

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

Ho. 49/42 STATEMENT BY MR. PAUL MARTIN, MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, AND CANADIAN DELEGATE TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON THE SOVIET "PEACE" RESOLUTION, IN THE FIRST (POLITICAL AND SECURITY) COMMITTEE ON NOVEMBER 15, 1949.

Mr. Vishinsky devoted a considerable amount of his time in his speech yesterday to the address made by the head of the Canadian Delegation at the opening of this Assembly. The importance and the validity of that speech were apparently fully appreciated by Mr. Vishinsky, for it certainly aroused the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. All that I have to say for the moment, in reply, is that nothing was said by Mr. Vishinsky which even he would regard as an adequate answer to what Mr. Pearson had said. Certainly, abuse and oratorical emphasis do not provide an answer. There is a saying which applies to this situation -- "If you wish to disturb a man's equilibrium, tell him the truth." That is exactly what Mr. Pearson did. That is exactly what Mr. Vishinsky did not like.

The Soviet resolution and the vigorous statement with which Mr. Vishinsky has supported it has had at least one good effect. It has drawn our attention to the existence in the world of concern and even fear lest the unsolved problems in international affairs lead us into another war. Mr. Vishinsky could quite easily have drawn this point to our attention without launching an attack of unparalleled violence against two of the world's great powers. We already know that Mr. Vishinsky does not like the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. Neither he nor any of those associated with him in the Government of the U.S.S.R. has ever concealed for a moment the fact that they regard these governments as evil and they confidently look forward to the day when they will be destroyed. He has made it equally clear that he holds this attitude also towards all the rest of the world, except for the small and uncertain number that votes with the U.S.S.R. on all occasions. Mr. Vishinsky did not need to put a special item on the agenda of the United Nations in order to tell us this. He has already found innumerable opportunities in our discussions, no matter what the item on the agenda, to inform us that all the world's ills can be attributed to the men who sit in Washington and the men who sit in London.

Mr. Vishinsky would have served us much better, since he insists that we consider what he calls the preparations for a new war, if he had told us in a sober and objective manner what he regards as the major issues in world affairs which threaten the peace, and if he had given us some practical suggestions of ways in which these problems could be solved on a basis of compromise and negotiation. We should probably have disagreed with his analysis, and I feel sure that we should probably also have had many reservations about his suggestions for settlement. If, however, these suggestions contained the slightest indications that some flexibility existed in the Soviet position on any of the problems which we now have reason to fear, my government, at least, would certainly have put its full weight behind any process of negotiation by which settlements might be reached. This would have been a practical and substantial contribution towards relieving the fears which Mr. Vishinsky has drawn to our attention by putting this item on the agenda.

We must regret, therefore, that all we have before us in the Soviet resolution is a proposal in the most general terms for a pact of peace amongst the five Permanent Members of the Security Council. It seems strange that in asking these states to join his country in a pact of peace he has denounced two of them, in the text of his resolution,

and again in his statement, in the most violent terms. This is scarcely the method best calculated to create the confidence that would give substance to the treaty he proposes. Does he really expect that a pact signed under these rude auspices will help to keep the peace?

The signature of the Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R. already appears, alongside those of the Foreign Ministers of other great powers, in a whole series of documents which contain the pledge, either in general terms or in particular terms, that international problems will be settled peacefully. We do not need any more signatures: we need some settlements. If Mr. Vishinsky wants peace all he needs to do is to call upon us to use the instruments for peace already in our hands; the best way in which to make that call would be to put forward concrete proposals about specific problems that gave some hope of a negotiated settlement, based on mutual confidence and tolerance.

We can only conclude that Mr. Vishinsky has put this resolution forward and has opened this discussion not for the purpose of strengthening peace at all, but for quite a different purpose. He has given himself the opportunity again of putting on the stage his familiar comic mis-representation of western civilization and, in particular, of the policies of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. This form of entertainment has some of the qualities of the hall of mirrors at a country fair. The Western Powers are sometimes made to appear thin from the evils of a shaky economic system or, alternatively, fat with their gluttonous exploitation of each other's resources. Sometimes they are so tall that they dominate the world, and sometimes so short that their pigmy-like power or influence can be treated with contempt and ridicule.

What can we take from all this? Mr. Vishinsky has found from experience that the platform of the United Nations gives him a good opportunity to put on this familiar act. To him, therefore, it does not really matter what happens during this debate. He does not care what reply is made to his speeches. He is not troubled about the form of resolution we finally adopt. All he wants is to get something on the record. He is not concerned if other delegations here challenge the distorted and even dishonest analysis he gives of world affairs. The only thing he cares about is that the Communist press the world over should carry the account of Mr. Vishinsky, unchallenged and uncontradicted, sitting in the committee room at Lake Success, telling the rest of us that we are to blame for the fears which grip the world. Perhaps the best judgment to make on this performance is one taken from the Moscow newspaper Izvestia of October 23 last. In that journal on that date a correspondent, signing himself "Observer", said:

"It has long been known that abuse on the lips of a statesman is a sign not of strength but of weakness before historical facts."

We could, therefore, dismiss as inconsequential propaganda the whole debate which Mr. Vishinsky has commenced. But instead of doing that, let us try to take it seriously and really talk about the things which Mr. Vishinsky has taken as the pretext for his attacks on the Western world. The real problem is not the preparations for a new war. The real problem is the fear and insecurity which lies like ice in the hearts of men everywhere. I wonder if Mr. Vishinsky will listen when we tell him what our reasons are for having this fear. In a recent statement in this committee, when the Greek question was under discussion, Mr. Vishinsky said that he was in favour of compromise, but that you could only compromise upon wrong, you could never compromise upon right. His remarks carried a strong implication that he and his

/Communist....

Communist sympathizers in the world are always right. If he clings to that attitude, there is, of course little hope that we can get beyond the stage of uneasy and distrustful watchfulness that now characterizes relations between Communist states and the rest of the world. But if he will admit for a minute the validity of some of our misgivings, then we might begin to take the first gradual steps towards understanding. It is in this hope that I proceed to tell him now some of the things that trouble us in the Western world when we look into those dark areas which are dominated by the Soviet Government, from which we are so systematically excluded, which we long to know but are prevented from knowing, with which we wish peace, but from which we receive a constant stream of abuse.

The first thing that must continually be in our minds is the attitude of the leaders of the Soviet State towards war. The philosophy of Communism, as we understand it, is based upon the theory that war between Communist States and the non-Communist world is inevitable. I know that leaders of the Soviet State from time to time deny this doctrine, and I should not be surprised to hear Mr. Vishinsky deny it again here.

At the same time, however, he will insist that the Soviet State is organized on the principles of Marx and on Lenin. And Lenin, in the Russian edition of his Collected Works, Volume XXIV, page 122, states:

"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. This means that if the proletariat, as the ruling class, wants to and will rule, it must prove this also by military organization."

Unless, therefore, Mr. Vishinsky and his colleagues are prepared to state categorically that the Communist analysis of history and of the relations between Communist and non-Communist States is false, they must believe in their hearts that one day, if they ever get a chance, they will wage war upon the rest of the world. Take, for example, the following quotation, dated October 24, 1946, from the Soviet newspaper, Red Fleet, which, as Mr. Vishinsky well knows, speaks with an official voice in the U.S.S.R. in a way that no Western publication does for its government:

"...war finds its origin in class society founded on private property and...war will disappear only when private property and antagonistic classes are destroyed....As a consequence, the task of the Soviet people in the field of internal policy is to fight for the further increase of its economic and military might."

Those who really prepare for war are those who believe in its inevitability. We do not believe that war is inevitable: it is a basic principle of our political philosophy that there is no political problem which cannot be solved by discussion, by negotiation, by compromise, by agreement. According to our beliefs, war becomes inevitable only when some nation determines either that it will get what it wants or resort to force. We think the same way about civil war. Our domestic political system is based on the principle that no individual or group in the community will be permitted to have his way by force.

/I know....

I know that Mr. Vishinsky and his colleagues will be cynical about this aspect of democracy. Their cynicism means only that they do not believe it is possible to govern with the freely expressed consent of the people who are governed. Their own political machinery excludes the possibility of political opposition and provides no means by which the strains and tensions within their society can find expression.

Under the system in the U.S.S.R. it is not possible for a man to make his own decisions. He must accept what is called the party line, which means the decisions handed down by the dictators. It is considered dangerous to the State if a man has an active conscience of his own: such an individual conscience is considered a danger to the rulers, because there is a state conscience. Similarly, personal moral and political convictions are considered dangerous, and a highly organized and pervasive state propaganda system seeks to substitute, for the free mind of man, the pattern of state-controlled thought.

The Soviet Delegates may not really know, therefore, what we are talking about when we speak of government by negotiation and compromise, either domestically or in international affairs, since they consider that force is an inevitable aspect of their government at home. It is not surprising that they also accept the inevitability of conflict in world affairs. The point I am making is of great practical importance. We believe that every problem which now troubles the world can readily be settled. If however, the leaders of the Soviet Union are convinced that war must come, and are teaching their people that war must come, then our hopes are indeed illusions. If the rulers of the U.S.S.R. could bring assurance to the peoples of the world on this point, they would be doing more to strengthen peace than could be accomplished by the signing of a dozen pacts.

Mr. Vishinsky says that he wants peace. But he turns his powers of vituperation - and I must admit that Mr. Vishinsky is very good at vituperation - against all nations who join together for collective security against aggression. Mr. Vishinsky seemed particularly bitter about the North Atlantic Pact. This Pact amounts to a declaration, by a group of peace-loving states, that an attack on one will be treated as an attack on all. It is not aimed against any specific country: it is aimed against any state which commits aggression. Mr. Vishinsky's vituperation on this subject reminds me of the proverb:

"The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

I can assure Mr. Vishinsky that no one who does not intend to commit aggression, or who does not plan to dominate the territory and people of other countries, need have any fear of the North Atlantic Pact.

I will tell Mr. Vishinsky just what the North Atlantic Pact does mean. Let me quote from a statement delivered in the Canadian House of Commons, on March 28 of this year, by Mr. St. Laurent, my Prime Minister:

"The purpose of the treaty is to preserve the peace of the world by making it clear to any potential aggressor that, if he were so unwise as to embark on war he might very well finish up in the condition in which the Kaiser found himself after the first great war. He might very well find himself in the position in which Hitler and Mussolini found themselves after the second terrible war. They were not told in advance what they would have to take on and overcome. I think it is fair, both to ourselves and to any possible aggressors to tell

/them....

them in advance that, if they attempt anything, they will have to overcome those who were great factors in preventing the realization of the hopes of the Kaiser and of Hitler and Mussolini."

No, Mr. Vishinsky, the North Atlantic Pact is not a threatening factor on the international scene. On the contrary, it is a stabilising factor -- one of those instances of co-operation among nations through which free countries believe that they can find security and progress in a troubled world.

The Soviet Government, I suppose because it prefers the maximum division, isolation, and hence weakness, among all peoples outside its own borders, criticizes these efforts to organize collective security -- just as it stands aloof from efforts, through the Specialized Agencies, to organize collective prosperity and welfare in the economic, social, and cultural fields.

This Soviet rejection of co-operation among the nations troubles us profoundly.

Let me give an example, in a field to which the Soviet resolution itself calls our attention. Several times during the past few days Mr. Vishinsky and his representatives have re-iterated, in the Ad Hoc Committee of this Assembly, their refusal to co-operate with the rest of us in a world-wide organization to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and to ensure effectively the prohibition and elimination of atomic weapons.

Mr. Vishinsky explains this refusal by asserting that international co-operation in this field would be incompatible with Soviet sovereignty. He says that a United Nations Atomic Control Agency would be nothing more than a super-trust dominated by the United States.

This charge is of course quite untrue: but it may throw a revealing light on Mr. Vishinsky's mind, and the minds of his colleagues in the Soviet Government. They seem obsessed with the idea of domination: their internal government, it seems to me, is based on the concept of dominating rather than serving the Russian people. And they seem incapable of imagining an international organization which they do not dominate, unless it is one which would dominate them. Is this delusion, that they must dominate or be dominated, the real explanation of Soviet opposition to international organizations in which they do not have a veto?

True peace, Mr. Vishinsky, involves true community. Community is a matter of give and take: it is a matter of mutual service and understanding. Domination has nothing to do with it.

This refusal to co-operate with the rest of the world to control the fateful powers of atomic energy involves a grave responsibility. Mr. Vishinsky knows this. He therefore does not reject openly the principle of international co-operation for atomic control. But he seeks to limit it so drastically that his proposals have seemed to every non-Communist country which has examined them utterly ineffective. Frankly, the Soviet proposals for atomic energy control have seemed to us a cynical and heartless trick. If they are not intended to be so, then I would be grateful if Mr. Vishinsky would reassure us on this point.

For example, will Mr. Vishinsky tell us now that he is prepared, on a basis of reciprocity, to allow international inspectors to go anywhere, at any time, in the Soviet Union, to the extent necessary to satisfy themselves and the world that no clandestine operations are taking place for the production of atomic explosives?

/Is...

Is Mr. Vishinsky prepared to accept quotas, if other nations will also do so, on the amount of nuclear fuel to be produced in his territory?

Is Mr. Vishinsky prepared, as the rest of us are, to accept limits to the size and nature of atomic energy facilities to be maintained in his territory?

Is Mr. Vishinsky prepared, as the rest of us are, to give up the right of his Government to act alone to produce and possess atomic explosives, so that the world may have confidence that such explosives can never be used in a surprise attack on the cities of men? I ask these questions in all seriousness. I know that Mr. Vishinsky stated that he will allow international inspectors to visit, at periodic and pre-arranged times, such atomic energy facilities as he may choose to declare to an international agency. Is he prepared to go beyond this, as we are, so as to satisfy us, as we will satisfy him, that there can be no evasions of the prohibition of atomic weapons?

If Mr. Vishinsky can answer these questions in the affirmative then this debate will have taken humanity a great step forward toward peace.

If he cannot so answer them, then we are rightly apprehensive. For we cannot depend on anyone's unverified word in these matters - nor do we ask others to accept our unproved pledge.

The peoples of all countries, and the governments of most countries, in which I certainly include my own, want disarmament. We want complete disarmament in the field of atomic weapons, and very substantial disarmament indeed in the field of conventional weapons. Yet we cannot disarm unilaterally. We learned in the 1930's that when democracies disarm, in the face of totalitarian dictators, they may encourage such dictators to commit aggression. Humanity learned also in the 1930's, that honeyed words and assurances of peaceful intentions from dictators are not enough. In the 1930's the world paid too much heed to such assurances, and the false sense of security thus engendered, proved to be the precursor of war.

We cannot afford to gamble with international security. We cannot afford to disregard the fear in men's hearts. That fear must be allayed not by peace resolutions, but by peace policies, on the part of all great nations.

That is why we seek to link the prohibition of atomic weapons with the establishment of effective control. That is why we link the question of reducing conventional armaments with proposals to establish methods of inspection and verification.

When Mr. Vishinsky rejects such effective controls, as he did last week in the Ad Hoc Committee, and when his representatives veto proposals for verification of armaments, as they did last month in the Security Council, we cannot help wondering at his motives.

There is a limit to chicanery. But did Lenin believe there was such a limit? Mr. Vishinsky will recall that Lenin, in his work entitled "The Infantile Sickness of Leftism in Communism, said:

"It is necessary.....to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of the truth."

The experience which most of us here have had with communists in our own countries suggests that these principles, laid down many years ago by Lenin, are all too often applied as a matter of policy by that party which seeks to substitute nihilist materialism for the moral and religious basis of free civilizations.

We must also be apprehensive about a political and economic

/system....

system which threatens the freedom of people who live within its reach. What are we to conclude from the accounts which were given in this Assembly by representatives of Yugoslavia of the merciless economic exploitation to which the Yugoslav people were subjected in the joint commercial enterprises which existed between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia? What are we to conclude about the announcement made only this week that a Marshal of the Army of the Soviet Union had become the Minister of War in Poland? Are these to be taken as normal manifestations of the free and friendly relations between equal and sovereign people?

In a recent interview with Mr. C.L. Sulzberger of the New York Times a Communist leader in the Free Territory of Trieste, Signor Vidali, made the following statement concerning Marshal Tito. He said:

"I speak of him as^a man who once belonged to the Communist movement and knew that there is one basic law -- that is our faith in the Soviet Union, whose Socialist party has more experience than any other in the struggle. He knew very well that in the history of our movement anyone who began to fight against its leadership inevitably joined our enemies.

"He destroyed the true Communist party and made a personal apparatus of it. The touchstone of a man's progressiveness is his attitude toward the Soviet Union."

The more we contemplate this kind of relationship between the Soviet Union and the small states on its borders which lie within its power, the more we are convinced that in these circumstances lies a real danger to the peace. Bitterness, resentment and hostility are created when relations between neighbours are based on force or the threat of force. And when bitterness and hatred prevail, there can be no stability. Twice already in this century, great wars have started because of unstable conditions in the areas which lie on the borders of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. in endeavouring to force everyone else out of this area, has taken upon itself the responsibility for the preservation there of peace. If from the rule of force there comes eventually the use of force, and we are once again confronted with violence in the border lands between the U.S.S.R. and Western Europe, those who are responsible will face a heavy accounting for history.

This Soviet policy of seeking to dominate its neighbours, is merely the extension to the international plane of the Stalinist principle that the leadership of the Communist party of the Soviet Union must dominate the body and soul of every member of every communist party throughout the world. Puppet governments are the logical fulfillment of the totalitarian fifth columns which the Soviet rulers have sought to establish in every free country on the earth. Many people, including even many rank-and-file communists, think that the basic principle of Communist parties lies in socialist ideals. This is not so. The basic principle is what they call "party loyalty", and which in communist movements means 100 per cent subservience to the party bosses, who must themselves be 100 per cent subservient to the rulers of Russia.

A former editor of the Daily Worker, Louis Budenz, in his book "This Is My Story", at page 234 wrote:

"The first requisite for a Communist is to understand that he is serving Soviet Russia and no other nation or interest. Never will he be permitted to express one word of reservation or criticism of the Soviet Government, its leaders or their decisions. Whatever they say or do is always 100 per cent right, and America can be right only by being in complete agreement with the Soviet Union. Never, during the twenty-five years of its existence, has the Daily Worker deviated from that rule; never has it ceased to prostrate itself before Soviet leadership."

/Sinc.....

Since Mr. Vishinsky has raised this question of the basic principles necessary for peace, I must take this occasion to tell him that a major contribution which his government can make, is the disbandment of their fifth columns in other countries. It is abhorrent that any group of rulers should seek to dominate the minds and souls of men, and to demand that complete subservience which is due only to God. For the Russian people, who suffer under this domination, we must all feel pity. But when these Russian rulers extend their pretensions to other lands, and seek to claim the subservience of the citizens of other countries, these pretensions become a threat to the peace of the world.

We must take this occasion also to tell Mr. Vishinsky that we in the west view with growing alarm the effects of a totalitarian Communist philosophy which shuts its people off as much as possible from contacts with the rest of the world. I know that Mr. Vishinsky will tell us that the Soviet Government secludes its people because it does not like the kind of thing which happens in the Western countries and wishes to protect them from these things which it regards as evil. I cannot believe, however, that the Soviet leaders really have so little confidence in the judgment of their own people. I can only conclude, therefore, that the Russian Government finds it necessary to give to the people of Russia a completely false impression of the Western world. The only way it can get its people to accept this false impression is by shutting them off from all normal contacts with the outside world. Consequently it goes to enormous lengths to prevent its own people from leaving the Soviet Union, to prevent people from outside the Soviet Union from entering that country, to exclude from normal contacts with the Russian people even the people of the neighbouring states which it regards as friendly, such as Poland and Roumania. The Soviet Government obstructs the movement of journalists and diplomats in the Soviet world, it permits them to move only under strict limitations. It excludes the ordinary traveller. A visitor from Russia may move freely in my country, but no private visitor from Canada can even set foot within the boundaries of the Soviet Union, except in the most unusual circumstances. The ordinary citizen of the Soviet Union is denied the opportunity to read our books, to listen to our philosophers, to study our scientists, to find out for himself what the West is like. If Mr. Vishinsky is concerned about the preparations of a new war, he should remember that war grows out of fear and fear out of ignorance. The ignorance which lies within the shadow of the iron curtain is as great a menace to peace as anything in the world today. The Government of the U.S.S.R. in the most deliberate manner is misleading its people in regard even to the most elementary facts concerning life in the western world. It is systematically portraying the democracies as determined to launch a war upon the Soviet Union. It is planting fear and hatred in the hearts of its people. It is giving these people no opportunity to correct the false picture of the world which they are being given. It is denying to the peoples of the free world, by the most systematic and far-reaching and overpowering censorship in history, the right to speak to the Russian people and to tell them of our great and genuine desire to live at peace with the people of the Soviet Union. Our basic differences are not with the Russian people themselves, of whom there are about 194,000,000 but mainly with about 3 per cent of that number who belong to the Communist party. Peace in the world, when it has existed, has been based on a community of interests amongst individual men and women which led them to adjust their differences by peaceful means. The Government of the U.S.S.R. seems determined to deny to its people the right to belong to the world community which is now rapidly developing not only amongst the nations of the world, but also amongst the individual people of the world themselves. We cannot build peace on a foundation of mistrust and fear. By continual distortion the Government of the U.S.S.R. is creating in the minds of its people a false distrust and fear of the peoples of the West. This debate itself is an attempt to stimulate such emotions. The peace of the world would really be served if, as a result of the debate, Mr. Vishinsky would return to his people and say to them "Let us build upon whatever basis of confidence there is" instead of telling them that fear and mistrust alone prevail.

/Finally....

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we must look with the gravest concern upon the activities of a government which dominates a vast section of the earth's surface, and which systematically isolates from that area the free play of moral, intellectual and spiritual forces upon which the Western world has grown. From roots in Hebrew and in Greek civilization, a vast and complicated civilization has developed in the Western world. Again and again this civilization has reached out and made contacts with the people of other civilizations. It has accommodated itself to these other civilizations, enriching them and being enriched by them. Now for the first time in history there is the possibility that a true world community may develop. From the most Western positions of the Soviet army in Europe, westward across the Atlantic and across the Pacific to the Eastern boundaries of Siberia, there is a vast and complex free society in which the moral and ethical values of religion play freely upon the daily operations of government, in which spiritual values are cherished rather than denied and cynically reviled, in which the free play of one idea upon another, of one political philosophy upon another of one religious concept upon another is the basis of progress and happiness. It is only in this free environment that the individual can possibly attain a relationship with his fellow citizens which makes him truly peaceful. This is the kind of progress towards peace that we must encourage and in which we must have faith.

Cannot we remove these iron curtains? Cannot we abandon these barriers which seek to divide the people of the Soviet Union from the rest of us?

Cannot we recognize that the basic reality of international politics as of village affairs, is the individual man and woman?

The individual is an end, not a means to an end. When this principle is abandoned, error begins -- and we have not yet seen where this error may end. In 1848 Karl Marx, in the first volume of *Das Kapital*, wrote this:

"I speak of individuals insofar as they are personifications of economic categories and representatives of special classes of relations and interests."

It is the beginning of sanity and wisdom, Mr. Chairman, to realize that the individual man and woman is never the personification of categories, economic or otherwise. The individual is nothing less than the image of God.

To the extent that this principle is recognized, we will be on the path to human brotherhood and the achievement of lasting peace.

The concepts which I have been discussing underlie and explain the attitude which my delegation will adopt on the resolutions which are before us, and explain why we intend to support the draft resolution that stands in the name of the United States and the United Kingdom Governments.

In summary, I would express these concepts in political terms by saying that the General Assembly must call upon each member of the United Nations

To renew the solemn pledges of the Charter,

To renounce all theories that war is inevitable,

To co-operate fully and loyally with every effort of the United Nations and all its specialized agencies to prevent war by removing the causes of war,

To maintain or restore the freedom of its people to communicate fully with all other peoples in the world,

/To support....

To support all efforts to bring about the entire measure of disarmament in all forces and weapons consistent with security,

To accept the limitations on national sovereignty necessary for these purposes,

To pledge itself never to impose its will by force or threat of force, direct or indirect, upon another member and,

To restore its faith in the destiny of mankind to build peace on the foundations of confidence amongst the nations.

These are ideals and objectives to which we freely subscribe and which we believe will lay the true foundations of peace.

s/c