

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWELFTH SESSION

Official Records



Thursday, 12 December 1957,  
at 8.30 p. m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 66:	
Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States. . . . .	399

**Chairman: Mr. Djalal ABDOH (Iran).**

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. de Barros (Brazil), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

### AGENDA ITEM 66

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

1. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Government had submitted the draft resolution entitled "Declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States" (A/3673) to the General Assembly because it was firmly convinced that the existing international situation was fraught with danger to world peace. Peoples and Governments should make unceasing efforts to improve relations between States and to avert the threat of another war, for the fate of mankind was at stake. The question was whether the world was to go on living in fear or enjoy the fruits of its labours in peace.

2. The international situation was characterized by the existence of antagonistic military groupings. The military preparations of one group inevitably produced counter-measures by the other, so that relations between many countries, with populations numbering hundreds of millions, tended increasingly to be based on distrust and hostility. The fact that certain States were applying "cold war" criteria to all relations between peoples, even trade and cultural exchanges, was not the least important reason for that situation. What rendered the danger even more acute was the fact that the race to produce weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, was assuming unprecedented proportions and was absorbing most of the creative efforts of the industrial Powers. The world was like a huge stockpile of fissionable material which a single criminal or even careless act could detonate.

3. Confronted by that situation, the peoples of the world were stating quite unequivocally what they wanted; they wanted peace, not war, and they were more and more insistent in their demand that States should end the armaments race and embark upon a policy of peaceful co-operation based on respect for their rights and mutual interests. No nobler task could be undertaken by the United Nations, whose Members, in the words of the Charter, should unite their strength to maintain international peace and security. The paramount need at the current time, therefore, was to know how international relations would develop.

In that connexion, it should be noted that never before had there existed in the world such a deep yearning for peace, for the liberation of colonial peoples and the easing of international tension. Statesmen could not help but recognize that side by side with the capitalist system there now existed a socialist system, which, from the Elbe to the Yellow Sea, grouped together one-third of the world's population in a peaceful community. In a very short time the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had made great economic, scientific and technical progress; the launching of artificial satellites using intercontinental ballistic rockets would enable the entire world to wrest new secrets from nature and use them to its advantage. In international relations, the socialist system had ushered in a policy based on principles of respect for the sovereignty of States, mutual advantage and peaceful co-operation. The desire for peace and progress was inherent in the very nature of the socialist countries, where no one sought to seize foreign territories, sources of raw materials or markets.

4. Immediately after its establishment, the Soviet State had proposed to all the belligerents in the First World War that they should conclude an armistice on all fronts and sign a democratic peace treaty. Lenin, its founder, had stated that he wanted peace with all countries without exception. Since that time the Soviet Union had been consistent in its efforts to ensure the application of the principle of the peaceful coexistence of all States, advocating the settlement of disputes through negotiation and emphasizing the need to replace the armaments race by economic and cultural competition which could not but benefit mankind. The Soviet Union wanted the establishment of peaceful relations and constructive co-operation with all States regardless of their political and social systems. That could be proved by a number of examples: on 6 November 1957 the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, interpreting the wishes of the entire Soviet people, had urged the peoples, parliaments and Governments of all countries to make efforts to establish peaceful coexistence between States with different systems, to reduce armaments and armed forces, to prohibit nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, to put an end to tests of those weapons, to establish a system of collective security in Europe and Asia, to develop economic and cultural relations, and to strengthen confidence between peoples. On 22 November Mr. Khrushchev had stated that the Soviet Union was in favour of peace and peaceful coexistence and would never embark upon a war against anyone unless attacked. On 10 December, Mr. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, in a message addressed to the President of the United States of America and to the Heads of the United Kingdom and French Governments, made important proposals concerning ways of easing international tension and ending the armaments race.

5. The cause of peace had been strengthened now that the Soviet Union had been joined by many socialist countries of Europe and Asia, including the People's Republic of China. Moreover, a number of States recently liberated from colonialism and exerting a steadily increasing influence in international relations were also in favour of peaceful coexistence. Thus there had been created a "peace zone" consisting of socialist States and many countries which followed an independent policy and did not belong to any military bloc. Furthermore, large segments of the population in every country of Europe and America also desired peace and security, realizing that the armaments race increased the danger of a world war.

6. The more far-sighted representatives of the Western Powers, once they had assessed the situation objectively, were asking that the foreign policy of their respective countries should not run counter to current trends and should be based on the inescapable need of the two existing systems for peaceful coexistence. The success of the coalition against Hitler, consisting of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and other States, had shown that socialist and capitalist countries could co-operate perfectly well. What had been possible in war could and should still be possible in peace.

7. Unfortunately, the Western Powers had adopted a completely different policy; instead of trying to settle their disputes with other countries by negotiations, they used force or threats of force to impose their will. To justify themselves, they tried to make the people of the Western countries believe that military preparations were necessary to meet an alleged threat from the Soviet Union. They even used the scientific and technical progress of the USSR as a pretext to intensify military preparations and to undermine international confidence. Yet the entire history of international relations since the Second World War showed that the policy of "negotiation from a position of strength", far from ensuring international security, could not even ensure the security of any one country. The advocates of that policy had no guarantee of winning the armaments race, and it was common knowledge that at the current stage of scientific and technical development no great Power could remain outside the theatre of military operations even at the outbreak of a conflict.

8. The Soviet delegation had no intention of accusing those who had brought co-operation between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers to an end; it was concerned with the future. Joint efforts must be made to avert another war, the consequences of which were beyond the imagination of man. Common sense and the vital interests of all peoples made it imperative to end the armaments race and war propaganda and to find means of achieving peaceful and fruitful co-operation. In the existing circumstances, that would be nothing more than an act of self-preservation. The first steps in the direction of peace could be taken through concerted measures to implement the principles of peaceful coexistence of all States without exception. That was not a utopian ideal; it was a real and urgent need. A number of States, guided by the United Nations Charter, had elaborated concrete principles for such coexistence. In that connexion mention could be made of the principles drawn up in 1954 by

the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India, namely, mutual respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage. Equally noteworthy were the decisions of the Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung in 1955; that conference had called upon States to base their relations on the principle of peaceful coexistence. The Soviet Union regarded that principle as the soundest basis for normal international relations. A large number of European, Asian and African countries had based their foreign policy on that principle and were reaping the benefit. Moreover, as was shown by the events of recent years, States with policies based on the principle of peaceful coexistence had thwarted the attempts of those who had wished to settle certain international problems by armed force. Nowadays no State could aspire to the hegemony of the world or follow a unilateral policy with respect to other States. Only joint efforts could ensure a lasting peace. The peoples of the world wanted all States to undertake to renounce force as a method of settling disputes. Respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States and the renunciation of force were the bases of international co-operation.

9. The existing international tension was due to the fact that some Western Powers interfered in the domestic affairs of other States, particularly the underdeveloped countries recently liberated from the colonialist yoke, and exerted political, economic and financial pressure on them. They linked economic aid to various political and military conditions incompatible with those countries' interests. A number of small countries had been induced to join military blocs whose purpose was anything but the maintenance of peace. Doctrines were being proclaimed the real design of which was the restoration of the colonial system. There was discrimination against States whose institutions were disapproved of. Clearly such a policy, far from reducing tension, was increasing the threat to world peace. Accordingly, it was absolutely essential that international relations should be founded on the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States.

10. The Soviet Union was aware that the adoption of that principle would not remove all the causes of conflict between States and all ideological differences. But everyone must be allowed the right to live as he wished, and the ideological struggle should be fought by means of an exchange of ideas, not with bombs. The USSR would never use armed force to impose communism on any country, and as Mr. Khrushchev had recently pointed out, it was for each nation to determine the road along which it was to develop. The Soviet people were fully aware of the advantages of their own system and their concern was that no one should prevent them from going their way. Economic emulation would show which was the better of the two systems.

11. The removal of the artificial barriers against economic and cultural contacts set up by the Western Powers would substantially improve relations between States. It was high time to renounce the idea of using economic ties as means of political pressure and to regard those ties as a link between the various countries. It was not an act of political wisdom to blockade a group of States representing a third of the world

population, and the Western Powers were the first to suffer from that policy, because they were thus depriving themselves of vast potential markets. Western business groups viewed the problem of international trade very differently from the strategists of the "cold war". Owing to the rapid development of their economy, the socialist countries were in a position to expand their trade year by year. They advocated the establishment of economic and cultural relations on the basis of mutual advantage with all countries sharing that desire. In that matter, the Soviet Union sought no privileges and laid down no political or military conditions. It regarded trade and cultural agreements as a means of ensuring economic co-operation and strengthening the national economy of signatory countries. The volume of its trade had increased fivefold, compared with the pre-war period. It had particularly close commercial relations with the socialist States, and also with a fairly large number of the Asian countries. The volume of its trade with South East Asia and the Near and Middle East had increased fourfold during the last few years. In Europe, it was trading chiefly with Finland, Sweden and Austria. Unfortunately, its economic ties with the United States and the Western European countries had not been developed to the fullest possible extent owing to the policy of discrimination practiced by those countries. The Soviet Union was prepared to enter into closer trade relations with the United Kingdom, France, the United States, Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany, a development which would be gratifying to many business firms and companies in those countries. Trade with under-developed countries should be scrupulously based on equality and mutual advantage.

12. The development of scientific and technical relations would also do much to ensure peaceful co-existence, particularly in the atomic age. In that respect, even the industrialized countries could learn from the under-developed countries. By pooling their experience, the specialists of all countries could accelerate the rate of progress for the benefit of all mankind. The Soviet Union was actively promoting scientific and cultural exchanges with other countries. During the past few years, many foreign scientists had visited the USSR to study the work of Soviet scientists. Soviet specialists, in their turn, had gone to other countries to find out what progress had been achieved there. Such exchanges were helpful to the development of science and technology and, in addition, promoted friendly co-operation between peoples. In that sphere, the United Nations offered great possibilities which had not by any means been exhausted; and if fully utilized, they would serve the cause of peace and progress.

13. According as States, and first and foremost the great Powers, observed or disregarded the above-mentioned principles, the international situation would develop in the direction of peace or of war. Unfortunately, not all the great Powers had accepted those principles. The Soviet Union was aware of the importance for peace of relations between the USSR and the United States and was therefore seeking to reverse the current trend and improve those relations. As Mr. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, had pointed out in his message to President Eisenhower on 10 December 1957, the current relations between the two countries could not be justified politically, economically or morally. It was therefore particularly

important that the United States and the Soviet Union should take the initiative to end the "cold war". Experience had shown the advantages of mutual co-operation. Before the Second World War, the volume of trade between the two countries had been much larger than it was currently, and the established order in either country had in no way been affected. There was no reason why relations between the Soviet Union and the United States should not be based on the principle of peaceful co-operation; the two countries and the entire world stood only to gain thereby. In the view of the Soviet Union, the following measures were required to achieve that end: the conclusion of an agreement between the USSR and the United States, in which the two countries would proclaim their firm intention of establishing relations of friendship and peaceful co-operation; cessation of the current propaganda, which created suspicion and distrust; the restoration of the conditions necessary for the development of normal trade relations between the two countries and intensification of their scientific and cultural relations. Those who opposed any improvement in relations between the USSR and the United States alleged that the Soviet Union aimed at dividing the world into two spheres of influence. There were no grounds whatever for that affirmation, since, by the very nature of the Soviet State, any idea of domination was repugnant to it. The establishment of friendly relations between the two great Powers would not prevent either of them from keeping its friends. Far from harming the interests of third parties, it would be interpreted by the whole world as an easing of international tension.

14. Similarly, the Soviet Union was prepared to improve its relations with the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries on the basis of mutual respect and equality, with due regard for the interests of the parties concerned. In its concern for the maintenance of peace, it was prepared to apply the principle of peaceful co-existence as the only basis for relations between States. Certain immediate measures would make it possible to achieve that result. Thus, the conclusion of a disarmament agreement would do much to remove the threat of a new war. The Soviet Union was prepared to consider such an agreement, and, to restore the necessary confidence, it felt that the following measures were essential: the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom should undertake provisionally not to use nuclear weapons and should announce that all tests of such weapons would cease as of 1 January 1958, even if only for two or three years in the first instance; the three Powers should agree not to station any nuclear weapons in the territory of West or East Germany. If the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic agreed in addition that no nuclear weapons would be manufactured or stationed in their respective territories, the Polish and Czechoslovak Governments would take similar action, as they had already intimated. Thus a large area would be created in the heart of Europe, inhabited by 100 million people, where the risk of atomic war would be reduced to a minimum.

15. A joint proposal should be drafted for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the signatories of the Warsaw Treaty. At the same time, any action must be avoided which might impair the independence of the Near and Middle Eastern

countries, and care should be taken not to use force in the settlement of the questions arising in that area.

16. Personal contacts between the political leaders of the various countries would encourage States to concert their efforts for the consolidation of peace. The Soviet Government was therefore prepared to consider a meeting at which the Heads of States would discuss all the problems they saw fit to raise.

17. Those measures would make for the security of all States; they would create a healthier international atmosphere and increase confidence. More radical disarmament measures could then be adopted, such as a major reduction of armed forces and armaments, the prohibition of nuclear weapons, cessation of the manufacture of such weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles, and the withdrawal of troops stationed on foreign territory. Military groupings would give way to a system of collective security.

18. At the current juncture, it was the duty of everyone to defend the noble principles of peaceful co-existence, which would make it possible to guide international relations towards peace. The United Nations could and should play an important part in the maintenance of universal security. That was why the Soviet delegation was proposing that the General Assembly should call upon all countries to observe the principles of peaceful coexistence in their relations one with another. On the instructions of the Soviet Government, it had submitted to the Committee a draft resolution (A/3673), which he proceeded to read out. The adoption of that text would meet the interests and wishes of all peoples and make the Charter of the United Nations an effective instrument for the settlement of political problems.

19. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland) said that if coexistence was interpreted as meaning the establishment of friendly relations between sovereign States having different political, economic and social systems, the relations established between Finland and the Soviet Union could be mentioned in that connexion. Finland had not, for its part, endeavoured to fit its relations with the Soviet Union into any established pattern. It had had to take into account its own particular problems and consider the need to safeguard its national interests. Finland therefore found it difficult to advise other countries regarding the best method of solving the problems involved in peaceful coexistence. It was very close to the other Scandinavian countries. They all had similar political, economic and social structures and equal respect for the dignity of man, the rights of the individual, fundamental freedoms, international law and the love of peace. The Committee needed no reminder of the price that Finland had had to pay for its freedom: 2 per cent of its population had been killed in combat and more than one-tenth of its territory lost. Finland had also had to absorb 450,000 refugees and reconstruct the north of the country, which had been almost entirely destroyed by the German Army.

20. At the end of the Second World War, political life in Finland had been dominated by the need to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union. In 1948, Finland had concluded with the Soviet Union an Agreement of Friendship which had subsequently been extended, in 1955, for a further twenty years; at the same time, the Soviet Union had given up its lease of

Porkkala, which it had been using as a military base. The parties to the 1948 Agreement pledged themselves to conclude no alliance and to join no coalition directed against the other party and to participate in all measures aimed at the maintenance of world peace and security in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. In addition, the Agreement laid down that Finland should be neutral and stressed the principles of mutual respect for national sovereignty, of territorial integrity and of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States; lastly, Finland agreed to use its armed forces only within its own frontiers and in defence of its own territory. The agreement also provided for co-operation in the development and consolidation of economic and cultural relations between the two countries. Such co-operation had greatly facilitated the development of trade between Finland and the Soviet Union in recent years; that trade was currently second only to Finnish trade with the United Kingdom.

21. The foreign policy of Finland was based on a few simple principles. Finland belonged to no group. Finland wished to live in peace with all countries and to maintain relations based on mutual consideration and co-operation. With that aim in view, Finland had made a point of furthering conciliation whenever necessary and had practised tolerance and consideration in its foreign relations.

22. It had been said that good relations with Finland were useful to the Soviet Union and that, by maintaining them, Finland was serving Soviet interests. The Soviet Union undoubtedly regarded its friendly relations with Finland as useful, but the attitude of Finland towards the Soviet Union had been dictated solely by its own national interest and had been developed without prejudicing the interests of any other nation.

23. U THANT (Burma) said that the declaration concerning the peaceful coexistence of States was as significant as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which the General Assembly had prepared ten years earlier. While the Burmese delegation was in full agreement with the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/3673), it felt bound to note that the explanatory memorandum preceding the draft resolution had "cold war" undercurrents; recriminations could hardly ease discussion of the question. The modern world was unfortunately divided into two camps and the yawning gulf between them was a constant threat to international peace. The immediate task was to ensure that the gulf should not widen. Such action was, however, inadequate and the threat would remain until the gulf between the two rival blocs had been effectively bridged. The United Nations could play a very important part in that task, and special efforts should be made by Member States which had not taken sides and could consequently take a more objective view of the situation.

24. The era of the atomic and hydrogen bombs had left the human race no alternative but to seek peaceful coexistence. Men now knew that they could not survive atomic war and must consequently devote every effort to maintaining peace. Regardless of his beliefs, traditions and economic, social or political systems, man must learn to live in peace with his neighbours. For the achievement of that aim, a new outlook was needed. More than before, man needed to exer-

cise courage, patience, tolerance and imagination. The fears and suspicions which had for so long characterized international relations must now be dispelled. International relations should be founded on new principles: mutual respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States; non-aggression; non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States, regardless of economic, political or ideological factors; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence. The historic Bandung Conference of twenty-nine Asian and African nations had already stated those principles in its final communiqué. However, their application required an atmosphere of confidence and mutual respect which had so far been lacking. Failure to recognize those principles had led many countries to make colossal increases in their military budgets to the detriment of many worthwhile social and economic measures for their peoples. It was that failure which had brought about the division of the world into two hostile camps and had given rise to a tense international atmosphere which bore the seeds of a new world war. If the principle of peaceful coexistence was accepted by all States, existing tensions would be eased and the armaments race would be halted; steps could then be taken towards an effective system of disarmament, and cultural and economic exchanges between States would be increased. States with different social, economic and political systems should be encouraged to compete in an atmosphere of peace and security, as that alone could meet the challenge of modern times.

25. He made a brief reference, by way of illustration, to the nature of the peaceful coexistence between Burma and China. Relations had first been established with the Kuomintang Government, then in control of China, and later with the Government of the People's Republic of China, which Burma had recognized at the end of 1949. Since that time, relations between the two countries had been guided by the five principles under consideration and had developed satisfactorily. Burma was firmly and irretrievably committed to a system of parliamentary democracy. It believed in democratic ideals and the dignity of man, and was thoroughly adverse to the idea of dictatorship in any shape or form. The Burmese people were determined never to change their way of life for another. However, those convictions did not prevent the Burmese from viewing the world in proper perspective. Burma understood why certain countries had chosen systems of government very different from its own and believed it had no right to pass judgement on those systems. That attitude enabled Burma to subscribe to the principles of peaceful coexistence and to maintain friendly relations with the People's Republic of China. The Burmese delegation was firmly convinced that if other States could adopt a similar attitude the world would be a better place. It was encouraging to note that the United States of America was gradually realizing the need to improve relations with the Soviet Union. A recent survey made by the American Institute of Public Opinion had revealed that the American people were prepared to accept the following four principles with a view to a greater exchange of ideas and information with the Soviet people: first, possibilities for Soviet and American leaders to speak directly and without censorship to the people of the other country; secondly, a wider exchange of Soviet and American students; thirdly, facilities for Soviet

and United States tourists to travel freely in each other's countries; and fourthly, arrangements to increase trade between them. If the results of the survey were reliable, they were a sure indication of the growing realization in the United States of the need for peaceful coexistence between the two countries. The Burmese delegation expressed the hope that the discussions in the Committee would reflect that attitude. He would support any resolution which helped to create the necessary atmosphere for the establishment of lasting peace in the world.

26. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) said that the discussions on disarmament had ended in complete failure. Some delegations had hoped that the twelfth session of the General Assembly would be the "disarmament session", but it had not even been possible to take the initial steps for a temporary suspension of nuclear weapons tests. An analysis of the resolutions that had been adopted showed that very little progress had been made with regard to the items on the agenda. The failure of the disarmament discussions had prevented the General Assembly from reaching constructive solutions in other fields. There were different reasons in every case, but all the problems had something in common: some States sought to settle controversial issues by resorting to expedients, mainly of a military character, which were seemingly directed towards strengthening the security of certain groups of nations but in fact increased the current tension and hampered the solution of international problems. The antagonism of powerful groups of States with different economic and political systems endangered world peace and created a risk of a universal conflagration which could be set off by the slightest spark. That was the context in which the Soviet proposal should be viewed if it was to be fully understood, for its importance derived from the situation as a whole.

27. The Polish delegation was convinced that if the principles enumerated in the Soviet draft resolution were rigorously applied every time a dispute arose, it would in many cases be possible to avoid conflicts and surmount obstacles. That rule was particularly true in relations between States with different political and social systems, the simultaneous existence of which was one of the main characteristics of the present international situation. The appearance of a large group of socialist States was an irrevocable historical phenomenon. Furthermore, a number of States had emerged from colonial status as independent entities and also demanded respect for their rights. Those two groups of States did not threaten others, even though the differences which existed in social systems, history and levels of economic development could give rise to problems which were difficult to solve. In the view of the Polish delegation, all those problems could be settled by negotiation provided that the principles of peaceful coexistence were respected.

28. It was clear that the adoption of the declaration concerning peaceful coexistence would not by itself settle international disputes, but it could provide the basis for a solution.

29. All attempts to reverse the historical process had proved futile. After the Second World War, certain States had tried to pursue the "position of strength" policy but had failed to obtain any positive results. All the issues which had been settled during the past

ten years—such as the peace treaties of 1947, the State Treaty with Austria of 1955, the Geneva agreements of 1954 concerning Indo-China and the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency—had been settled by negotiation and not by force or the unilateral imposition of will by one of the parties.

30. During recent years, the world had repeatedly been on the brink of an armed conflict, for the armaments race, the setting up of antagonistic military blocs and the establishment of foreign bases and rocket-launching sites increased the danger of a war the results of which would be incalculable for the whole of humanity. That was why it was essential to base mutual relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence. Those principles had long been part of international law and were being explicitly restated in an ever-increasing number of treaties. For example, respect for territorial integrity had been stipulated in Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and aggression had long been expressly outlawed. Since all of those principles were also embodied in the United Nations Charter, none of the delegations present could have any reservations of substance with regard to the Soviet draft declaration.

31. Those principles had not always been fully respected during the past twelve years. It was not by accident that they had been reaffirmed in 1954, when peoples had become aware of the nonsense and dangers of the "cold war" policy and had realized the possibility of relieving international tension.

32. The purpose of the proclamation of the principles of peaceful coexistence was neither to repeat the provisions of the Charter nor to replace them. It was rather to restore to the Charter its full meaning. Those principles were an expression of the will to establish normal peaceful relations between States. That desire was ever more widely shared and had been affirmed at the Bandung Conference, at which twenty-nine States, the majority of them United Nations Members, had adopted a declaration fully coinciding with the five principles of peaceful coexistence. Some of the States of Asia and Europe had adopted those principles to the letter in several bilateral and unilateral declarations. Among the States that had adopted those principles, irrespective of their political systems, there was no threat of war, because they had recognized the necessity of observing the rules in practice.

33. If those five principles were adopted by all States, the existing situation, which was more like "co-residence" than "coexistence", could improve. The point of departure for multilateral co-operation, which could only develop in an atmosphere of security and confidence, was the removal of the threat of war.

34. The first two principles contained in the USSR draft resolution concerned respect for one another's territorial integrity and sovereignty and the renunciation of aggression as an instrument of policy. If they were applied, the disarmament negotiations could undoubtedly take a more favourable course than at present, because there would no longer be any reason to fear that one side wanted to obtain superiority in order to destroy the other. The Western Powers seemed to believe that the only remedy for the existing situation was ever bigger armaments, but experience showed that the armaments race could only lead to catastrophe. Lack of confidence served as a pretext

for an increase in military power, which in itself caused even greater distrust. The vicious circle had to be broken. Mr. George Kennan had already raised that point in a series of lectures given in London.

35. The third principle stated in the draft resolution was that of non-intervention in one another's domestic affairs on any economic, political or ideological grounds whatsoever; its observance would strengthen good neighbourly relations between States of different political and social systems. It was indeed obvious that no ideological differences could justify unfriendly acts or intervention in the internal affairs of other States.

36. The fourth principle, that of equality and mutual benefit, had until recently been barely applied at all, even in theory. It was only since the strengthening of socialist States and the awakening of colonial and dependent peoples that an ever greater number of States insisted on being treated on the basis of legal and political equality and on being permitted to benefit from exchanges in the economic and cultural fields. By solemnly confirming their fundamental right to advance that claim, the United Nations would pave the way towards the universal application of a principle which was at present a kind of privilege granted to some nations and denied to others, depending on their political trend.

37. The fifth principle, that of peaceful coexistence, was a logical consequence of the preceding ones. Its application required the co-operation of all States in the economic and cultural fields, because there was a close interdependence between economics and politics.

38. During the "cold war" period, the trade turnover and economic co-operation among countries of different political and social systems had declined to insignificant proportions. Many economic organizations had been established within opposing military blocs and that had intensified the existing division.

39. Modern warfare was conducted not only at the military level but also at the economic level. The world's efforts should be devoted, however, to preparations not for war but for peaceful co-operation, and the solution of the major economic problems of the current time might be facilitated by the establishment of joint staffs for economic co-operation. Such staffs might include the regional economic commissions of the United Nations and the Economic and Social Council, but it would be necessary to exclude economic co-operation organizations which were appendages of military blocs and tended to destroy the economic unity of specific regions, such as the "Common Market", which embraced only a small part of Europe. The disparity in the rate of development between the industrialized countries and other countries was also a source of danger; that disparity was another product of past disregard for the principle of reciprocity in economic relations.

40. Cultural, scientific and artistic exchanges also played an important part in peaceful coexistence, and it was essential to promote contacts among scientists, students and writers.

41. Poland fervently desired the application of the guiding rules of coexistence. The Polish Government had made those principles the basis of its foreign

policy and was convinced that that was the only way to establish normal relations among States, irrespective of their social structure. With that factor in mind, Poland had proposed the creation in Central Europe of an area where no atomic weapons would be produced or stockpiled.

42. Poland regretted the division of Europe into antagonistic military groupings. The armaments race favoured militarist and "revanchist" tendencies in Western Germany. Poland also viewed with concern the coming meeting of the NATO Powers and the plans for a further development of West German armaments, which could only perpetuate the division of Europe.

43. He firmly believed that immediate negotiations

and the acceptance of the principles of peaceful co-existence were necessary in order to relax international tension and strengthen confidence among nations. The interests of all nations and of each nation separately could be safeguarded only by mutual agreements, particularly among the big Powers, which had a special responsibility imposed upon them. At a time when great technological progress was being made, international life was conceivable only with peaceful co-existence and co-operation. The application of the principles of peaceful co-existence would improve relations among nations and facilitate the solution of controversial questions.

The meeting rose at 11.5 p.m.