

Before calling upon him, I would like to announce to the Plenary Session the decision taken unanimously by the Steering Committee this morning that at the opening of our next session, that is tomorrow afternoon, the first speaker should be one who is esteemed in his knowledge, wisdom, and experience, Field Marshal Smuts of the Union of South Africa.

I now call on the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Delegation of Ecuador, whose speech will be translated later into English by Ambassador Ballen.

MR. PONCE ENRIQUEZ (in Spanish):

MR. DURAN BALLEÑ (in English): Mr. Chairman, and Fellow Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

To occupy this history-making rostrum to express with loyalty and precision the concepts which inspire the Ecuadorian attitude at this United Nations Conference on International Organization is indeed an honor and a privilege.

We, the representatives of 46 nations, have not come to San Francisco to lay down a set of conditions leading to another war but to build the foundation for an enduring peace. And so it is that our responsibility emerges, as creators of an international structure equipped with essential elements of preservation and defense, without recurring in the original mistakes which so mortally affected the old League of Nations, whose brief experience demonstrated to the world, in a pathetic way, that the spirit of peace which it sheltered lacked the positive means to live and to survive in a universe charged with unrestrained appetites and pitfalls.

To win the peace is a more complex task than to win the war because whereas victories are inspired by the firm will of those who achieve them, aided by all sorts of destructive techniques, to win the peace moral disarmament is necessary, that is to say, the instinct of violence of which men and states are possessed must be uprooted.

The findings of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference merely suggested the path along which the San Francisco Conference was to travel in order to achieve its transcendental task.

There were gathered in its text, by way of experiment, the elements of a system of world organization, fortified

to be sure, by the high prestige of the powers who attended that memorable meeting.

Yet, inseparably allied with its text, the Atlantic Charter had already stated the moral substance of certain guiding principles of international good neighborliness, which the San Francisco Conference cannot afford to disregard without nullifying itself.

There is, furthermore, as a background, as far as the guidance and behavior of America in this great assembly are concerned, the Mexico Conference recently held by the republics of the Western Hemisphere, where among other subjects, a chapter on international organization was debated and whose common aims were embodied in an instrument approved and subscribed without reservation by all the delegations which attended.

May I now be allowed, Sir, to present a bird's eye view of the suggestions of the Republic of Ecuador in connection with the Dumbarton Oaks plan.

In the opinion of my Government the structure of the international organization must rest on three indispensable foundations:

1. Its universality, so that, in any immediate or remote period of time all sovereign states of the world and those which might hereafter attain sovereignty may be admitted;
2. The efficacy of its mechanism to establish a worthy system of collective security; and
3. Its strict adherence to the supreme principles of justice and right without which the organization would degenerate into a mere political alliance carrying in its bosom the germ of its own disintegration.

For, in truth, Sir, we must now admit that the abstract production of writers and experts in international law, plentiful though it be, has been inadequate to preserve peace; libraries are bulging and curricula are saturated with captivating and promising treatises and speculative works. But has such plausible effort produced the improvement of man or raised international life to a moral level in which each one receives what belongs to him and where the ideas of aggression and defense, of conquest and liberation have been banished? Definitely no; because at the core of the problem of war and peace for the fit