave and pressing international importance calling for prompt and effective action on the part of the General Assembly at its present session, as well as of the fact that there is very little that my delegation can add to the wise thoughts and most constructive suggestions for the restoration of peace and future security, which have been brought out so vividly and eloquently in the illuminating and sterling speeches of those eminent and distinguished statesmen who have preceded me on this rostrum since the opening of our present session, my remarks must of necessity be somewhat brief.

59. First, my delegation desires me to express to the President its sincerest congratulations on his election as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the greatest international, legislative and consultative body of the world, as well as the pledge of its support and co-operation in the discharge of the duties and responsibilities of his high office. The size of the vote cast in his behalf is an eloquent testimony on the part of his colleagues to his imminent fitness and great ability to preside over the deliberations of this august body.

60. Secondly, to our recently retired President, His Excellency Brigadier General Carlos P. Rómulo, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, permanent representative and chairman of the Philippine delegation, we also extend our congratulations on his completion of a most successful term of office. During his incumbency, he wonderfully endeared himself to all his colleagues by his geniality, dignified bearing, simplicity of manner, powerful intellectual capacity, great forensic eloquence coupled with his wide breadth of knowledge of parliamentary rules of procedure and diplomatic precedence. General Rómulo certainly is a great national figure in his own country, but, in my humble opinion, he is also one of the outstanding statesmen of the world.

61. Collective security for world peace is the foundation upon which the edifice called the United Nations has been built and must always rest. Upon this edifice has been indelibly inscribed the solemn pledge of each Member State of the United Nations to join with each other in the achievement and maintenance of collective security throughout the world. The scope of the operations of the United Nations in this respect is not confined to any particular geographical segments of the world or to any specific racial and religious identities thereof. It is world-wide, embracing all peoples, all nations and all climes.

62. For the attainment of universal peace and security, there must be, first and last, universal freedom. One portion of the world cannot enjoy the great blessings of peace and freedom while other portions are being held in physical, political, economic, religious and intellectual bondage and restraint. Such restraint and bond-

age bring grave pain, unhappiness, poverty, unrest and turmoil to the peoples and nations who are thus affected, and so long as these conditions continue to obtain in any part of the world and are allowed to continue, there will not be any permanent peace. Peace and freedom are indivisible. Where freedom is not found, peace has no abode; and where there is absence of peace, misery, poverty, unhappiness, turmoil and strife reign supreme.

63. Freedom is the natural and divine aspiration of every individual and of all peoples, irrespective of race, and for its achievement and realization no sacrifice is considered too great. The boy, no matter how loving and affectionate his parents are to him, nevertheless longingly and wistfully looks forward to his coming of age, his twenty-first anniversary, the day of his legal freedom. The girl also looks forward to the day when she goes away from her mother's apron strings. So also do peoples long held under physical, political, economic, religious and social restraint and bondage look forward to the day of their liberation and freedom. There are many nations here represented in this General Assembly who not only bear testimony to this fact, but who also had to undergo long years of bitter struggle and oppression to obtain their freedom and liberty. The cries for liberty and freedom now going up from subjugated nations and oppressed peoples in certain parts of the world should not escape the ears of the United Nations or be permitted to pass unheeded. So long as these cries for liberty and freedom, with their woeful tales, continue to go unheeded and unassuaged, there will never be world peace.

64. One world of free peoples living under their own vines and fig trees, basking in the eternal sunlight of liberty and freedom under law was the glorious vision of those founding nations which met in San Francisco some five or more years ago and there drew up and attached their respective signatures to that great and memorable document known as the Charter of the United Nations, which will serve as a guide for the government of all free peoples and nations of the world. This was not an idealistic action, but an extremely realistic action growing out of centuries of painful experience on the part of humanity.

65. In bringing about the realization of this great vision, Africa and the Africans must be brought into the picture. The continent of Africa stands at the cross-roads of Europe and Asia. It gave asylum to the blessed Christ when His earthly parents were fleeing from the rule of Rome. One of its sons voluntarily relieved Him for a time of the Cross when He was struggling up Mount Calvary under the lashes of Roman soldiers for His crucifixion.

66. The sons and daughters of Africa have been forcibly torn from her and carried to Europe, America and other parts of the world and disgracefully used for the building of their financial and social economy. Africa's great mineral and other economic resources have been ruthlessly exploited by Europe to the woeful disadvantage of Africa's sons and daughters. African leaders, without any legal or justifiable cause whatsoever, have been forcibly dispossessed of their territories and subjected to the harshest political rule and tyranny

and kept in a state of subservience, ignorance and economic dependence verging on poverty.

67. These conditions exist in various degrees in the various European colonies in Africa. I am happy to say, however, that at present these conditions do not exist in the United Kingdom and French colonial possessions in Africa, except, perhaps in a limited and more modified form. Both the United Kingdom and French Governments seem now to be fully awakened to their sense of international responsibility for the well-being, prosperity and happiness of the inhabitants of those territories over which they rule, and they are now giving the most serious attention and consideration to the demands of their colonial subjects for more self-government and eventual complete independence. These are pleasing and hopeful signs towards peace.

68. It serves no wise purpose to place upon the cries of subjugated peoples for liberty, freedom and independence the labels of "communism" and "sedition". Let us face the facts and realize that it is not within the power of any nation or group of nations to push back time. We may turn the hands of the clock; nevertheless, time moves on just the same and cannot be stopped.

69. We are living in a new age, call it the atomic or any other name. We find new conditions confronting us. In the entire continent of Africa, containing over 150 million inhabitants, there exist only four independent sovereign states: Egypt and Ethiopia in the north-east; Liberia in the west, the Union of South Africa in the south. Looking at it objectively, is this not alarming?

70. The plea which has been put forward against the claims and demands for independence on the part of the inhabitants of certain parts of Africa has always been that those people are not yet fully developed, are not advanced and are not capable of governing themselves. If this is true, then what a sad and painful commentary on those governing Powers who have had the peoples of those territories under absolute and complete control for centuries past.

71. Be this as it may, the time has now arrived when the target dates must be fixed by the United Nations for the granting of self-government and independence to those peoples of Africa and elsewhere who are, in its opinion, prepared and capable of governing themselves. Governments of Europe having colonial possessions in Africa, should have no serious objections to such a procedure. They should bear in mind the fable of the lion and the rat.

72. My country, Liberia, an African sovereign State on the West coast of Africa, cannot be unconcerned and disinterested in the fortunes and conditions of all the inhabitants and peoples of Africa, more especially those of West Africa. We are, therefore, naturally in sympathy with the aspirations for freedom and the demands for political independence of those peoples of Africa who may now, and in the not too distant future, be prepared, by the general standard set up by the civilized world, to govern themselves in an orderly and peaceful manner. They have our deepest sympathy.

73. Africa is indeed the coming continent of the world — and that in the not distant future. Its potential power in human and material resources is great and incalculable. Its soil, in most parts, is rich and virgin. Large

quantities of the world's most valuable mineral still lie buried beneath its soil. Immense tracts of forest lands are yielding the highest grade of the most valuable woods for building and other purposes, despite centuries of ruthless exploitation. The large number of African youths, from various points in Africa, who go over to Europe and America for advanced culture and scientific studies and research, is rapidly increasing every year. For what reasons and to what purpose? The answer should be clear and apparent.

74. If the legitimate aspirations and yearnings of the peoples of Africa for self-rule and independence do not receive that sympathetic understanding which they deserve from the colonial Powers, then the continent of Africa will become a reeking bed of unrest and strife in the near future and a serious threat to world peace. This threat can be easily removed by the display of wise, far-sighted statesmanship on the part of the United Nations, and not by the subtle intrigues of international politics. My delegation feels that it is its duty to strike this note of warning and advice to all the nations assembled here, who are charged with the collective security of the peace of the world.

75. The actions taken by the Security Council *vis à vis* Korea, on 25 June last,³ have the unqualified endorsement and full support of the Government and people of Liberia. Such prompt and effective action on the part of the Security Council went far towards reviving the fading and dying confidence of the peace-loving peoples of the world in the effectiveness of the United Nations and of its further ability to re-establish and maintain world peace.

76. In spite of the propaganda which has been launched against the actions taken in Korea, it must be admitted, after a careful study of all the facts and circumstances in the case, that there was no other alternative left to the United Nations but forceful intervention in order to compel compliance with its commands issued to the Government of North Korea for the immediate withdrawal of all its military and armed forces to the 38th parallel. The die having now been cast, the situation admits of no compromise or appeasement. Military actions must be pressed to the final end, firmly establishing the authority of the United Nations in all of North Korea between the 38th parallel and the boundaries of North Korea and Manchuria. North Korean leaders should be held strictly responsible and accountable for all warlike acts and brutal atrocities committed by its armies upon the military forces of the United Nations and the military forces of the Government of South Korea and its civilian populations.

77. Until a satisfactory agreement can be reached between the United Nations and the Government of North Korea with respect to a united Korea, the United Nations should, in our opinion, continue its military occupation of North Korea and assume the political and civil administration thereof.

78. Mr. Bevin, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom, in his great speech delivered before the General Assembly on 25 September [283rd meeting], wisely and very clearly pointed out

in the following words what would have to be our post-war policy in Korea:

"We shall have before us, at this fifth session of the General Assembly, a number of grave issues which have arisen as a result of developments in the Far East.

"The conflict still rages in Korea, but I am confident that the authority of the United Nations will prevail. However, that is really only the beginning. It is also our duty to look beyond the conflict and to find means whereby peace and unity can be restored in Korea.

"In our view there must no longer be South Koreans and North Koreans, but just Koreans, who must be encouraged to work together to rebuild their country with the advice and the help and the support of the United Nations. It is difficult in war to see the picture in its proper perspective, but in this General Assembly we have a great opportunity to consult with one another and plan for the days that lie ahead.

"There has been, as I have already said, an overwhelming response to the call to resist aggression in Korea and to defeat the intentions of those who sought to use force to achieve their ends, but another test will be applied to our judgment in the settlement of Korea. Public opinion will judge us not only by the right use of our military power but also by the sincerity and good intentions of every Member of the United Nations in the final settlement of the problem and by the effectiveness of our actions for the rehabilitation of the country when hostilities have ceased."

79. What wise and constructive words!

80. The United States plan [A/1377], as put forth by the United States Secretary of State, for the enlargement of the powers and functions of the General Assembly in order to meet and overcome the obstructions of the veto in the Security Council on matters of grave and important international interests that may require prompt and effective actions to be taken for the security of world peace, also has the endorsement and full support of my Government. Undoubtedly, the United Nations should not merely be an instrument for peace, but rather a prompt and effective instrument. Promptness and effectiveness should characterize all of its actions. The further suggestion of the United States Secretary of State, to the effect that each Member State should be required to furnish and place at the disposal of the United Nations a certain number of soldiers, also has the support of my Government.

81. In conclusion, may I venture a remark and a suggestion? Taking into consideration the seriousness of our responsibilities, individually and collectively, we should be very careful about the decisions to be taken at this session of the General Assembly. We should not approach the various questions in a hostile and warlike manner. The General Assembly, as the United Nations, is intended not as an instrument of war, but as an instrument of peace. All and each of us come within these sacred portals with one objective, the restoration of peace to a troubled world.

82. Peace must be arrived at through peaceful understandings, deliberate and calm considerations. We should eliminate suspicion from our councils. We should hear the views of the other side. Suggestions of all types,

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 15.

regardless of the source, should claim the careful and calm consideration of this General Assembly; they should not be viewed in an atmosphere of suspicion. Successful negotiations cannot be accomplished that way. Every nation should do its utmost to prevent a great world catastrophe. Some of us have witnessed two great world wars. We all know their consequences and effects, which have been most far-reaching and disastrous. We are not only responsible to our respective Governments; we are not only responsible to the present generation; we are responsible to posterity for the way in which we use this great trust and responsibility which has been placed upon us.

83. Let us all, with one objective, retire to our respective places and appeal to the great Ruler of nations, without whom we can accomplish nothing. Without the aid and assistance of the great Arbiter of human events, all our efforts toward security and the maintenance of peace in the world will be in vain.

84. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): It is now five years since the United Nations Charter, in which it was laid down that the fundamental purpose of the newly-established international organization was to be the prevention of new wars and the maintenance of international peace and security, was signed at San Francisco.

85. What results have we to show at this fifth session of the General Assembly? What has the United Nations achieved during these five years towards the fulfilment of the tasks and purposes laid down in the Charter?

86. If we trace its activities during this period, we must, of course, acknowledge that, despite the difficulties which it has encountered, the United Nations has a certain amount of positive work to its credit. Nevertheless, the work of the United Nations has shown, and unfortunately continues to show, a number of serious shortcomings, which are reflected in the abandonment of the most important principles laid down in the Charter and, in a number of cases, in the direct violation of positive decisions taken by the General Assembly. The United Nations has signally failed to do all it might have done to increase its prestige and authority and to fulfil the tasks assigned to it, which are: to strengthen peace, to develop co-operation among peoples and States based on equality of rights, to strengthen friendly relations between them, to bring about by peaceful means the settlement of disputes and to prevent acts of aggression and conflicts between States.

87. As is well known, a number of important decisions having as their purpose the maintenance of international peace and security were taken during this period, but unfortunately these decisions have not been implemented, and many of the most important questions placed before the United Nations have not been carried to their proper conclusion.

88. On 20 September, in the course of the general debate, Mr. Vyshinsky, head of the USSR delegation, made a speech [279th meeting] in which he set forth a programme of peace and submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly a number of concrete proposals aimed at eliminating the threat of a new war and strengthening international peace and security. These proposals clearly express the sincere hopes of those peoples who experienced the horrors of the Second

World War for the maintenance of a lasting and firmly established peace.

89. The desire for peace is deeply rooted in the Soviet people, who are busy with their peaceful and creative labour. From the very first days of its existence, the Soviet Union has pursued a consistent and persevering policy of peace, a policy of unmasking any and every instigator of war. In its consistent struggle for peace the USSR Government is backed by the unanimous and active support of the entire Soviet people. In the Soviet Union the cry for war is not heard from a single platform, and speeches by haters of humanity demanding mass slaughter and the shedding of the blood of peace-loving peoples would be unthinkable. In the Soviet Union there can be no such thing as propaganda for military expansion, for national and race discrimination, for depriving any people of its national freedom and independence; whereas in the capitalist States propaganda for war and hatred of humanity is heard day after day, and the Press is full of it. Through its leading statesmen and its representatives in international organizations, through the proposals submitted by them to international conferences and meetings, the Soviet Union has constantly and consistently demanded the limitation of armaments, the prohibition of the atomic bomb and the utilization of the achievements of atomic science in the interests of humanity and for the strengthening of friendly relations between peoples. The Soviet Union is an active participant in the great struggle for the survival of mankind against the forces of destruction and death.

90. A simple comparison is all that is needed to demonstrate who is working for peace and who for war. While every effort is being made in the USSR to utilize atomic energy for peaceful purposes and economic development, the only concern in the capitalist countries is to find new ways of destroying a greater number of human lives, to discover new bacilli etc. for the annihilation of human beings. It is sufficient to note that at a moment when the capitalist countries are involved in a furious arms race, when thousands of millions of dollars are being spent for the production of atomic bombs and poisonous substances intended for the annihilation of humanity, the Soviet Government is beginning the construction of the two largest hydro-electric stations in the world on the Volga (at Kuibishev and Stalingrad), and another on the Dnieper. These decisions of the Soviet Government constitute new proof of the peaceful aims of the Soviet Union.

91. The peoples of the world have learned the bitter lessons of the past world wars; they passionately desire peace; they do not want war, and for this reason they are signing the Stockholm Appeal with immense enthusiasm. It is no accident that the Stockholm Appeal, which calls for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and the establishment of strict international control in order to enforce this prohibition, has already been signed by hundreds of millions of people. Millions of people of all countries refuse to serve as cannon-fodder for the war-mongers; they know that all over the world peace is endangered by an imminent and grave threat of a new war, and that such a war can and must be prevented.

92. The Byelorussian people, who have felt the impact of two world wars in a single generation, have hastened to add their signatures to the Stockholm Appeal. During

the Hitlerite occupation, the Byelorussian people lost hundreds of thousands of their finest sons and daughters. They are well aware what war means, and they are steadfast in their determination to foil the criminal plans of the war-mongers. The Byelorussian people will defend the cause of peace by every means within their power, and they are confident that the struggle for peace will end in victory.

93. The great Soviet people and the Soviet Union, the mighty country of socialism, which has consistently pursued a Stalinist foreign policy of peace and friendship among the peoples, constitute a staunch and trusty bulwark of the international movement in favour of peace. The Byelorussian people are confident that the might of the democratic forces, led by the Soviet Union, will inflict a resounding defeat on the aggressive plans of the capitalist monopolies, which are doing everything in their power to unleash a new and bloody war.

94. The causes of these tenacious attempts by certain circles to unleash a new war are openly described in the capitalist Press. The view is put forward that a lasting peace and, in particular, the peaceful regulation of relations with the Soviet Union, would "ruin business". A lasting peace, it is declared, would be a calamity, and must be prevented at any price.

95. Thus Mr. Lawrence, editor of the *U.S. News & World Report*, explained in detail in an article published in the issue of 14 January 1949 under the title "Our Unpreparedness for Sudden Peace" that if the "cold war" against the USSR were to end suddenly, the American economy would be dealt "a devastating blow", since its "false prosperity" is based entirely on the constant inflation of "armament expenditures". According to Lawrence, a lasting peace with Russia would make it impossible to justify present and future expenditure on armaments and the threat of "a sudden turn to peace by Russia" would therefore be "the biggest economic danger faced by America".

96. These words are a glaring example of the fear of peace. Those who think along these lines wish to hold off the possibility of peace as long as possible, and they therefore maintain a state of alarm and uncertainty in international relations. Their greatest fear is that a lasting peace might "break out", and they do everything in their power to prevent the peaceful negotiations desired by the peoples of the entire world.

97. On 20 September, we heard the speech to the Assembly of Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America [279th meeting]. Mr. Acheson attempted to place the blame for all the difficulties and failures of the United Nations on the Soviet Union, which he accused of having placed a number of obstacles in the way of the work of the United Nations. In actual fact, however, these barriers and obstacles to the work of the United Nations were erected by the United States and the United Kingdom.

98. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that certain of the proposals submitted by Mr. Acheson are incompatible with the Charter, and represent an attempt to bypass the Security Council, block its action and reduce it to a cipher by replacing it, in violation of the Charter, by the General Assembly and other organs. These proposals are therefore unacceptable, and should be made to conform with the Charter.

99. The representative of Iraq has openly called for the elimination of the principle of unanimity, which is the cornerstone of the United Nations Charter. Similar demands have been made in the Assembly by the representatives of Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Greece, Peru and others. This represents a new outburst of attacks against the principle of unanimity, which does in fact constitute an effective obstacle to the realization of the expansionist plans nurtured by the war-mongers. In place of a policy of strengthening international co-operation based on respect for the independence and sovereign equality of all nations, based on common respect for the rights and interests of all five great Powers, these gentlemen are proposing a plan for the undermining of the principles of the United Nations, for its liquidation by the abolition of the principle of unanimity.

100. The idea of replacing the Security Council by the General Assembly is not new and has been put forward in the past. At previous sessions, we have witnessed repeated attempts to abolish the principle of unanimity and bypass the Security Council and replace it by other organs. The Anglo-American majority took advantage of the absence of two permanent Members—the USSR and China—from the Security Council to adopt a series of illegal decisions reflecting discredit on the United Nations, and has exploited the Security Council, to which the Charter assigns the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, as a tool of its aggressive policy. If the opponents of the principle of the unanimity of the five Powers succeed in having it abolished, they will in fact have achieved the liquidation of the United Nations. Mr. Santa Cruz, the representative of Chile, has proposed [281st meeting] the conclusion of a four-point agreement which would render it obligatory for the States signatory to it to comply with recommendations of the General Assembly and automatically to declare war should the Assembly adopt a recommendation to that effect by a two-thirds majority. Mr. Santa Cruz long ago ceased to concern himself with the principle of unanimity.

101. It is not by accident that the former United States President, Mr. Hoover, and after him Mr. Dulles, spoke of the "reorganization" of the United Nations in order to remain in line with their uncomplaining satellites such as Mr. Santa Cruz. The same line is followed by the representative of Chile.

102. We must decisively sweep aside any attempt to hinder the normal operation of the Security Council and we must put an end to attacks against the principle of unanimity. All the Members of the United Nations are obliged to abide by its Charter.

103. We must expel the Kuomintang representative from the United Nations, beginning with the Security Council, and we must give his place to the real representative of the Chinese people, that is to say to the representative of the Central People's Government of China.

104. We must demand the immediate cessation of intervention in Korea and settle the Korean question by peaceful means, giving the Korean people itself an opportunity of deciding its own fate.

105. The Security Council has taken a number of illegal decisions on the Korean question. The Security Council has allowed the flag of the United Nations to be used in the present armed civil strife in Korea, thus

flagrantly violating the fundamental principles of the United Nations.

106. On 21 September [280th meeting], a speech was made here by the representative of Australia, Mr. Spender, who devoted some time to crude slander of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. It should be noted that such statements have become familiar to us and are not being made for the first time in organs of the United Nations. By distorting universally known facts, Mr. Spender tried to maintain that the Soviet Union was making no effort to promote international co-operation and did not wish to take constructive measures for the strengthening of universal peace. The representative of Australia was guilty of a completely untruthful statement, to say the least of it, when he declared that the Soviet Union was not conducting a peaceful policy.

107. The whole world knows that the Soviet Union has fought and is fighting for the extension of international co-operation and the strengthening of universal peace. It was in the interests of international co-operation and the strengthening of the peace and security of peoples that the Soviet Union drew to the attention of the United Nations such important matters as the question of the reduction of armaments, the prohibition of propaganda for a new war, the prohibition of atomic weapons and the conclusion of a peace pact. Hence, it is not the Soviet Union that is to blame. As far back as 1934, the head of the Soviet Government, Josef Vissarionovich Stalin, clearly and definitely formulated the foreign policy of the Soviet Union Government in the following words:

"Our foreign policy is clear. It is a policy of keeping the peace and strengthening trade relations with all countries. The USSR has no intention of threatening anybody and even less so, of attacking anybody. We stand for peace and defend the cause of peace."

108. Thus, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union in its relations with capitalist States is based upon the possibility of the co-existence of the socialist and capitalist systems and of wide-spread co-operation between them. It is clear to us that the instigators of an aggressive policy are not interested in agreement and co-operation with the USSR. Under cover of speeches on agreement and co-operation, they are taking all the measures at their disposal to undermine such co-operation, to avoid concluding agreements and, at the same time, to lay the blame upon the USSR.

109. The peoples of the world know full well that the instigators of a new war fear agreements and co-operation with the USSR above all else, since a policy of agreements with the USSR would undermine the position of the war-mongers and would render their aggressive policy pointless. Is it not clear from this that the representative of Australia, Mr. Spender, has made a crude and unmannerly attempt to distort and discredit the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and thus to transfer the blame from the guilty party to the innocent?

110. It is impossible to overlook the statements of the New Zealand representative [280th meeting], Mr. Berendsen, who, like the Australian representative, tried to distort the position of the Soviet Union in matters relating to international co-operation and the

strengthening of peace and security throughout the world. For the first time from the international platform of the United Nations General Assembly, the representative of New Zealand openly proclaimed that war was the only possible means of settling disputes. His actual words were as follows: "This is our chance to banish war, even if — and the anomaly is inescapable — by war itself".

111. Thus it would appear that only war can save the peace. In spite of the fact that a resolution [110 (II)] was adopted by the second session of the General Assembly on "measures to be taken against propaganda and the inciters of a new war", the representative of New Zealand takes the liberty of speaking from this tribune in favour of a new war. I think it would be correct to include the name of the representative of New Zealand, Mr. Berendsen, in the list of inciters of a new war. The representative of New Zealand not only refuses to acknowledge the General Assembly resolution on the prohibition of propaganda for a new war, but he has become so bold as to allow himself to make an open call to war within the United Nations.

112. Gentlemen, we must censure such statements in definite terms.

113. On 25 September 1950 [283rd meeting], during the general discussion, we heard the statement of the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bevin, who ascribes aggressive intentions to the Soviet Union and appraises peace petitions and peace campaigns for peace and security throughout the world as a propaganda manoeuvre. Whenever the question arises of discussing and settling serious problems, Mr. Bevin resorts to the word "propaganda". Every day the postal and the telegraph services bring to the United Nations telegrams and letters from all corners of the globe, from simple people of all nationalities and of all creeds, who beg the United Nations to outlaw the atomic bomb, to put an end to the race for armaments, to put an end to the intervention in Korea and to conclude a peace pact between the five great Powers. A great struggle for peace in all parts of the globe has unfolded before our eyes. The war-mongers have run up against the granite wall of popular resistance. The ranks of those who strive for peace continue to swell every day. One half of the human race has expressed itself, in one form or another, for peace and against war.

114. When it became difficult to ignore this vast movement towards peace, the imperialists began to conduct propaganda against the movement and also undertook repressive measures and fierce reprisals against the partisans of peace, who are being prosecuted, imprisoned, and dismissed from their work. Mr. Bevin calls all this a propaganda manoeuvre. This is no question of propaganda. It is a question of the future of peace throughout the world. Mr. Bevin will not succeed in his manoeuvre of white-washing the real aggressors, who are now conducting a sanguinary war in Korea, and of ascribing the aggression to States which are unremittably battling for the peace and security of the peoples of the world.

115. I have seen photographs, taken by American correspondents, of Mr. Dulles, who usually sits in this hall, in the trenches near the 38th parallel at a time when he was instructing Syngman Rhee's officers. These photographs were reproduced in the newspapers

of many countries. It is difficult to disprove such evidence. The Korean people know very well who organized the intervention in Korea. All this constitutes military interference in the affairs of other States. And those who do such things are the real aggressors, Mr. Bevin.

116. We must endeavour to establish mutual confidence and to unify all our forces for the maintenance of international peace and security throughout the world. We must endeavour to develop friendly relations between States on the basis of respect for the principle of equal rights and we must take all possible measures to strengthen peace and security throughout the world.

117. The representative of the Tito group made some slanderous attacks here against the Soviet Union; but the absolute nonsense which he uttered here is not worthy of any attention whatsoever. It would be beneath our dignity to waste time in refuting his slanderous fabrications.

118. The Byelorussian delegation, in expressing its people's aspiration towards peace and desire to avert war, whole-heartedly supports the real programme for peace formulated in the "declaration on the removal of the threat of a new war and the strengthening of peace and security among the nations", submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union for the consideration of the General Assembly [A/1376]. This declaration, which expresses the firm resolve of hundreds of millions of people to avert the threat of a new war, proposes once again to censure the propaganda in favour of a new war which is being conducted in a number of countries, to prohibit the use of atomic energy for military purposes, to institute international control to enforce this prohibition, to conclude a pact for the strengthening of peace between the five great Powers and to reduce the armed forces of the five great Powers by one-third during 1950.

119. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic calls upon the members of the General Assembly at this plenary meeting to support this declaration. By adopting this declaration, we shall give the peoples of the world a chance to free themselves from fear of a new war and shall make a valuable contribution to the cause of peace and security among nations.

120. Mr. LANGE (Norway): It may, perhaps, throw some light on the situation in which my own and many other countries find themselves to say that a few days before taking part in this debate in the United Nations General Assembly, I attended a special session of the Norwegian Parliament, called for the sole purpose of appropriating considerable additional sums for national defence. The burden of armaments is increasingly heavy for our people to bear. At a time when all our efforts should be directed to the economic recovery and the social and cultural development of our country, even a small nation like Norway finds itself compelled to divert an increasing proportion of its limited resources to the equipment and enlargement of its military forces. At a time when all our attention here in the United Nations should be concentrated upon the need for vast collective and co-operative undertakings to improve the living conditions of the peoples of the world, we are faced with one all-important and elementary issue — the necessity of stopping armed aggression. No wonder that people are asking themselves: What has happened?

Why do we find ourselves in such an absurd situation? Why is it that we have to sacrifice our well-being for the building up of defence forces which we would rather do without if we could?

121. The debate that we have listened to since the opening of this Assembly has, I believe, to a very great extent provided the answers to these questions. First and foremost, it has made the present situation perfectly clear: on the one side, as the world has recognized with a shock, armed aggression is being used as a means to bring about the solution of an international political problem. I am, of course, speaking about Korea. On the other side, we have seen the reaction of the major part of the world to this act of aggression: the firm resolve that aggressive war should not be allowed to pay. I am referring to the United Nations' action in Korea.

122. In these two facts—the will to launch aggressive war, and the will to resist it — we find the key to the understanding of what is going on in my own country and in other countries that are Members of this Organization. We have become aware of dangers which our instincts of self-preservation compel us not to overlook. And this feeling of danger is the source of the policy of rearmament I referred to a moment ago.

123. The feeling of fear, which has been aroused by the use of armed force to achieve political ends, is bound to prevail in the world as long as aggressors are not condemned and effectively opposed by all Members of this Organization. We know that the condemnation of the North Korean aggressors does not command the unanimous support of Member States. We know who those Member States are who do not take part in this condemnation and who oppose the United Nations' action in Korea. It is this policy of tolerating aggression that must bear the main responsibility for the feeling of fear which today haunts the peoples of the world. To dispel this fear and bring about an atmosphere in international relations that can reverse the present trend of rearmament and preparations for war, it is necessary that governments abandon such policies.

124. Some speakers in this debate have made reference to the peace campaign of which the so-called Stockholm Appeal is an expression. They have pointed to the support given to that campaign by millions all over the world as a proof of the longing for peace among the peoples of all countries. No one will contest the validity of this claim. Peace is the fervent desire of ordinary men and women in all lands. It is, nevertheless, very difficult to take seriously a peace campaign, the advocates of which refuse to associate themselves with the joint efforts now being made by the United Nations to restore peace in an area which for three months has been the scene of an aggressive war. I might mention that I read in the communist Press of my own country some time ago that the peace campaign was particularly successful in North Korea early this summer. I have no reason to doubt that my source is well-informed. This, indeed, was an enlightening piece of information. The spectacle of the North Korean leaders signing the Stockholm Appeal with one hand, while they were charging their guns to attack a weaker neighbour with the other, puts this whole so-called peace campaign in true perspective.

125. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the outlook is not all black and depressing. During the last

three months a growing feeling has emerged among our peoples that we do not stand helpless in the face of aggression. The reason for this rebirth of hope is the firm and swift action taken by the Security Council. It has been demonstrated before our eyes that the United Nations is a world organization capable, not merely of passing peace resolutions, but of acting, if need be, to repel aggressors and to restore peace. The soldiers now sacrificing their lives on the Korean battlefields are making the greatest of contributions to the strengthening of the United Nations as an effective universal peace organization. We have every reason to be thankful to the United States Government and the people of the United States for having so unhesitatingly taken upon themselves the main burden of battle.

126. The United Nations action in Korea has set a precedent for the future. It will be one of the main tasks of this session of the General Assembly to lay down such principles for the functioning of the various organs of the United Nations as will enable the Organization to act with equal firmness and equal swiftness should aggression again occur in the future. It would be an intolerable and most depressing situation if we accepted the idea that the United Nations must remain impotent in the face of such acts, because of the inability of one of its organs — the Security Council — to take effective action.

127. Later on during this session, we shall have an opportunity to clarify our minds on this issue. I want, however, even at this stage, to declare the general support of my Government for the main ideas outlined by the United States Secretary of State in his remarkable speech last week, when he put forward certain suggestions for strengthening the United Nations as a peace instrument.

128. Furthermore, it is the view of my delegation that in exploring the opportunities afforded by the Charter for strengthening the Organization, we should not overlook or deal lightly with important functions assigned to the Security Council, not only as a peace enforcement organ, but equally as an instrument for mediation and conciliation, a forum affording opportunities for contact and discussion between the great Powers with the assistance of the non-permanent members. Neither should we fail to explore possible ways and means to make the Security Council operate more effectively in its role as a mediator, both between its own members and between outside parties to a dispute. Any effort at mediation is hampered by undue publicity, by procedures which instantly engage the prestige of the parties. On several occasions the Secretary-General has referred to the possibility of certain innovations in the procedure and working of the Security Council. If a situation should arise which would make them possible of realization, his suggestions ought to be given the most careful attention.

129. This General Assembly will be called upon to deal with the Korean situation in all its implications. At the moment the first task is to restore peace in the area. But the problem of finding a durable settlement that will benefit the Korean people and the cause of lasting peace in that part of the world is a wider one — one that is becoming ever more urgent as the operations of the United Nations forces succeed, as they have done so magnificently during this past week.

130. In trying to find an over-all solution, my delegation feels that we should pay the most careful attention to ideas and proposals which may be put forward by the nations of Asia themselves. The process of national and social liberation in Asia is one of the most striking features of the revolution of our time. The experience already gained by countries which have recently and successfully emerged as free nations, several of which are represented in this Organization, entitles them to play a prominent part in the solution of the Korean problem. In this connexion may I say how happy my Government is that this General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Security Council, will shortly have the opportunity of admitting the Republic of Indonesia as the sixtieth Member of our Organization. The nations of Asia may be expected to have a better grasp of the problems involved in the reconstitution as sovereign States of nations that have long been under foreign domination than have countries more distant from the scene and with a widely different background.

131. Without going into detail, I should like to stress that in the settlement which we must try to effect in Korea the United Nations should in one form or another play a very important part. I give my wholehearted support to the idea of making Korea the scene of a great joint recovery effort on the part of the United Nations and all its specialized agencies. The presence of the United Nations in Korea after hostilities have ceased should also serve to dispel fears — unfounded as they may be — which may be entertained by Korea's neighbours.

132. In the same way as in Korea, the United Nations should play an important part in the economic and social development of all under-developed countries in Asia and in other continents. In building a firm machinery for deterring aggressors and thereby ultimately preventing war, we should not forget that this is only part of our task. It is equally important to improve radically those economic and social conditions which make nations easy victims of aggressors, who promise them a heaven on earth if they will only follow totalitarian principles. The task of the United Nations is not only a negative one, to stop aggression; it is as much the positive one, to eliminate the causes of war.

133. Looking back to the age of colonialism and imperialism, it is quite evident that the democracies did not in the past have too good a record, in the opinion of many under-developed countries. It is all the more important that the United Nations, by its decisions and by its actions, should make it quite clear that the Organization and its Members will further the political independence and the economic and social development of all under-developed countries. That is why, next to the proposals to strengthen the Organization and make its machinery more effective, one of the most important items on our agenda is the question of technical assistance to under-developed countries. I feel sure that if we all do our utmost to carry through this programme — and my own Government is prepared to take its proportionate share of such an effort — if we all do that, I am convinced that we shall have made another important contribution to prevent war and lay the foundations of lasting peace.

134. I agree with what was said by the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Stikker, the other

day [281st meeting], that the various matters before us ought to be dealt with each on its own merits. We do not want any confusion of issues. That being said, however, I should like to state that my delegation feels that a satisfactory solution of the question of China's representation is one of the most important problems before the Assembly. To my mind, a satisfactory solution means that China should be represented by that government which in fact exercises control over practically the whole territory of China, with the support of the overwhelming majority of the Chinese population; that means the Central People's Government in Peking.

135. Earlier this year the Secretary-General submitted to Member Governments a 20-year peace plan [A/1304], which has now been placed as an item on the agenda of the General Assembly. Whether the world situation will take such a turn that it will be possible to find a common ground upon which to deal with the many fundamental issues covered by his plan, I do not know. However, I feel that even if no such possibility should emerge during the present session, we should never tire of exploring again and again whether there is any basis for renewed negotiations.

136. To conclude, may I express the satisfaction with which my delegation has noted the relative moderation of language that has been characteristic of nearly all speeches during this general debate. Great as our differences are, and strongly as we may sometimes feel the need for plain and even for hard words, my delegation has never thought that the constant use of violent language, which we have so often witnessed in the Assembly, has ever served any useful purpose. May this debate, then, set a pattern for our discussion when we come to the specific controversial items on our agenda.

137. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): During its brief history, the United Nations has existed under a shadow of fear, the fear that the problems arising out of one great war would resolve themselves not in a peace, but in a new war. As the fifth session of the Assembly opens, this danger has been brought nearer to us by the reality of warfare in Korea. Indeed, as we debate the issues of peace and war in this Assembly, men are fighting and dying in Korea under the flag of and for the cause of the United Nations. We pay tribute to their gallantry and their devotion.

138. This war in Korea is but the continuation by armed and open aggression of the policies that communist imperialism has been pursuing by other means in other places. It is part of the theory of communism that the disruptions and dislocations of a post-war period give to a communist minority its best chance to seize power by force and maintain it by the terror and repression of the police state. Systematically, the forces of communist imperialism, in these last years, have been trying out these theories in the four corners of the world. In countries where they have been able to depend upon the direct support of the Soviet army, they have been successful. Only one country in which Soviet forces were actually present in the post-war period has been able to throw off the control of the Kremlin, and even that country now feels itself to be gravely menaced. Whether or not continental China will be brought into the orbit of this international conspiracy remains to be seen. We may hope, however,

that the Chinese people, with their own age-old civilization, with their traditional wisdom and patience, will not walk into the trap. The consciousness of their own great undeveloped resources and the strength of their national feeling will make them justly apprehensive of being exploited by Soviet imperialism.

139. In Korea, where the Soviet army had been present in force and where a communist minority was established in power in part of the country, conditions seemed admirably suited for communist seizure of the whole country. This time, however, the attempt was more open and violent than usual, and this time it met with collective United Nations resistance. That is what makes the aggression in Korea stand out. Despite all propaganda camouflage, the fact that North Koreans invaded the Republic of Korea was clear. This was not a *coup d'état* engineered by a minority as in Czechoslovakia, nor a régime imposed by an occupying force as in Rumania. This was armed invasion. As such, it came as a shock to peace-loving nations. But it also acted as a stimulus to them. A swift and sudden assault on a peaceful nation had an obvious meaning for us all. Hence the speed and determination with which many of the free democracies, my own country included, have applied themselves to the task of jointly building up our defences against aggression. The countries which have felt obliged to take these steps in self-defence and to preserve the peace will not be deflected from their purpose by any specious manoeuvres designed to weaken and divide them, or to put them once again off guard.

140. The effect of the North Korean aggression within the United Nations itself has been to give overwhelming support to the Organization in this crisis of its existence. It has, however, demonstrated that, with very few exceptions, the Members were not in a position to make that support immediately effective. They were caught by surprise and unprepared to meet at once the demands of the situation. We have, I hope, learned the lesson of this experience. But we have also learned that the United Nations can act in response to a challenge — that it is no longer remote from reality, a mere international talking shop. A new impetus has been given to our world Organization and a new atmosphere has been generated in this Assembly of which we are all, I think, conscious.

141. Events in South Korea, and United States and British soldiers fighting heroically, are rapidly demonstrating that aggression does not pay. It will soon be necessary for the United Nations to show with equal vigour and resourcefulness that it can deal with the problems of the post-aggression period in Korea. The political and economic life of that country must be established on a basis which will enable the Korean people to fulfil the destiny that has been promised to it. As hostilities draw to a close in Korea and the Assembly takes up its new responsibilities there, it seems to my delegation that certain specific principles should govern our decisions and that we should embody these principles at once in an Assembly resolution.

142. What are these principles? In the first place, as we see it, the general objective of the United Nations in Korea should be to fulfil now the purposes which have repeatedly been stated at previous Assemblies: a united Korea, a free Korea, a Korea which the Korean people itself governs without interference from

outside. This should be achieved by United Nations action and not through decisions reached by certain of its Members.

143. Secondly, the United Nations must assist the people of Korea to establish peace and order throughout its territory as the firm foundation for democratic institutions and free self-government. It is our hope that the people of North Korea, having been forced into a perilous and disastrous venture by its communist rulers, will now itself repudiate these rulers and co-operate with the United Nations in bringing to Korea the peace and unity which its people desire. This is the time for the aggressors there to cease fire, to admit defeat. If they do, it may not even be necessary for United Nations forces in Korean territory to advance far beyond their present positions. The United Nations must, however, leave its forces free to do whatever is practicable to make certain that the communist aggressors of North Korea are not permitted to re-establish some new base in the peninsula from which they could sally forth again upon a peaceful people.

144. Thirdly, the Korean people — once peace has been restored — must be assured that no nation will exploit the present situation in Korea for its own particular advantage. This, of course, means a Korea without foreign bases and free of foreign military domination. It means a Korea which will be responsible for its own defence within the framework of our collective security system. Above all, it means a Korea which will not be divided and disturbed by subversive communist elements directed from outside Korea.

145. The fourth principle should be that nothing shall be done in the establishment of a united, free Korea which carries any menace to Korea's neighbours. There has been some comment in the Press and elsewhere about the role which the Korean peninsula has historically played in invasions of the Asiatic mainland, so nothing must be done in Korea, as indeed nothing will be done, which holds the least suggestion that any Member of the United Nations has any purpose whatever in Korea other than to establish that country under the full sovereignty of its own people.

146. My fifth principle — and this is a principle which has just been enunciated by my friend, Mr. Lange — is that the free governments of Asia should take a major share of the responsibility for advising the Korean people upon methods of government which they should adopt and procedures which they should follow in establishing those methods of government. The countries of Asia and of the Western Pacific have made an outstanding contribution to the work of the United Nations. I think we should now make sure that we gain full advantage of the judgment of these States in charting a course for the future in Korea in the difficult days ahead.

147. Meanwhile, the destruction of the homes of the Korean people and the inevitable casualties to the civilian population which occur when hand-to-hand fighting is going on in a great city, as it is today in Seoul, are bringing terrible hardships to that unhappy country. Yet at this very time the Soviet Union delegation has the effrontery to produce in the Security Council resolutions condemning the United States Gov-

ernment for destruction and loss of life in Korea,⁴ when the Soviet Union delegation is well aware that, at a nod from the Kremlin, the North Korean aggressors would cease fighting and the bloodshed and suffering would be brought to an end. If the USSR Government were really in the least concerned about the sufferings of the Korean people, it has all along had it in its power, as it has at this moment, to bring to an end those sufferings which were caused in the first place by this communist adventure in aggression.

148. Those who fomented the Korean aggression must know now — if they did not know before — that their actions are running counter to the deepest and strongest trends of the age in which we are living. Today the peoples of the world, above all things, long for peace and security. I know that this is true of the populations of our free democracies, and I have little doubt that it is true also of the peoples of the Soviet Union and its associated States. The rulers of the USSR are well aware of this sentiment. It is one of the ironic tragedies of the present world situation that the Soviet Union Government, while pursuing policies of aggression, should be advertising itself as the champion of peace. It has been said that hypocrisy is the tribute of vice to virtue. The present Soviet-sponsored peace propaganda is a tribute to the universal desire for peace which they would exploit for their own purposes. This is a dangerous course, dangerous even to those who hope to profit by it. For people, even the Russian people, deprived as they are of access to the truth about political events, cannot be deceived forever. The game of pinning the name of aggressor on the victims of aggression cannot continue indefinitely and the disillusionment of people who, in their political simplicity, are signing the so-called Stockholm Appeal, will, in the end, act as a boomerang against communist imperialism itself. For sooner or later it will become clear to all, as it is clear to most of us now, what kind of peace the Cominform has in mind. It is the peace that prevails in a state dominated by one party, one political faith, one group of self-perpetuating rulers, one prophet; it is the peace of the policeman and the gaol.

149. We want peace, but not that kind of peace. Nor will we be led by any number of plausible answers to manufactured questions, or by superficially impressive resolutions about the prevention of war, reduction of armaments, the banning of weapons, to put ourselves again in a position where this kind of dead peace can be imposed on us by dictators. It is for genuine peace, based on the absence of fear and the presence of friendship and co-operation, that we long.

150. Furthermore, we are anxious not only to talk about peace and to pass resolutions about it, but to do something about it. It seems to us that the first practical step that we can take for peace is to put the security factor into the disarmament equation. We can disarm if — and only if — we are sure that in doing so we are not exposing our people to dangers from others who say they are disarming but are not doing so. If we are going to disarm ourselves, we must know — by seeing for ourselves and not merely by being told — that other people are disarming as well. We have, in fact, a right

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, Nos. 26 and 45.

to continuous reassurance that the olive branch does not conceal 175 divisions.

151. It is with these considerations in mind that we are bound to examine the draft resolution which the Soviet Union Government has placed before the General Assembly on the subject of peace and disarmament. We should, of course, approach it in a constructive spirit and with an open mind. This, I confess, would be much easier if we had not had a painfully disillusioning experience with a whole series of USSR resolutions in the past, couched in the most pacific terms, purporting to be contributions to the cause of peace which, on closer examination, have proved to be something else indeed. Nevertheless, the issues of the present time are too grave and the dangers are too acute for us to brush aside any proposal put forward in the name of peace. So we must apply to the Soviet Union proposal some touchstone which will enable us to see whether this is merely an echo of past performances or whether, within it, is to be found some firm ground for a step forward. For if we see the promise of even a short step in the direction of peace, we must not fail to take it.

152. The USSR draft resolution covers a lot of ground, a good deal of which we have been over before in previous sessions of the General Assembly. It speaks of the desirability of concluding a five-Power peace pact, of reducing the present armed forces of these five great Powers by one-third during 1950, that is, during the next three months; this is a transparently insincere and meaningless proposal. The resolution also urges the General Assembly to declare itself in favour of the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and the establishment of strict international control for the unconditional implementation of this prohibition.

153. My delegation is first of all interested in establishing what precisely is meant by these far-flung proposals, and we think that there is one very simple and direct test of the sincerity of those who have made them. There is one clear question which, if it could be answered by the Soviet Union representative, would go far to resolve our doubts. What does he mean when he says he is in favour of strict international control of atomic energy, or, indeed, of armaments generally? He used that phrase, "strict international control", several times in the course of his statement to the General Assembly in introducing the resolution. He spoke at some length to the last session of the General Assembly on the same subject. The Canadian delegation has studied his remarks with the care which they deserve — and no doubt other delegations have also — but we are quite unable to determine whether the Soviet Union view of strict international control differs in the slightest degree from what has been previously put forward by the USSR representative, which has been shown to be quite inadequate and unsatisfactory. Therefore I suggest that before the Soviet Union draft resolution on disarmament comes to a vote at this General Assembly, we have the right to ask for a clarification of the USSR conception of international inspection and control as applied to the problem of atomic energy, and indeed to disarmament measures generally.

154. One method of securing such clarification would be to introduce an amendment to the Soviet Union draft resolution by including at the appropriate places in that draft resolution some such words as the following:

"By 'strict international control' is understood a system in which the inspection rights of the international control authority would include:

"(a) The right of free access at all times to every atomic energy installation or plant of any kind whatever; and

"(b) the right to search for undeclared atomic energy facilities wherever there can be reasonable grounds for believing, in the opinion of the international control authority, that they may exist."

155. Such an amendment to the USSR draft resolution would, I suggest, act as the touchstone of its sincerity. If the Soviet Union delegation indicates by its readiness to accept this kind of definition, that atomic energy and disarmament negotiations might profitably be resumed, then I think that we should try once again to negotiate an agreement in this field that would be effective and would give us something more on which to base our common security than empty phrases and hypocritical gestures. If, however, the Soviet Union delegation refuses to accept some such definition of international control, then its draft resolution on peace and disarmament will be exposed for what it is — a propaganda manoeuvre designed for purposes far removed from ensuring peace and security.

156. Another important step that we can take at this Assembly has already been suggested by the United States delegation in its valuable proposal for the strengthening of the General Assembly. It has always been the view of our delegation that the General Assembly should be a second line of defence for the security of Members of the United Nations when the Security Council is unable to act.

157. Fortunately, when the crisis came in Korea, the Security Council was able to act with speed and force. This decisiveness, made possible because of the fortuitous and temporary absence of the Soviet Union member, forced the Soviet Union Government into a hasty reconsideration of its determination never to sit in the Security Council with any Chinese representative except the one of its choice. On 1 August, there was an end to dramatic walk-outs and in their place we had a "walk-back," which was equally dramatic because it showed how the United Nations had come to be regarded as a powerful instrument for peace even by those who disliked the peace that it was enforcing.

158. Now the spectre of the irresponsible and unprincipled use of the veto hangs over us once more, together with all the other devices for delay and frustration which have been used by communists all over the world to disrupt the activities of democratic bodies. In these circumstances, the Canadian delegation warmly welcomes the United States proposals, which will make it possible, in appropriate circumstances, to fall back upon the General Assembly as an instrument to express the determination of free peoples to resist aggression.

159. We are particularly interested in that part of the United States proposal which would call upon Member States to hold forces in readiness for the use of the United Nations. Certainly the need for such forces was demonstrated by the emergency in Korea. Our own experience in Canada is a case in point. As early as 1946, the Canadian representative at the United Nations said

that Canada was prepared to establish immediately its part of the forces referred to in Article 43 and that it would like the United Nations to tell it what military preparations it should make to fulfil its obligations under the Charter.⁵ But the Military Staff Committee, which was the agency in this case, was never permitted to function because of the obstructive tactics of the Soviet Union representative. As a result there never was any plan into which we could fit our collective security preparations. Consequently when the call came for help in Korea, my country and other countries did not have at hand land forces earmarked and trained for United Nations use, which could be quickly thrown into that area. Canada was able, however, to send, without delay, naval and air help. We then set about determining how best we could contribute to United Nations forces on the ground. We felt that this was exactly the kind of situation for which Members of the United Nations were supposed to prepare under Article 43 of the Charter. We decided, therefore, that we would take this occasion to put ourselves in readiness not only to meet the appeal in Korea but to fulfil similar commitments under the Charter in the future. For that purpose we have recruited in Canada a special force: a brigade group, trained and equipped by the Canadian Government for use on occasions when a United Nations appeal is made to which Canada must respond.

160. Our interest, clearly, in the United States proposal for establishing a United Nations force of national components is an obvious and immediate one. We accept that idea and we hope that it can be worked out in prac-

⁵ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second part of the first session, Plenary Meetings, 41st meeting.*

tice. But if this is to be done effectively, then every loyal Member of the United Nations must make its appropriate contribution to this new and great effort to put force behind peace and security.

161. The communist aggression in Korea was a blow struck at the very heart of the United Nations. That blow has been warded off primarily because of the gallantry and courage of the South Korean, United States and British forces. The aggressor has been met on his own ground and on his own terms. Even from evil, however, there may sometimes come good; and the good that has come out of this aggression is the new vitality which has been given to the United Nations. Because of the way in which the challenge has been met, we may now begin to walk the road towards collective security, a road upon which we first set our foot in 1945, a road upon which we may now for the first time advance with vigour and with confidence, the only road which can lead to peace.

162. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I hope that we shall complete the general debate early tomorrow afternoon.

163. I should like to draw your attention to a letter from the President of the Security Council regarding the Council's recommendation in favour of the admission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations [A/1402]. Immediately after the end of the general debate, I shall submit this question for your consideration, and I hope that your decision will be favourable.

164. We shall meet again tomorrow, Thursday, 28 September, at 10:45 a.m.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.