

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1022nd
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 3 October 1961,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Green (Canada)</i>	<i>197</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Shukairy (Saudi Arabia)</i>	<i>201</i>

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. Green (Canada): Before I commence my statement I should like to say how pleased Canadians are that Mr. Slim has been chosen unanimously as President of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly. Throughout the last few years we have learned to admire him for his friendliness and his great wisdom, and we believe that he has become one of the outstanding statesmen of the United Nations. We are pleased also because he represents Tunisia which, in its term as a Member of this Organization, has taken such an active and important part. It is most fitting that a Tunisian should have been chosen President of the General Assembly.

2. We believe, too, that it is appropriate that a representative of a nation of Africa should be President of the Assembly at the present time—that continent which is now the centre of attention for the whole world, a continent whose sons are playing such an active and important role in these halls.

3. For all these reasons I wish to congratulate the President on behalf of Canada and to assure him that we shall help him in every way possible during his term of office. It is not an easy time to be President of the General Assembly, but we know that he will fulfil the expectations of his many, many friends.

4. At no other time in its sixteen years has the United Nations faced so many large issues, some of which, we believe, threaten its very survival. Many of these issues have been placed on the agenda, but the one which immediately confronts us results from the tragic death of the Secretary-General. Before we can deal effectively with any other question, some interim arrangement must be made to enable the work of this Organization to be carried on.

5. The appointment of a Secretary-General is a matter so important that it would require mature reflection even if circumstances were normal, but in the prevailing political atmosphere an early appointment seems, from the Canadian point of view, out of the question.

6. But today's circumstances will not allow this Organization to be left any longer without direction. The Congo situation alone demands that an interim arrangement be made at once. Member Governments, such as the Government of Canada, with important

commitments in that country, have a right, and a duty, to insist that the United Nations operation be conducted under proper authority. Here we have important negotiations under way at this very time with Katanga, yet with no one here in New York to direct the operations of the Secretariat. That, I suggest, is a foolish situation, but surely there is enough wisdom in this Assembly to meet that situation and to appoint someone on an interim basis. The Advisory Committee on the Congo, made up of eighteen nations, of which Canada is one, has done splendid work here for more than fifteen months past, and yet there is now no one to whom that Committee can give directions. That, I repeat, is the situation which should not be allowed to continue.

7. No delegation here has expressed disagreement about the urgency of making an interim arrangement. Intensive consultations have already taken place about various possibilities. It is recognized by all—and I do not believe there is one delegation here that would disagree with the statement that I am about to make—that there are right here in this hall eminent representatives who have the necessary qualifications and who enjoy the trust and confidence of the Assembly. We should waste no time in selecting one of these widely respected men to take interim charge of the functions and responsibilities of the office of Secretary-General.

8. We do not expect such an arrangement to be indefinitely prolonged. We see it as a means for keeping the essential work of the Organization going, and as a means of affording to us the time required to give careful consideration to the appointment of a Secretary-General.

9. We would expect the interim appointee to have the loyal co-operation of the Secretariat at all levels. No doubt he will have his own working methods and will make his own arrangements for drawing on the advice and experience of the international staff. He may wish to make some adjustment in the Secretariat. He must, however, retain full authority to make the decisions and give the directions which are the sole responsibility of the office he will be filling.

10. As for the longer term problem, the Charter calls for the appointment of a single executive. Any change in the nature of the office would require amendment of the Charter. That does not mean that the composition of the Secretariat should not reflect the changed membership of the United Nations. On the contrary, all Member States have a legitimate interest in ensuring that the main geographical areas have equitable representation. However, no State or group of States should be in a position within the Secretariat to veto the implementation of decisions of any organ of the United Nations.

11. We stand firmly behind Article 100 of the Charter which provides that the Secretary-General and his

staff "shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization". And how essential that is, if this United Nations is to live and to expand and to meet the challenge which faces it. An independent international civil service must be preserved if the United Nations is to perform its impartial role.

12. There is no reason, moreover, why Member States should try to keep control of their nationals in the Secretariat. The appropriate political control of Secretariat activities is exercised by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the other organs of the United Nations. Those organs can give full instructions to the Secretary-General.

13. As well, we have wisely adopted the practice of establishing advisory committees especially for peace-keeping operations. I referred a few moments ago to the Advisory Committee on the Congo which we think is an excellent committee; perhaps because we are a member of this Committee. These committees afford an additional opportunity for interested states to offer advice and to give political guidance to the Secretary-General in the discharge of his mandates. This is a practice which has proven its worth, and one which can be developed further in relation to many activities of the United Nations.

14. Now I go on to deal with five different subjects: Berlin, nuclear testing and radiation, disarmament, outer space, and the strengthening of the United Nations.

15. First of all, Berlin. Most speakers in this debate have referred to the prevailing crisis over Berlin. The Soviet Union has seen fit to create there a very dangerous situation, where a few months ago no imminent threat to peace existed.

16. The peoples of the world are watching anxiously the steps which are being taken in the direction of negotiation. I have not doubt at all that it is the universal desire of this Assembly that a settlement on Berlin be negotiated with the least possible delay. Clearly the tension must be reduced and the frightening threat of armed conflict must be removed.

17. The primary responsibility for solving the Berlin crisis rests with the four occupying Powers in that city, but the United Nations could be called upon to play a role in a Berlin settlement. In any event, the United Nations cannot abdicate its responsibility in relation to any problem which raises acutely the fundamental issue of peace or war.

18. There are at least three ways in which the United Nations might be of assistance in the Berlin situation.

19. The first is to focus world attention on the problem and to leave the four Powers in no doubt whatever that they have an obligation to reach a negotiated settlement. This debate is already serving that purpose.

20. Secondly, if the four Powers agreed, the United Nations could serve in an observer capacity in the whole city and on the access routes. Properly integrated into a four-Power settlement, a United Nations presence in the Berlin area would add stability and would restore confidence.

21. A third possibility is that the United Nations might be asked by the four Powers to assume some responsibility for operating an international régime for the whole city of Berlin. The influence of such an international régime could be strengthened by locating

the European office or other agencies of the United Nations in Berlin. If Berlin were internationalized in this way, a heavy burden, it is true, would be placed upon the Organization, but the United Nations should not shrink from assuming the responsibility and accepting any obligations involved.

22. I go on the nuclear testing and radiation. During the last two weeks of September, following recent Soviet weapons testing in the atmosphere, the level of radio-active fall-out over one major Canadian city—Toronto—jumped by as much as 1,000 times over previous readings. We are making available to the United Nations complete details of Canadian readings but the following figures will demonstrate that there is real cause for the gravest concern.

23. Whereas in the week ending 10 September the highest level recorded anywhere in Canada was 20 disintegrations per minute per cubic metre, in the next week the following high readings were recorded: Ottawa, 90 units; Montreal, 100 units; Fredericton, 140 units; Windsor, 260 units; and Toronto, 470 units.

24. Long before this new and hazardous increase in the radiation to which our people are exposed, my Government had made crystal clear in this Assembly and elsewhere that it was unalterably opposed to the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. Now more than ever we are confirmed in our opposition to test explosions, particularly, of course, those which produce radio-active fall-out, whether such tests occur in the atmosphere, in outer space, or elsewhere.

25. The anxiety which is aroused in Canada by these test explosions is, I believe, shared by peoples everywhere. We take the strongest possible exception to having our present and succeeding generations exposed, through the actions of other States, to the danger of radio-active fall-out. We know that radiation presents a hazard to human health and the more we learn about the extent of its consequences the more disturbed we become.

26. In my view, this Assembly and world opinion—and this is the place to focus world opinion—must insist that there be no further testing of nuclear weapons. The time has come when it is not sufficient merely to express concern and to record blame. We must find means of compelling the countries responsible to cease the testing of nuclear weapons. Whatever success we may achieve in respect of the other grave issues will, I fear, be of little comfort to mankind if we fail to dispel forever the ominous and lowering clouds of radio-activity which hang over this and unborn generations.

27. In 1959 this Assembly unanimously endorsed far-reaching proposals [resolution 1376 (XIV)], initiated by Canada, for strengthening the important contribution which the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation can make to greater understanding of the extent and nature of the biological effects of radiation. At that time, Canada and about twelve other countries extended an offer of assistance to less well-equipped countries for the analysis of samples they might wish to send to our laboratories—samples of soil, air, bone and so on. Several have availed themselves of our facilities and today I invite other countries to do so. In addition, the recent sharp increase in the levels of radio-active fall-out in the world makes it all the more essential to support the work of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation.

28. The radiation hazard alone is sufficient justification for demanding the cessation of nuclear weapons testing. But there is another reason and that is the spectre of the development, as a result of test explosions, of new and even more terrible weapons, for example, Chairman Khrushchev's one hundred megaton bomb, which might be called the Armageddon bomb. The fact that the leaders of this great nation of the Soviet Union are even thinking of such a bomb shows the need for an immediate change of direction in world thinking. This is the time to call a halt to this sort of business. Let us all do a right about turn and not look any further at such a terrible prospect.

29. I am sure that it came as a profound shock to the whole world to learn that the critical negotiations which had gone on for so long in Geneva—for almost three years—and had borne so much of the hopes of mankind, had been abruptly brought to an end by the Soviet resumption of tests, tests which obviously had been planned for a long time. Such was the Soviet response to a series of Western proposals which offered further concessions and gave promise of the early conclusion of a treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests.

30. These developments demand that this Assembly give the highest priority to considering the permanent cessation of nuclear weapons testing. The progress achieved during three years of arduous negotiations in Geneva must not be sacrificed. At this session we must take positive steps to ensure that without delay the nuclear Powers renew their efforts to agree on a safeguarded treaty which will obligate them to end nuclear weapons testing. Subsequently all other countries should adhere to this treaty.

31. I should now like to say a few words about disarmament.

32. At this session, more than ever before, the question of disarmament requires our urgent attention. The crisis over Berlin and the great anxiety created by the resumption of nuclear weapons tests have brought to every mind the death and destruction which would follow the outbreak of nuclear war. We must check the spiraling competition for supremacy in armaments. That means pressing without delay for vigorous and effective measures of disarmament. After all, the Charter of the United Nations places the responsibility on the shoulders of all delegations present in this hall—new and old Members alike. To fulfil this obligation we must concentrate on the steps which will lead most directly to concrete measures.

33. Canada welcomes the Joint Statement by the United States and the Soviet Union [A/4879] on agreed principles to guide disarmament negotiations. This agreement represents an important accomplishment, but it is only the first step. Substantive negotiations have not been resumed, even though more than a year has passed since the previous talks were broken off in Geneva.

34. The comprehensive programme for disarmament introduced by President Kennedy [1013th plenary meeting] on 25 September 1961 provides a sound basis for serious negotiation. Canada co-operated actively in the preparation of this important new plan. The programme it sets out accords precisely with the principles which have been agreed upon between the United States and the Soviet Union. I commend this new plan to all members of the Assembly.

35. The Soviet Union, as all representatives here know, has also put forward a disarmament plan, the general philosophy of which is explained in the letter [A/4887] of the Soviet Foreign Minister to the President of the Assembly. Delegations may be asking themselves whose plan is the better—that of the Soviet Union or that of the United States. I suggest that it is unnecessary for this Assembly to decide that question.

36. In the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva, as also at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly and in the bilateral discussions this summer between the United States and the Soviet Union, there has been a drawing together of viewpoints, in spite of all the halts and setbacks. The main evidence of this drawing together is the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles just mentioned.

37. Now, there are still important questions relating to disarmament on which the position of the Soviet Union and its allies differs substantially from the position of the Western countries. But I believe that these questions can, and must, be resolved by a painstaking and business-like negotiation, in which concrete measures and related verification procedures will be examined in detail.

38. The United States plan is flexible and can accommodate reasonable proposals from the other side, or in fact from any quarter; it is very helpful to have suggestions from any delegation. If the Soviet Union and its allies will demonstrate a similar flexibility and spirit of compromise, it will now be possible to make real progress towards general and complete disarmament.

39. In their bilateral talks this year, the United States and the Soviet Union could not agree on the composition of the body which should undertake these negotiations. It is therefore incumbent on this Assembly to help reach a decision in this matter—that is, on the question of what form the negotiating body should have.

40. The Conference on disarmament held at Geneva in 1960 was conducted by a Ten-Nation Committee. It seems to be generally agreed that the composition of that Committee will require some modification. Canada believes that, if negotiations are to be productive and realistic, the negotiating body must have adequate and balanced representation of the major military groupings in the world; this was the principle upon which the Ten-Nation Committee was organized; it will be remembered that that Committee was set up by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and France.

41. But we also believe that nations which are not aligned with either of the two sides could play a constructive role in the renewed negotiations. With this in mind, we suggested at the last session [839th plenary meeting] that an impartial chairman, assisted by one or two other officers from uncommitted countries, could greatly facilitate the work and improve the effectiveness of the negotiations. We are, however, ready to consider other proposals on the question of composition. I believe that it is essential that other nations should be added to the negotiating body. If agreement on composition cannot be reached in the halls of the United Nations, it might very well be worth while to call a meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and give it the responsibility of selecting a negotiating group.

42. Once the composition of a negotiating body has been decided, the Assembly should recommend that

negotiations begin at the earliest possible date, on the basis of the principles agreed by the United States and the Soviet Union and on the basis of the plans which have been put forward by both sides. The negotiating body, with its broadened representation, should have a close and effective relationship with the United Nations, because general disarmament must eventually apply to all nations without exception. I think that it is important that the United Nations should be kept in this picture, in the disarmament negotiations.

43. At the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, Canada, joined by eighteen other nations, sponsored a draft resolution^{1/} intended to create such a relationship, as was recalled by the Foreign Minister of Chile in his statement [1019th plenary meeting] on 28 September 1961. The ideas then advanced may prove useful in facilitating a solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament. If we and our co-sponsors do bring forward a revised draft resolution at this session, I hope that it will receive the unanimous support of delegations here. The draft resolution which we presented last year did not get quite that support.

44. My second last subject is outer space. During the past year, both the Soviet Union and the United States have successfully launched men into outer space. Space travel and space exploration in manned vehicles may soon be commonplace—delegates to the General Assembly two or three years from now may be coming in outer space vehicles. While these scientific achievements stir our imaginations, we deplore the inability of the United Nations to make progress in regulating the use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes. Despite agreement at the fourteenth session—that is two years ago [resolution 1472 (XIV)] on the composition of a United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the vital tasks assigned to it remain unattained. The reason for this is that the two Powers whose achievements in outer space have uniquely fitted them for leadership in this field have failed to reach agreement on procedural arrangements—failed, I believe, to agree on who is to be Chairman, who is to be Rapporteur, and so on. As a result, the Committee has not met. Moreover, to this dispute there has more recently been added a further complication arising out of Soviet insistence that decisions must be taken unanimously.

45. The Canadian delegation believes that no effort should be spared to have the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space begin its studies without further delay. I read in The New York Times this morning a report from Washington:

"Joint Space Plan Urged for World

"U.S. and Soviet Aides Speak at Session in Capital"

The report goes on to say:

"Top officials in the United States and Soviet space programs appealed today for greater international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space.

"The appeals were made by Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, deputy director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Dr. Leonid I. Sedov, chairman of the Interdepartmental Commission on Interplanetary Communication in the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

"They spoke at opening ceremonies of the twelfth World Congress of the International Astronautical Federation."

46. Now it looks as if the International Astronautical Federation is more progressive and more powerful than the United Nations: down in Washington the Soviet and the United States citizens are able to agree on this—about doing something concerning outer space. I do suggest that it is time we got busy here and did something about it ourselves.

47. Unless there is some body of law, outer space could be exploited for aggressive purposes with greatly increased danger for all nations on this earth. Priority should be given to specific studies to determine in particular—and here I list some of the studies:

The limits of outer space;

The rules prohibiting military uses and the appropriation of outer space bodies;

Means for registering and identifying space launchings;

The allocation of radio frequencies for space research;

Methods for terminating radio transmission from outworn space vehicles—apparently, when these space vehicles are outworn they go on transmitting messages;

Rules governing the re-entry into the atmosphere and recovery of space vehicles; and

Principles of legal liability for the damage arising out of national activity in outer space.

48. These and other important questions are clearly within the terms of reference of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space set up two years ago and specifically asked to make preparations for an international scientific conference [1472 (XIV)B]. In the proper spirit of international scientific collaboration, much benefit would result from such a conference. However, we would not wish preparations for a conference to delay early consideration of the important questions I have mentioned. We hope to see the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space continued in being and given clear instructions to pursue its work energetically.

49. Should this prove impossible, we must turn our attention to alternative methods of moving forward—perhaps through various agencies of the United Nations; we should not allow delays over procedure to prevent us from making a new approach to the problems of outer space which are of universal concern and of constantly increasing urgency.

50. Finally, I come to the question of strengthening the United Nations. I should like to say a few words about the need to strengthen our Organization. It is timely and desirable that we take stock of its worth. The question we must ask ourselves is not, "Do we want a United Nations?" but, "What sort of a United Nations do we want?" Dag Hammarskjöld, with characteristic political foresight, placed that question before us in this year's introduction to his annual report [A/4800/Add.1].

51. If we are to maintain an effective United Nations, and if it is not to become just a big debating society, a number of things must happen and changes must be made.

52. Some constitutional adjustments are required which will give rights and opportunities to all Members to exercise the full weight of their influence. There is

^{1/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 67, 86, 69, 73, document A/C.1/L.255/Rev.1 and Add.1-5.

no doubt that some geographical areas are in present circumstances denied their equitable share of such opportunities.

53. This is why the Canadian Government is firmly in favour of enlarging the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. We see this as the only way in which the composition of those bodies can be adjusted to ensure a properly balanced and equitable representation from all geographical areas.

54. If sensible adjustments within the various organs are needed, it is even more necessary that the United Nations should have a suitable financial base for its operations in all fields. No satisfactory formula has yet been evolved for meeting the expenses of peace-keeping operations in the Congo and elsewhere. A limit has been reached, I suggest, to the process of raiding one reserve fund to support another. The United Nations—our United Nations—is now facing bankruptcy.

55. Canada has the greatest understanding for those who would pay but cannot, but we have no sympathy for the few who can pay but will not. I believe it would be folly to depart from the basic principle of collective responsibility which has been clearly established by the Charter. It would be quite unwise, either to give in to the Soviet view that Members need only pay for those undertakings which they like, or to admit the principle that any one State or group of States should make financial contributions disproportionately high.

56. The aim should be to find a formula which takes into account the difficulties of the less developed countries in paying the full assessment but which spreads the resulting additional burden equitably among the other Member States which are in a position to pay. Our concern about these financial problems flows from a desire to have this Organization act as effectively in the field of peace and security as in other fields.

57. Throughout this statement I have been at pains to emphasize the need to make the United Nations fully effective. I have urged that this international mechanism which we have so carefully assembled and developed through the years should be strengthened and used to its maximum extent to serve the purposes of the Charter and the needs of Member States. This is a reflection of a firm Canadian view that despite many obstacles and shortcomings, the United Nations has, on the whole, met the challenge of our times. We are proud of the United Nations.

58. We believe that the United Nations should be dynamic in its approach to the questions which come before it. This Organization must be free to develop if it is to meet new situations. It must not be stagnant. In my view, its capacity can be greatly increased if Member Governments are ready to make fuller use of its possibilities.

59. At this session, the outlook is darkened by the grave dangers the world is facing and by the serious internal problems of this Organization. Peoples everywhere all over the world are watching these developments fearfully. They are asking themselves whether nuclear war, which in recent years has been considered unthinkable, is now not only being considered possible but is being accepted as inevitable. The gravest danger we face is a drift into a nuclear war. I am sure all Members realize this fact. But at this time of tension and danger we must not be dominated by fear and panic. The very seriousness of the situation demands that we

keep calm and think clearly about our predicament. Actually I believe this to be the mood of this Assembly.

60. We have such an immediate responsibility to use our full influence to reduce the causes of tension. To do this we must enable the United Nations to act effectively, and all countries, large and small, must stand firmly behind this world Organization.

61. I think each one of us here at this session has a date with destiny. I do not believe there has ever been a session of the United Nations which held such potentialities for evil and for good. We are all human beings. We all have good motives. I am sure that down in the heart of each representative here, no matter from what country he may come, there is a sincere desire to help mankind. And we have such a wonderful opportunity to do it: what a great challenge. I hope and I am confident that when the story is written of this sixteenth session of the General Assembly, it will be such that each one of us who has been privileged to be here will feel that it was a great honour to be a representative in 1961.

62. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): Permit me to begin with the noncontroversial, and I would say outright, the topic of the election of the President. As he pointed out in his statement, his election was a great honour paid to himself and to his country. But it was also a great honour to the United Nations in its hour of trial. It seems as though this critical session has provided a rendezvous with his exemplary ability, unimpeachable impartiality and profound devotion. He brings to the Chair the enlightened traditions of Tunisia, the languishing aspirations of Africa and the skilful arts of the gentleman, Mongi Slim. Our congratulations therefore go to him, to his country and to the United Nations.

63. In the calendar of the United Nations, ours is the sixteenth regular session. True as it is in accordance with our established practice, yet such a nomenclature is a dull expression very far behind the march of events. Just to name it the sixteenth regular session and to act frigidly or timidly is not only to ignore the anguish under which the world is groaning, but also to to escape our primary responsibility for world peace, order and security.

64. With its heavy impact, even history has restricted this routine, seriatim procedure. On more than one occasion, the United Nations sessions were named after the events of the day. Hence we had the Congo emergency session, the Middle East session, the special Bizerta session, the Palestine sessions and the Korean session. Now, with anxiety as universal as it is, it becomes incumbent that this session should follow suit. It should go into history with a lively name, a name that echoes the fears of mankind all over the world, a name that should whip the United Nations, and indeed this General Assembly, to decisive action supported by effective sanctions.

65. And what name could this session be awarded if we are to consult our profound apprehensions—the apprehensions of all, of father and son, of man and woman, of infant and old, from every creed and from every race? No great labour is required and no genius need be invoked. Ours is the most dreadful of all sessions. Never has the United Nations, since its establishment, faced such a dreadful gloom. Never has the dome of this Assembly been so heavily loaded with heavy clouds of tension, mistrust, intimidation and, what is more, the threat of a nuclear war, a war that would leave this planet a melting heap of debris with no human life.

66. This session, therefore, must be the session of the brink, for we are just at the sharp edge between war and peace, on the blade of the precipice between survival and extinction and, in plain words, between existence and non-existence.

67. I am not here at the rostrum to terrorize the Assembly, nor is it my intention to make capital of the panic now prevailing in the minds of all peoples, both the haves of nuclear weapons and the have-nots. The world community is already plagued by panic to the point of saturation. My intention is simply to warn this august body of the peril of all perils that faces all in all and saves none at all. For it is no hallucination that we may be meeting here for the last time, and it is no stretch of the imagination that ours may be the last of the sessions. It may be the end of the United Nations, should there survive any of these nations, or a feeble, degenerated and debilitated fragment of a nation, in a scorched, devastated, desolate island on this earth.

68. With this smell of war, there is also going on a war of argumentation and justification. A heap of protests, memoranda and ultimatums are being exchanged by the great Powers in an endeavour to uphold a position or justify an action. But all this is vain—rooted in vanity. In the prelude of disaster, it is fruitless to support any claim, it is meaningless to uphold any contention, and, lastly, it is pointless to justify any action. Should a nuclear war take place, no incrimination or historic attribution shall avail. Who started the war, who fired the first bomb, who was on the offensive and who was on the defensive—all these questions are irrelevant and inadmissible, they are out of the question. At the end, there shall be the dreaded vacuum, a state of nothingness. There shall be no United Nations to resolve any dispute, there shall be no Nuremberg trials to determine the guilt, pronounce the condemnation or order the execution. There shall survive no judge to judge, no prosecutor to prosecute, no witness to testify and no audience to attend. Not even history shall exist to relate history. For no historian shall remain to record history, and no readers shall survive to read history. Should nuclear war take place, God forbid, the dreadful holocaust shall destroy anything and everything and reduce this world to nothing.

69. In tracking the course of events, two menacing factors rush to our minds—the resumption of nuclear test explosions and the deterioration of the situation in Berlin. The first is a perennial question on the agenda of the United Nations, as the representative of Canada rightly observed in his able statement a while ago, and the latter, the question of Germany, is a chronic topic of, or, I would say, a chronic headache to, the four major Powers.

70. The question of nuclear test explosions is too well known to the Assembly to call for elaboration. I do not wish to place before the Assembly the great volume of scientific evidence on the hazards of fall-out and the dangers of atmospheric contamination resulting from nuclear and thermo-nuclear explosions. The records of the United Nations are conclusive evidence in support of placing an everlasting moratorium on testing—never, never under any circumstances, to be resumed.

71. It was therefore quite understandable that the world at large was stirred by the resumption of nuclear explosions first by the Soviet Union and later by the United States. We are not here to define the responsibility for the failure of the Geneva Conference on the question: that would be too long and tedious a story to

relate at this moment. We are against nuclear testing, whether it be by the Soviet Union or by the United States, whether it be in Siberia or in Nevada. Resumption of nuclear tests is a double-edged danger. It leads to the contamination of the world atmosphere and it intensifies the armaments race. A race for what? Simply to make arms more effective and more destructive, causing the highest toll, at the lowest and cheapest cost.

72. It is a matter of record that the spark in this regard has been touched off by the resumption of nuclear explosions on the part of the Soviet Union. The event provoked a great deal of fear all over the world. At the Belgrade Conference,^{2/} the leaders of the non-aligned countries expressed their serious apprehensions in unmistakable terms. Such a stand on the part of the non-aligned nations was quite understandable, for the Belgrade Conference was a congregation of peoples who speak their minds independently and who think freely.

73. But it was highly amazing—highly amazing, indeed—for the major Western Powers to protest the Soviet explosions. We do not hesitate for one single moment to join with the West, as the representative of Canada wanted us to do, in voicing the most unshakable opposition to the actions of the Soviet Union when they merit opposition. But we cannot be a party with the West at their convenience. We cannot play their chorus at their mere pleasure or share an orchestra of their own, started when they will and silenced when they will. If resumption of explosions is condemned by the West as dangerous to peace and detrimental to human safety, it must be condemned at all times, against all nations and under all circumstances. Principles are principles. They are not commodities of trade, to be hoarded at will and displayed in showrooms at pleasure. The West cannot at random invoke principles on one occasion and entirely disregard the very same principles on another occasion. What is wrong for the Soviet Union should be equally wrong for France, no matter how France may be fashionably enticing or seasonably luring to some of the Powers represented here in the Assembly.

74. We all remember how the United States and the United Kingdom resisted, from this forum of the General Assembly, the African-Asian request addressed to France to halt nuclear testing in the Sahara. The language of the resolution [1379 (XIV)] on the matter was very soft, very gentle, and, I would say, very clean—certainly cleaner than the bomb which the French exploded in the Sahara. But, in spite of the solicitations of the African-Asian peoples, the United States and the United Kingdom supported France in that ignoble adventure.

75. They have not heeded the angry protestations of the international community nor have they cared a snap of their fingers for the safety of mankind. For our part we, the non-aligned nations, are fully justified in having taken the position we have taken vis-à-vis the test explosions of the Soviet Union. This has been our consistent position from which we have not flinched one single iota. But what legitimate complaint can the Western Powers make in this matter? It should be recalled that in explaining their position on French testing in the Sahara, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom contended that test explosions are not harmful. It was an advocacy marked with

^{2/} The Conference met from 1-6 September 1961.

ability, we should admit, if it only commanded veracity, scientific and skilful veracity. We render thanks to the United States and the United Kingdom that they have not claimed these explosions to be useful, and for this benevolence we must all be thankful and, I would say, grateful. We cannot fail to remember that in those statements to the First Committee on the subject, the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States cited their explosions in Maralinga in Australia and in Nevada in the United States. For what? As evidence of the harmlessness of nuclear explosions. This is their advocacy, this is the theme by which they have resisted the African-Asian request to halt French explosions in the Sahara. To refresh the memories of those whose memories need to be refreshed, I would simply refer to the statement of the United Kingdom which was made on 5 November 1959,^{3/} and to the statement of the United States which was made on 9 November 1959.^{4/} Both of these statements should be brought to the memory of those who are forgetful—forgetful enough here either by chance or by intention—and to find mindfulness here from this rostrum to speak of the harmfulness and the dangers of fall-out resulting from test explosions.

76. The picture, however, is not entirely gloomy. On the whole, the Western nations, and this is a fact which we must admit, are fully conscious of the perils of nuclear experimentation. Men in all walks of life are alive to the dangers of radio-active fall-out. Such people deserve our greatest respect and admiration wherever they may be. We are particularly delighted to refer to those groups who are known as the marchers in the United States and those groups who are known as the sitters in the United Kingdom, who recently led the campaign in support of nuclear disarmament. Of special mention, high above all, is Bertrand Russell, the genius brain of the English-speaking world. Bertrand Russell is the glanthero of this holy crusade. He merits the respect and sympathy of the world in leading this campaign against nuclear armaments. Bertrand Russell was sentenced to jail and from his jail he has spoken, as though to this Assembly, in these solemn words:

"The populations of the East and West, misled by stubborn Governments, in search of prestige... tamely acquiesce in policies which are certain to end in nuclear war... Our ruined, lifeless planet will continue for countless ages to circle aimlessly around the sun, unredeemed by the joys... which have given value to human life." ^{5/}

Thus spoke Bertrand Russell from his jail to this Parliament of Man.

77. Bertrand Russell was convicted under the law of the United Kingdom—I would not say rightly, or wrongly. But under the law of nations, I can positively say that he stands acquitted. Nay, he stands honoured and esteemed with remarkable veneration. By taking the lead, Bertrand Russell has served the cause of peace more than all of the policy-makers of the Western world, including his distinguished jailer, the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom. I am sorry that the distinguished jailer is not here with us in the Assembly hall.

^{3/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourteenth Session, First Committee, 1044th meeting.

^{4/} Ibid., 1046th meeting.

^{5/} Bertrand Russell's statement was reproduced in the The Times (London) of 14 September 1961.

78. The second horn of the dilemma is the question of Berlin. To be fair and precise, it is the dilemma itself. Although it may shatter the peace of the world and dynamite the United Nations, strangely enough this question has never been examined by the United Nations. It was left to the monopoly of the big Powers. The forensic argumentation for this paradox we all know, but the overriding aspect of international peace should not escape our attention. Berlin has become the trigger that may touch off a world conflagration at any moment. We are fully aware of the positions of the major Powers with regard to Berlin. We are cognizant of their apprehensions. But this is the more valid reason for the United Nations to step into the arena before the contesting parties stand ready on their pads—and what pads—launching pads, nuclear launching pads. If there is any international problem which calls for an immediate solution within the framework of the United Nations, it is the question of Berlin—and the question of Berlin first and foremost.

79. But what sort of a settlement could be worked out by the United Nations? We do not advocate any particular solution, but one thing should be clear and definite: the solution must be based on the principles of the Charter and not on the convenience of this major Power or that major Power. We must set aside the claims of all the major Powers to Berlin and more so to Germany as a whole. In the United Nations age no conquest, no military occupation should give rise to any right whatsoever. As the Second World War is over, so its legacies are over. Germany was conquered, it is true, but no conquest can deny a nation its nationhood, its sovereignty and its inherent right to its homeland. This should be the basic ground for any settlement of the question of Germany. Let us not make a mistake about it, lest the question of Germany again become the battleground of a third world war.

80. Germany reminds us of many things which we should always remember. Behind the First World War, let us remember, there had been German grievances that were met with a bad settlement. Behind the Second World War, let us also remember, there was the German question suffering again from a bad settlement. I am not here to justify war, but we should not fail to remember the causes, the roots and the reasons for war.

81. The driving forces behind the two world wars are to be found in the post-war settlement of the German problems. The grains of war have been ingrained, so to speak, by the policies of the allied Powers.

82. History, however, did not seem to be instructive enough to those who should abide by the lessons of history. After the Second World War, Germany was partitioned, Berlin was divided and the German people were humiliated. They were humiliated in every respect. And what humiliation is most degrading to Germany—the great Germany of industry—than to find itself compelled to buy small weapons for self-defence. And to buy from whom? From Israel. And we all know what Israel is to Germany.

83. What is more degrading to the German people than this illustration of humiliation, to compel Germany to buy weapons of self-defence. And from whom? From Israel.

84. And here we hear the Western Powers lamenting the destiny of Germany. It cannot be denied that military operations, by their nature, have necessitated

that Germany be occupied, administered under different zones. That was quite understandable; but what is not understandable, and indeed unthinkable, is that Germany should be partitioned, its capital divided. It was claimed that such an arrangement was designed to keep the peace of Europe. Succeeding events have shown how fallacious was this fallacy. We find now it is not the peace of Europe which is at stake. What is at stake at present is the peace of the whole world. You need only hear—and I ask you to lend your ears, gentlemen, to this—the breathing of the rockets on both sides of Berlin.

85. Germany is a great country. The contributions of Germany in all fields of science are of the highest order. It would be waging war against nature to humiliate such a people, to divide their capital, and partition their land. And here lies the biggest blunder, which is bound to breed the greatest danger.

86. At the present moment the nucleus of danger lies in Berlin simply because Berlin is divided between East and West. We will recall what great devastation has taken place in that great city. In the last two years of the war the city suffered no less than 1,000 bomber raids by the United States and the United Kingdom. It has been estimated that Berlin was blasted with 76,652 tons of explosives and incendiary bombs delivered by the United Kingdom and the United States Air Forces. Within the span of a few days the Soviet artillery concentrated about 40,000 tons of shells on the city. Yet, I would say that the division of Berlin is more devastating than the raids of the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom, not only to Berlin or to Germany, but to the peoples of the whole world. Failing to reach a just and equitable solution to the question of Berlin, we are afraid the bombs of the Second World War, compared to modern weapons, would prove to be as primitive as the bows and arrows of primitive man in the primitive age. So let us ponder before it is too late to ponder.

87. The remedy, therefore, should be related to the cause and not the symptom. If the division of Germany is the cause, if the partition of Berlin is the cause, then unity is the remedy—the unity of Berlin and the unity of Germany.

88. This is the only solution, and we see no other solution. Berlin should belong to Germany and Germany should belong to its people. This is what the Charter offers to all peoples, large and small, and Germany is no exception and should not be made an exception.

89. Yet, we cannot be blind to the fact that as a legacy of the war there are now two Germanies and two Berlins. We cannot ignore the existence of an existing situation, particularly when it refers to a people and their homeland. The people in Germany, East and West, are Germans and not aliens; and the people in Berlin, in the East or the West, are not aliens, they are Germans.

90. The two Germanies cannot be eliminated by our moving appeals, and the two Berlins cannot be ignored by our pious prayers. But we can create the necessary atmosphere for the two Germanies and the two Berlins to be united under one system or another.

91. Germany, we must recall, has given the world the classical examples of confederate, federate and unitary systems of government. The German people, whether in the East or the West, know how to do it, can do it and must do it. The German people have

done it in the past. They can do it at present. In fact, Berlin itself is the union of two cities that existed in the mediaeval age. Thus, unity in theory and practice is not a novelty to Germany, nor is Germany a freshman in the field of unity. Let us take the existence of West and East Germany—of West and East Berlin—as a starting point, and unity shall be the end, for this is the beginning to that end.

92. In outlining this approach to the question of Berlin, we have not taken cognizance of the so-called rights of the East and the West in Germany. I respectfully submit that neither the East nor the West has a legitimate right in one single inch in Germany, either East or West. This ado about the right of the West in Berlin and its approaches in the sky is groundless. Berlin does not belong to the East or the West. Berlin, with its land, its water and its skies, is the sovereign possession of Germany and Germany alone.

93. I have also refrained from dealing with the hardships now experienced by the people of Berlin as a result of the recent restrictions imposed by East Germany. This position of ours is not because of indifference or lack of sympathy. On the contrary, as victims of affliction, the people of East Berlin do command our sympathies. But because this question has become a subject matter of exploitation by Western circles, we refuse to be a party to such an exploitation of human sufferings.

94. In the last few weeks Western circles have unleashed a campaign of lamentation over Berlin—and I would say a literal lamentation over Berlin. It seemed as though the walls set up in Berlin have become the wailing walls of Jerusalem where the Western Powers bewail the destinies of Berlin and the miseries of the people of Berlin. The wall in Berlin, it was claimed—and these are Western words—stood as a monstrous guillotine that slashed the arteries and nerves of Berlin, that it cut through sewers, subways, bridges and thoroughfares, that it divides a cemetery—what a catastrophe, that it divides a cemetery—shears of churches and dwellings, that it has separated sons from mother and wives from husbands, friends from friends, and that Berliners on both sides of the wall exchange greetings, newspapers and foodstuffs, and even wave handkerchiefs.

95. This is the grim picture of the division of Berlin as portrayed by the Western Powers. Recently there was a moving story, which has been publicized, of a young East German who was riddled with machine pistol fire when he leaped into the water in an attempt to cross to West Berlin.

96. This, as well as similar tragic incidents, is most alarming and moving. They provoke our resentment and indignation. But these tears of the Western circles cannot impress the non-aligned nations, or indeed any justice-loving peoples anywhere. How on earth could we be impressed by the tears of some Western Powers which have become the crocodiles of the Western nations? The Berlin hardships can be found multiplied a thousand times in Palestine, while the Western Powers remain silent, indifferent and adamant. For Palestine, no tears are shed, not even eyebrows are raised, simply because, on the question of Palestine, the eyes of the Western Powers are covered by the fingers of Israel.

97. In Palestine, as a result of the barbed wire set up by Israel, the inhabitants of no less than 120 Arab towns and villages have been separated from their

lands, from their orange groves, vineyards, olive fields, pasturelands, and even from the wells to water their animals. Still the Western Powers have not been moved. It was only Mr. Adlai Stevenson—I wonder whether we are honoured by his presence at the moment—then without any official capacity, who, after his visit to the Middle East in August 1953, wrote the following about the barbed wire in Palestine:

"...you find villages chopped in two"—what an eloquent term was this used by the eloquent Mr. Stevenson—"Arab farmers with their land in Israel and their homes in Jordan—even houses and out-houses separated—and Jerusalem itself divided... I stood with Arab peasants and looked across the barbed wire to their neglected fields and orchards on the other side; I stood on a balcony in old Jerusalem with an Arab lawyer pointing to his house in Israel—which he had not been able to visit in five years."^{6/}

This hair-raising situation, as described by Mr. Stevenson, a great and able man—I do not know whether he is in a position now to restate these words and views from this rostrum—has not raised one single hair of those who are now bemoaning the situation in Berlin. If you are to cry, and to cry genuinely, this is a case where you should really cry and shed your tears before this august body.

98. For the last thirteen years the holiest city, held in veneration by the three religions of the world, Jerusalem, has been breathing day and night in an atmosphere of hardship a thousand times more monstrous than the hardships created in divided Berlin. Yet, to the Western Powers, divided Berlin is everything, and Jerusalem, the holy, is nothing. The hundreds of Arabs who are machine-gunned yearly by Israel forces have found no sympathy in the hearts of the Western Powers. Just when this session of the Assembly had started, Israel forces shot down a number of Arabs on their way to Gaza. The incident led to bitter Arab demonstrations in Haifa, Nazareth and Acre in protest against these brutalities of Israel. Day after day, Arabs are shot down by Israel soldiers only because they attempt to cross to their homes or their fields on the other side of the barbed wire. Barbed wire is wire—it could not be wire in Berlin and diamonds in Jerusalem.

99. The Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom spoke with passion and emotion—and this is the first time I had heard a United Kingdom representative speak with passion and emotion, but passion was there—on the hardships with regard to the labourers and university students of East Berlin. Let me remind the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom that barbed wire has separated thousands upon thousands of Arab farmers from their farms, Arab labourers from their factories, Arab owners from their properties, and Arab students from their schools. The barbed wire in Jerusalem has partitioned a hospital, one part on the Jordan side, the other part on the Israel side. This is a humanitarian cause for those who shed their tears on humanitarian questions with regard to students and labourers who are groaning under their hardships in East Berlin. In the same area, barbed wire has separated students from their school buildings—students on the side of Jordan go to their school on the side of Israel. Students have been experiencing this hardship for thirteen years—for 4,745 school days.

Yet the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom has never referred to these matters from this rostrum. Never has he shed his tears over these hardships.

100. To portray the tragic situation in Palestine, we can do no better than to borrow the masterly words of a great leader of a great people. In describing the situation in Berlin, President Kennedy recalled the order of the Czar in Pushkin's *Boris Godunov*: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced in by barriers... that not a single soul pass over the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly" [1013th plenary meeting].

101. The world is deeply indebted to President Kennedy for this moving simile. But if there is any place where this simile of President Kennedy's is applicable, Palestine, no doubt, ranks first and foremost. It is on the soil of Palestine where the orders of the Czar are put in force—except that in Tel Aviv it is a "petit" Czar, and not the Czar of President Kennedy.

102. It was in order to find a way out of this disastrous crisis that the non-aligned nations meeting in their historic conference in Belgrade dedicated a great deal of their deliberations to this matter. Like the Bandung Conference,^{7/} the Belgrade Conference ushered in a new epoch in international life. The non-aligned leaders who met in Belgrade have not only represented their peoples, but have in fact represented the mind and the conscience of the whole world. Like Bandung, Belgrade will go down in history as a seat—a great seat—of peace-making effort on behalf of mankind and for the survival of mankind.

103. It is regrettable, however, and rather deplorable that the efforts of the Belgrade Conference have been blemished. In the United Kingdom the Belgrade Conference was portrayed as a failure. Knowing what the United Kingdom wanted the Conference to do, or not to do, we are glad the Conference has met with failure. A failure to meet the desires of the United Kingdom is no doubt a glorious success.

104. Here in the United States the Belgrade Conference was received with discourtesy. Former President Truman, in a statement to the Press, has asked the neutrals to take sides with the free world. "They are free now," he said, "because we made them free." This statement, or to be more accurate, this misstatement, we flatly reject. The neutrals have not been made free by the free world. Precisely, they have been freed from the free world. This so-called free world was their captor and exploiter. It was through tears, sweat and blood in liberation wars that the neutrals achieved their freedom. One nation after another had to battle for liberty against the United Kingdom and France, the two giant architects of imperialism in this world. Contrary to what was said by the United Kingdom Foreign Minister, it was not a peaceful evolution but a bloody revolution. The non-aligned nations have made their freedom, but it is the West which has made something else. The West has made their neutrality.

105. It is an historic fact that most of the neutrals were parts of the French or United Kingdom empires. To the West they were allies, and they have fought its battles. But Western policies have alienated their sentiments. From allies these nations were converted to friends, and from friends they were made neutrals. That explains the present relations between the Arab

^{6/} See *Look* (magazine), 11 August 1953.

^{7/} The Conference of African and Asian States of 18 April 1955 was held at Bandung, Indonesia.

nations and the Western Powers. Most recently Tunisia has been made a neutral nation by the militancy of France and the arrogance of the West. Should such policies of the West continue the time may not be far off when the neutrals are turned into enemies. This is not a far-fetched possibility. The West is a genius indeed in the art of making enemies of friends and of throwing allies into the lap of enemies.

106. Furthermore, instead of behaving decently, the West has unleashed a campaign of slander against the peoples of the Belgrade Conference. The question of Western financial assistance to the neutrals was raised, but in no honourable context. It was raised in a slanderous context, a libellous context. In a well-prepared table it was shown that between the Second World War and March 1961 the United States had given and loaned some \$6 billion to 24 non-aligned nations. In spite of this assistance, it was contended, the nations of the Belgrade Conference had not supported the policies of the United States.

107. Such a devaluation of our Conference we totally reject. I am sure that I am speaking the mind of all the nations of the Belgrade Conference in expressing deep regret over such discourteous references. The non-aligned nations are satellites to none, and no amount of financial assistance could make them "stooges" to this bloc or that. Our freedom of thinking and action is our dearest possession which we are not prepared to sell for all the treasures of the earth.

108. But let us ponder this figure of \$6 billion for a moment of comparison. These \$6 billion, as stated by Western circles, go to more than half the population of the globe. In a conservative compilation of figures for the same period it has been shown that Israel alone was granted and loaned by the United States no less than \$3 billion. Just imagine the contrast or the comparison—whichever you like. If half the population of the world is allotted \$6 billion then this tiny Israel deserves no more than \$600. But that is the logic of the West which lacks all the dictates of logic—and lacks also the authenticity of a mathematician, if you please.

109. However, this is an occasion for me to put matters right. Economic assistance has been generally misunderstood and misconceived. "Economic assistance" is a misleading term. It is wrong to speak of "economic assistance". It is economic restoration—economic indemnification. The people of Asia and Africa, and for that matter the people of Latin America, have been robbed of their wealth all through the ages. They were the victims of Western exploitation and Western imperialism. Their lands were markets, their peoples were labourers and their raw materials were a prize. The history of Western imperialism was nothing more than the dispossession of the wealth of the East—its pearls, its gold, its diamonds, its ivory, its rubber, its oil, its cotton, its minerals and all the sources of wealth, including paintings, pottery, statues and the corpses of slumbering kings and queens. It is the wealth of the East which made the West what it is now. Any payments by the West to the East are, therefore, a repayment in part, a refund in part—indeed, only a fraction of the great fund of the East.

110. It is true, in fairness to history, that the United States has no record of imperialism, as was brilliantly observed by President Kennedy and brilliantly protested by the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom [1917th plenary meeting], but the United States, I sub-

mit, is paying now on behalf of its imperialist partners—and this is the rule of the game.

111. It is true also, as President Kennedy has rightly remarked, that about forty-two nations have achieved their independence since the Second World War, but the tragic fact is that colonialism still remains. Colonialism is still reigning in Africa and Asia, and freedom-loving peoples are still fighting for their freedom. The battlefields are far apart, but it is one single front in the war for human dignity and human liberty. Whether in Algeria or Angola, whether in Palestine or Oman, whether in South Africa or West Irian, the battle is one and the same. It is a fight right at the approaches of the United Nations to force its doors open to all the peoples of the world—and our doors shall be wide open to every race and to every creed.

Mr. Pipinelis (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.

112. In Africa, the people of Algeria are still fighting for their independence. That war now enters its eighth year. This year, France has started negotiations with the Government of Algeria. We are glad France at last has brushed aside this myth of French Algeria. As for the people of Algeria, their Government has always expressed its readiness to negotiate an honourable settlement. Regrettably, however, negotiations between the parties have failed. In as much as we have hailed France's starting the negotiations, we have deplored France's ending of the negotiations. France has bogged down on the question of the Sahara and the unity of Algeria. As a national hero whose record is associated with North Africa, President de Gaulle should know better—better history and better geography. The unity of Algeria is as final as destiny, and the territorial integrity of Algeria, its coasts, its mountains and its Sahara is as decisive as fate. These questions the Algerian Government shall never negotiate, even should the Algerian war become the Hundred Years War. In a national cause, there are many things which stand intact—unnegotiable, so it is with Algeria. The unity of its people and the integrity of its land are not negotiable—now or for ever. We wonder whether in any given negotiation, President de Gaulle would be ready to negotiate the unity of France and the territorial integrity of France. In fact, let us recall that General de Gaulle's liberation movement started against French quislings who accepted the negotiating of the liberty and the unity of France. Let us remind President de Gaulle of the glories of General de Gaulle.

113. The role of the Assembly on the question of Algeria at this session therefore stands abundantly clear. The pressure of the United Nations has been a great help to the cause of Algeria. Material help and various forms of assistance have been extended to the Algerian people in their struggle for freedom. Recently, in the Belgrade Conference, a number of States declared their recognition of the Algerian Government—and they deserve our admiration.

114. But the Algerian cause, the cause of a gallant people, calls for more and more. If we want negotiations to succeed between France and Algeria, if we are eager to have peace reign in North Africa, if we wish liberty to triumph, we should do more and more. France does not seem to be very much impressed by the Charter as a code of international law, or indeed by the United Nations as an Organization. In the words of President de Gaulle, this is a "United Nations disorganization." These are his words. In a sense, we

entirely agree with President de Gaulle that this Organization has become a disorganization. It is France that has made this Organization a disorganization. France has flouted the wishes of the General Assembly on more than one occasion, and France is still occupying its seat in the Assembly. France had defied the resolution of the Security Council, and France is still seated in the Security Council as a permanent member. If President de Gaulle should heed his own logic, France should unseat itself from the Security Council and from the General Assembly. France would do better to quit this Organization right at this session. Maybe, this Organization would then become a respectable Organization, not a disreputable disorganization.

115. That is why, to support the cause of freedom in Algeria, we should extend more support, we should exercise more pressure, we should cast more votes, and let me say, we should supply more arms and more ammunition—for in the long run, France, it seems, will abide only by the force of arms, rather than by the force of the Charter or the pressure of this high and august body of the Assembly.

116. Although geographically at quite a distance from Algeria, there are two related problems: colonialism in Angola and racial discrimination in South Africa. The history of Africa consists of one chapter, and one chapter only—European imperialism. Europe has imported from Africa the best of its wealth and treasure, and Europe has exported to Africa the most obnoxious of its products: colonialism and racial discrimination. The question of Angola is a classical example of imperialism—and the problem of South Africa is racial discrimination and segregation in its most ugly form. Our duty, therefore, is to make every effort to extend liberty to Angola, and equality to the people of South Africa. The people of Angola are fighting for their liberty, and the people of South Africa are fighting for their equality. This fight we must recognize as a United Nations fight; and as a United Nations fight it calls for our support. The principles at stake are the principles of the United Nations.

117. In Asia, colonialism is still holding a few strongholds—mainly in Oman, in West Irian and in Palestine. In Oman; on the eastern fringes of the Arabian Peninsula, a liberation war is being waged by the people of Oman against the United Kingdom forces. Although seized by the Security Council in 1957,^{8/} the war for liberty in Oman is as old as British imperialism in Eastern Arabia. In fact, the war in Oman is only a part of a whole liberation movement to free the Arabian Peninsula from British domination. I say British domination in spite of the pious words of the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom. His statement on self-determination and on freedom was precisely a sermon from the pulpit. How holy, how saintly, and how angelic are the words of the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom. Lord Home really deserves to be ordained as His Beatitude, the Archbishop of the United Nations.

118. Then we come to the question of West Irian, another vestige of European colonialism in Asia. West Irian, we all know, is part and parcel of Indonesia—a great country with a great people led by a great President. It is high time that West Irian be reunited with the mother country. The proposal of the Netherlands to hand over West Irian to the United Nations

simply avoids the issue. A child abducted, and for so many years, should be restored to its mother and not to a nursery. We cannot accept the argument that this land of Asia belongs to Europe. Imperialism is finished. Europe stays within Europe and Asia stays within Asia, not in isolation, but on the basis of free and mutual co-operation.

119. I come last to the most dangerous stronghold of imperialism in Asia, and without much guessing, it is Israel. The Palestine question is as old as colonialism in the Middle East, and the emergence of Israel in 1948 is only one chapter of the tragedy of imperialism.

120. It is not my desire at this stage to trace the history of the Palestine question, or to track the various efforts of imperialism that led to the partition of Palestine, the creation of Israel, and the expulsion of the people from their homeland. Nor is it my intention to place before you the picture of the present plight of the refugees, now living in exile for thirteen years, away from their homeland and deprived of their property. The records of the United Nations are loaded with an avalanche of material on this tragedy—and what a human tragedy indeed.

121. Yet, because at this session the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine is scheduled to report on the question, we deem it necessary that the fundamentals of the Arab position on the Palestine problem, of which the refugee question is only one part, should be set out before the Assembly.

122. At the outset, I must say in the most solemn terms, addressing myself particularly to the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia, that the establishment of Israel in Palestine was not the legitimate emergence of a people in their legitimate homeland. Palestine has been part and parcel of the Arab homeland since time immemorial. It is the ancestral home of its people, its legitimate citizens: the Moslems, the Christians and the Jews—just as any country represented in this august body is the ancestral home of its people.

123. The crux of the problem is that Palestine has fallen victim to imperialism, just as did many countries in Asia and Africa. Like all the peoples represented in this Organization, the people of Palestine have national aspirations of their own. They are entitled to the right of self-determination. Like many of your peoples, the people of Palestine have struggled for their liberty. They fought against United Kingdom imperialism for no less than thirty years, leaving on the battlefields thousands of martyrs whose bravery was second to none. And lastly, just as many of you have suffered imprisonment or deportation at the hands of imperialism, so have the leading figures of the Palestine people been put in prisons, detained in concentration camps or deported to distance lands in the heart of Africa. In a word, the people of Palestine—now a refugee nation—breathe the very same hopes you breathe, enjoy the very same aspirations you enjoy, love their homeland as you do, live and die for their country as you live and die for yours.

124. But the creation of Israel has made these people homeless. They have been deprived of the sovereignty you exercise. They have been deprived of the liberty in which you glory. And lastly, they have been deprived of what is dearest in human life—of the dear homes you enjoy and the homeland you adore.

125. Thus, the emergence of Israel is not the legitimate establishment of a legitimate State. All of you

^{8/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twelfth Year, 783rd meeting.

have come to the United Nations as a people lawfully rooted in your ancestral homes. Unlike Israel, you have displaced no one, and no one have you robbed; unlike Israel, none have you expelled and none have you dispossessed. Your statehood was a triumph against imperialism. But Israel's emergence was the reverse: although only for a time, it was a triumph of imperialism.

126. When I relate Israel to imperialism, I do so not out of malice or bias. It is a solid fact. Israel is the embodiment of imperialism, the symbol of colonialism, the fruition of capitalism, the founder of racialism and, finally, the author—and do not be surprised when I say this—of antisemitism. And this is not an indictment without evidence.

127. Israel is the embodiment of imperialism, for it was the United Kingdom—in its not so great days of imperialism—that conceived the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine to serve as a military base to defend the route to India and the Suez Canal.

128. Israel is a symbol of colonialism, for Israel is neither Asian nor African. It is a foreign ingathering of alien people from all parts of the world, bent on the domination and exploitation and the displacement of the native people.

129. Israel is the fruition of capitalism, for Israel's very existence is a capitalist adventure aimed at dominating the economies of Asia and Africa. It was Lord Rothschild, the great financier of British imperialism, who in 1917 received the written pledge of the United Kingdom Government, known as the Balfour Declaration,^{9/} to support the establishment of a Jewish national home. Ever since, all economic help to Israel, as well as all fund-raising campaigns led by the Zionist organization constitute nothing more than capitalist enterprises. At present, the penetration of Israel into Asia and Africa is backed by imperialist financiers from France, the United Kingdom, Belgium and other States.

130. Israel is the founder of racialism, for Israel has created a race of no race, disrupted their loyalty to their mother country, making of Israel a ghetto open only to the Jews, to no one but the Jews.

131. Lastly, Israel is the author of antisemitism, for it was the misunderstood philosophy of the "chosen people" which led to self-segregation, self-seclusion and non-assimilation, which, in turn, have led to the reaction of antisemitism—the most heinous crime against mankind.

132. That is Israel—its genesis and its evolution. Its existence in Palestine is no more than the existence of the relics of imperialism in Asia or the vestiges of colonialism in Africa. The problem of Palestine, viewed by Africa, should be regarded as the problem of Algeria, Angola and South Africa multiplied a hundred times. For in Algeria, Angola and South Africa, the people are there—they are at home. But in Palestine the people have been overpowered by imperialism—a million refugees have now been living in exile for the last thirteen years.

133. That is why Palestine is, for the Arabs, the problem of all problems. The problem is neither racial, religious nor political. It is the problem of a homeland which has been usurped, invaded, and literally robbed. The United Nations itself has furnished the figure

that Israel up to the present moment owns only 5 per cent of Israel—and that is all; this, I repeat, is a United Nations statistic.

134. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the Arab position on the question of Palestine should be fully understood by all, once and for all. Palestine is an Arab homeland, and we are not prepared to surrender one inch of our sacred land. Israel is in Palestine by a military occupation, by the sheer force of arms. And, just as many countries in Asia and Africa have been freed from imperialism, so, in the same manner, Palestine shall be freed from Israel.

135. At the present moment we ask nothing of the United Nations. Torn by power politics, the United Nations is too feeble to redeem a country for its people or to repatriate a people. Thus far, the General Assembly has adopted fifteen resolutions urging the repatriation of the refugees, but not a single refugee has been repatriated.

136. What we urge—and this a legitimate demand—is that a policy of dissociation be followed on the question of Palestine. Let Israel alone. If justice for the people of Palestine cannot be supported, let no one support this flagrant injustice called Israel.

137. For four consecutive days the United States identified itself with Israel four times—a *per diem* exercise. On 6 August 1961, the Legislature of California passed a resolution in support of Israel. On 7 August 1961, the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate passed a resolution in support of Israel. On 8 August 1961, Governor Rockefeller issued a statement in support of Israel. On 9 August 1961, Secretary of State Rusk wrote a letter at the end of which he expressed support for Israel.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

138. We should like to ask on behalf of the people of Palestine, and indeed on behalf of all decent citizens of the world, is Israel the sole business of the United States? Is there no other business—useful business—for the United States to do? Is Israel the fiftieth state of the United States across the Mediterranean? Is Israel more vital to the United States than the questions of Germany, Berlin or Soviet test explosions?

139. The United States, through economic and military assistance, has made the existence of Israel possible. Even the very creation of Israel was manipulated by the United States through every form of pressure. Is there no end to this policy on the part of the United States? Is there no end? Should the Arabs wash their hands entirely of the United States? Should they lose all hope of any sense of justice in the United States? I hope the United States will answer these questions in deeds rather than in words. Let the United States answer these questions—before the Arab peoples make the answer—although many of them have already made the answer themselves.

140. The Arab peoples have patiently waited for so long, hoping to see a basic change in the policy of the United States on the question of Palestine. A change not to favour the Arabs, but to be just, to be equitable to be impartial, to be neutral, to start a policy of dissociation, and, in plain words, to leave Israel on its own. If we are to stockpile all the resolutions passed by the United States in support of Israel: if we are to add up the grand total of United States economic and military assistance extended to Israel, the conclusion is dreadful—and is dreadfully dreadful. One would

^{9/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Supplement No. 11, annex 19.

then be led to believe that this country is not the United States, it has become a Greater Israel. It is a source of pride—I repeat, it is a source of pride—and satisfaction for the Arab peoples to have the best relations with this great nation of the United States, well known for glorious traditions and values. But the Arab nations would not want to have relations with the United States if the United States identifies herself as Greater Israel.

141. I have set out the Arab position on the Palestine question, because particularly at this session of the brink, this rostrum of the United Nations should be employed for what it is intended: to examine the problems that endanger peace and security in the world. The problem of Palestine is relatively dormant now, but it may explode at any moment. As long as

Israel is there, divided. Jerusalem may prove to be more dangerous to world peace and security than divided Berlin.

142. For our part, we shall do everything in our power to help Palestine regain its unity, Jerusalem redeem its integrity and the people rebuild their national entity. We shall do everything in our power to make peace reign again in the land of peace.

143. Peace based on justice is our ultimate goal in Palestine, so that the Holy Land can again become holy for its people and for all the millions of believers all over the world.

144. May God the Almighty extend peace to the land that gave the world the greatest Messenger of Peace.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.