

the preservation against external aggression of the territorial integrity and political independence of every member of the Organization. The New Zealand amendment on this point was defeated. It is true that there was added to the Chapter of Purposes and Principles an undertaking to *refrain* from any act of aggression against the territorial integrity and political independence of any member. This negative provision is, however, in our view, an inadequate substitute for the New Zealand amendment.

The Charter lacks an even more important provision which our delegation sought to have incorporated in the form of an undertaking on the part of all members "collectively to resist every act of aggression against any member." This proposal suffered varied fortunes at the hands of the Conference. It was at first rejected in sub-committee by a majority that included the votes of the five Great Powers, but was resurrected in the full Committee and put to the vote after Mr. Berendsen had insisted forcefully that a clear pledge against aggression was the minimum undertaking to which the smaller nations were entitled, and that it was in fact the core and kernel of any system of collective security. In spite of the fact that no fewer than twenty-five other nations supported New Zealand, the Great Powers remained opposed to it, and, with the assistance of thirteen other votes, they were able to prevent it from gaining the required two-thirds majority.

The New Zealand delegation attached such importance to this proposal, and to the substantial majority of votes it had gained despite the restricted time made available for its discussion, that I felt it my duty to draw the attention of the relevant Commission to the result of the voting, and to the grave defect that remained in the principles of the Charter. Without proposing that the question should be reopened, I made a declaration in the name of the New Zealand delegation explaining that the point of our proposal was that when the Security Council had decided that an act of aggression against one of the members of the organization had taken place, there should immediately result a clear and unmistakable duty on every member of the organization, great and small, to resist and defeat that aggression by the means laid down by the Security Council.

The New Zealand delegation placed on record its earnest hope that the Security Council, in its work of resisting aggression and establishing and maintaining international peace and justice, with the support of all the United Nations and with increasing experience and confidence, would find it possible and advantageous to accept the New Zealand proposal in practice as a guiding and basic principle in what we devoutly trust will be its realistic approach to the problems with which it will have to deal.

The New Zealand delegation endeavoured during the Conference, through its own amendments and those put forward by other Powers, to give its support to any proposal for widening the powers of the *General Assembly*. We felt that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals conferred excessive authority on the Great Powers and, while we realized that no security programme could be fulfilled unless it commanded the adherence of the Great Powers, we felt, and still feel, that the smaller nations could take a much greater part in framing the decisions of the World Organization than has been envisaged in the Charter.

The New Zealand delegation protested vigorously against a situation under which the Great Powers retained for themselves the right to say in every important case whether the Organization should or should not act, and whether they themselves should be bound or not, and under which the Great Powers were at the same time vested with the right to deny to the smaller Powers not only a vote, but a voice in these matters.