

this time to join in the task of bringing the war in Korea to an end on terms considered acceptable to the United Nations and in conformity with international law.

In speaking to the General Assembly on October 14, the opening day of the present session, I said:

"Our task will not be easy, for the General Assembly of 1952 faces its own crisis. The effort by the United Nations to bring about an armistice in Korea on honourable terms - which would be the only ones acceptable - remains frustrated and unsuccessful. The United Nations, therefore, has not been able to move forward into the positive phases of peaceful settlement and reconstruction in that area which should be possible, on the basis of decisions already taken by us, once the aggression has been stopped and the fighting ended. Those who prevent this armistice - the first step in the process of healing and restoration - bear a heavy responsibility before history and humanity".

Despite the reply from the Central People's Government and the North Korean authorities, I am convinced that the efforts which we have made have not been in vain and that they represent a major achievement in the history of the seventh session. For one thing, we would have failed in our responsibility to this world organization and its principles had we not made the attempt. For another, it has been demonstrated that nearly all our members were prepared to agree on a proposal which, consistent with United Nations principles, provided the basis for an armistice and eventual peace in Korea.

To bring the fighting in Korea to an end and to move forward into the positive phases of reconstruction and peaceful settlement is still, therefore, the great challenge which faces the United Nations. I have no doubt that, through our Organization, we shall persist - and we shall succeed - in our joint effort to achieve this objective, which remains our only objective in Korea.

The other major problem which has occupied our attention arises from colonial and racial issues. The problem here has been to achieve a reconciliation of the principle of the domestic jurisdiction of sovereign states and the responsibility of some of them for the administration of dependent peoples in their progress toward self-government, with the legitimate interest of the United Nations in human rights and freedom for all peoples. Under several items on the Assembly's agenda, these issues have been fully and freely discussed, and on the whole with moderation and a high sense of responsibility. We have come to see that our differences rest more on questions of means than of ends, more on the pace of progress than on our destination, about which we are in general agreement.

I have no wish to attempt to assess in detail the work of the Assembly. For one thing, it is not finished. I wished only to touch on one or two examples to show why I think that this has been an important and not unproductive Assembly so far. If we have failed to find answers to the big questions, if we have seemed to be substituting resolutions for solutions, and if we have at times laboured long for results that did not measure up to our hopes, this is not primarily the fault of the United Nations. I believe that, in the world in which we live - not the one in which we should