

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records


 Saturday, 14 December 1957,
at 10.40 a. m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 66: | |
| Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States (continued) | 435 |

Chairman: Mr. Djatal ABDQH (Iran).

AGENDA ITEM 66

Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States (A/3673, A/C.1/L.198) (continued)

1. Mr. SIK (Hungary) recalled what the Burmese representative had said at the 935th meeting concerning the timeliness of the USSR draft resolution on peaceful coexistence (A/3673), which offered the world its only chance to avert general catastrophe. The very existence of the United Nations showed the validity of the principle of coexistence. The great Powers had established the United Nations in order to help nations to live together as good neighbours, at a time when their social systems had already been different. Without the idea of coexistence the Charter of the United Nations would never have come into being. However, that principle should be reaffirmed, for some Members appeared to have forgotten the true reason for the existence of the United Nations.

2. The United States would like to make the United Nations an instrument against nations and Governments whose social system differed from its own. The United Kingdom and United States delegations had been unable to refrain from reintroducing into the debate the old slogans of the "cold war". To explain his distrust the United States representative, Mr. Lodge, in his statement at the 936th meeting, had quoted statements by Marxist theorists and politicians on the future development of economic and social systems. Yet it was precisely the confidence of the socialist countries in that development which made it necessary for them to intervene in the domestic affairs of other States. The United States delegation, on the other hand, had often expressed the intention of changing the political structure of the peoples' democracies. Recently the United States Government had again spoken of installing new atomic bases and speeding up preparations for war. He wondered what there was in common between such statements and the ideals of the United Nations.

3. The United States representative had sought to evade all responsibility by pointing out that there was no State Press or radio in his country. It was obvious, however, that the United States Government could urge the information media to desist from spreading tendentious reports about events in the socialist countries. If it had taken the principle of coexistence seriously, it would have found ways to discredit such

radio stations as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. The part played by the latter station at the time of the Hungarian counter-revolution was known. The United States Government had never protested against the collection of funds to finance that broadcasting station, a fact which gave the impression that such activities had the blessing of the authorities.

4. The United States Information Service, an official agency, constantly broke the rules of coexistence. At Calcutta, for example, the show windows of the Information Service had exhibited highly tendentious photographs and descriptions of events in Hungary. It was impossible to approve of the use made by the United States Government of the freedom which the Indian Government gave to foreign information services. No information agency of any Socialist country would permit itself to spread propaganda hostile to another country. The United States representative himself was mistaken with regard to the events that had taken place. Speaking of Hungary, he had claimed that nothing had been done to give the Hungarian people an opportunity to choose its representatives. Had his country's information services been working efficiently he would have known that in the middle of November 1957 the inhabitants of Budapest, who made up one-fifth of the Hungarian population, had held elections for the municipal and district councils. Ninety-three per cent of the electorate had voted, and an overwhelming majority had endorsed the Government's policy.

5. It was common knowledge that the United States Government aided political emigrants, including those from Central Europe. The very fact that reactionary forces all over the world were basing their hopes upon the policy of the United States provided glaring evidence that the United States Government did not propose to rest content with peaceful coexistence. Hungary had found that out by bitter experience. It had been on the brink of a civil war and a war against a neighbouring country. The existence of the nation and of peace had been at stake. Those who had asked for the help of the Soviet Union had saved the Hungarian people and spared Central Europe from a new war. In the circumstances it was essential that Soviet forces should remain in Hungary so long as United States forces remained in Western Europe.

6. The USSR draft resolution, if adopted by the General Assembly, could hasten the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary because it would facilitate the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Europe. Whether that draft resolution was adopted or not rested with the United States. If the declaration contained in the draft resolution was adopted, it would take on historical importance, for it would provide a means of influencing the foreign policy of Governments and would show the peoples that they were no longer living under the threat of a new world-wide catastrophe.

7. In conclusion he pointed out that his country's economic and cultural relations with other countries were growing stronger every day. It was to be hoped that such contacts would develop even further and would result in a reduction of world tension.

8. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) felt that discussion of such a vital question as peaceful coexistence should enable the General Assembly, which had unfortunately been unable to reach agreement on disarmament, to end its work on a note of hope.

9. The Nepalese delegation fully endorsed the five principles set forth in the USSR draft resolution (A/3673) but regretted the somewhat combative tone of the accompanying explanatory memorandum, which reduced the chances for general agreement. The principles in question were the basis of the treaty which Nepal had recently concluded with the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, they were all stated in the United Nations Charter and in the declaration on the promotion of world peace and co-operation set forth in the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference of 1955. Some of the principles were of earlier origin. The idea of the sovereignty of States had taken shape when the concept of the State had been evolved. Respect for the territorial integrity of States was mentioned in Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and nonaggression has been the theme of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Moreover, the Charter prohibited intervention in the domestic affairs of States on any grounds whatsoever, whether political, economic or ideological. With regard to the principle of equality and mutual benefit, the Charter stated that one of the purposes of the United Nations was to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character. The very notion of peaceful coexistence itself was mentioned in the Preamble to the Charter, which stated that the peoples of the United Nations were "determined . . . to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours".

10. Coexistence had become an imperative necessity at a time when, unless nations settled their disputes by peaceful means, mankind ran the risk either of perishing in the cataclysm of a nuclear war or of living in perpetual fear and tension. Any error of judgement by the statesmen of either of the two great hostile international blocs would plunge the world into an unprecedented catastrophe. In order, therefore, to safeguard the existence of the human race it was important that the two blocs should first accept the idea of peaceful coexistence and cast aside their prejudices, fears, resentments and suspicions. If they persevered in their efforts they would be able to conquer those feelings, which were now poisoning their mutual relations. To that end it was necessary to strengthen the exchange of ideas and information, the exchange of cultural missions, contact and negotiations between East and West.

11. As he saw it, history showed that what was good in any ideological and philosophical system survived despite all attempts to crush it. The history of religious wars bore out that point very clearly. Despite the antagonism between paganism and Christianity, between Protestantism and Catholicism, and later between Christianity and Islam, all those religions had survived. Each of them had contributed to the moral progress of mankind. The history of the con-

flicts waged in defence of moral, religious or philosophical principles amply proved the futility of war and reinforced the lesson that the spark of freedom, like that of hope, could never be stamped out. The concept of respect for human rights and the dignity of the human person, on which the Western democratic system was based, and the concept of economic and social justice, which characterized the Soviet system, were not irreconcilable. There was every reason to hope that the world would succeed in combining everything in either system which was of lasting value. The happiness of the world depended on that evolution and that synthesis. Thus conceived, coexistence might usefully take on a competitive character.

12. He referred to the example of his country, which was situated between two great Asian civilizations, the Chinese and the Hindu. Nepal had made a synthesis of those two distinct civilizations, while maintaining its independence for three thousand years in spite of the historical vicissitudes of the two neighbouring empires. It was the practice of tolerance and of living in peace with its immediate neighbours, as with the other countries of the world, which had enabled Nepal to survive and to surmount all difficulties through the centuries, and which, it was to be hoped, would enable it to survive the nuclear era. In order to safeguard its existence, mankind as a whole should also adopt those principles.

13. His delegation sincerely hoped that through gradual adjustments, tolerance and mutual understanding, East and West might reach an understanding without sacrificing any real values. Of course, acceptance of the five principles enunciated in the USSR draft resolution (A/3673) would not solve every problem. The principles themselves were not so important as the manner in which they were applied. In order to preserve peace, nations must above all practise tolerance and maintain neighbourly relations.

14. His delegation would be glad to vote for any draft resolution which would help to create a peaceful atmosphere in the world.

15. Mr. GUNWARDENE (Ceylon) said that in the twelve years of its existence the United Nations had achieved positive results. It had presided at the birth of many new States and had enabled them to take their rightful place in the community of nations. It had succeeded in ending hostilities in many parts of the world: in Indonesia, in Kashmir, in the Balkans, and, on two significant occasions, in the Middle East. Its forces had been used to repel aggression in Korea and to preserve peace in the Middle East, where they were still stationed. Moreover, everyone was well aware of the great achievements of the United Nations in the economic, social and humanitarian fields.

16. Yet, when all that had been said, it should be asked to what extent the United Nations had achieved the noble objectives set forth in the Preamble of its Charter. That Preamble, which had stirred the hearts and minds of so many people and so many nations when it had been drawn up, could not be read without bitterness today, not because the ideals enshrined in it had lost their validity but because at the close of each session one began to wonder whether their realization was not further and further away.

17. For example, the peoples of the United Nations had declared in the Charter that they were determined

to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours. Yet not a day passed without some border incidents or other events which marked the worsening of international relations. The peoples of the United Nations had declared their determination to unite their strength to maintain international peace and security; and yet many nations were diverting their strength to channels which could lead only to the disruption of international peace and security. The peoples of the United Nations had declared their determination to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force should not be used, save in the common interest. And yet they had often compromised on principles and set those methods aside; it was all too true today that armed force was being used not in the common interest but in the interest of a particular nation or group of nations. The peoples of the United Nations had declared their determination to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. And yet, while more than half of humanity lived in woeful poverty, the technical skill, the resources and the money which could be used to better humanity's lot were being dissipated in the manufacture of arms and equipment which could lead only to wholesale destruction.

18. It was not his intention to apportion the responsibility for the existing situation; in a sense, all nations, large and small, were responsible for it. Although many of them had not taken part in the senseless arms race or in the equally senseless formation of military blocs, they should perhaps have united more determinedly to prevent the events which had set those developments in motion.

19. Peaceful coexistence had long ago ceased to be a slogan. Today it was a vital necessity. There was no choice. If the States wished humanity to continue to exist they must devote all their energies to peaceful coexistence.

20. All the nations represented in the Committee no doubt believed in the need for peaceful coexistence, especially since today man, by his ingenuity, had succeeded in creating armaments and devices capable of destroying not only whole cities but whole nations and continents. It should be possible to avoid the creation of the atmosphere of suspicion, distrust and, above all, fear, which apparently stimulated the striving of nations to outdo each other in the creation of ever more powerful means of destruction. As the President of a great nation had once pointed out, the only thing to be feared was fear itself. It was fear which was at the basis of the armaments race and the establishment of military blocs. Yet the nations of the world should not devote their time and energy to expressing their fear and justifying their suspicions, as they had been doing since the Second World War—a procedure which had itself prevented the elimination of the cause of that fear. Too often the United Nations had been a forum in which nations aired their grievances, and justified their actions and their policies. It had too rarely fulfilled its original purpose, which was that of uniting for peace. He wondered if it was not too late to reverse the trend and return to those basic principles of the Charter to which the Governments had subscribed.

21. Certainly, that was a difficult task. Nations must of course defend their interests, and Governments

could remain in power only if they did not subordinate national interests to other considerations. It would also be futile to expect every nation to consider all problems with the objectivity and impartiality they deserved. Traditional alliances as well as traditional rivalries were long-lived. Every nation had commitments to its people, its friends and to the group to which it belonged, and those commitments engendered others. There were no easy solutions, but all the nations represented in the General Assembly should strive ceaselessly to find solutions and should devote as much energy to that task as they devoted to pleading their causes or justifying their policies.

22. The declaration on the peaceful coexistence of States proposed by the Soviet Union (A/3673) was, in his delegation's opinion, a commentary on what had so far occurred and an indication of what might be accomplished in the future; above all, it was a warning that very little time remained. The declaration did not provide all the solutions the world desired but it might create an atmosphere of mutual confidence which would make their attainment easier. The principles it contained were not new; they appeared in the Charter of the United Nations in more or less the same form; they had been enunciated in the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference, and they had since served as a foundation for relations between many countries. The foreign policy of Ceylon was firmly based on the Bandung declaration.

23. His delegation was convinced that if it adopted those principles the General Assembly would make a great contribution to the reduction of international tension and the enlargement of the area of international co-operation. It wished to make it clear, however, that it did not subscribe to the explanatory memorandum attached to the Soviet draft resolution, with which it disagreed on many points. The memorandum was essentially out of keeping with the draft resolution which it was intended to explain; he deeply regretted that the Soviet delegation had thought fit to submit an explanation which smacked of "cold war" politics.

24. With regard to the principles set forth in the declaration submitted by the USSR, the first, mutual respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, was a somewhat clearer version of Article 2 of the Charter, which enjoined all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State. That statement was positive in that it implied not only a renunciation of the threat or the use of force, but also an express undertaking on the part of all States to respect each other's territorial integrity. The fear of a nation for its territorial integrity was not always the result of threats of violence and aggression. It might well be engendered by what might be termed defensive alliances built around that nation. However defensive such alliances might be in origin or in character, they hardly made for the peace and security of the nations surrounded by them.

25. The second principle, non-aggression, was clear enough, but it had been violated so often, particularly in recent years, that it seemed as if nations had forgotten that in subscribing to the Charter they had renounced the use of force. Its insertion in the declaration was therefore timely.

26. Non-intervention in the domestic affairs of a State was another principle which had been violated

more often than respected. In some cases, the intervention had been blatant; in others, it had been more subtle but no less sinister in intent. Since the purpose of the declaration was conciliatory, there was no need to cite examples of intervention in the domestic affairs of nations. The principle implied that any nation, however small, should be allowed to develop its own way of life and to adopt any social or political system it valued, without outside interference.

27. As understood by his delegation, the expression "equality and mutual benefit" meant that there should be freer contacts between peoples in the economic, commercial, social and cultural fields, and that those contacts should be based on the principle of the equality of all peoples. In the economic field, it implied co-operation as opposed to domination. In the commercial field, it meant the elimination of artificial trade barriers and the development of international trade. In the social and cultural fields, it meant the free exchange of ideas as against the imposition of a particular nation's ideas or cultural values on a smaller nation. In all those activities, the equality of States should be recognized.

28. The last principle was peaceful coexistence. That principle was the most important of all, for the others would never be realized without it. Coexistence was, of course, a fact, as the presence of the different delegations on the Committee proved. But peaceful coexistence was another matter. The Government of Ceylon maintained peaceful relations with many countries, in both the East and the West. But it should also be recognized that the relations of other States were still governed by attitudes adopted and suspicions engendered during the bitter days of the "cold war". Regrettably, the end of the "cold war" was not yet in sight as the debate had abundantly proved. Obviously those attitudes could not be changed nor could suspicions be dispelled by the mere adoption of the declaration, but it would be tragic if false pride were to prove an obstacle to its adoption.

29. The Government of Ceylon firmly believed in parliamentary democracy and in the political and social institutions that it involved. But that belief had not prevented it from entering into diplomatic and trade relations with countries with different systems of government. The trade agreements it had concluded with such countries had in no way affected its harmonious and long-standing relations with the Western nations, in either the political or the commercial spheres.

30. It might be argued that Ceylon, being a small country, had to be on friendly terms with all nations. But it seemed strange, in the age of the thermonuclear bomb and the intercontinental ballistic missile, to speak in terms of small and large nations within or without military alliances. His delegation took the view that some nations were capable of blowing up the world, and others were not. It was for the latter to seek not only to develop better relations with one another and with the great Powers, but also, through mediation and conciliation, to bridge the gulf between the great Powers themselves, and so to create a favourable climate for the peaceful coexistence of nations.

31. The "cold war" had failed miserably. A "hot" war was well-nigh impossible, for it would destroy not only the parties engaged in it, but all mankind. It now

remained to find a modus vivendi based on human understanding. The declaration proposed by the Soviet Union provided such a basis. It was to be hoped that the sponsor, as well as those who had expressed doubts about it, would decide to adhere firmly to the principles enunciated.

32. The delegation of Ceylon earnestly appealed to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union, which were primarily responsible for maintaining world peace, to set aside their prejudices and elaborate a disarmament programme that would ensure a peaceful world.

33. In that hope, the delegation of Ceylon had pleasure in supporting the draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.198), three great nations whose peaceful intentions were beyond question.

34. Mr. CHAMPASSAK (Laos) confessed to some doubt concerning the true motives of those who had initiated the debate. He said it would be dangerous to be led astray by mere words and to forget that specific and concrete deeds would further peace more than would the adoption of another theoretical resolution.

35. As far as principles were concerned, his delegation could not but support any formula that incorporated the five principles of peaceful coexistence, because they were the very foundation of the policy of good will and tolerance pursued by the Royal Government of Laos. The very essence of the Buddhist religion was embodied in the Pancha Shila. The five principles endorsed unanimously by the African and Asian countries were bound together in such a way that no component part could be removed without destroying the balance of the whole. For example, taken in isolation, the principle of non-intervention might lead to a policy of national withdrawal which would be out of harmony with the steady trend towards interpenetration and interdependence in international relations. Similarly, the principle of peaceful coexistence should be taken in conjunction with the other four principles, otherwise it would be meaningless.

36. The Government of Laos enjoyed neighbourly relations with all adjoining countries and ties of friendship with a number of others, regardless of their political system. That did not mean that it did not maintain particularly cordial relations with certain States or that it was ready to dissolve the traditional ties of friendship by which it was bound to the United States, France and India. Nor did it mean that its political system was merely a blend of the various philosophies favoured by neighbouring Governments. Laos was deeply attached to its constitutional monarchy, which it was determined to defend against threats and pressure from any quarter. As far as internal affairs were concerned he said that the government of His Highness Prince Souvanna Phouma had successfully integrated the adherents of Pathet Lao, who supported an ideology different from that to which the majority of Laotians subscribed. But that liberal step did not imply that the Government of Laos was prepared to countenance any attempt at international subversion.

37. The delegation of Laos fully approved of the substance of the Soviet draft resolution (A/3673) which did no more than reiterate the terms of the communiqué issued by the Bandung Conference. Unfor-

tunately, the explanatory memorandum accompanying the Soviet text clearly showed that it constituted a political manoeuvre which Laos did not intend to be associated with. Moreover, the principles of peaceful coexistence were in fact enunciated in the Charter. In the circumstances, the Laotian delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by India, Yugoslavia and Sweden (A/C.1/L.198). It would do so all the more readily since the sponsorship of those three States provided the best guarantee of the integrity, sincerity and validity of the solution which they proposed to the Committee.

38. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia) thought that the concern shown for peaceful coexistence reflected the popular desire to see world peace established on that basis. That was why there were no differences of view on principles: the whole world wanted peace and consequently coexistence. Tensions and fears had made consideration of that agenda item necessary. There was certainly a growing recognition of the urgency and importance of strengthening international peace and of developing peaceful and neighbourly relations among States, irrespective of their divergencies, or the relative stages and nature of their political, economic and social development. An increased interdependence of States had made regional collaboration necessary. Unfortunately, the tensions of international life had created two hostile blocs, which in turn had aggravated those tensions. Seeing their survival in terms of a balance of power only, they had sought to obtain military superiority, a policy resulting in an arms race so costly as to prevent the elimination of that abject poverty in various parts of the world which might itself become a cause of war. Another regrettable consequence of that situation was that States had given up thinking in isolation and were basing their attitude on solidarity with the other members of the bloc, instead of trying to settle all international problems by purely peaceful means, such as negotiation. As a consequence, international peace rested on a balance of power, or, in the last analysis, on fear.

39. The Bandung Conference had shown the way to more fruitful relations between peoples, by emphasizing respect for diversity, the peaceful settlement of disputes through combined efforts and co-operation for the common good. Such co-operation was essential, and it was significant that the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.198) spoke of relations "based on mutual respect and benefit".

40. There were indications of an increasing awareness of the need to replace distrust and fear by confidence and good will. Quite recently, Mr. Lester B. Pearson, the Nobel Peace Prize winner, had called upon the nations of the world to show initiative and imagination, determination and sacrifice in working for peace. It was necessary to act in order to secure peace and deliver the peoples from fear. The United States and the Soviet Union, the two great nuclear Powers, had the main responsibility in that matter.

41. Mr. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, had submitted to the President of the United States certain proposals for improving international relations. It had been announced that the State Department of the United States was giving the most careful study to the proposals. The two parties had recognized the seriousness of the situation and

had shown that they did not dismiss the possibility of contacts or an exchange of ideas which might lead to a solution of the problems plaguing international affairs.

42. He urgently appealed to the two blocs to stop thinking in terms of military strength, to utilize their diverse gifts and resources, to compose their differences in the spirit of the Bandung Conference, and to promote political, economic and cultural co-operation for the benefit of all. If the peoples struggled for peace with the gigantic energy they were using to prepare for war, the rewards of peaceful coexistence in the present troubled world would also be gigantic.

43. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that when, in mid-September 1957, the General Assembly had been seized of the letter from the Chairman of the USSR delegation (A/3673) requesting consideration of the item currently before the Committee, the Salvadorian delegation had interpreted the request as an attempt merely to impress world opinion and to gain sympathies for the Moscow régime by making it appear in the guise of a veritable champion of peace, concerned to have international relations governed by a policy of respect for the equality of States in law, and for their sovereignty and territorial integrity, a policy of non-aggression and non-intervention, in other words of peaceful coexistence in a world of frankness, friendship and fruitful co-operation.

44. His delegation had felt that such presumption ill befitted a régime which, in violation of the principles of international law and morality and of the express provisions of the United Nations Charter, had not only committed flagrant aggression against Hungary, by intervening in the domestic affairs of that country and consequently violating its sovereignty and territorial integrity, but had also consistently refused to heed the repeated appeals launched by the General Assembly in favour of the martyred Hungarian people.

45. Like many others, the Salvadorian delegation had not been able to forget that Communist theoreticians and men of action had constantly proclaimed that the ultimate object was to expand the Communist political and economic system throughout the world, by peaceful means if possible, and by force if necessary. The rulers of Moscow had never concealed their view and their hope that time was working for them.

46. In the circumstances, the Kremlin's advocacy of an international policy of peaceful coexistence could hardly be interpreted as anything other than a cloak for the design of the USSR to gain time in its preparations and manoeuvres for extending ever more widely its sphere of influence by peaceful means in Europe, in the Middle East, in South-East Asia and elsewhere; at the same time, the USSR was perfecting and building up vast arsenals of nuclear weapons for the decisive moment of a new war.

47. Moreover, his delegation had, at first, thought that there was little object in a declaration which would merely reiterate many provisions of the great Charter signed at San Francisco, including Chapter I, which enunciated the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations; similar purposes and principles had in any case governed the relations between the peoples of the American hemisphere long before they had been incorporated in the United Nations Charter or in

the Charter of the Organization of American States or proclaimed at the Bandung Conference.

48. A searching study of the general world situation, however, the tone and trend of many of the statements heard during the current debate and the reasonable and prudent considerations underlying the draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.198) and also its own attachment to the principles enshrined in that draft resolution had led the Salvadorian delegation to think that it might not be superfluous to launch such an appeal, an exhortation to all States, particularly to the countries which had the privilege of being the most powerful in the world, to make every effort to strengthen international peace, to promote relations of friendship and co-operation, to settle their disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the provisions of the Charter and with the draft resolution itself.

49. In the view of his delegation, such an appeal, unanimous if possible, at the end of the twelfth session of the General Assembly would have the special advantage of summarizing in a few words the purpose of all the constructive efforts made during the session to bring about disarmament, the peaceful settlement of the conflicts and disputes existing between certain Member States and friendly co-operation and assistance among all countries.

50. In conclusion, he expressed the earnest hope that there would be some substance to that message of peace, sent to the world a few days before the anniversary of the birth of Christ, and that the message should not be fleeting like the word of men, sicut nubes, quasi navis, velut umbra.

51. Mr. JAWAD (Iraq) said that, before dealing with the item under discussion, he wished to extend to the delegation and people of Iran his delegation's sincere condolences on the occasion of the earthquake which had taken place in Iran.

52. The term "peaceful coexistence" had only recently made its appearance in international law. In the past, historians had merely spoken of peace as distinct from war. It was significant to note that the term had come into current use with the ideological conflict which divided the world, with the expansion of the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of peace and with the great process of national liberation which was manifest everywhere. It seemed to mark a definite phase in the evolution of ideas, reflecting the general desire to live in peace and to settle disputes by means other than war.

53. The significance of the term derived from two historical currents: the growth of science and technology, with all their destructive potentialities, and the widespread movement for the promotion for international conditions and institutions favouring the maintenance of peace. Since the period preceding the First World War, there had been a general evolution, made imperative by events. The two great world conflicts, and particularly the Second World War, had shown the futility of wars and their inherent danger to civilization and humanity, a danger vastly increased by recent scientific discoveries. The nations, acutely conscious of the peril, desired to live in peace and work for their advancement, irrespective of the material and cultural differences between them.

54. Although, internationally, there was a manifest desire to avoid war, certain advanced nations had not hesitated to resort to force. One would be tempted to conclude that the desire to live in peace had not become universal and that nations, including small nations, were less sure of the possibility of living peacefully as good neighbours. Such a conclusion, however, would be erroneous. Even if certain States continued to use force as an instrument of policy, a substantial sector of the public opinion in those States and in the world at large openly condemned such methods.

55. During the past ten years, the propaganda coming from the opposing camps had only strengthened the movement for peace, not only in Europe but in the entire world. That had become an important factor in the life of every nation. War was hated by all States, especially by the small Powers which had always been the victims of the struggle between the advanced countries for sources of raw materials and markets.

56. It was a historical fact that the colonial system was only the consequence of the economic structure which had developed in the industrially advanced countries. Since the end of the eighteenth century, practically all wars had been wars of conquest between European States. Wars waged outside Europe had been either directly or indirectly due to rivalry between European countries. During the nineteenth century, Europe had been the political, financial and cultural centre of the world. It had attempted to establish a world hegemony, based on the capitalist system of production, which had had two results: first, the rise in Europe of political, economic and cultural ideals and their spread to other parts of the world, and secondly, the belief that those fundamental ideas should be of universal application. In other words, Europeans had believed that all mankind should be governed by the same economic, political and philosophical rules. Their economic superiority had engendered a superiority complex in other fields of life.

57. Events had shown that Western culture and organization of society were not the only ones and could not be recognized as universally valid. While the capitalist system of production had given rise to a collective or socialist system, the peoples in the subjugated territories had shaken the hegemony of the West. Western society was now on the defensive. As an American writer had said, there was no longer one world, but several worlds which coexisted and competed with one another. The change, however, had only been brought about after a struggle between Europe and its colonies and between the capitalist and socialist systems. The Second World War had been the last fight carried out within the camp of Western society under the impulse of the old forces emanating from the economic system of the nineteenth century. It had demonstrated the failure of the League of Nations. The forces that had moved the West and Soviet Russia to promote a new machinery for peace had been largely born within the confines of the old system of relationships in the old world. The United Nations had been brought into existence in order to bring into harmony the different worlds then beginning to emerge and to create universal unity. As a result, all those who hoped for peace now had their eyes fixed on the United Nations. That, however, did not prevent certain countries from pursuing a warlike diplomacy, for old practices always died hard.

58. In order to ensure the success of the United Nations, its Members had to realize that the world had changed. Scientific discoveries were a source of grave danger unless utilized for peaceful purposes. Furthermore, the attempt to obstruct national liberation movements might perpetuate the economic and political causes of war. Nobody could deny that the United Nations had succeeded in reconciling some divergent national interests and in averting a world war but there was still some doubt whether the Members of the United Nations had acquired the necessary profound conviction that there was a close relationship between political and economic justice and peace. For example, the present application of the Trusteeship System and of the Principle of the right of peoples to self-determination was still governed by colonial concepts. The colonial system was trying to perpetuate itself, in contradiction with the Charter and the requirements of the modern world.

59. Discussions on those problems had often been of an academic nature. International tension, however, and acts of aggression against small countries were fraught with danger. They could not be rationalized by any moral or political arguments whatsoever. The world situation had constantly been obscured by censorship and tendentious propaganda, but the small Powers and the underdeveloped countries realized the dangers confronting them as a result of the conflict of economic and ideological systems. Their only concern was to live in peace, on an equal footing with the advanced countries. That was the basis of the charter of coexistence proclaimed at Bandung by the African and Asian countries. In the minds of their peoples coexistence had no ideological connotation. It meant simply a peaceful life without any foreign intervention. Those countries were waging both internal and external struggles in order to build up a modern economic and social structure and to free themselves from the shackles of the past. When they spoke of peaceful coexistence, they were thinking in dynamic terms. In fact, the very notion of coexistence was dynamic, as it tacitly called for the utilization and development of the human and material potential of the entire world.

60. In conclusion, he said that the supreme question at the current time was how to adapt economic and social systems to the requirements of the modern world and thus to avert a war of destruction. The present world was no longer the nineteenth century world. As Mr. Walter Lippmann had said, a hundred years ago the world capital had been London; after the First World War, the world capitals had been London and Washington; after the second, they had been Washington, Moscow and London; now the world capitals were Washington, Moscow, London, Peking, New Delhi; and, perhaps, eventually, Cairo will also be included.

61. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) said that the proposals before the Committee called upon Member States to reaffirm their faith in the fundamental principles of the Charter.

62. The opinions, criticisms and appraisals heard during the debate could be divided into two categories. Some believed that the principles of the draft resolutions were already defined in the Charter and that there was no need to reaffirm, in a General Assembly resolution, the determination of the United Nations to abide by them. Others believed that the primary duty

of Member States at the current time was not to restate principles with which everyone agreed, but to act in conformity with those principles and to show by deeds and actions a determination to remain faithful to them.

63. In the Ethiopian delegation's view, both those criticisms were constructive but not compelling enough to induce Member States not to support the draft resolutions. A reaffirmation of belief in the principles stated in those texts could not be considered unnecessary, as it would certainly do no harm to anyone and might well be beneficial to all Member States. The constructive feature of the second criticism was the implied admission that, in view of the great difficulties of the current time, all Member States could profitably reiterate in a formal and solemn document the undertaking they had assumed in the Charter. Apart from those considerations, the principles stated in the draft resolutions had been adopted, and consequently also reaffirmed, by the Bandung Conference in 1955.

64. Consequently, the circumstances seemed appropriate for the great regions of the world represented in the General Assembly to voice once again their unanimous desire for universal harmony and thus to confirm that they were united in their resolve.

65. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) wished, like the representative of Iraq, to express his sincere sympathy with the Chairman on the earthquake Iran had just suffered. Mexicans were particularly close to the Iranian people in its grief as they themselves were familiar with such calamities.

66. The item under discussion was so closely linked with that of disarmament, on which his delegation had expressed its views in great detail, that he need not do more than recall some of the essential points made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico during the general debate at the twelfth session of the General Assembly (699th plenary meeting).

67. Although the title of the item mentioned the peaceful coexistence of States, everyone knew that it meant principally the peaceful coexistence of the great Powers and in particular those which had a monopoly of nuclear weapons. The reasons for the world-wide anxiety were obvious. All peoples and Governments the world over realized that the old notion of victor and vanquished was now a thing of the past, that a general conflagration in which such weapons were used would cause a hecatomb unprecedented in the history of the world, and that its fearful consequences would affect all humanity. In other words, there was no escape from the alternative of living together or dying together.

68. Thus, if only in the purely selfish interest of their own survival, the so-called great Powers should constantly endeavour to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, in accordance with the Preamble to the United Nations Charter. It would be enough, to achieve that end, if they adjusted their conduct to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter itself and fulfilled, in good faith, the obligations they had assumed under it.

69. The wisdom and effectiveness of the precepts set forth in the Charter for maintaining and consolidating international peace and security and promoting friendly

co-operation between States, had been demonstrated not only during the twelve years' fruitful existence of the United Nations but also in the fruitful and still longer experience of regional organizations such as the Organization of American States, the purposes and principles of which coincided in their essentials with those of the United Nations and even, in certain respects, went further than the Charter in the categorical formulation of its precepts, as, for example, in the case of the principle of non-intervention.

70. It could perhaps be said that the Charter was complete as regarded the fundamental rules which should govern the relations between States in order to ensure peaceful coexistence, but it would nevertheless be appropriate and useful for the General Assembly to reaffirm from time to time those of the Organization's purposes and principles whose fulfilment seemed particularly necessary in the circumstances of the moment.

71. In order for such reaffirmation to be constructive, it should be unanimous, if possible, and to achieve such unanimity it was essential to avoid presenting principles in a context which certain Member States could criticize. The best procedure, therefore, was to entrust to the small and medium Powers the task of exercising their moderating and conciliating influence once again and of preparing the relevant draft resolutions.

72. That was why his delegation warmly welcomed the draft resolution submitted by India, Sweden and Yugoslavia (A/C.1/L.198): it embodied all the main ideas in the USSR draft resolution but added to them certain plainly important concepts, such as the need to attain the purposes and apply the principles set forth in the Charter, incorporating the whole in a text which both in spirit and in letter seemed unexceptionable and worthy of praise. The Mexican delegation would very gladly vote for the three-Power draft resolution and firmly hoped that both the First Committee and the General Assembly would adopt it unanimously.

73. Mr. KITAHARA (Japan) observed that it was not the first time that an attempt was being made to adopt a resolution of a general character reaffirming the principles of the Charter with a view to reducing international tension and strengthening peace. He mentioned, in that connexion, General Assembly resolutions 110 (II), 190 (III) and 290 (IV). Quoting the main paragraphs of resolution 290 (IV), entitled "Essentials of peace", he said that his delegation entirely subscribed to the principles laid down in the resolution and that Japan would not have hesitated to support that text had it been a Member of the United Nations at that time.

74. Nevertheless, he noted with regret, from reading the record of the debate which had preceded the adoption of resolution 290 (IV), that it had been characterized by mutual recriminations. That might have been due to the fact that one of the great Powers which had requested the inclusion in the agenda of an item calling for the condemnation of the preparations for a new war and the conclusion of a five-Power pact for the strengthening of peace had tried simply to secure the condemnation of the other two great Powers. That debate, far from reducing international tension, had merely accentuated the differences between East and West. It was very significant, moreover, that very shortly after the adoption of that resolution and

before the fifth session of the General Assembly, the Korean War had broken out. That showed to what extent a debate on a general resolution could be used for propaganda purposes and how small a contribution it could make to the maintenance of peace.

75. He recalled that at the fifth session of the General Assembly the Soviet Union had requested the inclusion in the agenda of another item concerning a declaration on the removal of the threat of a new war and the strengthening of peace and security among the nations. But the General Assembly, remembering the Korean War, had seen fit to adopt resolution 380 (V), entitled "Peace through deeds", because it had felt that a simple declaration of principles was pointless. In fact, after the outbreak of the Korean War, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 377 (V) setting up a Collective Measures Committee, thus indicating its sincere desire to adopt a policy of suppressing aggression through the united strength of the Member States. At the same time, the General Assembly had refused to act on such proposals as that relating to a "Declaration on the removal of the threat of a new war and the strengthening of peace and security among the nations". Once again the General Assembly had shown that mere declarations had no practical value, and that a demonstration by deeds was essential for the maintenance of peace.

76. After the conclusion of the Korean Armistice in 1953, the Geneva Conference in 1954 had given reason to hope that international tension had to some extent been relieved. The United Nations, with a new earnestness, had directed its efforts to finding a practical solution of a concrete problem—the disarmament problem—as an effective means of reducing international tension. Unfortunately, the disarmament negotiations had resulted in deadlock, since the Soviet Union had at the current session indicated its intention not to participate in the work of the Disarmament Commission as it was currently composed.

77. The examples he had cited would indicate what could be the value of declarations of a general nature. Quoting a passage from Article 11 of the Charter, he said that his delegation believed that if the Assembly wished to take constructive action there was one concrete and specific objective for it, namely, disarmament. If a political declaration was not followed by some progress in such a major sphere as disarmament, it would remain a dead letter. The Japanese delegation considered that a political declaration such as the one before the Committee and a concrete disarmament programme were the two parts of a single whole and were both indispensable for the maintenance of international peace and security. It was the earnest hope of the Japanese delegation that a political declaration endorsed by all Member States would contribute to a relaxation of tension and would make it possible for progress to be made in the negotiations on disarmament. The major Powers, motivated by a genuine desire to contribute to peace, had an opportunity to prove by their deeds their intention to put into practice the principles embodied in the draft resolution. Until tension was reduced, the conclusion of a non-aggression treaty or an agreement for friendly co-operation as suggested by the USSR would be merely an empty gesture.

78. In conclusion, he reaffirmed that the settlement of the disarmament problem under the auspices of the

United Nations offered a sure means of maintaining peace. The General Assembly must not be content with merely adopting theoretical resolutions. Any resolution must carry with it the will and intention to follow it up with concrete measures. The Japanese delegation hoped that the Committee would be guided by that spirit in acting upon the item now before it.

on his own behalf and on behalf of his delegation, to the representatives of Iraq and Mexico and to all who had offered words of sympathy with regard to the earthquakes in Iran. He would not fail to transmit them to his Government and he was sure that both the Government and the people of Iran would greatly appreciate that mark of sympathy, which was the best proof of international brotherhood.

79. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) expressed deep gratitude,

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.