

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1016th
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 26 September 1961,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Luns (Netherlands)</i>	89
<i>Speech by Mr. Gromyko (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)</i>	91
<i>Speech by Mr. Vela Hervas (Ecuador)</i>	103
<i>Statement by the representative of Indonesia</i>	108

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. LUNS (Netherlands): Never during the many years that I have been attending sessions of the General Assembly have I done so with such a heavy heart. Not only are the threats to peace more serious than ever before in the history of this Organization, but in this tense and bewildering situation we have to do without the guidance of the man who was the embodiment of all that is best in the United Nations and what it stands for. Dag Hammarskjöld was a great Secretary-General, and his tragic death is felt as a personal loss by all his friends, as a bereavement by the Organization for which he gave his life and as a calamity by the world.

2. It so happens that in the introduction [A/4800/Add.1] to his last annual report on the work of the Organization, the late Secretary-General left us a document which is now his political testament and in which, in his clear and concise way, he traced the outline of a possible future development of the United Nations. Rejecting the theory of those who conceive of the Organization as a static conference machine for resolving conflicts, he argued with force and vision for the opposite concept: that of the Organization as a dynamic instrument of Governments through which they should, jointly and for the same purpose, not only seek reconciliation but also try to develop forms of executive action undertaken on behalf of all Members and aimed at forestalling conflicts.

3. This introduction is not only a masterly exposé of opposing doctrines: it is more than that. It is a lucid and convincing rallying call to all those who have the welfare of mankind and of the Organization at heart to work for a dynamic United Nations with executive and operational powers and a strong and dedicated, truly international Secretariat under one head. My Government has heard the call and will heed it, as will become apparent from the stand we shall take on various questions that will come up for discussion during this session.

4. Among the most ominous of the problems now endangering world peace are the plans for West Berlin announced in such menacing terms by spokesmen for

the Soviet Union and the fact that that country has set off a series of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere. It is our profound conviction that the way of life which the people of West Berlin have freely chosen must be respected and not obliterated by the system that surrounds them, which is unacceptable to them. In East Berlin the right of self-determination has lately been contemptuously denied to the inhabitants of that part of the city. It is now the future of the 2.5 million inhabitants of West Berlin which is at stake. The right of self-determination which is involved engages the very principles of our Organization. Any solution—and my Government sincerely hopes that a solution will be found—must safeguard that right. I shall refrain at this moment from expounding other aspects of the German problem, as my Government sees them.

5. At a moment when three years of patient negotiation on the banning of nuclear tests seemed about to bear fruit, the Soviet Union brusquely resumed the thunder and the pollution of the atmosphere which we had all hoped to avoid. This is a negation of the concept of peaceful co-operation and has created another obstacle to the achievement of disarmament, of which our world stands in such dire need.

6. The shadow that these dangerous developments cast over the Assembly renders it more than ever necessary that each country should make its contribution, large or small, to an improvement in the world situation, and that it should do so in the spirit indicated by the late Secretary-General.

7. It is with these considerations in mind that the Netherlands Government has decided to place before the Assembly a plan which we have conceived for the welfare and peaceful development of an area under our sovereignty: Netherlands New Guinea.

8. I need hardly mention that Indonesia maintains a territorial claim to that territory, which would nullify the population's right to self-determination. On 19 September 1961, H.M. the Queen declared, in her statement from the throne:

"Discussions with Indonesia on the future of Netherlands New Guinea have, unfortunately, proved to be impossible, since the conditions put forward by Indonesia for such discussions are at variance with the principle of self-determination."

9. As is well known, the Netherlands at present administers the western part of the island of New Guinea as a Non-Self-Governing Territory under the terms of Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations. The efforts that the Netherlands Government is making to speed up the process of development in this Territory in order to enable its population to decide at the earliest possible moment on its own destiny are equally familiar to the Members of the Assembly—or, at any rate, to the members of the Fourth Committee—as my country, in accordance with the rules laid down in Article 73 e of the Charter, has not only faithfully

transmitted extensive reports on the economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory, but has moreover voluntarily reported on the political conditions in the Territory as well.

10. The reports of the last few years, which have been discussed in the Fourth Committee of the Assembly as well as in the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, give a clear picture of the important steps the Netherlands has taken to accelerate the development of the population of Netherlands New Guinea towards self-government through such measures as the establishment of a New Guinea Council as well as of local councils, and the training of indigenous cadres in order to speed up the Papuanization of the administration.

11. On 4 October 1960, I declared in this hall during the fifteenth session [886th meeting] that the Netherlands was prepared to subject its policy and its actions, aimed at the speediest possible attainment of self-determination by the Papuan people, to the continuous scrutiny and judgement of the United Nations.

12. Two months and ten days later the Netherlands delegation voted in favour of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], which resolution declares *inter alia* that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that immediate steps shall be taken in all territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories.

13. In casting this vote my Government was not making a cheap meaningless gesture. It fully intended—and intends—to apply the principles mentioned in that Declaration. To that end, I now have the honour of placing before the Assembly, first of all, five considerations which have led my Government to make to the General Assembly of the United Nations a concrete proposal concerning Netherlands New Guinea, and after that, the concrete proposal itself. These considerations are the following:

(a) The sole purpose of the Netherlands in its policy in respect of Netherlands New Guinea is the granting of complete self-determination to the people in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

(b) In conformity with resolution 1514 (XV), the Netherlands is prepared to terminate its sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea at the earliest possible date; that is, as soon as the right of self-determination of the people is properly safeguarded.

(c) The Netherlands Government, however, is aware that the Territory will still for some time to come require foreign technical assistance and guidance.

(d) The Netherlands therefore is looking for ways by which resolution 1514 (XV) can be implemented as soon as possible with respect to Netherlands New Guinea and by which, at the same time, the population may receive the necessary guarantees of assistance and guidance required for integral development towards self-determination.

(e) In its resolution 1514 (XV), the General Assembly declared that the Administering Authorities should take immediate steps to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories administered by them, at the earliest possible date. In conformity with this expressed desire, the Netherlands now requests that the General Assembly assist in attaining that aim.

14. The following are the concrete proposals, based on the aforementioned considerations, which, if approved and adopted by the General Assembly, would implement in a practical way resolution 1514 (XV) and lead to speedy development of the Territory and to early termination of the present Netherlands administration while, at the same time, providing a *bona fide* guarantee of the right of self-determination.

15. First, the Netherlands is prepared to bring the administration and the development of the Territory under the active supervision of the United Nations and is prepared to accept a decision of the General Assembly which clearly guarantees the right of self-determination of the population.

16. Second, to this end the Netherlands is prepared to relinquish sovereignty to the people of Netherlands New Guinea.

17. Third, in this connexion the Netherlands is prepared to transfer its present powers, to the extent required by the above purpose, to an organization or international authority established by and operated under the United Nations, which would be vested with executive powers and which could gradually take over tasks and responsibilities and thus prepare the population for early self-determination under stable conditions.

18. Fourth, the Netherlands is prepared to continue its financial contribution to the development of the Territory, on the basis of the present annual level of about \$30 million, and until such time as may be decided upon in the future.

19. The third proposal which I mentioned constitutes a form of international administration by a development authority under the supervision of the United Nations. This new form of administration could, if required, be established by an agreement to be concluded between the United Nations and the Netherlands.

20. Responsibility for economic, social and educational development should at once be entrusted to the authority with executive powers. International experts could be recruited in accordance with the rules applicable to the United Nations technical assistance personnel.

21. The Netherlands Government is prepared to request its civil servants of Netherlands nationality at present serving in Netherlands New Guinea and numbering approximately 2,800 to remain in office so long as necessary as international civil servants.

22. When deciding upon the establishment of an international development authority, the General Assembly could decide simultaneously that, after consultation of the population, intermediate and final target dates be set for self-determination by, and the further transfer of powers to, the people of Netherlands New Guinea.

23. Since these proposals embody an entirely new concept in the history of decolonization, the General Assembly might wish to study them more closely before taking a final decision on them. The Assembly might also wish to acquaint itself with the present conditions in the Territory and the wishes of the population, and to have a complete and impartial report thereon.

24. Therefore, the Netherlands Government suggests that a United Nations commission be set up which

could perform the following tasks on behalf of the General Assembly:

(a) To proceed to Netherlands New Guinea and to investigate: first, the political, economic, social and educational conditions in the territory; second, the opinion amongst the population as to its present situation and its future; third, the possibilities for organizing an early plebiscite under the supervision of the United Nations in order to register the wishes of the inhabitants of the territory.

(b) On the basis of the findings on the spot: first, to suggest, if desirable and feasible, intermediate and final target dates for self-determination and the transfer of powers to the people; second, to investigate the possibility of bringing the development of the territory during the interim period under the administration of an international development authority.

25. The commission should report, together with its recommendations, to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session.

26. In due time, my delegation will take the appropriate initiative for enabling the General Assembly to decide on these proposals which I have now outlined.

27. These are the considerations and proposals which the Netherlands Government has deemed it right to announce to the Members of this Assembly. I feel justified in asserting that they are, on the one hand, unprecedented and, on the other hand, based exclusively on the interests of the people of Netherlands New Guinea and on the principles set forth in the Charter.

28. I end with the prayer that the Almighty may grant His blessing to the work of this Assembly under the able guidance of the President.

29. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you, on behalf of the Soviet delegation, on your election to this high office.

30. Sixteen years have passed since the United Nations was born. When the Founder States affixed their signatures to the Charter, the guns in Europe had ceased to roar. It is true that the war in the Far East had not yet ended, but people already sensed the imminent falling of the curtain, and in fact that mankind's great tragedy would soon be over.

31. The peoples, tortured by hunger and suffering, were directing their thoughts to a single question: how could a new tragedy be avoided, how could the path to war be barred? That was why such applause greeted the emergence of the United Nations, which proclaimed the maintenance of peace as its supreme goal.

32. With the passing of the years, the United Nations has grown. Dozens of new countries have poured into it. Let us recall that the Charter of the United Nations, as adopted at the constituent session of San Francisco in June 1945, bore the signatures of fifty-one States. Look around you today, in this General Assembly hall, and you will see that the number of Members of the United Nations has almost doubled, mainly on account of the Asian and African States which have acceded to national independence in the post-war period.

33. We must admit that the United Nations still has much to do if it is to attain the goal for which it was founded—to save mankind from the scourge of war. How far we still are from that goal is shown by the fact that the present session of the General Assembly

is meeting under circumstances more disquieting than those of any previous session.

34. Why has this happened? Has mankind now moved backwards in its development? Certainly not. Never has historical progress been so impetuous, never has the creative genius of Man reached such heights, as in our day. To get an idea of the possibilities opened up by progressive science, technology and culture, suffice it to recall that it was in this year of 1961 that Man first escaped from the sphere of the Earth's attraction. In truth, all present in this hall understand our feeling of pride that the first human beings who as pioneers opened up the road into outer space were citizens of the socialist Soviet Union, and that the space-ships on which they accomplished their heroic flights were created by our compatriots.

35. Profound transformations are taking place over a substantial portion of our planet, and the relations between people are changing so as to reflect the principle of fairer shares for all in the production and consumption of material goods. In our country there is nation-wide discussion of the magnificent programme for the building of a communist society, on the portals of which will be engraved that lofty principle of which the world's best people have long dreamed: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs".

36. The true causes of the intensification of international tension must be sought in the aggressive policy of the Powers belonging to the NATO military bloc. Only recently the "cold war" seemed to be dying out, together with the so-called policy of "brinkmanship", and a sober appraisal of the relationship of the real forces in the world seemed to be taking its place. But those expectations proved unjustified.

37. One cannot help wondering, today, where the activities of the principal Powers in that military bloc are leading us. If they continue to brandish weapons and broadcast threats, as they now do in connexion with the Soviet proposal for an immediate German peace treaty, no one can be sure that events will not go beyond the fatal limit. If that were to happen, those achievements of human brain and brawn, at which the world marvels today, would be used against mankind, to destroy all the treasures built up by Man over many generations and to annihilate hundreds of millions of human beings.

38. It must be candidly said that, so far, the United Nations has all too often been content to play the role of observer, and has preferred to remain on the sidelines, when the Governments of the Western Powers have been playing their dangerous international game. The agenda of the United Nations General Assembly continues to contain questions on the solution of which an abatement of tension and, in the last analysis, the future of mankind itself depend. And although many fine speeches have been made from this rostrum, the major and most acute questions in international relations today—general and complete disarmament, the total abolition of the colonial system, and the final closing of accounts in regard to the Second World War—still await solution. With what relief the peoples of the world would breathe if the present session of the General Assembly were to mark a turning-point in this respect!

39. The General Assembly has at its sixteenth session to consider many international questions, the importance of which we all recognize. But there is one

question which, whether or not it is formally on the agenda, has today eclipsed all others—the question of concluding a German peace treaty. Dangerous passions seethe around it. Along the Elbe and past the Brandenburg Gate run dividing-lines which create the highest degree of international tension and can at any moment result in the launching of thunderbolts upon each other by the two military groups of Powers.

40. This threat to peace has arisen neither today nor yesterday. It has matured from year to year, in proportion as the conclusion of a German peace was postponed. The unsettled situation in that part of Central Europe, where there were only fragments of Hitler's Reich and then two German States arose, created one of the most dangerous knots of contradiction between States. With time, the knot has been drawn ever tighter and the contradictions have become ever more acute.

41. The two German States—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—resemble each other, perhaps, only in the black-red-gold colours of their national flags, each a heritage of the Weimar days. They are separated, not merely by frontier-posts, but by the most profound social and political differences. Unless this is taken into account, no proper understanding of the new situation that has now developed in Germany and Europe can be gained. The fact that certain politicians may close their eyes to this new situation does not, of course, result in its removal.

42. The German Democratic Republic has broken forever with the shameful past of Nazi Germany; it has radically transformed its economy and social life; and it has stripped political power and economic might from the standard-bearers of German militarism. It has voluntarily limited the size of its army, has refrained from introducing compulsory military service, and has expressed its readiness to abstain from equipping its armed forces with nuclear weapons. The German Democratic Republic makes no territorial demands on its neighbours. The entire twelve-year history of this State has been the history of the struggle to strengthen, on German soil, the idea of friendship and co-operation between States, regardless of their social structure.

43. But what of the other German State? Behind the façade of a sham parliamentary system, affairs in the Federal Republic of Germany are in the control of those who in the past erected fascism, those who are primarily responsible for the Second World War. Having seized the commanding positions in the political and economic life of the country, Hitler's political successors, and sometimes even his former assistants, are mobilizing their forces, awaiting the hour when they can take revenge for the lost war. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is openly demanding the revision of the frontiers established as a result of the Second World War. Press, radio, television, cinema—all modern propaganda media are utilized to implant the idea of revenge. Inoculation with the bacillus of "revanche" and militarism begins, indeed, at the school bench.

44. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany attempts to apply a little "make-up" to its policy, and with this object it appends the word "peaceful" to its demand for a revision of European frontiers. But who can be taken in by such words? The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, like all of us, is very well aware that the States to whose territories it lays claim will never modify their fron-

tiers for the benefit of the German revenge-seekers and will refuse to let themselves be drawn into any deals on this question.

45. Most wars, as a rule, originate precisely in attempts to modify existing frontiers for the purpose of acquiring fresh territory. Such was the case with the two world wars unleashed by Germany. No matter how much the word "peaceful" is used in connexion with a demand for the revision of existing frontiers, it cannot mask the fundamentally aggressive nature of the policy pursued by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in this matter.

46. The most dangerous feature of the situation is that the adventurous plans of the West German revenge-seekers repose on a fairly solid military and material foundation.

47. At the insistence of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, even those insignificant and essentially formal restrictions imposed on military production in Western Germany by the Paris Agreements of 1954^{1/} are, one after the other, being removed. These restrictions have already been revised three times. But even that is a matter of little account to the West German militarists. They persistently demand possession of nuclear weapons. Under every pretext—such as claims of insufficient room for rearguard services, for manoeuvres, or for firing-ranges—the Federal Republic of Germany is thrusting its network of military strong-points and bases ever more deeply into the territories of West European countries.

48. Already Western Germany has strong armed forces, commanded by former Hitlerite generals who sullied themselves by monstrous crimes committed against the peoples of the Soviet Union, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece and many other countries. The war criminal Fertsch has been appointed to a very high post of command in the "Bundeswehr" by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. The Hitlerite generals Heusinger, Speidel and others are prominent in NATO organs. One may ask what such leaders can teach the "Bundeswehr" soldier, what ideals they can inculcate in him, what morals they can instil in their subordinates. From its inception, the West German "Bundeswehr" has been shaped and trained as an aggressive force.

49. The same features that characterized the policy of Germany on the eve of the Second World War stand out, with ever-increasing distinctness, in the present policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. Many of those sitting in this hall remember, of course, how the rulers of Hitlerite Germany likewise demanded the right to "equality in armaments", likewise emitted heart-rending cries about the "communist menace". In exactly the same way they corrupted the souls of the Germans with the ideas of "revanche", which today pervade the entire foreign policy of the West German State. If Ribbentrop had not ended on the gallows, a comfortable arm-chair would certainly have been found for him in the West German Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

50. It is also worth glancing at the dominant slogans of the recent West German electoral campaign. Were they, by any chance, slogans calling for the strengthening of peace and the removal of the mines left on German soil by the war, so that they should no longer

^{1/} Signed on 23 October 1954.

threaten international relations? Did they call for normal relations with the neighbouring countries, for mutual understanding between the two German States? No, the calls that then resounded from the banks of the Rhine were entirely different. The slogans were permeated with the madness of chauvinism, and looked for all the world as though they had been directly transplanted from the pages of fascist newspapers to the election posters of the West German political parties.

51. The statesmen of the West, including Chancellor Adenauer, in objecting to the conclusion of a German peace treaty, often speak of "self-determination" for the Germans. By "self-determination", however, they understand nothing more nor less than absorption of the German Democratic Republic by West Germany, although the adventurous nature of such a policy should be obvious to all.

52. To this we have answered and still answer, very simply, that the Germans have long since exercised self-determination. They exercised self-determination as long ago as the autumn of 1949, when they established two independent States, elected the parliaments of those States, and formed their own Governments. Year after year the distance between those States widened, as they developed in opposite directions. One of them, the German Democratic Republic developed along the paths of peace, in the circumstances of the building of socialism; the other, the Federal Republic of Germany, developed along military paths, under conditions of capitalism. No one can help seeing that the Division between these two German States took place not in a national but in a social context.

53. The "self-determination" of the Germans, to which those who oppose the conclusion of a German treaty allude in certain capitals of the West, is an expression belonging to a policy of deceiving the peoples. That dish is an imperialist one, to the taste only of those who shape the destinies of West Germany. Speculation built around the slogan of "self-determination" has nothing in common with the true national interest of the German people. If anyone in Bonn or in Washington does not like the social order established in the German Democratic Republic, does not like the Government and leaders of the German Democratic Republic, what of it? The German Democratic Republic does not cease to exist on that account, just as the other German State, the Federal Republic of Germany, does not cease to exist because its social order, Government and leaders are not to the taste of many people in other countries.

54. The wider the international recognition granted to the two German States, and the sooner they are admitted to membership in the United Nations, the stronger will be the foundations of the post-war peace in Europe and the less free will be the hands of the West German militarists and revenge-seekers.

55. Many of the participants in the recently ended Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries^{2/} quite justly pointed out that this step was overdue. How can the General Assembly continue to be inactive with regard to a question which is so important for the fate of the world? The United Nations would be showing courage and foresight if it decided to admit both German States to membership in it. We would like to emphasize, with the utmost clarity, that life itself is

insistently bringing this demand on to the agenda: the demand for the admission of both German States to the United Nations.

56. The Soviet Government raises the question of a threat to peace from West German militarism so insistently not, of course, from any fear of its military preparations. But just as no particular strength is needed in order to pull a trigger, so one does not have to be stronger than others in order to unleash a war.

57. What is the remedy for this situation? How can the threat of war be prevented from arising in connexion with the present position in Germany and in West Berlin, where the long-obsolete occupation régime still exists? There is a remedy: in 1961 a German peace treaty should be concluded and the situation in West Berlin should on that basis be restored to normal, West Berlin being converted into a demilitarized Free City; a peace conference for that purpose should be called immediately. Such are the well-known proposals of the Soviet Government.

58. The Soviet Union is not begging for a peace treaty. It has earned the right to conclude such a treaty, at the cost of enormous sacrifice.

59. Who will suffer from the fact of a peace treaty legally stabilizing the present German frontiers? No one. Whose interests will be damaged if the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic undertake not to manufacture or equip their armed forces with nuclear rocket weapons? No one's. Who will be harmed if the two German States undertake to settle all disputes solely by negotiation? No one. The only people who may be infuriated by these proposals are the enemies of peace.

60. We sometimes hear it said that a peace treaty will be an impediment to the unification of Germany. What curious logic! When, owing to the absence of a peace treaty, the situation in Germany and around West Berlin is becoming more and more acute and the tension in the relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany is continual increasing, that, apparently, produces no impediment to the unification of Germany. But when the conclusion of a peace treaty removes the tension and both German States have a common platform, at least with regard to the conduct of their external affairs, that, apparently, hinders a "rapprochement" between the two. How can these arguments be accepted? Is it not more correct to assume that they are put forward, for the sole purpose of making it more difficult to conclude a German peace treaty, by those to whom the interest of restoring the national unity of Germany is as foreign as the interest of concluding a German peace treaty?

61. Anyone who has studied the Soviet proposals attentively will doubtless have noted that they take account of the actual situation which evolved as a result of the defeat of Hitlerite Germany. The conclusion of a peace treaty would entail no disruption in the way of life of either German State, or of West Berlin. In so far as the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany belong to different Power groups, the Soviet draft peace treaty takes that fact also into account: it does not call for the immediate dissolution of the political and military ties binding the two German States to their allies.

62. We are ready to sign either a single treaty with the two German States or separate treaties with the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic

^{2/} Held from 1 to 6 September 1961.

of Germany. For the Soviet Union the most important thing is to write finis to the Second World War by concluding a German peace treaty which would serve the interests of a strengthening of peace and the interests of the peoples of Europe, including the German people.

63. The conclusion of a peace treaty would enable the situation in West Berlin also to be normalized, on the basis of such a treaty.

64. West Berlin has now become a source of great military danger, like the crater of an active volcano which constantly threatens to erupt. It may be that countries which are geographically remote from West Berlin do not realize entirely clearly what is happening there. The Soviet Union therefore regards it as a duty to warn the peoples, over and over again, of the situation which is developing as a result of the absence of a German peace treaty. The Soviet Government has frequently drawn the attention of the Governments of the Western Powers to the serious nature of the existing danger. This was referred to by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, at his recent meeting in Vienna with Mr. Kennedy, President of the United States of America.

65. There is, in the world today, no place where there is such a hive of subversive, diversionary and espionage centres as in West Berlin. Western propaganda has given many names to West Berlin, such as "an arrow in the flesh of the German Democratic Republic", "a bridge-head for a drive to the East", "a front-line city". But it would be far more correct to describe West Berlin as a cesspool in which wallow the completely outdated occupation régime, the criminal subversive centres of the Federal Republic of Germany and the NATO powers, and the crowd of West German militarists and revenge-seekers.

66. The representatives of the Powers which are responsible for the absence of a peace treaty and for the present abnormal situation in West Berlin frequently invoke the principles of the United Nations Charter. But is there anything in common between the principles of that Charter and the policy which their Governments are conducting in opposing a German peace treaty? Of course not.

67. We are proposing that the situation in West Berlin should be regulated by a peace treaty in conditions which would affect the prestige neither of the USSR nor of the Western Powers.

68. Do the Western Powers want the freedom and welfare of the people of West Berlin to be safeguarded? We are in favour of that. We will repeat once more, as we have done countless times: we are in favour of that.

69. The United States of America, the United Kingdom and France do not want the established way of life in West Berlin—the social order or, as they say, the social system—to be disrupted. That coincides with our attitude. No one has designs on the social order which exists in West Berlin. We have stated dozens of times, in the most formal terms, and we declare once more, that we are firmly of the opinion that the people of West Berlin should be guaranteed—I repeat, guaranteed—the right to live and to work in whatever social structure suits them. We propose that this right of the inhabitants of West Berlin should be reliably protected against any encroachment. How many times must all this be repeated, in order to put an end to the con-

tinuing attempts to distort the clear and consistent position of the Soviet Union?

70. Freedom of communications between West Berlin and the outside world? We are in favour of ensuring those communications.

71. But why is it asserted from all sides that free access to West Berlin is being threatened by someone? That is another gross distortion of the Soviet Union's position.

72. The implementation of our proposal for a peace treaty involves no prohibition of access to West Berlin, nor a blockade, as some have tried to assert. No; a Free City of West Berlin would have the right to establish relations with any country on any continent. For this only one thing is required—unfailing respect for the sovereignty of the State through whose territory pass the land, air and water communications linking West Berlin with the outside world, that is, for the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic, with which the appropriate agreements concerning the use of those communications will also have to be concluded.

73. Do the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France not know that the Soviet Government is ready to assume, together with them, a solemn obligation to protect and respect the freedom, independence and rights of a Free City of West Berlin, including the freedom of its external communications? And if the four Powers reach an agreement for the presence of token troops in West Berlin as a guarantee of the Free City's status, only hopeless sceptics and people who have lost all common sense can doubt that the status of the Free City will be reliably guaranteed. Since co-operation between the four Powers succeeded in bringing Hitler's Germany to its knees, it will surely be easier to arrange effective guarantees for a Free City of West Berlin.

74. As the Soviet Government and the Head of that Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, have frequently stated, the United Nations could also be a guarantor of the status of the Free City. For such a purpose that status could be officially registered with the United Nations, and other forms of United Nations participation in guaranteeing the freedom and independence of the Free City could be envisaged. The Soviet Government is also ready to agree to the use of contingents of troops from neutral States, or United Nations troops, as guarantors of the Free City's status.

75. In a word, what we say is: accept the proposal for the conclusion of a peace treaty and the conversion of West Berlin into a Free City on the basis of that treaty, and we will accept proposals for the most effective guarantees for that City which are known to modern international practice. Do not all these proposals of ours ensure respect for the lawful interests of the Western Powers? Surely they provide a solution of the problem for those who are seeking a solution, those who sincerely want to solve the question of a peace treaty by means of negotiation, readiness for which was mentioned yesterday by Mr. Kennedy, President of the United States of America.

76. The solution proposed can inconvenience only those whose hatred for peace and socialism beclouds their vision and who do not see where the policy of preserving the remnants of the last war in Germany is leading. The Soviet proposals can fail to suit only the narrow-minded strategists from the military staffs of NATO or those statesmen who consider West Berlin

to be necessary to that military bloc as a spring-board for a drive to the East. They much prefer the situation as it is, when every day sees the accumulation of more inflammable material owing to the absence of a German peace treaty. Is there not evidence of this in the recent very dangerous provocation committed against the German Democratic Republic, when its air space was invaded by two military jet aircraft equipped for carrying nuclear bombs? Whose were these invading aircraft that used the air corridors, temporarily made available for the transit of unarmed transport aircraft of the three Western occupying Powers, for an incursion deep into the territory of the German Democratic Republic? They were fighter-bombers of the West German "Bundeswehr".

77. The Soviet Government has warned the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, and also the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, that in future any invading military aircraft will, in such circumstances, be destroyed by any available means, including rockets.

78. How do the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France respond to the Soviet Union's proposal for the elaboration of a German peace treaty? Instead of coming to a peace conference table and considering the Soviet proposals in a business-like manner, or putting forward their own proposals, the Western Powers have begun to intensify their military preparations and have gone so far as to threaten, point-blank, the use of force as a response to the conclusion of a peace treaty. We will not enumerate those military measures to which the NATO Powers have resorted in the last few months and which have, so to speak, brought the international situation to boiling-point.

79. The leading politicians of some Western Powers often declare that those Powers will not shrink from a test of strength in answer to the conclusion of a German peace treaty—will not shrink, in other words, from replying with war to the peace which is proposed by the Soviet Government. But the question arises as to whether those bold words are weighed carefully enough, whether it is sufficiently borne in mind that there is a great difference between a declaration of readiness to use force and the use of force itself, if it be considered what such use of force would mean, what consequences it would entail for Europe, for the world and, last but not least, for those States which, for some unknown reason, so often and so vociferously proclaim their readiness to resort to force as an answer to the signing of a German peace treaty.

80. What is there to add in reply to such declarations? I can remind you of the words of the Head of the Soviet Government who stressed that if in response to peace, in response to a peace treaty, force is used—that is, if aggression is committed—the Soviet Union will be compelled to stand up for its just cause, for its security and for the security of its allies, together with whom it is endeavouring to do away with the vestiges of the Second World War through the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

81. There is one other important point which the Soviet delegation would like, most emphatically, to stress. The Soviet Government, as it has more than once declared, will conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone only if, despite all our efforts, no agreement with the Western Powers is reached.

82. If the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France do not proceed to the joint conclusion of a German peace treaty, as the Soviet Government urges them to do, the Soviet Union and the other countries concerned will have no alternative but to conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic and to settle the question of West Berlin on that basis. In that event, no one will be able to reproach us with not having tried to persuade those who were formerly our allies, in the war against Hitler's Germany, to remain our allies in the reaching of a German peace settlement.

83. We should not like to act towards them as they acted towards the Soviet Union when, without its participation, they concluded a peace treaty with Japan. But we are entitled to draw the appropriate conclusions from that circumstance. The upshot is, that when the Governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France conclude a peace treaty with Japan without our participation it is perfectly right and proper, but that when, after repeated appeals to the Governments of those same three Western Powers, their refusal to act jointly with us compels us to conclude a peace treaty without them, such procedure on our part becomes inequitable and improper. So singular an approach to the problem of distinguishing what is lawful and what is unlawful is possible only when the facts are weighed in the imperialist balance. But today, in international affairs, such a balance has no place.

84. It has been said here that there is a possibility of a peaceful solution which would take into account the rightful interests of the peoples in the establishment of European security. Yes, we too favour such a solution. But what, in present circumstances, is meant by safeguarding the interests of European security? It means, first of all, concluding a German peace treaty which would establish the position that has developed in Europe and Germany in consequence of the Second World War, and calling, for that purpose, a peace conference in the very near future.

85. It is two years since our draft of a German peace treaty was communicated to the Governments concerned, and published. There has been ample time in which to study the Soviet proposals and convene a peace conference. Favouring as we do the immediate conclusion of a peace treaty, we advocate the speediest possible calling of a peace conference, open to participation by all States which, with their armed forces, took part in the war against Hitlerite Germany.

86. The conclusion of a German peace treaty involves more than the question of liquidating the problems left over from the last war. It involves the whole question of the fate of the world—the question whether there is to be war or peace. To such a question no single State, no single responsible Government, no single responsible statesman can remain indifferent. No State can be neutral on this issue, just as the United Nations as a whole cannot and should not be a neutral, disinterested observer.

87. Such is the position of the Soviet Government—and, we are happy to declare from this rostrum, such is also the position of our allies—on the subject of a German peace treaty.

88. In the opinion of the Soviet Government, one of the central problems that should be considered at the General Assembly's present session is the problem of disarmament.

89. A good many years have passed since, after the most destructive war that ever descended upon mankind, the States embarked on disarmament negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations. Even today, however, that problem is far from solution, while weapons of ever more lethal form continue to be created and the arsenals bulge with their stockpiles.

90. Two years ago there was an event which breathed new life into the search for ways of stopping the arms race. Many of those present at today's meeting of the General Assembly must surely still remember the day when from this rostrum the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, submitted for the consideration of the United Nations a programme of general and complete disarmament. That programme gave hope to all sincere supporters of disarmament. We are entitled to say that the fourteenth session of the General Assembly fulfilled its duty to the peoples by unanimously adopting a resolution which proclaimed general and complete disarmament to be the most important question facing the world of the day and called upon all countries to make every effort to solve it in the shortest possible time.

91. Everyone knows why the work on the implementation of this resolution proved fruitless and why the activities of the Ten-Nation Committee, charged by the General Assembly to consider the programme of general and complete disarmament, ceased to be meaningful. The primary reason was that the opponents of disarmament did not intend to give way. They did everything possible to obstruct an agreement on general and complete disarmament and to prevent the negotiations, even on that occasion, from breaking out of the cycle of empty talk.

92. What course remained open to a protagonist of disarmament? There was only one—to submit the whole question once more to the General Assembly for consideration. And that was what the Soviet Government did. But even at its next, its fifteenth, session the General Assembly was unable to move the disarmament problem off dead centre. More specifically, it proved unable to adopt clear and unambiguous directives for the drafting of a treaty on general and complete disarmament. Consideration of the disarmament question had to be postponed, because the new Government of the United States had requested time in which to study it. Simultaneously it was agreed that the Soviet Union and the United States of America should engage in bilateral talks on disarmament—an idea which was approved by the General Assembly.

93. This bilateral exchange of views yielded certain positive results. Despite considerable difficulties and despite differences of opinion on many important aspects of the disarmament problem, it proved possible to work out a Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations [A/4879]. The results of the Soviet-American talks on disarmament were well received in the Soviet Union. We have no doubt that they were received with satisfaction in other countries as well.

94. The Joint Statement of Principles, together with the communication of the Soviet Government on the course of the Soviet-American talks has already been circulated to all States Members of the United Nations. If you read the text of the Soviet-American statement, you will see that it expresses, first and foremost, recognition of the need to achieve agreement on a programme of general and complete disarmament. This is yet another indication that the idea of general and

complete disarmament is steadily making headway, in the present international situation, while the forces whose policy is linked with the arms race are finding it ever harder to maintain their positions.

95. If the Joint Statement of Principles is compared with the Soviet disarmament plan, it will easily be seen that the statement contains a number of provisions advocated by the Soviet Government ever since it first came forward with the programme of general and complete disarmament. We allude to those provisions of the Joint Statement relating to: the disbanding of the armed forces of States; the dismantling of military bases; the elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction, the cessation of the production of such weapons, and the elimination of all means of delivering them; the elimination of other forms of armament, and the cessation of their production; the closing of all military training institutions, and the abolition of all institutions designed to organize the military effort of States; and the discontinuance of military expenditures. The Soviet Government has always considered that the combination of these measures should constitute general and complete disarmament. The Agreed Statement of Principles also contains other useful provisions.

96. Thus, as a result of the bilateral exchange of views, there has been presented to the General Assembly a document that may serve as a directive for the purpose of subsequent negotiations for the preparation of an agreement on general and complete disarmament.

97. But is it possible to say that the "green light" has been given and the road for disarmament negotiations is now clear? No, such optimism would today be excessive. It is, of course, a welcome development that the two States—the United States of America and the Soviet Union—which bear the main burden of armaments in the world of today have been able to agree on a common platform for the resumption of disarmament negotiations. But there is a real danger that attempts may be made so to interpret these provisions as to inject into them matter extraneous to genuine disarmament.

98. The Soviet Government deems it impossible to pass over in silence the inability of the parties, during the talks, to settle the fundamental dispute as to whether the subject of discussion should be disarmament and control of disarmament—I repeat, control of disarmament, of general and complete disarmament—or control of armaments. There is no possibility of escaping this question.

99. During the bilateral negotiations, the United States of America, or, more precisely, its representatives, declared—as was only natural and proper—that the armed forces and armaments of States which under the treaty became subject to reduction or abolition at the relevant stage of general and complete disarmament should be placed under strict control. But the representatives of the United States of America added, at the same time, that it would also be necessary to place under control—forthwith, beginning at the very first stage—that part of the armed forces and armaments of States which, under the treaty, was to remain at the States' disposal. Confirmation of this position of the United States of America is also contained in a letter received by us from the United States side at the bilateral disarmament talks after agreement had been reached on the basic principles.

100. How is all this to be understood? If this demand is translated into ordinary human language, if everything is reduced to its simplest terms, then it would appear that States could reduce their armed forces and armaments by a negligible amount—say 5 per cent—but at the same time would have to open all their doors to international control—in other words, to foreign investigation. But what would result from acceptance of this demand, a demand which is in no way dictated by the interests of disarmament? The only result would be to give a potential aggressor information about the armed forces and armaments of the States in which he was interested. That might, precisely, serve the purposes of aggression—purposes, that is, diametrically opposed to those of disarmament. It would, of course, play into the hands of certain circles in the West—into the hands of the military staffs of the NATO military bloc. But no peace-loving State valuing the interests of the peoples' security, the interests of the maintenance of peace, and its own interests, could or would accept the establishment of control over armaments.

101. Such conclusions are substantiated by the fact that our partners in the talks indicate no time-limits for the implementation of an agreement on general and complete disarmament, and that, consequently, the opponents of disarmament could at any time advance some contrived, artificial pretext for obstructing disarmament, having in the meantime secured intelligence regarding the States' armed forces.

102. In an attempt to justify their proposals in this matter, the representatives of the United States of America advance the argument that, unless all the existing armaments of States were subjected to control, the quantities which they still retained after the reduction in armaments and armed forces at any given stage had been implemented would be unknown. Such an argument, however, is completely unfounded. Even now, no one knows what armaments and armed forces are at the disposal of States, simply because, for understandable reasons, States do not disclose such information. And this is entirely natural. The same situation would persist even after implementation of the disarmament measures envisaged for any given stage prior to the completion of general and complete disarmament. Consequently the States' armaments would still remain unknown, but with the substantial difference that a considerable part of the armament would have been liquidated and in that matter effective control would have been established. With the achievement of general and complete disarmament, permanent and all-embracing control would be established—I emphasize, permanent and all-embracing control.

103. If the partisans of control over armaments do not abandon their position—if they do not recede from the position stated from this rostrum by Mr. Eisenhower, the former President of the United States—it will mean that future disarmament negotiations are likewise doomed to failure.

104. Last year the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, stated in this hall that the Soviet Union was ready to accept any proposals for control of disarmament that might be made by the Western Powers, provided that those Powers accepted the proposals of the Soviet Union for general and complete disarmament. So far, no answer to this statement has been received from the Western Powers. I draw the attention of everyone present to this fact: so far, up to this moment, we have received no answer to this declaration by the Head of the Soviet Government. We

received no such answer yesterday, when the position of the United States Government on the question of disarmament was set forth.

105. How do matters in fact stand? Do the Western Powers agree to accept our proposals for general and complete disarmament, if we accept their proposals for control of disarmament? It is essential to secure an answer to this question. We declare again, with all determination, that the Soviet Union will never agree to the establishment of control over armaments.

106. Let us now turn to the question of international armed forces in circumstances of general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Government agrees that such forces should be established in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Their administration—and the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, has said this more than once—must be truly international; that is to say, it must be in the hands of representatives of the three principal groups of States—such representatives having equal rights—and not in the hands of some servitor of the NATO military bloc. We regret that, in this matter as well, our partners in the talks take up a different position. This can only complicate consideration of the disarmament question.

107. The Soviet Government, which put forward the idea of general and complete disarmament, will do everything in its power to give effect to it.

108. The Soviet Government would like to call the attention of the General Assembly to one problem which, though it has to do with organization, is important and has not yet been solved. I refer to the composition of the body which should prepare the treaty on general and complete disarmament.

109. It is well known that the composition of the Ten-Nation Committee, on which five socialist countries and five Western Powers were represented, did not reflect realities, did not reflect the actual distribution of forces in the world and in the United Nations. The neutralist countries, constituting the third major group of States in the world, were not represented in the Ten-Nation Committee. But questions of disarmament cannot be solved without the neutralist countries, whose population represents one third of mankind and whose contribution to the strengthening of peace is by no means small. Of this the Soviet Government is convinced.

110. It might, of course, be said that the neutralist States lack powerful armed forces. That is perfectly true. But it does not follow that questions of disarmament are of no concern to them. No; questions of disarmament, on whose solution the maintenance of world peace depends, affect the vital interests of all States.

111. And if this is so, then countries belonging to all three groups should participate in the disarmament negotiations. It goes without saying that the neutralist countries must have, in the disarmament negotiating body, rights equal to those of the other members of that body, and not—as proposed by the Western Powers—attend its meetings as private individuals, with second-class rights.

112. The Soviet Government fully supports the demand by the participants in the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries that these countries should be represented in all future disarmament negotiations. The Soviet Government insists that the disarmament negotiating body include representatives, with full

powers, from the three main groups of States, without whose participation there can be no constructive negotiations on disarmament.

113. The need for reaching the earliest possible agreement on disarmament would not be stated completely if no reference were made to the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. This is all the more necessary in that attempts have recently been made, in connexion with the Soviet Government's decision to conduct experimental nuclear explosions in the USSR, to distort the true picture and to depart from the course which really leads to a solution of this problem.

114. Many Western statesmen have spoken on this subject recently. But their statements miss the mark and avoid the real issue. There is plenty of demagoguery in them, but no proper evaluation of the position and of the reasons which compelled the Soviet Union to take this decision.

115. The Soviet Government has clearly stated that it took the step in question with a heavy heart. It did so in the face of hard facts, in reply to direct threats by the United States and its NATO allies to use force if a German peace treaty should be signed. Given the Western Powers' massive military preparations directed against our country and other socialist countries, the Government of the USSR had no choice but to take steps to strengthen the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union.

116. You also know that the NATO military bloc was systematically—I repeat, systematically—conducting nuclear weapons tests, as though nothing were amiss, during the whole period when the Soviet Union was not conducting such tests—the period which is often called the "moratorium". The fact that these tests were conducted by the French does not alter the position in the least. It is of no real significance to the Soviet Union which of the NATO Powers it is that acquires new information as a result of experiments with nuclear weapons. The nuclear tests by France were part of an over-all programme for the strengthening of NATO's military potential. In consequence, that bloc and the States belonging to it gained a definite military advantage in relation to the Soviet Union, which since 1958 had carried out no nuclear weapons tests.

117. Let everyone in this hall put himself in the Soviet Union's position and answer how he would have acted if one of the Members of the NATO military bloc, systematically ignoring the Soviet Union's pledge regarding the conduct of tests, had proceeded to make a nuclear test.

118. We warned the Americans, the English and, of course, the French that if France continued nuclear weapons tests the Soviet Union would also be obliged to resume such testing. What answer was given to the Soviet Government's warnings? It was announced that the tests were continuing and would continue. If there were no other reason, but merely this reason of nuclear tests by France, that alone would fully justify the resumption of nuclear weapons testing by the Soviet Union.

119. It must also be stressed that the United States and the United Kingdom have never agreed to a complete cessation of all nuclear weapons tests. They have always tried, and still are trying, to leave themselves loopholes to legalize the perfection of nuclear weapons. First they proposed—and they are now again proposing—that the agreement should not cover under-

ground test explosions of nuclear weapons; that is, precisely those explosions which they had long since prepared for the purpose of designing new types of nuclear weapons, as has now been confirmed by the latest American underground tests. Then they proposed the legalization of so-called nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, although it is well known that in explosions for peaceful purposes the nuclear devices used are the same as those employed in explosions for military purposes.

120. No, gentlemen—we say to the Governments of the Western Powers—if you want honest co-operation with us, do not try to cheat and put the Soviet Union in a position of inequality.

121. The hypocrisy of the cry raised in Western capitals about the harmful effects of nuclear tests on human health is obviously a mile off. It is amazing that they made that "discovery" there precisely after the decision to conduct nuclear weapons tests had been taken by the Soviet Union. Where were they before, these people who are now carried away by this studied compassion for human beings? Why were they not concerned about the pollution of the atmosphere and the poisoning of surface water by radio-active deposits, when for a period of several years explosions of American and British nuclear bombs were resounding over the expanses of the Pacific Ocean and in the United States itself? After all, the Western Powers have detonated many more nuclear explosions, all told, than the Soviet Union has.

122. What is most surprising is that this ostentatious concern for humanity is being displayed by the very people whose actions and policies are pushing the world towards the disaster of nuclear war. Pushing things to a nuclear war, whose flames would consume whole States and incalculable material and cultural resources—that is considered a normal procedure; but nuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union for the purpose of raising a new barrier in the path of war—that is abnormal. It is clear that the Western Powers' position on the question of nuclear tests contains not a grain of genuine concern for the future of humanity. It is theatrical and false in character.

123. Yes, the Soviet Government is conducting nuclear weapons tests, is constructing new types of nuclear weapons, is showing and will continue to show concern for strengthening the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union and of our allies who, together with the Soviet Union, are pursuing a policy of peace and, like us, advocate general and complete disarmament. The Soviet Union is being forced to all this by the actions of the NATO Powers. The position will change if these Powers renounce their aggressive policy and tread the path of general and complete disarmament.

124. We do not propose to make questions of the Soviet Union's security the subject of imperialistic arbitration on the part of NATO. We do not propose to allow them to be decided by those who are forging weapons of war day in day out, who have established dozens and dozens of military bases in areas adjacent to the Soviet Union.

125. The Soviet Government was not lacking in patience when we negotiated with the Western Powers on disarmament questions as a whole and on the question of prohibiting nuclear weapons tests in particular. The Soviet Government did everything possible to facilitate the reaching of an agreement with the Western Powers. But these Powers responded by

making their policy increasingly aggressive and by intensifying their military preparations to the point of direct provocation. They responded with treachery, continuing nuclear tests when the Soviet Union had engaged in no such tests over a long period.

126. What is the way out of the situation which has arisen over the question of nuclear weapons tests? There is a way out, and the Soviet Government is proposing it. It consists of reaching agreement on the questions raised by general and complete disarmament. Such an agreement will also mean the solving of the question of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

127. We understand the attitude of those States which do not possess nuclear weapons and sincerely desire that the testing of such weapons should be completely and universally prohibited. But in this connexion we must emphasize, with all the firmness at our command, that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests alone, with the international situation as it is now—I repeat, with the international situation as it is now—would not reduce the danger of a nuclear and rocket war.

128. For it is well known that, in the absence of an agreement on general and complete disarmament, the arms race—including the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons—would continue and that the stockpiling of these weapons would consequently also continue, quite apart from the fact that the existing stocks would remain intact. Meanwhile, the amounts of nuclear weapons already in existence are such that their use in war would entail the most terrible results for the world. In the case of States with comparatively small territories and a high population density, the consequences would be catastrophic. These are facts, cold facts.

129. Moreover, if the Soviet Union had not resumed nuclear weapons testing, that would have greatly increased the danger of war. Yes, increased; since the aggressive forces might have been tempted to embark upon adventures and to overstep the boundary beyond which yawns the abyss of nuclear war.

130. The conclusion of a separate agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests whilst the Western Powers continue the arms race can only create the illusion that something is being done to avert nuclear war, whereas in fact the Western Powers are heading straight towards it. The conclusion of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear testing, in such circumstances and outside a programme of general and complete disarmament, could only give the peoples a false sense of security, acting as a kind of opiate to lessen their vigilance for the preservation of peace.

131. If States carry out general and complete disarmament under effective international control, if all forms of weapons, including nuclear ones, are destroyed and the armies disbanded, the incentive to perfect nuclear weapons will disappear, and hence the incentive to test them. There will then no longer be any sense in testing nuclear weapons on the ground, underground, in the atmosphere or in outer space; there will in fact be nothing to test, since all nuclear weapons will have been destroyed. In this way, the difficulties which have arisen in negotiations over the question of control, including control of the prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, will also disappear. Of course, the most careful international control will be needed during general and complete disarmament, and the control bodies must be granted free access into every nook and cranny, without a veto or restrictions of any kind.

132. At the present time the question of the cessation of all nuclear tests can be resolved only on the basis of general and complete disarmament, since the conclusion of a separate agreement on the cessation of tests would not solve the main problem of removing the threat of nuclear war and could be used by certain circles to achieve their aggressive aims. General and complete disarmament would not only preserve the health of mankind; it would save its very life, and deliver it from the threat of bombardment by destructive, death-dealing nuclear weapons.

133. The position of the USSR in the matter of nuclear weapons tests is set forth in detail in a memorandum on this subject [A/4893] which the Soviet Government is submitting to the General Assembly.

134. The Soviet Government, as it has repeatedly stated, considers it desirable that, *pari passu* with negotiations on general and complete disarmament, an agreement should be reached to carry out a number of measures designed to reduce international tension, to strengthen trust between States and, by this means, to facilitate solution of the disarmament problem. Amongst such measures we envisage the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact countries, the creation of atom-free zones, the withdrawal of foreign troops from territories, and other steps. Detailed proposals on these questions are set out in the special memorandum which the Soviet Government is putting before the General Assembly.

135. I repeat, the implementation of these measures must not be made dependent on an agreement on disarmament questions, and the achievement of a disarmament agreement must not be made conditional on a decision to take the steps that I have indicated.

136. In this connexion, particular attention should be paid to the importance of withdrawing troops from foreign territories within the national boundaries of States. As you know, there still exist foreign troops, and numerous foreign military bases, on the territories of many States. In a number of cases the disposition of these troops and bases on foreign territory constitutes direct military occupation, aggression, pregnant with the danger of serious international complications. Surely it is obvious, for instance, that there can be no talk of a lasting peace in the Far East so long as part of the basic territory of China—the island of Taiwan—continues to be occupied by American troops.

137. The Soviet Government would like to express its confidence that the General Assembly, having considered the disarmament problem and measures designed to reduce international tension, will be able to take decisions which will open a new chapter in the peoples' struggle to translate into fact mankind's centuries-old dream—the creation of a world without weapons, a world without war.

138. A year ago the General Assembly, on the initiative of the Soviet Union, adopted a resolution containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [1514 (XV)]. You will well remember the long and impassioned discussion in the United Nations, and throughout the world, which preceded the adoption of this Declaration. Nobody will deny that the United Nations Declaration struck a heavy blow at the colonial system of government and at colonialism as a whole. Naturally, the Declaration did not please the colonizers.

139. The question arises: what has been done, and what remains to be done, to implement the Declaration?

140. Over the past year, the former United Kingdom colony of Sierra Leone has become independent and United Kingdom trusteeship over the territory of the Cameroons has come to an end. In December of this year Tanganyika, and in January 1962 Western Samoa, will be declared independent.

141. In Algeria and Angola, in Kenya and Uganda, in Rhodesia, Nyasaland and West Irian, the peoples' struggle to free themselves is constantly gaining momentum. It is because of the self-sacrificing struggle of the Congolese people, supported by its many friends throughout the world, that it has been possible to thwart the original schemes of the colonizers and their associates. In the Congo there has been set up a national Government which is recognized by the overwhelming majority of the world's States. However, the situation in the Congo is disturbing—the colonizers do not want to leave the country, they are hatching plans to dismember the Republic of the Congo and to detach from it the rich province of Katanga. The imperialists are making a suspicious fuss about the Congo and we do not want to be present at another performance by the colonizers to cover up an imperialist deal to share out the riches of Katanga. True, the colonizers are quite happy to trip each other up in the Congo, but the danger of the country being stifled by a new agreement between them still remains.

142. The liberation movement is dealing colonialism some crushing blows but the colonial system is not yet completely demolished. At the beginning of 1962, territories with a population of more than 70 million will still be under colonial domination.

143. Look at what is happening in Africa. In Algeria a criminal colonial war continues. There is no need to go through the list of the colonizers' misdeeds in that country. Much is being said about that in the General Assembly and in the Press, including the French Press. From time to time the French Government enters into negotiations with the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic. But unfortunately these negotiations produce no results, because the French side breaks them off as soon as they have started. The reason for this is that the French Government, while paying lip-service to the Algerian people's right to self-determination, is still trying to suppress the embattled people of Algeria by force of arms. The United Nations must not reconcile itself to this situation, but must raise its voice in defence of the Algerian people.

144. The peoples of the Soviet Union are deeply indignant at the persecution of the non-white population in the Republic of South Africa, which, with its apartheid policy, is like a modern version of ancient slave-owning Rome, where for every freeman there were several slaves who were deprived of elementary human rights.

145. You know that this policy of suppressing national movements of liberation is, not the independent policy of individual colonial Powers, but the collective policy of the Powers which have formed themselves into the North Atlantic military bloc, NATO. Could Portugal wage a colonial war of destruction in Angola and keep 13 million people under its domination in its colonies? Of course not. Portugal is a small backward State, which is really a protectorate of certain imperialist Powers.

146. Could the bloody events in Bizerta have taken place if the NATO countries had not supported the colonizers against Tunisia? No, they could not.

147. Among the States members of NATO there is a kind of division of labour in colonial policy, although from time to time an internecine battle for the riches of the colonies takes place. However, the general trend of this military bloc's policy is one of mutual responsibility and mutual support as between the colonizers.

148. The representatives of the colonial Powers sometimes try, in this hall, to preach democratic freedoms and human rights. They talk about the so-called "free world", although in actual fact they play the executioner in the colonies to this day. They constantly assert that the peoples of the colonial countries are not yet mature enough to govern themselves. To listen to these gentlemen one would think that the real purpose of exterminating the people of Angola and its intelligentsia is to create conditions in which Angola can become independent. And presumably the colonizers have for the last eight years been destroying the flower of the Algerian people in order to prepare Algeria for independent self-government. What hypocrisy!

149. But not long ago they were saying and doing the same things in regard to those countries which have now achieved independence, which are developing successfully as independent States and whose representatives are with us in this hall.

150. Can the General Assembly ignore the existing situation and avoid taking measures to implement the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples? No, it cannot do so, unless it wants to lose the confidence of those peoples. I should like to recall the warning given by the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, who said in this hall on 12 October 1960, during the fifteenth session of the General Assembly:

"The General Assembly must realize in all earnestness that unless steps are taken with the utmost dispatch, colonialism will remain capable of inflicting much further suffering and hardship, of ruining millions upon millions of further lives and of provoking armed conflicts and wars, thereby threatening peace and security not only in individual areas but throughout the world." [902nd meeting, paragraph 7].

151. The Soviet Government supports the decision of the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, recently held at Belgrade, which formally declared the need for the immediate, unconditional, complete and final abolition of colonialism. The Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples was colonialism's death sentence, and this sentence must be carried out. We support the demand made at the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries that 1962 should see the final liquidation of colonial régimes everywhere. We consider that this appeal must be supported here and that the United Nations should give it the status of an international decision.

152. The Government of the Soviet Union has proposed that the item "The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples" should be discussed at the present session. We hope that appropriate measures will be taken as a result of such discussion.

153. The Soviet Government believes that first of all the United Nations should firmly demand the immediate and unconditional cessation of terrorism and colonial wars. It is essential to effect the withdrawal of all the Administering Powers' forces and the complete liquidation of all foreign military bases in colonies, Trust Territories and other Non-Self-Governing Territories. The peoples of all colonial countries, without exception, must be given the opportunity to enjoy democratic rights and freedoms in practice.

154. All colonial laws and regulations based on racial discrimination or banning or limiting the activities of political parties, trade unions and other public organizations must be immediately revoked. In all colonial countries, elections to the legislative organs must be held on the basis of universal suffrage, and genuinely national democratic institutions must be set up. All power must be transferred to these bodies, and all organs of the colonial administration, whether working openly or under cover, must cease to operate.

155. All agreements of a colonial nature, whether secret or not, which are designed to limit the sovereignty of the newly emerging independent States, must be completely annulled.

156. The Soviet Government considers it essential that a United Nations commission should be set up to exercise strict and unceasing control over the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and over the measures which I have described. It submits for your consideration a memorandum on the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration [A/4889] and expresses the hope that the proposals made therein will obtain the support of the States represented in the United Nations.

157. We all fully realize that the achievement of independence by former colonial countries is a result of the struggle engaged in by the peoples of the colonies and their many friends throughout the world. Those who oppress the colonial peoples will stop at nothing in order to be able to go on plundering those countries, even after they have gained political independence. To this end the colonial Powers use the methods of economic, political, military and diplomatic pressure, seeking to preserve the colonial character of these countries' economies and the system by which they are exploited.

158. Unequal agreements binding many young States of Africa and Asia, military establishments on the territory of former colonial countries, bases of colonialism in various parts of the world, military colonial blocs, constant interference in the internal affairs of States, various forms of economic subjugation and domination—such are the manifestations of colonialism against which many peoples are obliged to battle hourly in the fight for their independence and freedom. This is the true face of the military colonial blocs, the true face of colonialism.

159. In the modern world, there are various social systems and ideologies. In these circumstances there is no way to preserve peace other than the peaceful coexistence of States. Of course, peaceful coexistence is not just a temporary absence of military conflict between States, reminiscent of an unstable truce. Peace on such a shaky basis would be neither solid nor lasting. Peaceful coexistence presupposes the development of trade and of economic, cultural, scientific and other ties between States.

160. An indispensable condition for peaceful coexistence is unconditional recognition of the fact that it is the inalienable right of each country to establish its own social and political order. Only the individual nations are entitled to decide how they wish to live, what way of life they wish to follow.

161. But within the precincts of the United Nations one sometimes hears statements to the effect that the leaders of certain States dislike the domestic systems of the socialist States, whose representatives sit in this very United Nations hall. Such leaders have more than once execrated socialism, socialist doctrine and the systems in the socialist countries. We reply, as we have replied before: the socialist States came into being by the will of their peoples. They did not request permission to appear from those who now condemn such systems. They exist and are growing, and we are proud that their strength is increasing daily and that the socialist social system is revealing the grandeur and brilliance of its expanding potential.

162. We do not dictate to others what systems they shall have. But we declare categorically that we shall not allow anybody to tell the socialist countries what their systems should be. We, too, dislike the domestic systems of some countries where everything—the labour, the feelings and the desires of millions and tens of millions of people—is subordinated to the interests of a trifling minority who hold all power and wealth in their hands. We might find much to say about such systems, but we do not say it, because we came here for entirely different purposes.

163. The United Nations is precisely the world centre from which the struggle to implement the principles of peaceful coexistence can best be organized. Not so very long ago the leaders of certain Western Powers were afraid—indeed, some are still afraid—to pronounce the words "peaceful coexistence", regarding them as a species of communist enticement or communist trap. Yet this concept is already in permanent international use.

164. The United Nations cannot fulfil its task of consolidating peace and promoting international collaboration so long as the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the Organization have not been restored. All who are concerned to strengthen peace and wish to make the United Nations into a genuine instrument for peace and collaboration among States should take steps for the immediate restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and for the expulsion of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique from all United Nations organs.

165. During the twelve years that have elapsed since the people's power was established in China, the Western Powers, and the United States of America in particular, have prevented the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. But Washington's dislike of China's domestic system is no reason for violating the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China. The people of a country, and no one else, decides whether its Government shall be changed. The United Nations may only recognize the Government; it is not entitled to discuss what Government should be in power in a particular country, still less to approve or disapprove its existence. For the United Nations to assume any other attitude on this question would constitute patent interference in China's domestic affairs, which is entirely inadmissible under the United Nations Charter.

166. The Soviet Government is gratified that the resistance of those who for an entire decade have prevented the General Assembly from considering the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations has finally, at the General Assembly's sixteenth session, been broken down. This very important item has now been included in the agenda for the session, and the Assembly will express its influential view on the issue.

167. To all appearances, however, those opposing the restoration of the People's Republic of China's lawful rights in the United Nations have not really surrendered but have merely changed their tactics. It is rumoured that they would like to force this question into some sort of special commission so as to postpone a decision once more, although the question is perfectly clear and requires no further study in any commission or committee.

168. These manoeuvres have a clear purpose: to spread the aggressive and completely fallacious theory of "two Chinas". But no State that bases its policy on realities and displays concern for the maintenance of peace, no honest person anywhere in the world, will ever agree to those political corpses, the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique who have entrenched themselves on Taiwan under the protection of United States bayonets, continuing to occupy a seat in the United Nations. Needless to say, the Soviet Union and all the genuine friends of the People's Republic of China are prepared today, as always, to reject firmly all attempts to put additional obstacles in the way of the restoration of the People's Republic of China's lawful rights in the United Nations with the help of the imperialist theory of "two Chinas".

169. Depriving the People's Republic of China—one of the greatest Powers on earth—of its lawful rights in the United Nations does irreparable damage to all activities of this Organization and seriously hampers the consideration in the United Nations of a number of important international questions, such as general and complete disarmament, the final liquidation of the colonial system, the economic development of under-developed countries, and other questions which cannot be solved without the collective effort of all States.

170. The Soviet Government appeals to the General Assembly, and to all the Governments represented in it, to put an end to the present intolerable situation in which the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique are unlawfully usurping China's seat in the United Nations. We are convinced that any Government which really stands for peace and for general and complete disarmament cannot fail to support this equitable view. Any Government represented in the United Nations which casts its vote with the opponents of the restoration of the People's Republic of China's lawful rights in the United Nations and against those who favour respecting the inalienable rights of the Chinese people, strengthening the United Nations and consolidating peace and collaboration among all States, regardless of their social systems, will bear a heavy responsibility.

171. At the last session of the General Assembly, Cuba was warmly applauded. The people of this country has accomplished a great revolutionary feat by overthrowing the tyrant Batista and the foreign monopolies, and has boldly taken the new road of a free and independent life.

172. What do the Cubans want? They want to govern their country themselves, to use its wealth themselves,

and to adopt the system and way of life that they prefer. Is not this in line with the principles and high purposes to which the States Members of the United Nations subscribed in signing the Organization's Charter? And is it not a crime to organize against Cuba—whose people wishes to build its own State in independence—subversive activities, an economic blockade, and armed intervention?

173. The General Assembly cannot overlook the fact that those who organized the recent intervention are hatching fresh criminal plots against the Cuban people. The Soviet Union's attitude towards that imperialistic policy is well known. Its warnings remain in force.

174. It would be desirable for the situation in Laos to be restored to normal, at the earliest possible moment, and for an agreement to be reached enabling Laos to develop as an independent and neutral State. We hope that the three-Power negotiations in Laos for the formation of a Government of national unity headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma, and the Geneva conversations concerning non-interference in the domestic affairs of Laos and respect for its independence and neutrality, will end in success. The Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, is in favour of settling this problem promptly and of signing, even tomorrow, the necessary agreement. It is now for others to play their part.

175. Peaceful coexistence is closely linked with the problem of overcoming the backwardness of the industrially under-developed countries, a position which they inherited from colonialism and imperialism. As the Head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, has frequently stressed, the present level of science and technology makes it possible to solve the problem of the economic backwardness of the under-developed countries within a brief period of time—during the life of one generation. If only a part of the huge amounts spent by States on military items and the arms race were converted to peaceful economic construction, all the necessary engineering projects and undertakings, which are at present impracticable, for developing the vast natural wealth of Africa, Asia and Latin America could be carried out in a comparatively short space of time.

176. The United Nations is called upon to serve these lofty aims of peace and the peaceful coexistence of States. The principles of equality of rights and respect for the sovereignty of States, great and small, and the principles of economic collaboration and progress laid down in the United Nations Charter must cease to be merely fine phrases and highflown turns of speech. They must become a basic and unconditional rule in relations between States, binding upon all. The Soviet Union has supported and will continue to support that view.

177. As is well known, three main groups of States have now taken shape in the international arena—the socialist countries, the countries belonging to the Western military blocs, and the neutral States. The problem is to work out agreed solutions which take into account the legitimate interests of these different groups of States; unless this is done, the United Nations cannot become an effective centre for harmonizing the States' activities. Nevertheless, some Powers want to control the situation by using the United Nations as their own apparatus. So far, all States have not had equality of representation in the organs of the United Nations; the Organization's structure has not

yet been adjusted to reflect the real pattern of power in the international arena.

178. At the fifteenth session [869th meeting, paras. 282-285], the Head of the Soviet Government put forward a proposal for reorganizing the structure of the United Nations. The events of the past year have shown how the completely abnormal, lop-sided structure of the United Nations and the one-sided composition of its main organs have seriously impaired international collaboration.

179. It is sometimes asserted that implementation of the Soviet Union's proposals would paralyse the Organization's activities. But such a contention is absurd. The United Nations will not be paralysed by the reorganization that we propose. What will be rendered ineffective or, if you will, paralysed is the mainspring for the policy of some Powers which is designed to subordinate the United Nations to the narrow, selfish interests of certain military blocs. But is that a matter for regret?

180. On the contrary, the activities of the United Nations will then rest on a more durable foundation. Certain people seek to depict the situation which has now arisen in the United Nations Secretariat as in some sort a "crisis" of the entire Organization. To this we reply: an organization that fell into a critical situation whenever the post of its administrative head became vacant would not be worth twopence. Crises in the United Nations, as well as greater effectiveness in its work, can be brought about only by States Members of the Organization acting through the principal organs on which they are represented—primarily, that is, the Security Council and the General Assembly.

181. We favour a prompt solution of the question concerning the leadership of the United Nations Secretariat, on a basis reflecting the real situation that obtains in the world today. The Security Council should deal with this problem, since the Council must be the principal body to express an opinion on the matter. But we should like to warn those who consider that the Secretariat should continue to work at the beck and call of a particular group of States that they will meet with determined opposition from our side. We urge the States Members of the United Nations to decide this question by agreement; the decision may be a temporary one to start with, but it should be such as will not widen the existing gulf between States but will create a firmer basis for collaboration within the framework of the United Nations. Precisely because there is no such collaboration at present, the United Nations has been powerless to stop the tragic course of events in the Congo, Angola, Bizerta and Algeria.

182. The Soviet Government firmly supports the policy of the peaceful coexistence of States having different social and economic systems. All our vast economic plans constitute eloquent confirmation of the fundamentally peaceful policy of the socialist Soviet State.

183. The magnificent, practical and scientifically-grounded aim of the Soviet people is to increase industrial production approximately two and a half times within ten years. Our plan is one of peace and of peaceful economic competition with the capitalist countries. The chief objective of the Soviet Union's foreign policy has been, and still is, to ensure peaceful conditions for such constructive work within the USSR and other friendly socialist countries, and, together

with all peace-loving countries, to save mankind from a destructive world war.

184. We aim at the broadest possible extension and development of all economic and other useful ties with every single State, including of course the independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, but also the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and other developed capitalist countries.

185. We are not pessimists, and do not see the horizon as hopelessly darkened by the leaden clouds of approaching war. The world situation is serious and does not inspire complacency. The sixteenth session of the United Nations is meeting in troubled times. But this makes it all the more incumbent upon us to act resolutely and do everything in our power to make the international horizon brighter, so that the warm sun of lasting peace may finally shine upon mankind.

186. Mr. VELA HERVAS (Ecuador) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, on behalf of the Ecuadorian delegation, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your appointment.

187. It is a very great privilege for me, as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador, to attend the opening of the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, and to begin my statement in these august precincts by expressing my country's most cordial greetings to the delegations here present from all the countries of the world.

188. All problems become actual at this rostrum, before the expectant eyes of the world, and all men anxious for peace and yearning for a better life, fix their hopes here.

189. However, the agony of peoples appearing to have found its most significant expression in the grandeur of sacrifice, we agree with the philosopher's view that only "where there is a Calvary is there a Redeemer", and nothing can be more true, in the profound philosophy which derives from life itself the optimistic conviction that life has a meaning, than the saying that "it is the dead who lead us". Here, in this solemn moment of recollection when one man's life has been transformed into a light showing the way for humanity, let us consecrate our thoughts and pay homage to the glorious memory of Dag Hammarskjöld.

190. At this moment, mankind is living in a world of contradictions; we exalt the ideals of peace, theories are advanced which kindle hopes for a better life and, in the field of ideas, remedies are proposed for all problems. At the same time, however, we are faced with a bloody and ironic reality in which poverty is rampant, the rule of law is broken, the freedom of the peoples is denied, human dignity is disregarded, national feelings are distorted through lack of understanding and are judged, not in a proper sociological light, but from a limited political standpoint and in which unsuspected desires for destruction and war are manifesting themselves.

191. Ecuador, like all the countries of America, young in history and still hopeful for the peace which the immense natural wealth of the world can offer, has faith in the decisions of this high body, this signal contributor to the future of mankind, the General Assembly of the United Nations.

192. Here we confront the enormous responsibility and ineluctable duty of this world Organization: first and foremost to work for peace and, in addition to this noble task, to strive at the same time to ensure that

the fruits of peace are not lost, and that the world once again becomes a place of opportunity and security for all mankind. We cannot, even for a moment, ignore the agonies of the present, and we must recognize as an unequivocal fact that the hour of the emancipation of the peoples has come.

193. If we disregarded this historical phenomenon, which nothing and nobody can alter and which I have called the emancipation of the peoples, not only would we be fleeing reality, but we would be leaving the way open for lawless and conflicting forces to undermine the very basis of our civilization.

194. When the United Nations was founded, shortly after the end of the last World War, it was said that it was not being created to find a speedy solution to all the world's problems, but to prevent those problems from leading the way to the abyss of war and slavery.

195. The world Organization does not and cannot constitute a universal panacea for all the ills of our day; but it can and should play an extremely important part in eliminating the worst of those dangers which involve a threat to the peace of the world, by which I mean, to the very existence of civilized man.

196. Mankind is in fact passing through a very grave moral, material, political and sociological crisis such as it has not known at any other period in its history, and, it should be stressed that, as at no other period of history, action cannot be postponed or delayed, because the time for talk has passed. Today, peoples no longer believe in empty phrases or in dialectical theories; they have lost their faith in speeches.

197. Of the four freedoms proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter^{3/} during the Second World War, the peoples are justly claiming the right to live in "freedom from fear", and the right to freedom from fear does not mean only that they should feel free from the imminent threat of a new war, but also and above all that they should be able to lead their lives in freedom from the threat of hunger, of poverty, of slum living conditions, of ignorance and of malnutrition. The borderline of hunger, as someone once called it with cruel but realistic frankness, today divides mankind in two. The erasing of that frontier is the vital task confronting Governments, statesmen and politicians today. The United Nations also has a duty to bring about a transformation of this frontier which is the symbol of the modern age, a transformation which we must bring about in order to establish a world which will not only be more secure for ourselves, but also more secure, brighter and more joyful for the generations who will come after us.

198. The Latin American peoples, young and powerful, rich in strength and spiritual resources, have also been going through an acute political and constitutional upheaval, with the obvious divergencies deriving from their varying sizes and the political, economic and social factors that have arisen in the course of their social progress. We have not escaped the influence of this time of emancipation of peoples. The countries of our American continent, many of which have potential riches that await only immediately effective plans for their development, have found themselves held back in their material and social progress by various factors which have seriously inhibited their development. Victims or prisoners of geography, on the one hand, and forced by their infant economies, shortages of

capital and technical knowledge and lack of communications on the other, to face a series of problems, some common to all and others particular to each nation, we have encountered difficulties, but we have retained and nurtured the spirit which is necessary for overcoming all obstacles, because, happily, the Latin spirit includes among its most noble attributes the admirable virtue of idealism.

199. The common problems of the American continent derive from the lack of political and commercial unity among the peoples and the absence of certain vital factors which are essential for industrial development and therefore for modern economic life.

200. Unfortunately, these economically and politically divided countries reveal many crooks in their social and political structure and a number of shortcomings which seriously affect their future. The still-feudal system of land tenure, the population explosion, the alarming shortage of means of transport, the problem of arid lands and of vast uncultivated and uninhabited expanses, the unexplored jungles, the one-crop economies, the river systems which are unsuitable for navigation, the desert areas, and, above all, the antiquated methods used to exploit their vast natural wealth, combine to form a discouraging picture for which a definitive solution must be found if we do not wish to see major social discontent break out sooner or later.

201. Bearing in mind all these factors, which help us to understand these problems better at the world level, we are not misled by the rational desire of all peoples to overcome such problems and to aspire in human fashion to a better life, nor do we attempt to tag all social movements with a particular ideological label.

202. My ideal would be to make it possible for all mankind to satisfy its most elemental needs—in a real sense of the meaning of life and an objective application of the true principle of liberalism—for if we fail to understand this new era, and if we ignore the yearning of the masses, if we insist upon specious and passing classifications of the impulses by which men are moved at this time, the result will be, quite clearly and simply, that we shall be forced to witness a "radical solution" of the historical situation through which we are living.

203. The harsh conditions of material existence in which our peoples live have rendered the politico-social situation on the American continent more acute. We cannot shut our eyes to this important reality. Any Government which ignores it, any statesmen who disregard it will fall victims to their own blindness and obstinacy. Peoples cannot live, as it were, on the fringe of history; history is written in the blood of all the uprisings of the past, and the period of insurgency of the Latin American peoples is simply part of the history of the contemporary world, and of our civilization, which we must preserve, unless we wish to ignore the needs of our time and let slip by the final opportunity to achieve more settled conditions in the present day world.

204. With its specialized agencies, its programmes of technical assistance and its plans for social development, the United Nations can do much for our peoples, for we do not consider that the world Organization is a forum, an exalted forum where we should merely discuss problems relating to peace—though those problems are certainly the most acute and important for the Organization. It should also be a force which we

^{3/} Proclaimed on 14 August 1941.

must use to meet the essential needs of the peoples, for we must realize that, in the long run, so to act is to work for peace and mutual understanding, for the sympathy and comprehension which are created by efforts to avoid the abysses which lie in the path of our generation.

205. A great deal is said about democracy, about the fight for democracy, and about the urgent need for action to consolidate the victories so far won and to make them secure against all dangers, against all passions and against all the minor wars which are still being fought in this turbulent world in which we live. However, this requires unflinching endeavour and a real readiness for sacrifice. Democracy is not and cannot be merely liberty, or government of the people, by the people and for the people, or even the noblest and purest republican principles. Democracy also means working steadily and tirelessly to make the whole world a happier place, more fit for men to live in. And a happy world can only be brought into being if, through the self-determination of peoples—who are the sole masters of their own destinies—all those dictatorial régimes disappear which offend human dignity. A world fit for men to live in can be attained only if all the forces of democracy exert themselves to ensure for the peoples, not only a maximum of liberty, but also a minimum of comfort, welfare and social progress. Once the peoples feel secure, once they are aware and conscious that they have a native soil on which to live, aware that they have sure safeguards, fully guaranteed and genuinely effective, for their material advancement—then the exercise of their civic rights is the simple exercise of a conviction: conviction in the advantages of a democracy which permits not only free political activity but also the crystallization of man's most human and natural aspirations for a better life. It is then that alien theories, totalitarian terror and extremist doctrines of all kinds cease to present even a potential danger. Political democracy without economic and social democracy, without respect for the freedom and self-determination of peoples and without respect for the dignity of man in the light of his most noble spiritual attributes, is not real democracy.

206. We must recognize that the great currents of history cannot be stopped. If a people tries to ignore these currents which impel us onward, whether we like it or not, it is likely to be destroyed in a tragic maelstrom of civil war and class struggle. Let us accept these currents of history, and realize that this crucial moment in the life of mankind is not so much the hour of the peoples as simply the hour of man himself, of man working in this complex world, of man yearning for what is his by right on the grounds of his human condition, his dignity as a man and above all as a free man: a clean home in the sun, secure and dependable employment and the logical enjoyment of all the comforts of the modern age.

207. Throughout the world, the last decade has, without doubt, been distinguished by two unique phenomena: the social pressure of the masses, expressed in the desire for a better life; and the demand of colonial peoples for independence, and of others for self-determination and control of their own political destiny.

208. The age of the subjection of men has passed. It is therefore all the more evident that the age of the subjection of peoples is passing and must go for ever.

209. It should not be forgotten, however, that the old theories upheld by the countries which possessed or

possess, even on a very small scale, colonial territories, still survive today; for the conviction with which they defended or defend these theories is based, in reality, on politico-economic imperatives which unquestionably need to be overcome in this modern age, in view of the just and legitimate desire for independence, a desire deriving from the irrevocable and indomitable aspiration of men for freedom.

210. Ecuador considers this approach to be of particular importance, and, within the world Organization, has continually and consistently given its support to any proposal that recognizes the right of peoples to achieve full sovereignty, thus giving them the moral assistance which they needed in order to consolidate and guarantee their independence; for we have a moral obligation to assist the new States which, having passed through the colonial stage, can and must now take their place, in their own right, in the world community of free and sovereign peoples. This is the position we take, and it should be noted that our support for this position must be and always had to be consistent with the clear and decisive position of the Government of Ecuador, headed at the present time by a statesman of firm and deeply held liberal convictions, in harmony with the clearly defined position of my Government, within its general principles of international policy.

211. The United Nations has an imperative duty and inescapable obligation to preserve world peace. All the countries making up this great world Organization must act in conformity with this natural and logical faith and trust which give the United Nations its strength and its very *raison d'être*.

212. Because of its very nature and the role it has to perform, the United Nations must be an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security. However, that obviously does not preclude the conclusion of direct arrangements and agreements between Member States, which aim to promote international harmony, in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

213. Hans Kelsen says that no State is "sovereign", legally speaking, since all are subject to the authority of international law. The United Nations, born after the tragic interlude of the last war, is the one, qualified, authoritative and competent organ for the preservation of justice, law and peace among the countries of the world.

214. As a faithful reflection of modern life and an irrefutable manifestation of the history of the present day world, the two trends into which the latter is divided or appears to be divided are also to be found in the world Organization. It is undeniable that the cold war has penetrated into the chambers of the United Nations, particularly into the General Assembly and the Security Council. An ideological battle is taking place within the Organization. We cannot deny the facts of the situation because to deny that the conflict exists will not take anything from the tremendous seriousness with which the problem, so painful and even tragic in its possibilities, is being fought out on the world stage. However, while the world Organization cannot be a shelter for any form of political proselytism, it nevertheless has the inescapable duty of seeking the best path towards the most just and honourable solutions.

215. This being the situation, we must accept it in its brutal reality, and prudent courses adopted within the strict limits of legal order will provide the best means

for settling differences that still appear beyond solution, and for dealing with extremist attitudes which, with an understanding approach, can undoubtedly be overcome.

216. Ecuador has always founded its international policy on a profound respect for law, justice and peace. Its present Government, which is a completely democratic one with a very liberal outlook—being guided by the ideals and actions of Dr. José María Velasco Ibarra, a statesman who is unswerving in his convictions, his love of freedom and his devotion to spiritual forces and to the most noble popular virtues—is aware of the needs of the hour, which I repeat without hesitation, is the hour of the emancipation of peoples, and has made sound, honest and constructive efforts at home to seek the best means of solving the serious problems created by illiteracy, ignorance, the housing shortage and the general problem of the land. It has prepared thorough and well-conceived plans for such projects as the construction of roads and schools, irrigation, land settlement, agrarian reform, housing banks and others, and has thus helped to further the noble and altruistic aims which today inspire the Government of the United States and which have been given substance in the plan so ably outlined by President John Kennedy in his "Alliance for Progress" programme.

217. Abroad, this same Government which is now presiding over Ecuador's destiny has remained absolutely faithful to its legal and moral principles—and legal and moral principles are, or at least should be, the only permanent and mandatory principles governing the policies and actions of States. Inspired by this conviction, my country has always devoted its utmost attention to the consideration of continental problems and of the grave issues which are threatening general peace among nations.

218. Accordingly, Ecuador—which, for special reasons not unknown in America, maintains and will continue to maintain with dignity a firm defensive attitude—is entitled to make clearly known its dissatisfaction with dogmatic ideological views and wordy resolutions in a situation where there are abuses, where law is flouted, where even justice is denied, and will, with passionate conviction, give its full support to any proposal, the implementation of which, in this age of discord, may effectively promote peace.

219. Surveying the grave problems affecting the world, we would say that the most imminent threat to peace lies in the grievous situation of the 16 million people in East Germany who have been subjected to a special status that is inconsistent with the respect owed to the elementary humanitarian principle that peoples shall be allowed to choose their own political destiny freely and of their own accord.

220. Fortunately, the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, in what we consider—bearing also in mind the significant fact that he has put forward proposals for disarmament—to be a sincere desire to strengthen world peace, has also endorsed the peaceful coexistence of nations. Inasmuch as this peaceful coexistence necessarily implies the recognition of self-determination as a prerequisite for the spontaneous and free constitution of sovereign States, we may confidently trust that the Soviet Union, through its Government, will contribute to world peace by offering its decisive co-operation in order to ensure that thanks to a free and spontaneous expression of

opinion, the German people may be able to choose its own political destiny—not merely on humanitarian grounds, or grounds of law and justice, but also in fitting deference to the noble traditions of German history and culture.

221. If peoples are masters of their own destinies, and if peace cannot be achieved unless the full freedom of States and the full dignity of the individual are recognized, it seems inconsequential and paradoxical to speak of "peaceful coexistence" of peoples. In view of the latest crisis in Berlin and Germany, Ecuador therefore hastens to raise its voice amidst its fellow-Latin American nations in order to seek a solution which, while respecting the rights of the parties, would yet spare the world a more serious crisis arising out of that problem. As Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ecuador, I was gratified and honoured to contact all the distinguished Chancelleries of Latin America and to inform them that, inasmuch as the President of the Republic of Ecuador had received from the Government of West Germany a detailed statement on the situation of 16 million German people who were being subjected to a special status in the Eastern sector, my Government—in the light of that problem, which was a source of international tension and constituted a threat to world peace and security—thought that it would be useful if the Latin American countries, having been the initiators of a new and more humane concept of international law, and being rightly concerned to ease international conflicts, were to address a friendly appeal on the highest level to the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, who on numerous occasions has expressed his respect for the norms governing the peaceful coexistence of nations, and ask him to permit the German people freely and spontaneously to express its views regarding its political future.

222. This initiative taken by Ecuador has been received favourably by the majority of Latin American countries, and my delegation wishes to say through me and on behalf of my Government that we appreciate this and warmly thank the countries concerned, and that we trust that this initiative will also be viewed favourably by the majority of peoples in the other continents.

223. Almost all the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Latin America, as well as public opinion and the press of the continent, have expressly welcomed this initiative through which my country has simply reiterated the well-defined principles which govern its international policy—principles which may be expressed as respect for the self-determination of peoples (considered of course as an integral function of nationality *per se*), as well as for the sovereignty of States and for their equality under law.

224. Ecuador views with deep interest the problems which affect its sister nations and will always be prepared to lend its assistance to ensure that any differences that may arise between them may be solved peacefully.

225. Ecuador is a friend of all the nations of the world, although by reason of its geography and traditions, race and history, its culture is Western and Christian. Accordingly, its policy is pursued within the framework of representative democracy and full respect for human rights.

226. It cannot be denied that relations between the nations which together constitute the American com-

munity should be based strictly on respect for their sovereignty and their dignity as nations—that is to say, on all those principles which underlie the legal and political life of the American continent.

227. These basic principles are simple, yet they are fundamental and must be regarded as definitive. They are: non-intervention, self-determination of peoples and legal equality of States. These are the positive rules which govern the relations between these nations and they constitute the substance of American international law.

228. The principle of "non-intervention" is the embodiment of the respect due by States to one another, whereby each State is allowed to take the political course it desires and to adopt whatever socio-political structure it may wish, without feeling itself threatened by the intervention of others in matters which are its own concern. This is a cardinal principle which involves the inalienable right of every nation to control its own destiny, a principle which admits of no compromise if we are to defend the most precious attribute of our public law. The annunciation, consecration, and defence of this right of "non-intervention" have cost America enough bloodshed, suffering and delays in the continent's political development. Fortunately, however, this right now appears to be solidly embodied in the inter-American system, following its formulation in a contractually binding form at the Seventh Inter-American Conference held at Montevideo in 1933, at which a Convention on Rights and Duties of States was signed.

229. I may assure the General Assembly on behalf of my delegation that Ecuador has been one of the most ardent defenders of the principle of non-intervention, from the time when that principle first saw the light as a mere proposition or postulate, to the present, when its justification is self-evident and, as a solid and unalterable foundation of the American continental structure, it cannot be ignored, unless we wish to undermine the very existence of our American juridical and social system. My country has supported and still supports this principle unequivocally; it has upheld and defended it passionately and with conviction. Its zeal has been such that in signing the Additional Protocol relative to non-intervention, adopted at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace held at Buenos Aires in 1936, it explained that it adopted the Additional Protocol "in all cases and without reservation, but with the understanding that the procedure of consultation provided for by the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Re-establishment of Peace shall not be considered as direct nor as indirect intervention".

230. I was glad to refer just now to this principle of self-determination of peoples in connexion with the two great social trends which, in my delegation's opinion, are today of burning concern to mankind.

231. I was saying that we cannot arrest or, even less, interrupt the course of history. Peoples arise and simply demand their place in the sun. In the same way as individuals need to live in freedom, without physical or moral compulsions, masters of their own fate, guaranteed their natural right to an equitable share of all the material well-being and progress of the age, peoples too desire to live their own lives without any feeling of subjection and in control of their own destiny. Each people has the right to choose the political system best suited to it and to preserve its freedom, sovereignty and independence. Many of the larger

countries, until recently the owners of vast colonial possessions, because they understood this historical phenomenon have hastened to allow the peoples which were until yesterday under their political domination to express their views spontaneously and freely today. Thus we have seen how a legal and political personality has been acquired by many new countries which have duly become Members of the United Nations, strengthening the Organization by their adherence.

232. My country views with deep sympathy this birth, or rather this rebirth of the new peoples. They themselves can and will bring their energy to bear in order to build a better world in the future. And, because we have given them the chance to express their views, they will in turn feel obliged to assist in upholding the principles of universal peace and security, contributing all they can as young and vigorous nations.

233. The juridical equality of States plays an imponderable role in the destinies of our nations, as an essential element of their sovereignty.

234. Indeed, the existing structure of the American continent is to a great extent, dependent on the respect shown for this principle in international relations. How disjointed and ineffective the legal basis would become, if we failed to observe strictly all these positive precepts to which I have referred and which must be emphasized, not merely to show the important role which the American peoples have assumed in the field of international law, but in order to continue to advocate such observance, insisting that such precepts be faithfully respected. This is the only way of ensuring not only that we may live in peace, but that we may also continue fully to perform America's important historical mission in this dark hour which is fraught with international problems but in which we long and hope for the new dawn that is to come. We must pray for and firmly believe in this dawn, not only because we are young peoples full of optimism and good will, and conscious of our constructive ability, but because this is the only way in which we can leave our mark on history or justify our part in it.

235. The Ecuadorian delegation has sought to illustrate through these examples the international policy pursued in accordance with its profoundly liberal convictions by the Ecuadorian people, guided with great insight by the President of my country, who is the true representative of the hopes, desires and beliefs arising from the fundamental principles of this policy.

236. Ecuador, an upholder of law and a staunch defender of justice and peace, has, since the dawn of its independence, shown a marked inclination or vocation for justice. Ecuador has always been prepared to offer its aid in order to make peace a certainty, within the canons of right and freedom. It has never denied its support to peoples suffering any form of oppression and, for the same reason, has always hoped and continues to hope that the just views it has expressed regarding the defence of its sovereignty and integrity as a State, which ultimately is a problem affecting the entire American continent, will win understanding and due acceptance in the conscience of America and of the whole world, as they have already begun to do.

237. Ecuador, as a Member of the United Nations, has repeatedly voiced its support for the theory that agreements freely and voluntarily entered into, which do not violate explicit legal precepts or the principles of law, constitute the basis of international coexistence.

238. It is clear, however, that a new tendency in international law has led to the proclamation of the noble human principle that force, war, conquest and aggression cannot and must not be the source of binding obligations or legal commitments.

239. In this day and age, conquest and force can never constitute a legal basis. Therefore, the American legal system, adapting the old concept of international law, contains the patiently but firmly formulated doctrine which reaffirms the principle of the "non-recognition of territorial conquests by force". The precept embodied in this doctrine was, as early as 1933, at the Inter-American Conference of Montevideo, elevated to the category of a positive precept of American international law, was subsequently consecrated in the 1938 Declaration of Lima and is now contained in concrete form in Article 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

240. With the respect which I feel and which I believe should inspire the world forum of the United Nations, where I have the honour to speak on behalf of the delegation of Ecuador, I pay tribute to all the peoples of the world represented here and express the sincere hope that this sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly will be fruitful for the peace and well-being of mankind.

241. I am sure that the distinguished persons who represent here the nations of the world will, with their vast experience and talents, perform harmonious, intelligent and decisive work. Ecuador is ready to contribute as far as it is able in the great struggle for world peace and security; for the security and dignity of the men of today and of succeeding generations.

242. Great concepts and great ideals are sometimes summed up in simple thoughts or sober but vital statements. For example, to solve the complicated problems of security in an undeniably complex world, we must observe the simple but vitally important principle that "respect for the right of others is peace". Because peace is a duty, the first duty of peoples and Governments, as was recently stated in the revered words of Pope John XXIII.

243. As regards the contribution we must make in order that the generations immediately following us may find a world in which it is safer to live, a world without fear and without hunger, the understanding we

show of the obvious historical reality which we are experiencing, and which we must face, will be the first step along the road to the most effective solution—a solution which will allow peaceful coexistence of peoples and perfect understanding between all men, if all men are guaranteed work and the human right to live in freedom and justice.

244. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now call upon the representative of Indonesia who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

245. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): My delegation listened carefully to the statement made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. Since many of the points raised by him need further scrutiny, my delegation would like to exercise the right of reply at a more appropriate time.

246. At this stage, however, my delegation wishes to place on record its rejection of the arguments advanced on the question of self-determination for the inhabitants of West Irian, which is an integral part of the Republic of Indonesia. The people living in West Irian are Indonesians, who have already exercised their right of self-determination, together with their compatriots of the other islands of Indonesia, on 17 August 1945.

247. To speak now of the sacred right of self-determination for a part of the Indonesian territory which the Netherlands has been able to control only by force of arms is merely to cloak the "divide and rule" policy of colonialism. This kind of self-determination is nothing else but fragmentation of Indonesia and the Indonesian people, which is a flagrant violation of the principles embodied in resolution 1514 (XV), on the ending of colonialism, referred to by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. From that resolution, adopted by the General Assembly in December 1960, I should like to quote operative paragraph 6, which reads as follows:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.