

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



Thursday, 2 November 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

Page

United action for peace: reports of the First Committee (A/1456) and the Fifth Committee (A/1463) (continued)	307
---	-----

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

United action for peace: reports of the First Committee (A/1456) and the Fifth Committee (A/1463) (continued)

[Agenda item 68]

1. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom): This General Assembly has been notable for the new atmosphere of hope and confidence which has transformed our proceedings. This is due, in the first place, to events in Korea, which have shown that, in a clear case of aggression, a great Power has been ready to lead and others have been ready to follow in taken even extreme measures in defence of the Charter. I believe it is due, in the second place, to the main draft resolution submitted by the First Committee [A/1456], which shows that fifty Members of the United Nations, having once seen collective security in action, are now determined to assert their right to make effective use of the machinery of the Charter on any future occasion where a two-thirds majority of their number is satisfied that aggression has occurred.

2. The opponents of this draft resolution have alleged that it weakens the Charter by impairing the power of the Security Council, but this is not at all the case. Even when the General Assembly has approved this resolution, as I am sure it will, the Security Council will still be able to take any action that it thinks right or to decide to take no action. Moreover, if it decides to take no action, no other body will be able to usurp the Council's prerogative of taking direct action to meet aggression under Chapter VII of the Charter. The Council's freedom of action, therefore, will remain quite unrestricted.

3. The Soviet Union and others, however, in an effort to prove that the resolution will weaken the Security Council, has attributed to the Council a power which it has never had under the Charter, namely, the power to insist that, because the Council has itself been reduced to impotence in the face of aggression by disagreement among its permanent members, the entire world Organization shall wash its hands of the whole matter and let aggression take its course. The Council has never pos-

sessed any such right. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive that the authors of the Charter at San Francisco would have lent themselves to a proposition so far out of tune with the hopes and wishes of the peoples of the world.

4. I am afraid that the Soviet Union attitude in this matter is only one more manifestation of a policy followed since 1945 and designed to obstruct the building of effective collective security in any form. The USSR has gone very far to shake the confidence of small nations in the Security Council as a protection against aggression. It has tried, in the face of clear provisions in the Charter relating to individual and collective self-defence and to regional arrangements, to assert that it is illegal for groups of nations to join together for mutual assistance against aggression, as has been done by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. And now, in opposing this draft resolution, the Soviet Union is saying in effect: "Not only shall you have no assurance of effective action by the Security Council, not only may you make no agreements for joint self-defence, but in addition you have no right to use the machinery of the United Nations even to obtain the moral approval of the world Organization for resistance to an aggressor or to enlist the voluntary support, including the military support, of peace-loving Member nations."

5. The only inference we can draw from this deplorable course of conduct is that the USSR does not wish to see collective defence measures made effective in any form whatsoever. Fifty nations repudiated this point of view in the First Committee and I do not doubt that they will repudiate it again in this Assembly.

6. We hope, of course, that the lesson of Korea will be learned and that no further aggression will occur. This resolution should help to make aggression less likely by giving notice to any intending aggressor that he risks uniting the world against him. If, nevertheless, aggression takes place and the Security Council is prevented from acting as the majority of its members thinks it should, then we look to this resolution to strengthen resistance to the aggression in three ways:

first, the United Nations will be able to obtain objective information about what is happening through a peace observation commission; secondly, on the strength of that information it will be able to make a quick appeal for help to Member States; and, thirdly, Members will be better equipped than in the past to respond to the appeal with effective forces owing to the activities of the collective measures committee.

7. The operations in Korea have compelled us to concentrate our attention for the time being upon measures to resist aggression, but we must not, of course, overlook the economic and social causes of conflicts. This point was well made by the representative of Chile in our debates in the First Committee,¹ and it is the substance of his views which is now embodied in section E of the first draft resolution.

8. Nor must we overlook the obligation which lies upon all of us to settle disputes peacefully before they reach the point at which forcible measures may be needed to resolve them. The second and third draft resolutions presented in the Rapporteur's report serve to remind us of this.

9. The second draft resolution expresses what has always been the view of my country about the obligation resting upon members of the Security Council to bring Chapter VII of the Charter into effective operation as soon as possible. We have long struggled, together with the majority of our colleagues on the Council, to make some progress in this matter, but so far always in vain. We hope that this draft resolution, introduced by the delegation of the Soviet Union, is intended to be something more than propaganda, and that that delegation will now give some practical sign of an intention to meet the opinions of the majority in the Council and in the Military Staff Committee.

10. The third draft resolution, which we owe to the initiative of the delegations of Iraq and Syria, stresses the need for consultations over a much wider range of problems between the great Powers. This, too, we are ready to accept, albeit with a word of caution. I said in the First Committee, and I reiterate it, that the basic difficulty has not been any lack of meetings, but the difficulty of finding the necessary spirit of co-operation on the part of one Power, which nearly always stands in self-imposed isolation.

11. If the Soviet Union should now feel able to modify its attitude, none would be happier than my delegation, but quite frankly we have heard nothing from the USSR in the course of these debates up to the present moment which gives us any very solid ground for anticipating an early solution of our difficulties. I say this because I realize how fervently all the smaller nations desire to see rapid agreement reached between the great Powers, and I do not wish to mislead them into thinking that, because this draft resolution has received—and will again receive today—such general approval, the problems themselves are likely automatically to melt away. We are, however, always ready to try again whenever any possible road to agreement seems to be open to us.

12. All the peace-loving nations must welcome the strengthening of the forces of peace which the passing

of these resolutions will represent. The very introduction of these proposals has already increased confidence, and if Member States will only respond by their actions in the coming months as they have already responded by their votes, and will respond by their votes again today, we shall have taken a very practical step forward in our efforts to mobilize the forces of peace and to lift the threat of aggressive war from the peoples of the world.

13. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): The Chilean delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee; it believes that the General Assembly will be taking a decision of great importance in approving that Committee's report on the item "United action for peace", and particularly in ratifying the first of the draft resolutions contained in that report. I shall not dwell on the scope of the provisions of that first draft resolution because it has been explained at great length at the meetings of the Assembly and by the Press of the whole world. I should merely like to say that, in our opinion, the United Nations will be supplied, by virtue of this resolution, with the instruments necessary to check and repel aggression wherever it may occur and to act promptly and effectively in any situation endangering world peace and security. Thus the Organization will always be in a position to act in as effective and timely a manner as it did, only because of a combination of fortunate circumstances, in the case of the aggression against South Korea.

14. We believe that by adopting this draft resolution the Assembly will be taking measures which are perfectly legal, necessary and in accordance with the Charter. Those measures were wisely conceived and elaborated and were defended in the First Committee by the authors of the draft resolution with weighty arguments and a proper understanding of democracy.

15. Our delegation believes that the Assembly should thank the authors of the draft resolution for their real guidance in this matter. But the draft resolution is not confined to improving the operation of the machinery which the Charter provides regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. Section E, which was approved unanimously with only two abstentions, provides the foundations for a complete and lasting peace. In the first place, it recognizes that the ultimate purpose of the United Nations is not the establishment of machinery for collective security that would prevent or successfully repel aggression. This is only a means of achieving the true goal, namely, a peaceful and prosperous world where mankind can live in decency and dignity. The draft resolution recognizes that that goal can be achieved only by observing all the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and carrying out the recommendations and resolutions adopted by the principal organs of the United Nations with a view to maintaining peace and international security. The draft resolution thereby stresses the moral value of the recommendations of the General Assembly and the three Councils of our Organization and also affirms the moral obligation of complying with them as an essential prerequisite for peace.

16. That is a theory which Chile has enthusiastically defended and it is a definite step in the direction of the formula Chile proposed; we asked that a study should be made of the possibility of concluding a pact whereby

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, First Committee*, 354th to 371st meetings inclusive.

Member States would undertake to implement the recommendations referred to in the draft resolution.

17. In that section E it was also sought to stress two of the principles and purposes of the Charter which are indivisibly linked with peace: universal respect for fundamental human rights and the need to achieve world-wide economic stability and social well-being through international action directed primarily towards the development of backward countries and areas.

18. The draft resolution calls upon Member States to intensify joint action and to stimulate universal observance of, and respect for, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Human rights and fundamental freedoms are not vague concepts for the United Nations; on the contrary, in approving the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 [*resolution 217 A (III)*], the General Assembly clearly defined those rights and freedoms. That Declaration envisages a democratic society in which all men are equal, that is, a society in which there can be no discrimination for reasons of race, sex, origin, religion or opinion. Men are free to live, to think, to speak, to travel, to assemble and to associate together; they are free to elect their own government—which must be representative—and they have the right to work, to the protection of the law, to culture and to social security. Thus the resolution we shall approve implicitly favours the universal extension of representative and democratic government, which imposes upon society the duty to make provision for the economic and social security of the individual without which political freedoms are illusory and cannot easily survive.

19. This appeal, which the General Assembly will make to Member States, so that they may intensify their joint action in co-operation with the United Nations to develop and stimulate universal respect for, and observance of, such rights and freedoms, should be met in the first place by a sincere effort on the part of each State to bring its political, social and economic life into line with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Obviously that is not an easy task and cannot be accomplished by a mere legislative or governmental provision, because the limitations prevailing in many countries in relation to full respect for human rights arise from profound causes which can be eliminated only through slow and patient work; those causes are economic backwardness, lack of political consciousness on the part of a large section of the population, deep-rooted religious convictions or centuries-old traditions. But each nation, stimulated and assisted by the Organization, should direct its individual action towards the gradual elimination of all these factors, and the United Nations, in accordance with the mandate of the Charter, which the draft resolution under consideration again reaffirms, can and must collaborate actively by means of propaganda and teaching, as well as by ensuring respect for the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

20. The same section E which we are discussing also urges Member States, in co-operation with the Organization, to intensify their individual and collective efforts to bring about conditions of economic stability and social progress, with particular regard to the promotion of the development of under-developed countries and areas.

21. On this subject the First Committee could not do more than make a statement of principle and a general

appeal. The important point is that this statement and this appeal are being made at a historic moment, and in the form of a resolution which will certainly also prove historic in the life of the United Nations. They are being made in implicit recognition of the fact that the initial success of aggression in Korea was due to the existence of economic and social conditions which weakened both the material and moral resistance of the sector attacked. They are being made as a result of the conviction that the same thing may happen in other areas in the Far East; as a result of the conviction that those same conditions are producing a dangerous ferment of discontent in the Middle East; and, finally, as a result of the conviction that the noble and patient peoples of Latin America, the majority of whom live in countries where the economic structure is still semi-colonial, and where world economic disequilibrium has aggravated the state of permanent crisis, are also exposed to serious social upheavals which are liable to produce any form of totalitarianism which, in itself, constitutes a serious threat to peace.

22. For this reason, the resolution the Assembly is about to adopt cannot be considered as just one more of those recommendations which the various organs of the United Nations have periodically adopted in the last few years. It must be the tocsin to awaken those who, because of egotism, self-interest or lack of sensitivity to world difficulties, still see no connexion between the peace and prosperity of their own country, group or class, and the peace and prosperity of other areas, countries, groups or classes.

23. The recommendation of which I am speaking, and which, as I have said, is about to be adopted in exceptional circumstances, should be a new point of departure in a great co-operative effort to develop the economically backward areas by all the nations of the world. It must, however, be inspired by a real feeling of human solidarity. It must be directed towards an economic development which will result in raising the standard of living in the various countries and areas by making their economic structure more stable and more progressive.

24. It must be admitted that what has so far been done—the plans for technical assistance, for example—is not enough to satisfy the urgent material needs which exist in all the continents, and is still less able to satisfy the aspirations towards progress and well-being which the masses of the world are demanding with one voice—a voice which is sometimes loud and sometimes anguished.

25. The Indian delegation, which has made such an outstanding spiritual, technical and moral contribution to the United Nations, has made a new and important contribution in submitting its idea for a United Nations peace fund [*A/C.1/598*], which will be discussed within the next few days in the First Committee. We hope this idea will be studied with the interest it deserves. Other formulae may be suggested for achieving the same results. What we wish to emphasize, at this time, is the need for a bold, new approach to international collaboration in the economic field, which will make it possible to meet the situation swiftly and effectively.

26. Finally, the Chilean delegation wishes to express its gratitude to the First Committee; it also wishes to thank the authors of the draft resolution which has served as a basis for the one we are about to adopt for having included in their text all the fundamental ideas

expressed in the proposal which Chile had placed before the General Assembly as a basis for its action at this session. My delegation is fully satisfied, for it has witnessed the realization of its desire to see the Organization progress towards perfecting its mechanism for collective security and effectively implementing the recommendations of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council on the subject of security, human rights and economic and social co-operation. Full satisfaction has also been given to our desire for the formal recognition of the inseparability of the three basic concepts of the Charter on which a complete and lasting peace depends—political security, economic security and respect for the dignity and worth of the human person.

27. Mr. THORS (Iceland): Since the Icelandic delegation did not participate in the discussion in the First Committee of this item which is now before the General Assembly, entitled "United action for peace", I wish to take this opportunity to explain very briefly our attitude regarding the various proposals and resolutions now before the General Assembly.

28. The Icelandic delegation will vote in favour of the first draft resolution as approved by the First Committee. This draft resolution was originally presented to the First Committee by the delegations of Canada, France, the Philippines, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States and Uruguay, and its main objective is to strengthen the structure of the United Nations. We entirely agree that the General Assembly should be enabled to take immediate action in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and where the Security Council has failed to exercise its responsibilities. The United Nations cannot, at any time, risk being rendered ineffective by the lack of co-operation of any single Power or group of Powers. We are, therefore, anxious to see that the role of the General Assembly is extended and arrangements made to ensure that a special session may be called at short notice. Therefore, we favour the measures in section A of the draft resolution.

29. My delegation also favours the establishment of a peace observation commission as described in section B of that draft, and we are hopeful that such a commission may render valuable service in the future whenever international tension may exist which would be likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. It is most desirable that, as the First Committee decided, the membership of that commission should be as representative as possible.

30. With regard to section C, paragraph 8, which recommends to the Members of the United Nations "that each Member maintain within its national armed forces elements so trained, organized and equipped that they could promptly be made available, in accordance with their respective constitutional processes, for service as a United Nations unit or units", we regret that we shall have to abstain from voting, as Iceland has no armed forces. This fact was clearly expressed when Iceland joined the United Nations in November 1946 [48th meeting].

31. As regards sections D and E, we are in favour of both.

32. We are also in favour of the second draft resolution, which was originally proposed by the delegation of the USSR and amended by the First Committee in accordance with a proposal of the French delegation. In that draft, the Security Council is called upon to perform various important duties outlined in the Charter which the Security Council has not been in a position to carry out so far.

33. We shall also be happy to vote for the third draft resolution, which was originally presented by the delegations of Iraq and Syria. This draft resolution recommends to the permanent members of the Security Council that they should meet and discuss "all problems which are likely to threaten international peace and hamper the activities of the United Nations, with a view to their resolving fundamental differences and reaching agreement in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Charter". No delegation could oppose such a resolution, but I regret to have to say that, unfortunately, the effects of such resolutions have been shown in previous years to be out of proportion with the degree of agreement which such proposals have received in our Organization. A similar proposal, presented by the delegation of Mexico, was received with general applause at the third session of the General Assembly in Paris in 1948 [147th meeting], but we cannot conceal the sad fact that no fruitful result has been obtained. Let us hope, however, that this time we shall have more success. People all over the world are yearning for that.

34. Mr. HAJDU (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that it is not necessary to go again into those considerations which were analysed so thoroughly, by the Czechoslovak delegation among others, during the discussions of this matter in the First Committee and in the General Assembly. Neither does the Czechoslovak delegation consider that it is necessary to answer the venomous fantasy spread about Czechoslovakia by Mr. Dulles. This has already been done by the head of the Czechoslovak delegation, Vice-Premier Siroky, in his speech in the First Committee. The absurdities produced by Mr. Dulles are typical of the authenticity of American statements. That same authenticity also characterized Mr. Dulles' speech yesterday [299th meeting] during which, on the one hand, he violently and maliciously attacked the policy of the Soviet Union and, on the other hand, spoke of the immaculate record of United States policy.

35. I think no one need stand up in defence of the policy of the USSR. This policy defends itself by its deeds and by the record of thirty-three years of Soviet history. But let us take a look at the record of United States policy since the end of the last war. Let us put this record in the form of practical questions which by themselves will show whether it is the Soviet Union or the United States that is menacing world peace.

36. Let us begin by asking whose armies entered Greece to intervene in the Greek civil war and who carried out military intervention in the Indonesian war. Was it the Soviet Union? Or do you not think it was the United States? Whose land and naval forces are fighting in Korea? Whose land and naval forces are occupying Taiwan? Are they those of the USSR? Or do you not think they are those of the United States? Who is pouring money and armaments into Vietnam and Malaya, and thus intervening to bolster up crumbling,

corrupt colonial régimes? Is it the Soviet Union, or is it the United States? The answers are obvious: it is notorious that it is not the USSR but, of course, the United States.

37. Who, led by the obsession of a pact mania, is organizing aggressive military pacts such as the North Atlantic Treaty? Who is threatening the whole of mankind with the atomic bomb? Who stands against disarmament, and who is madly arming and boasting of the fact? Obviously it is not the Soviet Union, which has introduced draft resolutions demanding disarmament and the prohibition of atomic weapons, but the United States, as is proved by that country's attitude toward the USSR proposals.

38. Who is rearming and remilitarizing Germany, and who is using former fascist generals? Who is building air and naval bases all over the world? Is it not the United States? One has only to ask for what and against whom. The answer is obvious.

39. Who is putting pressure on governments as to what they should do and what they must not do? Is it not the United States? Many of you must know about that and could say something about it.

40. Having objectively answered these questions—and the answers are so notorious that these really amount to rhetorical questions—please answer for yourselves, in an objective and unbiassed way, and basing the answer on facts and on your answers to the previous questions, a supplementary question which follows directly from the previous ones. That question is, who, then, is threatening world peace? Who constitutes a menace to the whole of mankind? Is it the Soviet Union? Certainly not. It is the United States. And this is the famous immaculate record of its post-war policy, a record spoken of yesterday by Mr. Dulles.

41. So let us once and for all stop these ravings about the Soviet bogey, so well known from the outpourings of Hitler, Goebbels and company and used now by the Americans, as they were previously used by the nazis, as a pretext to cover one's own past and present aggressive policies and one's intentions of continuing that aggression in the future, and also used to try to fool the whole of mankind. Let us stop this fooling. "Deeds, not words" is the slogan of the gentlemen who wave this red bogey. Here you have deeds—the deeds of United States policy from the end of the last war until now. Compare them with the high-sounding words of United States statesmen. Compare them and you will have the answer as to who is threatening the sovereign rights of peoples, who is the aggressor, who is a menace to world peace through a policy of aggression and a policy of armaments and threats. Clearly it is the United States.

42. Contrary to the opinion that it is not necessary to go into considerations that have already been analysed, the Czechoslovak delegation thinks that it is necessary to show here the experiences arising out of the debate as well as out of the general consideration of this question in the First Committee, and to draw conclusions from these experiences as to the consequences of the adoption of the draft resolution now under discussion.

43. The discussion and the voting have primarily shown that some delegations, in addition to the sponsors, supported the draft resolution while fully conscious of the

fact that it clearly violated the provisions of the Charter which are so fundamental that the basis of co-operation within the United Nations, the very strength of the Organization, rests upon them. They deliberately supported the adoption of a resolution which would weaken the United Nations and which would undermine its ability to contribute to the maintenance of peace.

44. In vain did many delegations present political and juridical arguments which proved concretely in which sections of the draft resolution the Charter was being violated and undermined. Several delegations, in addition to the sponsors, although they had no reply which could disprove our effective arguments, continued to push through the adoption of the draft resolution although they knew that they were violating the Charter.

45. The first event, therefore, was that the sponsors of the draft resolution and some other delegations insisted on the adoption of the draft resolution with the intent of violating the Charter and weakening the United Nations. As they had shown during all of the deliberations of the General Assembly, they did not want to co-operate within the framework of the United Nations and on the basis of the letter and the spirit of the Charter. They were contemptuous of the laws which they deliberately violated by forcing through their objectives in disregard of legality.

46. It is enough to point to the clear statement of the Australian representative, Mr. Spender, to the First Committee, of which I have already spoken. He said that his delegation was not concerned with legality. This really shows the manner of thinking of his own delegation, as well as of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Next to him in clarity and in confirmation of our experiences was General Rómulo. Yesterday [299th meeting] he stated, among other things, that the principle of the inviolability of the Charter must be rejected. At the same time he spoke of lack of imagination on the part of the USSR. I must say that he has more than enough if he advances such monstrous opinions. He and so many other speakers would like to introduce something new into the theory of international law—the theory of illegality. This is an absurd theory in connexion with the word "law". For these gentlemen and for many others, as they have proved on this and many other occasions, politics and legality are two altogether different things. This is not so for us. Our policy is always based on respect of the law and legality, contrary to their policy.

47. The second event was the fact that approximately twenty speakers of the more than forty who participated in the general debate expressed serious doubts as to the lawfulness of the individual provisions of the draft resolution. Some of these speakers entered upon a discussion with the authors of the draft and proved to them that many of its provisions were contrary to the Charter. Some speakers even had a discussion with their own conscience. In spite of all these publicly expressed considerations and doubts, in spite of the fact that they themselves had pointed to the illegality of the provisions of the draft, all those representatives, with the exception of perhaps one, voted for its adoption.

48. A further event was the fact that during the discussion the sponsors of the draft resolution, led by the United States, refused to agree to any amendments directed towards supplementing the text with provi-

sions in conformity with the Charter, which would make possible the elimination of parts of it which violated the Charter.

49. The final event was that the authors of the draft resolution refused to accept the hand of the Soviet Union and of the peoples' democracies which offered justice and law. They refused to change even one dot in their draft or to accept any amendment or addition whatsoever proposed by the Soviet Union, even if it was only of a technical character, although the USSR and the peoples' democracies were ready to accept important and even fundamental parts of the draft resolution, thus showing their good will to take the road that would lead to the safeguarding of peace through the maintenance of the principles of the Charter and through agreement among the great Powers.

50. Certain specific conclusions, as well as one general conclusion, arise out of these experiences. One of these conclusions is that the United States, the leading Power of the capitalistic camp, does not wish to solve by peaceful agreement with the other Powers the outstanding questions in dispute. It is misusing the United Nations; it wishes to push through its opinions without even admitting arguments directed against these opinions. Further, by exercising pressure and terror on other delegations, it forces them to vote to carry out the United States concept of policy against their own better judgment and against their own interests. Finally, it is not in the least concerned with the form in which it carries out its policy or with the fact that it is doing so even at the price—and in this case only at the price—of violating the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

51. The general conclusion arising out of an evaluation of the debate is that the United States wishes to change the present character of the United Nations, which is that of an international forum in which the existing disputed questions can be solved on the basis of the Charter. It wishes to change the Organization into an obedient instrument of its policy, one-sidedly directed towards the calling up of conflicts, in such a way that the Organization—in other words, its Members—would be an obedient helper in the carrying out of this policy; thus other nations would eventually contribute even with their blood towards United States plans for world domination, and the authority of the United Nations would cover this policy and these aims.

52. This is confirmed by the whole discussion which has taken place on individual issues at this session of the General Assembly. The most important step in that direction was the approval in the First Committee of this very draft resolution. I do not wish to revert here to the question of the particular provisions of the Charter which are directly violated by the various sections of the draft, because we and others dealt with that conclusively in the First Committee. It is sufficient to enumerate the most mishandled of them, which are chiefly Article 11, paragraph 2; Article 20, Article 27, Article 43, Article 47, Article 106, Article 108 and Article 109. It is necessary to demonstrate whom such a resolution serves, what purposes it serves and how it eventually could be made use of in the future.

53. The heading of the draft resolution is a cynical parody of reality and represents cheap demagoguery, for

this text has nothing in common with peace or with the maintenance of peace. It is, on the contrary, a draft resolution which is a considerable contribution to the aggressive United States policy. Its provisions, in ridicule of the Charter, rattle with arms, arms which could be used, and certainly, in the intentions of the United States, are intended to be used, for the suppression of internal disputes within States, and in this way could lead to the unleashing of civil war and to the suppression of every movement of national liberation.

54. These provisions are to serve the protection of colonial domination and the further extension of the exploitation of hundreds of millions of peoples awakening to national consciousness. They are also to serve the maintenance of disintegrating régimes—by means of foreign intervention where the territories concerned already have sufficient national consciousness. It is therefore a renewal of the Holy Alliance, and that to an unheard-of extent.

55. Any internal events in whatever area of the world would, with the help of this resolution, be used for the unleashing of local and continental conflicts in harmony with the needs, plans and objectives of United States policy at a time most convenient to it. On the basis of this resolution, the United States and the other Powers could indefinitely occupy or could ensure the occupation of territories and States. On the basis of this resolution, for instance, the United Kingdom could indefinitely give reasons for the maintenance of its troops in Egypt.

56. The resolution could also be misused by the United States for the launching of aggression against any State in the light of its newest theory of aggression which we could call preventive aggression, as it has already applied it in the case of Taiwan, which aggression it seeks now to validate and legalize by a vote and decision of the General Assembly. That is the meaning and the purpose of the whole draft resolution. That is why the United States refused to accept the proposal of the Soviet Union directed towards a democratic settlement of the questions in dispute.

57. That is proved by the draft resolution itself, which is only a link in the chain of decisions adopted at this General Assembly. This policy of violence, of using the United Nations for the United States' own aggressive purposes, has already been confirmed by the attitude of the United States in the solution of the Korean question. Thus, in spite of the concrete proposals of the USSR and four other States—among them Czechoslovakia—for the peaceful solution of the Korean question and for the cessation of war, the United States had a resolution voted upon which enables it to continue to wage war under the authority of the United Nations, to continue shedding the blood of innocent people, and to solve the conflict with arms instead of in a peaceful manner [294th meeting].

58. This is also confirmed by the consideration of the present Soviet Union peace proposals [A/C.1/595], which contain concrete provisions with respect to the possibility of reducing the danger of world conflict by means of disarmament, prohibiting atomic weapons and of concluding a pact among the great Powers. The United States does not even wish to hear of these proposals because they are in contradiction with and would

hinder the plans and objectives of United States policy, which is directed towards unleashing conflicts. It is satisfied with the draft resolution under discussion, because that draft provides such possibilities; and it might be satisfied with another draft, which it would cynically substitute for the Soviet Union proposals, because it also provided them with similar possibilities.

59. This is further confirmed by the submission of the question of Taiwan to the General Assembly by the United States, which once more wants to put the United Nations at the service of its own policy and to hide its aggressive aims behind that authority. This is also confirmed by the disgraceful episode yesterday morning in the General Assembly, namely, the illegal re-appointment of the Secretary-General. This resolution, which is a worthy link in the chain of United States proposals, attempts to change the United Nations into a United States institution and into a branch of the Department of State. The United States is trying to place the United Nations at the service of its policy, and it wishes, under the protection of the name of the sixty Members of the Organization, to carry out this policy of aggression, which is directed towards world domination.

60. It seems that for the United States, all the existing and planned-for future aggressive pacts against the whole of progressive mankind, and in particular against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies, are no longer sufficient. It wishes to create, it seems, a universal pact against progress—the progressive world being primarily represented by the USSR. In order to achieve these objectives, it even wants to utilize the Organization which has been built up by us, although, by its universal character, the Organization should and must serve different aims—peaceful aims.

61. We must not permit the United Nations or its individual Members to become active or passive accomplices in the achievement of the low aims of the United States policy of world domination, directed against all peoples. By adopting this draft resolution, the individual delegations would greatly aid in the realization of United States efforts to make the United Nations an instrument of its policy. By adopting this draft resolution, almost all the delegations would be going against themselves, against their own interests and the interests of their peoples. The delegations which voted for this proposal would be helping the United States to forge a new instrument, with the help of which the United States would try to realize its aims of world rule by any means whatever. This cannot be permitted. In case of its adoption, the hundreds of millions of people, ever growing all over the world, and sincerely calling for and desiring peace, will not accept it. Among them are the tremendous masses of people of those countries whose delegations voted for the adoption of the draft resolution.

62. These hundreds of millions of people all over the world will not permit this. This is particularly so because the road which the United Nations should follow is traced before them by the Soviet Union draft resolutions on this question as well as by the USSR peace proposals, which have been discussed in the First Committee.

63. The Czechoslovak delegation has taken this clear road by most warmly supporting the amendments as well as the independent Soviet Union proposals in connexion with this draft resolution, and by supporting the Soviet Union proposals in the First Committee. This support is just as warm and sincere as is our strong opposition to voting on this draft resolution in the form proposed, which, in the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, is illegal because it violates the fundamental provisions of the Charter. The warning voice of caution of the USSR against taking the dangerous road represented by this draft resolution is followed by the modest voice of warning of the Czechoslovak delegation.

64. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): A French author had the happy idea of entitling his work *A la recherche du temps perdu** ("In search of lost time"). Our Organization could very well imitate Marcel Proust and say that this Assembly, at its fifth session, is "in search of lost peace". It is this unending search for human happiness within the framework of peace and security which has led a number of States to propose the legal means for achieving this difficult goal through the draft resolution we have before us.

65. The Bolivian delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution. I took part in the very lengthy debates in the First Committee in order to explain why we had followed and would continue to pursue that policy. With your permission I shall now present a brief summary of those arguments, purposely leaving aside any controversial questions in order not to disturb the calm atmosphere of our debate.

66. I must, however, recall that the whole structure of our Charter is based upon the concerted and harmonious action of the Security Council and the Assembly, although it seems that this cannot easily be achieved. The sponsors of the Charter, many of whom are with us here, tell us that there were serious disagreements at San Francisco regarding the major or minor role which should be given to the Assembly. A number of States were inclined to minimize its powers, transforming the Assembly into a mere collegiate body charged with the task of recording the decisions of the Security Council, and making the latter the keystone of the edifice. That very clear tendency was opposed by the representatives of the democratic governments and the small nations who feared, and not without reason, that a Security Council founded on the rule of unanimity of the five permanent members might find itself unable to act because of that drastic rule of unanimity.

67. Those legal experts and diplomats, who were evidently very perspicacious men, feared that the principle of unanimity might endanger the peace and security of the world. Among those legal experts was the United States Senator, Mr. Vandenberg. We all know Mr. Vandenberg. He is recognized in both hemispheres as a level-headed man of great moral integrity. Mr. Vandenberg on 14 October 1950 wrote our distinguished colleague Mr. Dulles a very interesting letter, which bears out what I am saying.

*The title of the English translation of this work is *Remembrance of things past*.

68. Among other things, Mr. Vandenberg wrote: "I shall never forget the violent battle that raged around the effort to give the General Assembly authority to discuss 'any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter'. I well recall the dramatic finale of the San Francisco meetings in the Fairmont Penthouse when the Russian delegation conceded this language and the Assembly freedoms, which it was presumed to create. The contest over this point, as I recall it, came closer to deadlocking San Francisco than almost any other quarrel. I am perfectly sure that this authority justifies the current purpose to strengthen the powers of the Assembly to cope with aggression. I agree with you, the powers of the General Assembly we now invoke were won that day in San Francisco; there is no occasion now to put them in question; rather now is the time to use the rights so hardly won."

69. What happened at San Francisco happened *mutatis mutandis* in the First Committee. We came up against the same States determined to minimize the powers of the Assembly for the purposes of their national policy, whereas we, the truly democratic nations, defended those powers in order thereby to ensure that our Organization in future times of crisis could take rapid action in defence of peace.

70. At the risk of wearying my listeners, I must recall that the powers of the Assembly derive from Article 10 of the Charter, subject to the reservation in Article 12, paragraph 1. The Council's powers derive from Article 24, paragraph 1. Under these two articles, the Members of the United Nations confer upon the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In fulfilling this function, the Security Council acts in the name of all the Member States and in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

71. From the concordance of these two articles, a fundamental premise may be deduced, namely, that the Security Council acts in the name of all the Members of the United Nations. It is, so to speak, a proxy appointed to assume the responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, within the limits, of course, of Articles 24, 25, 26 and 27, and subject to the reservations laid down in Article 10 and in Article 11, paragraph 4, which relate to the powers of the Assembly.

72. It is thus apparent that the harmonious functioning of the Security Council, which is dependent upon the unanimous agreement of the permanent members, constitutes the only guarantee of peace and security in the world. This unanimous co-operation and the duty to act in concert also constitute a responsibility which the permanent members of the Council have assumed towards those from whom they derive their powers, namely, the Member States, on whose behalf they act, in conformity with Article 24, paragraph 1.

73. But unfortunately—and we repeat this for the tenth time—the permanent members of the Security Council, because of their conflicting policies, have not been equal to the task entrusted to them. Their decisions in innumerable cases have not been unanimous. They have failed from the very start and today we see the Security Council paralysed, unable to fulfil its task to act in good faith in the name of all the Member States and in accordance with the purposes and prin-

ciples of the Charter. But by implication this suggests a violation of the Charter. National interests cannot be allowed to override the collective interest.

74. The exercise of the right of the veto, which has obviously been altogether excessive, and which has been attacked by some and defended by others, compels us to stop and think. As Member States of the Organization, we are entitled to ask whether, in the exercise of its functions, a member of the Security Council has fulfilled in good faith the obligations it assumed under the Charter. Any vote cast in the Security Council—as that eminent Greek jurist, and our colleague, Mr. Spiropoulos, has said—which is not inspired by the purposes and principles of the United Nations, should be considered illegal and, from the legal point of view, declared null and void. Here, then, we see where the theory leads us. I am fully aware that much can be said about contradictions in the Charter and the underlying rivalry between the Security Council and the Assembly.

75. But let us leave academic considerations aside and face reality. What is actually happening? The fact is that the Security Council, stricken as it is with paralysis, does nothing to allay the concern of the Member States and even less to promote the purposes and principles of the Charter.

76. I realize that it might be said that the Security Council did awake from its lethargy when on 27 June 1950—one of the most memorable dates in the annals of international relations—it named the aggressor and took the decision which the Korean affair required.² At this very moment the forces of the United Nations, organized as a result of that decision, are fighting and winning in Korea, not only to chastise an aggressor but also to make people more and more aware that the settlement of conflicts by war does not pay and that every aggressor will have to reckon with the United Nations, which has an effective force at its disposal. That is an obvious fact which no one denies.

77. There is, however, an equally obvious fact: the unexpected circumstance of the tactical absence of one of its permanent members permitted the Security Council to act with dispatch and certainty. We are not prejudging the conduct of the permanent member concerned, but events have shown what its attitude would have been on 27 June had it not sulked in an isolation consisting of a strange mixture of pride and parliamentary tactics. Once again it would have cast its veto and, on the pretext of seeking new contacts and possible agreements with the other members of the Security Council, it would have played the game of the North Koreans by gaining time for them to take advantage of the factors of surprise and careful military preparation. It must be said quite frankly: the North Koreans and their sponsors believed, for certain reasons which turned out to be mistaken, that the aggression would be a military parade from the 38th parallel to the port of Pusan.

78. The paralysis of the Security Council, when confronted with this first serious case, would have been the beginning of the downfall of the Organization, with moral and material consequences which can readily be imagined. It is to the lasting credit of the Government

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 16.*

of the United States that it urgently requested a meeting of the Security Council and placed at the disposal of the United Nations the first soldiers to fight and die for the ideals of the United Nations. Those young men did not die in vain and it may well be that their sacrifice has warded off the danger of greater sacrifices and more widespread conflagrations. It is also to the credit of the Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, and his collaborators, that they calmly carried out the decisions of the Security Council. All these have strengthened peace and the prestige of the United Nations, which was already somewhat weakened.

79. The great German poet, Schiller, said: "Liberty is a possession which must be defended day by day . . ." Allow me to add that peace and security are equally worthwhile possessions which must be deserved by defending them day by day. That is what we are doing at this very moment when we call for the adoption of the draft resolution before us.

80. The question we are all asking is this: what will the United Nations do if the Security Council should find itself paralysed once again in a case as serious as that of Korea, or even more serious? Must we echo the advice of Soviet bloc: "Well, gentlemen, let us discuss it, let us try to reach agreement. Let us look for new solutions, let us negotiate. We have Articles 106 and 43 of the Charter. Let us all negotiate for the establishment of a United Nations army." We know from the bitter experience of the last few years where such negotiations would lead us: to inertia, waste of time, the triumph of an aggressor whenever he could count on the sympathies of a certain permanent member of the Security Council. All this would lead to the downfall of the Organization, to inertia and paralysis.

81. To have recourse in these circumstances to the Security Council, where quarrels would become more acute with every passing day, would be tantamount to asking a paralytic to take a message to a dying person. You may be sure that the dying person would pass away without receiving the message. In every conflict, and particularly today in the era of radar, aeroplanes, radio and nuclear energy, dispatch and swiftness of decision are paramount factors in securing peace.

82. Confronted with this indisputable premise, with the failure of the Security Council and with the failure of the Military Staff Committee, the Assembly has paramount duties to carry out; in accordance with Article 10 and Article 11, paragraph 4, of the Charter, it must act, and act swiftly. If it failed to do this, its members would be violating the Charter and encouraging future acts of aggression.

83. "But that is illegal", say our opponents. "Only the Security Council can act when any action must be taken in cases of conflict. The Assembly can only make recommendations which the Council may consider. Its powers go no further." We cannot accept such a restrictive theory. Article 10 is quite clear and Article 11, paragraph 4, does not limit the rights of the Assembly.

84. The Charter of the United Nations is a treaty, a multilateral treaty which was established to govern, by prior and spontaneous consent, the lives and destinies of the peoples. It is a treaty regulating the essentially

changing and fortuitous lives of those peoples. Treaties are not untouchable monoliths. To invoke the letter of a treaty—sometimes a letter prematurely dead—is to go counter to life itself, counter to evolution; it is to fly in the face of reality and reason and frequently of justice.

85. A member of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, Mr. Alejandro Alvarez, stated in his dissenting opinion, delivered in response to a request for an advisory opinion addressed to the Court by the General Assembly on 22 November 1949 [*resolution 296 J (IV)*]: "Even the clear provisions of a treaty must not be given effect, or must receive appropriate interpretation, when, as a result of modifications in international life, their application would lead to manifest injustice or to results contrary to the aims of the institution."³

86. The present situation cannot be better defined. What could be more contrary to the aims of the United Nations than the votes indiscriminately cast by a permanent member of the Security Council for the sole purpose of serving its own interests? To meet such a paradoxical situation, so contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter, we must follow the suggestion of the great Chilean jurist whose opinions are dictated by his wide experience and the wisdom derived from study, reflection and age. We must, I say, interpret the Charter in an evolutionary manner to facilitate the task of the General Assembly, which may be called upon to come to the assistance of the Security Council in cases of emergency.

87. The sponsors of the draft resolution ask us to vote for it. We must all vote for it consciously and deliberately; all of us, large and small, weak and strong, must defend the peace — with the Soviet group, if it so desires, and without it, if it refuses. There is no human quarrel which cannot be settled by peaceful means. We shall defend peace whatever the cost; we shall not allow ourselves to be turned aside by sophists or cowards, and even less by would-be fishers in troubled waters. We desire peace because peace is the vital need of mankind.

88. The document which we are going to approve will, by giving the Assembly the means with which to act, serve to maintain peace. It is our duty to approve it. It is a matter of the public weal.

89. Mr. SARDER (Turkey): The first draft resolution, which was adopted by a large majority in the First Committee and which is now submitted to the General Assembly for final approval, may be considered to mark a turning point, not only in the short history of the United Nations but also in the history of mankind. In making this claim, I want in no way to minimize the value and the importance of the Charter, for we all know very well that all the ideas contained in this resolution have been envisaged in the Charter itself, in even greater detail. What is proposed to be done by this draft resolution is to move along boldly and with determination in the putting of these ideas into effect. I am sure that the foresight and action of the General Assembly in this respect will gain the prayers and admiration of history and of generations to come.

³ See *Competence of Assembly regarding admission to the United Nations, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950, page 17.*

90. The First Committee worked intensively on this question for eleven long days. Both in the debate there and in the discussions here, almost every argument which can be adduced in favour of this draft resolution has been adduced. Arguments against it, relevant or irrelevant, have also been explained extensively. It is therefore very difficult, if not impossible, to bring any new contribution to this discussion, and I do not propose even to attempt it. However, I should like to point out that everything that has been said, and in particular the arguments adduced against this draft resolution, have further strengthened our conviction that the initiative taken in bringing this proposal to the General Assembly was very timely, appropriate and necessary.

91. As one of the original co-sponsors, I should like to dwell upon the idea that no new measures are proposed in this draft resolution which are not contained in substance in the Charter itself. I do not intend to go into the detailed arguments which were brought against us, but I want to place this on record as a general remark in reply to the most important amongst them. A number of articles in the Charter, in or out of their context, were repeatedly mentioned during the debate by those who opposed this resolution. However, it will suffice to recall the following passage of the Preamble:

"[Determined]

"...

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

"To ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest..."

92. This principle is the essence of our Charter and of our Organization. We have accepted this principle in the deep and firm conviction that peace on earth is the highest goal to be reached. Peace was then the fundamental objective of our policy, and peace remains the fundamental objective of our policy today.

93. We do not define peace simply as the non-existence of a state of war. Peace is a positive concept and it is not unqualified. Peace, yes; but peace with freedom; peace in a democratic world. There is one thing that we hold above our lives, above everything else, and that is our freedom, our belief in our own way of life. And that, perhaps, is precisely why we want peace and security. That is why we can in no way tolerate aggression. And that, as we see it, is the basic principle, the main purpose of the United Nations. That is what we have undertaken to uphold, what we have pledged ourselves to attain. That is what we are united for.

94. The sole objective of the present draft resolution is to provide a practical method through which these aims can be accomplished. It was argued against us that since the Charter had already provided for a certain course, it would be contrary to the Charter to adopt another method. It was proved during the debate that such was not the case. Indeed, the draft resolution before us is in perfect harmony with the provisions of the Charter, both in letter and in spirit. It is not an attempt to modify the Charter. We believe that the

Charter as a living document should in due time be modified, but that is not what we are doing now. As long as the Charter is there, we are for the Charter. The course proposed in this draft resolution is by no means a replacement of the system laid down in the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is within that system. No attempt is being made to take over the functions of the Security Council. The Security Council will continue to discharge its functions and, we hope, successfully, more successfully than it has hitherto been able to do, for we believe that the proposed resolution will act as a stimulant to the Security Council in discharging the task entrusted to it by Member States. It will help the Security Council in carrying out its functions.

95. What we have tried to overcome by this draft resolution is the inactivity of the Security Council. It is no secret that the abuse of the rule of unanimity and obstructionist tactics have paralysed the Security Council frequently in its work. We could not condone that. We could not overlook the fact that the inactivity of the Security Council was likely to lead the world to certain destruction. This would have been a suicidal course, and we refused to take it.

96. The eyes of the world are upon us. The peoples of the world have put their faith in the United Nations and its mechanism for the maintenance of peace and security. But the mechanism can be doomed to inactivity by any one member raising his hand at the wrong time. Can the nations which are determined to live accept this? Can we accept it on their behalf? The smaller Powers are far from being disinterested in the understanding and friendly co-operation among the five great Powers; on the contrary, they wish for such understanding in all sincerity and earnestness. But even there, there are conditions. They would not be willing to see the world ruled by a small directory of States without consulting them. Similarly, they are not willing to see the world headed towards certain destruction because of the misuse and abuse of the special privilege afforded to the permanent members of the Security Council. Furthermore, they are not willing to overlook the obstacles to collective action where such action is necessary, where threats to peace cannot be removed by individual action. Collective action indeed becomes necessary at times. Under the present unsettled conditions in the world, we unfortunately continue to have international disputes or situations which are likely to lead to a breach of the peace.

97. And what is the remedy? We should earnestly try, and we certainly do try, to settle such disputes and situations peacefully. We even try to reach a compromise, if compromise is at all possible, because a reasonable compromise is an adjustment of ideas and interests. But we also believe that the spirit of compromise should never degenerate into attempts at appeasement of a potential aggressor, who would then have all the benefits of the appeasement, biding his time and being able to strike even harder within a few years. If we cannot prevent a breach of the peace through reasonable compromise and by peaceful means, we must be ready to face and repel aggression with all our might. If we want peace and security in the world—and there is no doubt that we do want it—we must unite to defend it. That is what we propose to do in this draft resolution.

98. Mr. SKOROBOGATY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR expressed its point of view on the question under consideration during the general debate in the Political Committee; I shall therefore be brief.

99. The General Assembly must examine at this meeting a draft resolution which was submitted to the First Committee by the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Turkey, the Philippines, France and Uruguay, and which was adopted by a majority of the members of that Committee. We also have before us a draft resolution [A/1467] and some amendments [A/1465 and A/1466] submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union.

100. As we know, the United States delegation stated that its aim in raising the question was to strengthen international peace and security and remove the threat of a new war. In actual fact, the matter was raised with a view to substituting the General Assembly for the Security Council, paralysing the Council's action and converting the United Nations into an instrument of the foreign policy of the United States.

101. In their speeches, Mr. Dulles and the other authors of the draft resolution sharply attacked the principle of the unanimity of the five great Powers. They were firmly convinced that their position was secure and that they had a sufficient number of supporters to obstruct the principle of unanimity. The draft resolution which we are now considering gives formal expression to what the supporters of the abolition of the veto were previously trying to achieve.

102. While not explicitly attacking the existence of the Security Council and the right of veto, the draft resolution in fact proposes that the General Assembly should be invested with powers which, under the Charter, belong only to the Security Council. The purpose of the proposals put forward in the draft is to by-pass the veto and establish within the United Nations the predominance of one group of Powers to the detriment of the rights and interests of other Powers and of the Organization as a whole.

103. Under cover of eloquent references to "peace", the authors of the American-inspired draft resolution are mutilating the Charter and misinterpreting a number of its articles. Thus, for example, they interpret Article 11 in their own way, ascribing to the General Assembly more rights than are conferred upon it under the Charter.

104. The General Assembly can undoubtedly discuss any question and recommend any kind of action except enforcement action. But that is not the point; the point is that, in Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter, it is clearly provided as follows: "Any such question on which action (i.e. enforcement action) is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion." Clearly, what is referred to here is the enforcement action which it is necessary to take to maintain international peace and security. Such action is within the competence only of the Security Council, and not of the General Assembly. Mr. Dulles and the other authors of the draft resolution refuse to accept these clearly expressed provisions.

105. At this point I shall venture to comment briefly on the speeches made in the First Committee on the question we are now considering by a number of representatives who actively defended the draft resolution which had been submitted by the seven delegations.

106. Yesterday [299th meeting] we heard the speech of Mr. Kanellopoulos, the representative of Greece, who again attacked the veto and demanded that the General Assembly should take over the functions of the Security Council. The representative of Greece openly said: "The veto, and especially its abuse, is negation". We have long been aware of the fact that the representative of Greece is physically unable to bear the veto and that he explains all the difficulties in international relations by the existence of the veto in the Security Council. He demands that this "Carthage" should be destroyed.

107. It is characteristic of him that he attaches particular importance to events which have taken or are taking place within certain States, such as the struggle of the Greek patriots against the reactionary monarchist régime in Greece, or the struggle of the Korean people against the anti-national clique of Syngman Rhee.

108. Everyone knows that Greece today is under a police régime of terror, terror directed against the patriots, whom the representative of Greece calls the fifth column. A police régime based on savage terror and imprisonment is of course neither stable nor durable, and therefore the representative of the Greek Government, ignoring the fact that the Charter forbids the United Nations to interfere in the domestic affairs of States, demands such interference to provide armed support for such a régime or a similar one. Such statements are inadmissible in an international organization of States which is supposed to defend and safeguard the sovereign rights of States and peoples, and human rights and freedoms.

109. As to the speech made here by the representative of Yugoslavia [299th meeting], who said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution, nothing else was to be expected from that delegation after the reports which have appeared in the American Press on the subject of a \$200 million dollar United States loan to Yugoslavia.

110. Speaking in the First Committee, Mr. Spender, the representative of Australia, declared that some of the articles of the Charter, particularly the articles concerning the exercise of the veto in the Security Council, were now useless, and he demanded a revision of the Charter of the United Nations. Mr. Spender attempted to show that the principle of the unanimity of the five great Powers had been adopted under pressure by the great Powers at San Francisco, and had been written into the United Nations Charter accidentally. Everybody knows that the representatives of Australia, from the San Francisco Conference to the fifth session of the General Assembly, have actively combated the principle of unanimity and urged other representatives to do likewise.

111. The representative of Australia should know that the principle of the unanimity of the five Powers was not adopted accidentally. The recognition of that principle reflected the desire of the United Nations to ensure agreement and concerted action on the part of the five

great powers. Prior to the Second World War, the great Powers did not have this desire for unity of action in the defence of peace and security, and therein lay the source of great tribulations for mankind. The principle of the unanimity of the great Powers in matters bearing on peace and security has deep roots. It was accepted by the United Nations in their desire for a more reliable method of protecting the interests of all peace-loving States, great and small.

112. Charter in hand, Mr. Spender quoted articles at random from various chapters. He referred, for example, to Articles 55, 56 and 60 of Chapter IX of the Charter, concerning international economic and social co-operation, to Article 62 of Chapter X, concerning the Economic and Social Council, to Article 76 of Chapter XII, concerning the International Trusteeship System, and to other articles irrelevant to the matter at issue. It was clear that Mr. Spender had not thoroughly mastered the question and therefore substituted all kinds of distortions for arguments.

113. Mr. Belaúnde, the representative of Peru, speaking in the First Committee, said that there could be no doubt that, according to the letter of the Charter, the General Assembly was also fully competent to make concrete recommendations in cases where the Security Council was paralysed. He added that that was the true spirit of San Francisco. Mr. Belaúnde went on to explain what he meant by the "spirit" of San Francisco. In accordance with that spirit, he said, it was necessary to preserve for the General Assembly all its prerogatives, all its principal rights which were sometimes exercised by the Security Council. The representative of Peru now apparently considers that the time for this has come. He is demanding that the Security Council should be directly superseded by the General Assembly.

114. Statements in the same vein have been made by the representatives of Canada, France, the Philippines, Turkey, El Salvador and others. No unbiased and objective person would find it difficult to realize that an active struggle is proceeding in the United Nations between the champions of two political trends.

115. The Soviet Union, the Ukrainian SSR, the Byelorussian SSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia are staunchly and consistently fighting for the strict fulfilment of the aims and purposes set forth in the United Nations Charter. The aim of these delegations is to strengthen the authority of the United Nations in every way, to develop and strengthen peaceful co-operation among States. The Soviet delegations in the United Nations have striven tirelessly for peace, they have submitted proposals which, while based on principles, can be carried out in practice, and which are designed to bring about the cessation of the armaments race, the prohibition of atomic weapons, peaceful international co-operation and the conclusion of a peace pact among the five great Powers.

116. The USSR has always taken the initiative in putting forward practical proposals for settling the differences among the great Powers and laying the foundations for a lasting peace. Its constant concern is to ensure the defence of the cause of peace and friendship among peoples and the adoption of every possible measure for preventing war. The Soviet delegations have always welcomed and taken a constructive attitude

towards any proposals which are based on a recognition of the principles of international co-operation and the strengthening of peace and security throughout the world.

117. The present discussions and controversies about the veto are evidence of the intensification of the differences between two main political policies. One policy is to ensure the defence of universally recognized principles of international co-operation among all States, large and small. The other expresses the desire of certain influential groups to have a free hand in order to embark on a programme of unlimited expansion. The latter policy is aimed at weakening the very foundations of the United Nations and eventually destroying the Organization; it constitutes a threat to the United Nations and to world peace.

118. I now propose to comment on certain individual points in the first draft resolution before us.

119. The USSR delegation has already submitted its amendments [A/1465] to that draft resolution. In paragraph 1 of section A it has proposed the deletion of the words "to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security" and the substitution therefor of the words "to making appropriate recommendations to maintain or restore international peace and security, it being understood that any such question on which action is necessary shall, in accordance with Article 11 of the Charter, be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion".

120. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR cannot accept the existing wording of the draft resolution and will vote against it, because, inasmuch as the text envisages a situation where the General Assembly would be called upon to take action instead of the Security Council, it is aimed at the overthrow of the Charter.

121. Paragraph 2 of Article 11 explicitly states that any question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council. The reference here is to recommendations relating to enforcement action, of which I have already spoken. The General Assembly has no right to take such action and cannot therefore make recommendations on the subject. The Charter stipulates that no organ of the United Nations except the Security Council may call for measures involving the use of armed force. That is why we cannot accept paragraph 1 of section A of the draft resolution.

122. Our delegation is also unable to accept the words "on the vote of any seven members" in paragraph 1, and supports the USSR delegation's amendment for their deletion. We cannot accept that proposal because, under the Charter, the right to which it refers is vested in the Security Council as a whole, including all its permanent members. Article 20 states that "special sessions shall be convoked by the Secretary-General at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the Members of the United Nations"—the reference here is to a two-thirds majority. To submit a proposal which radically alters the meaning of Article 20 is to disregard the Charter and to commit a flagrant violation of its provisions. The words "at the request of the Security Council" mean that decisions must be taken not by

any seven of its members but by the Council as a whole and hence by all its permanent members. We categorically oppose such a proposal.

123. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has no objection in principle to calling of special sessions of the General Assembly, inasmuch as this is in accordance with the Charter, but we are strongly opposed to the proposal that such sessions should be called within twenty-four hours. It therefore supports the USSR proposal for the deletion of the words "within twenty-four hours" and the substitution therefor of the words "within ten days". Time is needed to prepare for a session, to study the documents and proposals. Time is also of course needed to enable representatives to travel to New York. For all these things the necessary time is required.

124. It is provided in paragraph 3 of the annex to the draft resolution, which sets forth amendments to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that the Secretary-General shall notify the Members twelve hours in advance of the opening of an emergency special session. It is clear that it would be impossible to convene an emergency special session at such short notice. The United States and the neighbouring countries of the American continent would be represented at such a session but a number of other countries would be excluded, as they could not be represented. There can be no doubt that such haste would be contrary to the interests of Members of the United Nations.

125. That is why the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supports the Soviet Union amendments to section A of the draft resolution and will vote for those amendments.

126. My delegation has no objection to section B, which provides for the establishment of a peace observation commission.

127. As regards section C, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR cannot agree to the proposal for the creation of United Nations armed forces and also for the appointment of a panel of military experts, as the proposal is an attempt to curtail the rights of the Security Council. The proposal is fundamentally opposed to the United Nations Charter, particularly to Chapter VII, which provides that States Members of the United Nations shall make armed forces available to the Security Council, in accordance with special agreements to that effect; the Charter provides, moreover, that such armed forces must be at the disposal of the Military Staff Committee, which is responsible to the Security Council. That is what the Charter says.

128. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR strongly supports the second draft resolution of the First Committee, which is based on a draft submitted on 11 October 1950 by the USSR delegation. That draft recommends that the Security Council should take the necessary steps to ensure that the action provided for under the Charter is taken with respect to threats to the peace or acts of aggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes or situations likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. It recommends that the Security Council should devise

measures for the earliest application of Articles 43, 45, 46 and 47 of the Charter of the United Nations regarding the placing of armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council by the States Members of the United Nations and the effective functioning of the Military Staff Committee.

129. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR also supports the other draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in the First Committee on the same date, and which is now before the Assembly [A/1467]. That draft stresses the particular importance of concerted action by the five permanent members of the Security Council in defending and strengthening peace and security among the nations. It is therefore essential that, before armed forces are placed at the disposal of the Security Council under special agreements concluded in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter, the General Assembly should recommend to the five permanent members of the Security Council—the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, China and France—that they take steps to ensure the necessary implementation of Article 106 of the Charter, providing for consultation between them, and that they should consult together in accordance with the said Article 106 of the Charter for the purpose of taking such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may prove to be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

130. We take exception to the proposal for the establishment of the so-called collective measures committee, since, under the Charter, the Security Council also has obligations with respect to the struggle against breaches of the peace and the warding off of acts of aggression, that Council being responsible for the maintenance of peace. This question is intimately related to that of the means and resources, including armed forces, which may be made available to the Security Council for the maintenance of peace. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR sees no need for the establishment by the General Assembly of a special committee having such functions. My delegation therefore opposes this provision.

131. In conclusion, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR deems it essential to state that, under the guise of such recommendations—which, it is alleged, are intended to increase the effectiveness of United Nations action against aggression—the first draft resolution of the First Committee, which originated with seven delegations headed by that of the United States, aims at transforming the United Nations into an instrument of intervention in the internal affairs of peace-loving States, into an instrument of aggression. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR can in no way agree to these proposals and will therefore vote against them.

132. The PRESIDENT: We have heard fifteen speakers on this question. I think the time has come to close the list of speakers. It is as follows: Cuba, the USSR, India, Argentina, Yemen, Ethiopia, the Ukrainian SSR and Canada.

133. The list of speakers is closed.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.