

Bailey Warren

Sources A-E supports the view that the Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter itself under Articles 10, 11, and 12. This is shown most explicitly in sources D and C, in descending order of reliability. These sources show that the resolution would take the power away from the Security Council which is explicitly given to them under the Charter. Although, Sources A, E, B, and C, in descending order of reliability, support the contention that although it is against the UN Charter itself, it is not against the general purpose of the UN to enable peace in the world which is being inhibited by the current setup of the UN during the early Cold War times. Plus the Security Council wasn't given explicitly exclusive control and the General Assembly has some broad powers given to them in the Charter and is therefore not inconsistent.

The Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter as supported with Source D. Source D, coming from an American Journal of International Law in 1956, six years after the introduction of the Resolution and therefore more information available as to whether the Resolution would've been effective, from an American traditional perspective means that it is mostly pointed towards the USSR as being bad. Source D shows both sides of why Resolution 377 was approved of and disliked, pointing out the objective of the Resolution and what the opponent's argument was. The objective that was given was to improve the UN so it is able to keep peace with the lack of action that was currently being done as the USSR vetoed 17 of the 18 vetoes. The document itself says that it puts the General Assembly before the Security Council which is against the Charter itself and the purpose of the UN and is therefore not allowed to amend the Charter with the proposed resolution. This was all said in an American Article the same year as the Suez Crisis in Egypt and the reelection of Eisenhower which was on American minds. The Source provides the view of both sides of the argument and provides facts, although it doesn't say where in the Charter. Source D and C brings the fact that the Resolution was against the Charter itself by inhibiting the principle function of the Security Council. Source D and B both give American perspective on the subject, showing that the country as a whole was not completely united on its opinions on the resolution. Source D supports that the resolution was inconsistent with the Charter because it changed the whole process of the UN maintenance of peace through the unanimity of the Security Council.

The Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter as supported with Source C. Source C, coming from a Soviet Representative in the General Assembly on the same day that the Resolution was proposed and there was his true traditional Russian opinion as he didn't have time to collect and revise his ideas. Source C brings up actual Articles under the Charter with Articles 10, 11, and 12 and how the proposed resolution would be against the Charter because although, the General Assembly has the right to consider peace and security matters, they are not allowed to act, as this is the sole job of the Security Council as said in Articles of the Charter, and therefore the proposed Resolution is inconsistent with the Charter. Although the document only has the Soviet view point on the matter with the Soviets worrying about having a lack of control if the General Assembly was allowed to act based on the US having more than double the amount of allies in the General Assembly than the USSR and therefore the USSR is against the resolution for personal interests, not just the legality of it. The document is rather emotive in tone and is mostly one sided towards the USSR being the greater

member. This Soviet insecurity would eventually lead to Khrushchev recommending splitting the Secretary General in three with Troika which was also against the Charter. Source C and B, all from the day of the resolution was proposed shows the general reaction to the proposition of Source A and therefore unaltered opinions in Source B and C. Source C supports that the resolution was inconsistent with the Charter because it was against specific Articles of the Charter and therefore was against the Charter.

The Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter but wasn't against the main purpose of the UN, of maintaining peace, as supported with Source A. Source A, being the Resolution itself from 1950, being unaltered by people's opinions, and the basis for the arguments in the other sources. Source A, being very objective and unemotional, shows that the Resolution isn't against the UN itself as it just wants to help the UN recognize the failure of the current setup of the UN with the current conditions of the bipolar world and of the UN and the lack of action going on in the Security Council for maintaining peace. Although, when the USSR was boycotting the UN because of the US blocking the admission of the People's Republic of China, the Security Council acted for the first time and joined forces in Korea and therefore isn't completely inhibited by the current setup of the UN to act; although, the Security Council wouldn't act as a whole again until the First Gulf War. This resolution was proposed after the USSR went back to the UN because the US realized that the USSR wouldn't boycott the UN again. Source A was proposed after the Soviet boycott and therefore is a response to that and not for the actual benefit of the UN itself and its purpose of maintaining peace and security in the world. Source A is argued on the legality and morality of the resolution itself in document B-E, showing how each view is different on the legality of the resolution proposed. Source A supports that the resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter but it wasn't against the main purpose of the UN maintaining peace and security because of the lack of action going on in the Security Council with the bipolar conditions of the UN, although these conditions may have actually been keeping the peace as the lack of action led to less conflicts being involved with.

The Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter but wasn't against the main purpose of the UN, of maintaining peace, as supported with Source E. Source E, coming from an educated person's doctoral thesis 57 years after the proposition of the resolution and therefore the most available information on whether the resolution was actually against the Charter with new information. The thesis is coming from a University in Europe that would have an outside view of the Cold War, separate from the traditional American or Soviet viewpoint. Although, it is still their personal, post revisionist view point, opinion on the subject matter. Source E being rather un-emotive in tone because of the Cold War having ended almost twenty years earlier but only highlights the benefits of the resolution and is supportive of the General Assembly when he says "the Assembly gained the confidence". The source shows that although the Charter states that the Security Council has the "primary responsibility", this doesn't mean "exclusive responsibility" and is therefore not against the Charter when it allows the General Assembly to act when the Security Council doesn't for it is doing so in the main principle of the Charter – peace. The organs of the UN are supposed to work together in part and is therefore necessarily reasonable for the General Assembly to work to help the Security Council to get things done in the world where many conflicts were arising such as the Arab Israeli conflict which

CL
3

started in 1948 and the division of India in three in 1947 which would cause further tension. Source E agrees with Source B in that the General Assembly should be able to act to maintain peace in the bipolar world with the USSR vetoing everything in the Security Council because of the current relationship with the US. Source E supports that the resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter but it wasn't really inconsistent with the Charter because the Charter articles itself say that the Security Council has a "primary responsibility", not a "sole responsibility".

The Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter but wasn't against the main purpose of the UN, of maintaining peace, as supported with Source B. Source B, coming from the future US Secretary of State for Eisenhower, on the same day as the resolution was proposed so he expresses his true feelings on the matters. Dulles presents the sole aim of the Resolution as allowing the General Assembly, which has the most representation in the UN by the world, to consider the issues of peace and make recommendations to the Security Council when the Security Council can't act because of veto. This is against Article 12 of the Charter though because the General Assembly can't do this if the Security Council is currently acting on the matter. Dulles wanted more responsibility to the General Assembly because the US had the most allies in the General Assembly and could therefore act more there than in the Security Council because the USSR kept vetoing things of the US. Although, these allies based on the US providing aid to them didn't generally mean they would automatically gain their support in voting in the General Assembly, especially with countries in the Middle East in the latter half of the century. Source B has the General Assembly receiving broad powers under the Charter and therefore should be allowed to act in the case that the Security Council doesn't in order to maintain peace in the world. Source B brings up the fact that it was the Security Council's "primary responsibility" not exclusive responsibility, which is also brought up in Source E. Source B supports that the resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter but it wasn't really inconsistent with the Charter because the Charter gave broad powers to the General Assembly and therefore should be able to act to maintain peace if the Security Council can't act because the Security Council doesn't necessarily have sole responsibility on the matters of maintaining peace.

In conclusion, sources A-E support the view that the Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the Charter itself based on Articles 10-12 of the Charter. This view of the Resolution being inconsistent with the Charter can be seen the most through sources D and C, with D being more dependable based on it is published six years after the proposal for the resolution and therefore had more time to gather facts and is more objective. Source D is coming from a traditional American view during the time of heavy tension in the Middle East and the reelection of Eisenhower which influences the view of the resolution going against the UN Charter by giving more power to the General Assembly than it was originally designated, infringing on the right of the Security Council, during a time when the US didn't want to be more involved in the issues going on because of the Middle East. Source C isn't as dependable as Source D based on the emotive tone and blatant dislike of America when he says that the US "twists any questions whichever way it wants", showing his opinion, even though it provides the Articles of the Charter that support his claim. C is coming from a USSR Representative the same day as the Resolution as he is addressing the General Assembly providing facts to support his argument with Articles 10-12. Although, Sources A, E, and B, in descending order of reliability, show that although the

resolution isn't really consistent with the UN Charter, it is consistent with the true principle of the UN- of maintaining peace. Source A is the most reliable source as it is the resolution itself presented to the General Assembly in 1950 after the UN Security Council had voted to go to Korea and therefore wanted to ensure that the UN would be able to continue to act because the USSR was back in the UN and therefore would be vetoing things again which is why they made it where the General Assembly had more power on the issue of acting to ensure peace. Source E is the second most reliable source as it provides an educated outside perspective on the issue many years after the resolution was presented and therefore had more information available to make the most educated decision. It presents the idea that the resolution itself was a product of the current conditions of the bipolar world and the General Assembly wanting to take more control as a way to maintain peace in a time when decisions couldn't be made objectively in the Security Council. Source B is the third most dependable as it from future Secretary of State Dulles addressing the General Assembly the same day it was proposed to show his traditional American viewpoint on why the resolution should be accepted, showing both sides of the argument but favorable to the US and the US's goals. Therefore with the evidence provided, the Resolution was inconsistent with the Charter of the UN based on Articles 10-12, although it was for the benefit of pursuing the true purpose of the UN, peace, and the General Assembly has broad powers under the Charter and the Charter also doesn't designate exclusive responsibility to the Security Council for peace.

June 1950