

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1031st
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 10 October 1961,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Speech by Mr. Wachuku (Nigeria)	339
Speech by Mr. Shaha (Nepal).	347

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. WACHUKU (Nigeria): I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Slim once more on his unanimous election as President of the General Assembly during its sixteenth session.

2. I want also to state once more on behalf of my delegation and the Government of Nigeria how deep the loss of the Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, has been not only to the Organization or to the Swedish Government, but also to the Government of Nigeria. To indicate to the Assembly how much our Government feels this loss, I shall read out two messages which were sent by the Governor-General of Nigeria and the Prime Minister.

3. The message of the Governor-General reads as follows:

"I am deeply distressed to hear of the death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld while in search of peace for a troubled African country. His death will be a most serious blow to the United Nations Organization, which he has served most faithfully and with unswerving loyalty. His loss will have a far-reaching effect in the affairs of mankind, which now mourns him."

The Prime Minister sent the following message:

"I was most sad to hear of the death of Mr. Hammarskjöld. In him the world has lost a great statesman. Throughout the years that he has been Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Hammarskjöld has done his best to bring about peace among the nations. He should always be remembered for trying to hold a balance between the East and West. During the years that he held his position, there were many difficult situations. In all of them he played a magnificent part.

"Therefore, I wish to send, on behalf of the Federal Government and the peoples of Nigeria, our heartfelt sympathy and condolences not only to the United Nations as an Organization, but to the entire world, for the peace of which he laboured, and to his relatives."

4. Those two messages are short and precise, but they do give an insight into how we Africans feel the loss of this great man. In conjunction with other

Africans who have made this statement, we feel that there should be a thorough investigation, a more comprehensive and complete investigation, of the circumstances that led to the death of the Secretary-General.

5. It has also been suggested that a memorial should be built in honour of the Secretary-General. Permit me to say that, apart from the suggestion which has come from some quarters that the new United Nations library should be dedicated to his memory [see A/4908], I would like to suggest that a special memorial should be built in Leopoldville, in the Congo, in memory of the Secretary-General, who lost his life in that part of Africa in quest of peace for that troubled country, the Republic of the Congo. I think that such a memorial would be a constant reminder to all sojourners who travel to that area of the African continent when peace and tranquillity find their abode in that region once more.

6. This is my first intervention in the general debate of the Assembly as the Foreign Minister and the Minister of Commonwealth Relations of Nigeria. At the last session I came here holding the portfolio of Minister of Economic Development and serving as the Chairman of my delegation. Therefore, I think it is fitting and proper that I should explain to the Assembly the main tenets and bases on which the Nigerian Government expects to conduct its foreign policy. That will give the Assembly an insight into our general attitude towards the various problems that confront the Assembly and the world community to which we belong.

7. Our foreign policy is based on three basic pillars; the concept that Nigeria is an African nation; it is part and parcel of that continent of Africa and therefore it is so completely involved in anything that pertains to that continent that it cannot be neutral and must never be considered as a neutralist country. I say this because there have been misnomers and misrepresentation, and countries have been called neutralist. Nigeria is not a neutralist country. We are independent in everything but neutral in nothing that affects the destiny of Africa. The moment Africa is affected we are involved. We want to make this absolutely clear: Nigeria finds itself involved in anything affecting the African continent anywhere, any square inch of African territory—we are involved. We cannot be neutral, so that neutralism, used in a broad sense, should exclude our country when it comes to African affairs. And being a member of the African community and feeling ourselves completely bound to its destiny and accepting our involvement in everything that pertains to it, obviously all questions pertaining to Africa must be considered as questions pertaining to Nigeria. The peace of Africa is the peace of Nigeria. Its tribulations are our tribulations and we cannot be indifferent to its future. I will deal with this in greater detail later in my statement.

8. We also know that we belong to that organization called the Commonwealth, an organization of peoples or States of diverse racial groups and different experiences, but bound together because of certain common political experience and having certain attitudes with respect to certain questions affecting them. It used to be called the "British Commonwealth", but I can assure you that it is nothing of the sort today because the majority of the members are not British. It is an international club and interracial political organization in which all the States within that organization act independently of each other when it comes to matters affecting them. But whenever there is something that is of common interest, they take the opportunity to discuss it together and see what will be acceptable to all. We, as members of that organization, view our relations in foreign affairs in terms of that also.

9. We also, by virtue of independence and membership of the United Nations, find ourselves as Members of the community of independent States. When we were admitted here, at the fifteenth session of the Assembly, and our Prime Minister stood before you on this rostrum [893rd meeting] and made a statement, he accepted all the obligations that all other Members accepted on behalf of the people of Nigeria. Consequently, as I have said before, we are most ardent supporters of the United Nations and we would do everything possible to make the continued existence of the Organization a practical reality. We do not subscribe to the type of pessimism that has been made manifest in the various organs of public opinion with which one has had the opportunity to be in contact. With that particular matter, I hope to deal in greater detail, particularly as there are certain problems that face the Organization, starting with the immediate problem that has been created by the tragic death of the Secretary-General and the question of the re-organization or increase of representation in the various organs of the Organization, leading me to other problems in the world context.

10. As I said before, we are an African State and therefore our first and foremost concern must be in Africa. Just as every region has got its own peculiar problems, for Nigeria the first consideration is our own immediate problems, then the problems of Africa and then we come to the problems of the world as they affect us as members of the world community. In Africa and to ourselves, our first problem is to consolidate our independence, to have a stable government, a stable and viable economy, to develop our economic, social and cultural assets in order to be of assistance to our fellow African countries that have emerged or are about to emerge to independence alongside us. As I have said on this platform before, we view Nigeria's independence as a means to an end and not an end in itself.

11. That takes me to the next aspect. If we have a stable government and we have a viable economy, then it is our duty, as a prerequisite to the fulfilment of our destiny on the continent of Africa, to press immediately for the complete and total liquidation of all forms of imperialism and colonialism on the face of Africa. In that respect, it is our determination to have independence for African States: the type of independence that will be real; not an independence that will be secure today and lost tomorrow; not the type of independence that will be an attraction for political marauders or hawkers of ideological conflicts; independence that will be peculiarly African;

independence with peace and tranquillity; independence that will last.

12. At the last session the Soviet Union introduced a draft declaration^{1/} on the abolition of colonies throughout the world. The African States participated most vigorously in the debates on this subject, and finally the Assembly passed a general resolution [1514 (XV)]. That resolution applies to the whole world, but we in Nigeria do understand that it is not possible for all countries that are today under an imperialist domination or a colonial régime to become independent at the same time. As I am sure we have all read this morning in the newspapers, it has been announced in London that Uganda will be independent in October 1962. That is in Africa. We welcomed Sierra Leone here in the earlier part of this session [1018th meeting], and we look forward to the admission later of Tanganyika. When you look at the map of Africa around the Republic of the Congo, you find that the bulk of the dependent territories are in that area, and some of the future headaches for the Organization will be in that area. Within it you have Angola, South West Africa, Bechuanaland, Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Kenya, Mozambique, Basutoland, Swaziland and of course the perennial question, South Africa. In other words, the major part of the area of turbulence in Africa is confined within that area stretching from the south-west coast to the south-east coast. There are other smaller areas, in both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, facing the same problem, but the fact remains that the bulk of the areas that are dominated in the world today are to be found on the African continent. Therefore Nigeria is determined to commit its resources, its energy, its intellect and everything it possesses, not only to consolidating its position but to seeing that these areas are completely rescued from imperialism.

13. So, when we come to the consideration of the question relating to independence for Africa, one of the items to be dealt with in plenary meetings, it is the intention of my delegation to introduce a draft resolution for the complete abolition of colonies in Africa within certain dates. When that time comes, I sincerely hope that there will be no quibbling in the Assembly, that all those who say they are genuine friends of Africa will show their friendship by supporting that draft resolution, by not telling us to wait until we have solved the problem of the whole world before we begin to solve the problem of Africa, by assuring us not only in words but in deeds that it is not their intention to look to Africa as a place for ideological conflicts or as an outlet for surplus population—which is the origin of colonization and settlement by peoples of alien races. These are things of the past, and I think this session should put a stamp of character, a stamp of finality, on further imperialism on the African continent. That will show that we are working progressively. At the last session we had a general declaration; at this session we should take a definite decision with respect to Africa; and at the next session we can take another decision with respect to a particular area. So we shall finish off the job in the shortest possible time consistent with solidity and viable independence.

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4502.

14. The other problem that faces Nigeria—one we are committed to deal with in accordance with our foreign policy—is a racial one. We have been talking about the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb and all sorts of bombs, but there is a particular bomb which everybody knows and which perhaps is more devastating than any of those bombs: that is the bomb of racial discrimination and refusal to accept the black man on terms of equality. Nigeria is determined to use its independence to see to it that every black man is considered on terms of equality with any other human being anywhere in the world. When we deal with the question of colonialism later in the Assembly, it is our intention to bring forward a draft resolution calling on all who practise this discrimination, an insult on the black race, to stop it. Not only must we be recognized and admitted to organizations, but we must be accepted on terms of equality. There can be no two ways or two standards about it.

15. In the past we have been exploited. So-called experts have written nonsense about the African people and their cultural traditions, perhaps sometimes in ignorance. They have equated certain things with the black man. The time has come when the black man will be not only seen and heard, but felt and accepted. I am only serving notice now, just as I did at the last session when we were looking for representation in various organs, and we were told there was a "gentleman's agreement". We served notice then that that gentleman's agreement would have to be changed in order to consider the new gentlemen who had arrived, and of course we succeeded in settling the question amicably; we had the necessary admission and then we went on.

16. Again, the question of racial discrimination, which is the bugbear in South African policy and in the policy of some other States, has got to be taken up by the Assembly very, very seriously. We do not want to make it an issue now, but certainly Nigeria, along with other African countries, will bring it along in the near future. Therefore, I am serving notice to all concerned that they should begin to do a little bit of spring cleaning; spring cleaning in their social habits, in their intellectual thinking, in their cultural set-up.

17. Of course, you cannot proclaim that you are in love with Africa and the Africans when, in fact, you go on discriminating against them or putting them in a position a little higher than the lower animals.

18. For us, in Africa, these are the two major problems. Just as in the Western world and in the Eastern world, you have the question of Berlin, the question of Germany, etc., to us in Africa the question of colonialism and the abolition of colonialism and of racial discrimination against the people of African descent are the two major questions that must be answered in terms of the African context. As far as Nigeria is concerned, a positive answer to those two questions, the prerequisite for measuring the standard of your likes and dislikes for Africa and the African, must be given.

19. Last year, on the African scene, we discussed in every detail—in Committees, inside and outside the General Assembly—the question of Algeria. We are watching very intently all the developments taking place in connexion with the Algerian question. I shall not say that I am either happy or sad, but I shall say that it is encouraging to know that those who had chosen to be obdurate in the past, who had chosen

to claim that Algeria was part of their metropolitan territory, have now been forced by common sense to realize that that fiction can no longer prevail. The simple question is that Algeria is part of African territory and the Algerians are entitled to their independence. People have fought against reality and found that, in the final analysis, nationalism wins.

20. What I am trying to say here is that it is necessary in the Assembly for representatives of various countries to accept this simple truth: once nationalism is born, you cannot defeat it. It is a dangerous seed. Once it lands in the soil, germinates and grows, I am afraid you have had it. If you are an imperialist, you have had it. And, since history is said to repeat itself—because many refuse to learn from the lessons of history; they do not carry out their assignment and, consequently the assignment remains to be done, and if you refuse to do it, it whips you—the sooner that is learned the better.

21. I am saying this in the context of another State—in respect of Portugal and Angola. Portugal has been consistently refusing to accept the simple truth, that Angola, the home of the black man, can never, never, never be Portuguese; that Mozambique, the home of the black man, cannot be transformed by magic or by any form of mesmerism to become a Portuguese territory. Two huge chunks of African territory, one on the south-west coast and the other on the south-east coast—how these could become automatically a part of the Iberian peninsula I do not know. And yet, what happens here each time the matter is raised? The representative of Portugal comes to this rostrum and begins to protest that something is factual and real when it is not in fact practical. Why not accept the simple truth?

22. In respect of Angola I want to make the position of my country and my delegation quite clear. Nigeria will never accept, and has never accepted, the principle enunciated by Portugal that Angola is part of Portugal. And I know of no African country which has accepted or ever will accept such a thing. My country is a country of peace; we like peace and tranquillity. We have been fortunate in having in our large territory the necessary material and human resources and the administrative set-up to enable us to develop a stable government and a stable economy; therefore, we have no territorial ambitions. But Portugal should appreciate that, if it comes to a future showdown and all these African countries stand together to see that Angola, whether Portugal likes it or not, is independent, Portugal can do nothing about it. Portugal will be the loser. Not only will it lose materially, but also morally. It will lose the friendship that flows from starting as friends. And that will affect its economy, because if Portugal loses friendship, it will lose the economic relations that are part of the relations between independent States.

23. Thus, there are three propositions that I should like to put forward on behalf of my Government and my delegation; there are three things we want from Portugal: one, that Portugal must now accept the principle of independence for the people of Angola—call it self-determination or anything you like, but accept the fact that you are wrong in saying that Angola and Mozambique are part of Portugal. They are not, and therefore the people of Angola are entitled to independence. Secondly, the Portuguese Government should understand that once nationalism is born, it thrives and grows and it will win. There-

fore, to treat the Angolan nationalist leaders as brigands or highway robbers is simply a waste of time. We Africans have accepted the nationalist leaders as leaders of their peoples. We are going to support them as leaders of their peoples. Those of us who have had experience of being prosecuted, sentenced to imprisonment and treated as all sorts of things, know exactly what happens. Therefore, we accept the Angolan nationalist as the true leaders of their people; and, therefore, we ask Portugal to recognize these nationalist leaders of Angola and Mozambique and to try to work out a basis for discussion, to discover a means of setting up the machinery of government.

24. If they are prepared to do that, my country is quite prepared to render assistance, and I am sure the other African countries will be willing to co-operate, because we want peaceful development in those areas. We do not want to use our resources, and dissipate the things that we require for economic, social and cultural development, in wars of destruction and annihilation. That does no one any good. So, that is another suggestion which I want to put to Portugal now, before it is too late.

25. Third, Portugal must accept the fact that it is absolutely necessary to begin now to set up the machinery of government in Angola and Mozambique. There is no need for Portugal to tell us that it is going to increase the membership of its legislature in Lisbon from 120 to 130 in order to have ten additional places for Africans in Lisbon. That is an insult. The people want their legislature in Angola; they want their legislature in Mozambique; they want their own local government and they want to control their machinery of government in their own country. They do not want Portuguese rule.

26. So we say to Portugal, "Do these three things and you will find that Nigeria will be forthcoming in co-operation". And I am sure that all the African countries will help Portugal, and if there is any way we can make the people of Angola forget the crime that has been committed against them by attempting to annihilate them, driving them from their homes and bombing them we shall persuade them and say, "Well, these are some of the casualties we suffer whenever we are fighting for independence. Somebody must suffer due to a misunderstanding". But if Portugal still insists on living in the past and remains an ostrich burying its head in the sand when it is completely exposed to the rest of the world—well, it is just deluding itself.

27. There is no point in running up to this rostrum and wasting the time of the Assembly protesting over something that no one wants to listen to. The days of imperialism are numbered. In fact, the chapter is closed. The only thing is that these imperialists are trying to resist the irresistible.

28. So, as far as we are concerned, we want to make it clear that the battle is joined. As far as Angola and Mozambique are concerned, if Portugal persists in refusing to accept the truth, the truth will make Portugal whole, because when the truth begins to surround Portugal with a withering fire, the decadent outside coating will be burned up, and the internal remains will be purified, and hence Portugal will be confined within the geographical limitation of its own territory.

29. That is an African setting. Again, the type of attitude we have in relation to our foreign policy in

Africa was seen recently in Tunisia when France sought to bully that country by trying to force itself into Bizerta against Tunisia's will. My country did not hesitate to tell the world its attitude to that type of action. Our Prime Minister, while visiting this country at the invitation of the President of the United States, did not hesitate to tell the world that Nigeria considered France as an aggressor. France had no right to impose itself there. It entered Bizerta by negotiation, and, therefore, if Tunisia wanted France to get out, France should call for negotiations to establish the method of pulling out. France remained obdurate and would not listen to anybody, but I am happy to see now that reason seems to be prevailing and that France seems to value the friendship that had existed between Tunisia and itself more than the effort to embark on that kind of escapade. Over and over again we are being reminded that we should do the right thing at the right time, and not get ourselves committed to things and find that we shall be forced by circumstances to go back to the original starting point.

30. There is a point which I want to make clear, again in the African setting, and it concerns the question of Mauritania. Mauritania became independent last year. Nigeria recognized Mauritania's independence and sent the Minister of State and the Minister of Foreign Affairs to attend its independence celebration. For some reason best known to the great Powers, Mauritania has been prevented from joining the United Nations. I want to make it clear to all concerned that the fact that Nigeria has not come forward to make a fuss about Mauritania is not due to indifference. We thought that reasonable people would appreciate that Mauritania was an African country. I cannot see how the problem of Outer Mongolia or the problem of China should be connected with Mauritania. I cannot see that at all, and why any country should ask another Power to veto the admission of a small country which wants to live its own life is more than we can understand. Therefore I want to say here that Nigeria supports the independence of Mauritania. Nigeria wants Mauritania to be admitted at the sixteenth session. From my own understanding, and from my contacts with various African States, it is clear to me that at least—I say "at least"—the twenty African States that met in Monrovia^{2/} have made it absolutely clear that they support the admission of Mauritania and that the Mauritanian question should not be connected with the questions of Outer Mongolia or China.

31. I take this opportunity to implore the big Powers not to abuse their veto. The essence of the veto, as we understand it, was to enable them to give guidance, to examine problems objectively and to prevent hasty decisions—not to use the veto as an instrument for committing injustice on unsuspecting, simple, helpless States—just because, perhaps, an African country has certain aspirations in respect of another. So I am begging those responsible for this unfortunate position to reconsider and let Mauritania into the United Nations during this sixteenth session.

32. We do not threaten anybody, but all of us have our own interests in one form or another. I used the words "at least the twenty African States", but I can say that the majority of the twenty-six African States—except, perhaps, those which are directly

^{2/} Conference of Independent African States, held 4-8 August 1959.

involved in the question of the border dispute, or whatever it is, which is natural to man—want Mauritania to be admitted here, and nobody has the right to keep it out. To do so is to work against the interests of Africa. There is no use telling us that you are interested in Africa if, when an African State becomes independent and we all want to see it admitted to the United Nations, you keep it out. That is an unfriendly act, and whoever commits it at the sixteenth session should know that the treatment of Mauritania in keeping it outside the Organization is an unfriendly act as far as Africans are concerned.

33. Of course, we also have before us the perennial question of South West Africa and South Africa. I am not going to burden the Assembly with the same old arguments. Our attitude in respect of South Africa is very well known. It is a situation where a microscopic minority continues to dominate the majority. This is ridiculous and impossible.

34. I want to warn South Africa once more. We have managed to get it out of the Commonwealth. If South Africa persists in this behaviour we may have to get it outside this world. Those who are interested in South Africa because of investments in the mineral resources of Africa should begin to think twice. South Africa cannot continue to behave as it is doing. I will not say any more about South Africa, but our position is quite clear. We are opposed to everything that the present South African Government stands for in respect of the treatment of the black man in Africa. If they were to accept themselves as Africans and behave as Africans, there would be nothing to prevent them from enjoying life more abundantly on that continent. But they cannot enjoy life and make it impossible for the majority to enjoy life as well. If they do not change, the future will make it clear that it will be impossible for South Africa to live side by side with the rest of black Africa.

35. As regards those minorities, there are one or two things that can be done. They will either adjust themselves to the changing circumstances or find some boats and migrate somewhere else. We have no intention of driving them to the sea. We would welcome their adjusting themselves to the changing circumstance and using their talents to help develop that continent. But if they do not want to pursue that type of healthy exercise, then the best thing, in order to avoid any future conflicts, would be for them to charter some boats and go to some areas where they will be acceptable, and then they can practice their racial discrimination to their heart's content.

36. This brings me to the major question which confronts us today in Africa, and that is the question of the Congo (Leopoldville). At the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, the position of Nigeria was one of non-committal to either side. We refused to participate in what I called here a disgraceful exercise. We wanted peace in the Congo. We participated in seeking peace. Today we have succeeded in founding a Central Government in the Congo. I want to make it clear that my Government wholeheartedly supports the Central Government of the Congo headed by Prime Minister Adoula. There can be no question of who is Prime Minister and no two governments can be recognized in the international relations of the Congo. If there are people, in or outside the Assembly, who are scheming to bring about the dismemberment of that Republic, we ask them kindly to stay clear.

37. The Congo became independent as one united country with six provinces, and Katanga is one of them. I have read quite a lot about this situation in the newspapers. I spoke to a group of people recently and someone asked me a question. Where, they said, is the principle of self-determination as regards Katanga? I said the following: "How would you as an American like it if the State of New York or the State of California were to be cut off from the United States because the people wanted self-determination? You want the most economically-developed area of the State to be dismembered and to be taken away, and then you expect the Congo to survive economically. If you will not agree that the State of New York should be taken out and created as an independent entity, and if you will not allow the State of California to be taken out of the United States, then you should understand how the Congolese feel. You may call it a province, you may call it a state, but it is the same thing."

38. They have a provincial government and it is the most economically developed of the areas in the Congo; yet, because of alien investment, people support the dismemberment of the Congo, and today they are arming the provincial government to rebel against established order.

39. My country is one thousand per cent in support of the Central Government and will be opposed to anything that would suggest that the Assembly, by any means, will support anything likely to make Katanga a separate State. The Congo is the heart of Africa and its heart must continue to beat, and nothing must be introduced to make it stop beating. Nigeria will not contribute to anything that will mean that the Republic of the Congo will be killed by intrigues on the part of people who are more interested in economic wealth and their investments than the well-being of the people of Africa and the people of the Republic of the Congo. Let us remember that there are 14 million people there. It seems to me that there are people who are thinking more of the copper and the cobalt and the uranium and the diamonds and gold there than of the 14 million people of the Republic of the Congo.

40. Therefore, the question of Katanga being part of the Congo, as far as we Africans are concerned and as far as my country is concerned, cannot be the subject of debate here. I want to make this absolutely clear, so that nobody will make a mistake as regards the stand of Nigeria on this matter. Katanga is part and parcel of the Republic of the Congo and any country that dares to suggest that Katanga will by any means be taken out of the Congo is an enemy of Africa as far as we are concerned. Let that be clear.

41. We examined the situation as we saw it, and in the light of our own experience in Nigeria, because we had our own Katanga problem in 1953. One of our own states of the three regions wanted to secede, and this was encouraged from the outside too. At that time that state was the wealthiest spot in Nigeria, because it was the most developed. It was exactly the same thing as Katanga, and that was encouraged by the western region.

42. Other resources, later discovered by geological surveys, had not then come to the surface. They even wanted the revenue and location returned 100 per cent. We agreed and, just like the Congo, where you had a unitary government, we found that in order to keep our country together we had to create a federal

institution. Then later on, in 1954, in 1957 and in 1958, the other regions found their own resources. Geological surveys showed more resources in other provinces or regions, and there was development all around. Today that same region is one of the strongest advocates of the unity of the country.

43. Now, in the light of that experience, the Congolese Constitution has already created a quasi-federal institution. We believe in our own country that the Congo, organized as a federal State, can be unified with strong powers for the central legislature and the Central Government.

44. But there are people who, instead of looking for a constructive solution to the problem, want a complete dismemberment of the Congo. In other words, they want the Congo to become a bird with two wings, and with one cut off. How do they expect that bird to fly? We have pointed the way for finding a solution constitutionally for the Congo problem, but there seem to be people who are determined not to find a solution in the Congo. There were some people who, before the Congo had the Central Government, were busy in Stanleyville trying to make the situation impossible. I sincerely hope that the external intervention in the Congo will stop. The fact that there exists today one President, one Prime Minister, one Foreign Minister, and one Central Government, should be accepted, recognized and respected by all Members of this Organization.

45. The continued interference in the internal affairs of the Congo and disruptions because of ideological conflicts—this must stop. Africa wants to develop in peace and tranquillity. Africa does not want war. Africa has been exploited for so long that it does not want any more of that. Africa wants to be a continent of peace. The universal disarmament which is being talked about should start from Africa, in the sense of leaving the African States to develop peacefully and not to use their resources for the purpose of buying arms and bombs for self-annihilation, but rather to devote money to the development of their economy and their cultural and other social aspects. That is what we want on our continent.

46. There are other aspects of African economy that I could discuss, but I want to make this clear. Before Nigeria became independent we found that the continent of the new States of Africa were divided into two groups: one was called the "Brazzaville group" and the other was called the "Casablanca group". Through the efforts of Nigeria and other countries, a conference was convened in Monrovia^{3/} to bring all sides together. Unfortunately, some who sponsored the conference decided at the last moment not to come. I want to take this opportunity to appeal to all African countries to realize that the salvation of the Africans can only be in terms of unity and in a settlement of their own disputes internally. I am not happy to listen in the Assembly and find one African State raising a question of a boundary dispute with another State here when in fact we can treat this as a domestic affair and deal with the matter at home.

47. I am appealing to all concerned: African States, do not make speeches at this rostrum about boundary questions. That is why my country, in its foreign policy says: "Leave these territories as they are". We know that the imperialist Powers divided Africa

artificially. We know that families were divided, and that households were divided arbitrarily. But if we begin to change those things now, we will find that we get ourselves into difficulties and then we will not have the time to settle our economic, social and cultural differences that have been introduced in our own continent. After we have solved the cultural and economic problems that becloud the issues, the question of alteration will follow naturally. The moment African States begin to fight among themselves in the Assembly, imperialism begins to fish in troubled waters. Therefore, it is the intention of my Government to try as much as possible to persuade the African States to try to solve their internal problems within their own circles and not in the Assembly.

48. Have we not suffered enough? Our resources have been channelled to foreign industries. Now that we are winning independence steadily, is it not right that those who are now leaders in the great revolution—it is a revolution on a world scale—should learn from the mistakes of other Powers, instead of going on imperialistic escapades or having aspirations for using some part of Africa as an appendage to others? I think every country in Africa should forget and abandon the idea of looking to another territory in Africa with an eye to grabbing and acquiring its neighbour's territory with the intent of expanding. That is the beginning of a decline. Any attempt to do that at this stage is sowing the seeds of destruction. Throughout history one will find that Powers grow and become great empires. But why do they collapse in the final analysis? Because they laid their foundation on sand. Africa, which has participated in everything that has made the world what it is today—good, bad and indifferent—should have learned sufficiently to know that the path of imperialism and exploitation ultimately ends in death for imperialism and exploitation.

49. I come to the question of the United Nations and our role as a member of the world community. I said here earlier that I am surprised to note that in many of the newspapers, on TV, on radio and in various publications there is such pessimism about the future of the Organization. I do not know why. I do not share that pessimism. Is it because an individual has died tragically that we become so despondent as to believe that the collective wisdom of man, accumulated throughout the centuries, has suddenly evaporated, that it is not possible, throughout the whole world, to find a substitute? Nigeria does not share that point of view. We honestly and firmly believe, on the basis of history and everything that man is capable of doing, that even within the precincts of the Assembly hall, if we search, we can find men who will serve humanity, men who have no desire for personal aggrandizement, men who have no desire for conquests, men who believe in the service of man and humanity. It is only when we think in terms of power politics, big Power, small Power—I think the time has come when the question of the definition of greatness in the Assembly must be considered. What is true greatness? Is it because one produces a rocket and because one has weapons for destruction—is that greatness? That you have been able to produce a thing which should be used for the good of humanity and for everyone, and then you turn it against yourselves? Is that not madness and insanity? Should insanity be equated with greatness? My answer is, "No". We in Nigeria will not term anybody "great" who, after building a magnificent edifice, sets out to

^{3/} Ibid.

use petrol to set the whole thing on fire and burn it. That is exactly what the great Powers are doing.

50. Human ingenuity has been able to discover the secrets of nature, to discover the power that is latent in the atom. Societies have been transformed. With the jet age, the world has contracted. Rockets can be used to travel to the unknown. But, instead of being used for the good of man, these discoveries are going to be used to destroy humanity. Why? Because there is a quest for power, a desire to dominate and to enslave one's fellowman.

51. I think that I can say without any fear of contradiction that we, the African States, do not want to be dragged into this human suicide. Leave our continent alone. Give us our independence and then leave our continent to us. Let us build a new continent of peace, where we can develop in peace and tranquillity, where we can learn from history. Do not bring these ideological conflicts to our continent. We put up this sign: "Please do not touch. Take your rockets to your own homes. Test your atom bombs in your own kitchens. Do not bring them to our continent." That is why we were unanimous in opposing France's test explosions in the Sahara desert. France can carry out these explosions in the Pyrenees and the Alps and on the farms of France. It is all right with us if France wants to bomb itself at home—although, as human beings, we support the simple, ordinary French human beings who want peace despite the fact that there are madmen who want to destroy themselves.

52. The discovery or selection of a Secretary-General—a temporary one or a permanent one—has been mixed up with power politics. My delegation cannot understand why this question has been complicated in this way. We have the Charter. We have the machinery by means of which we can ensure continuity and succession. How can we be told that it is impossible to find this superhuman person?

53. I have been told that when the late Secretary-General was discovered, he was a virtually unknown quantity. No one knew what he could do until he was put in the job. He grew with the job. Is it not a simple fact that if one person, who was an unknown quantity and was not known as a superman, was able to grow with the job, it is possible to find another unknown quantity, someone who can be put in the job and can grow with it? That person can at least try. If he fails, we shall have to find someone else. That is what we do in our respective countries.

54. We are told that two Powers cannot agree on this question. But our patience is getting exhausted. We, the smaller Powers, have been very patient. We have been looking to the large Powers to tell us what they can do. If they do not find a solution, we may decide to try to find a solution ourselves. The world is no longer divided in two. I have not seen that division anywhere. When I look at a map of the world, I see that countries are linked in some way or another—by oceans or by land masses. I see no place where there is not a bridge, either of water or land, between countries. In these times, even space has become a bridge between all parts of the world.

55. Thus, my delegation does not share the pessimism or the implied acceptance of the view that man has lost his reason, that the collective wisdom of man is no more.

56. Now, in the past the Western world has produced the Secretaries-General. If at the present time the West and the East find that they cannot produce a Secretary-General, why not ask Asia to produce one? If Asia cannot produce one, ask us in Africa to do so; we shall produce a Secretary-General. I believe that Asia can produce a Secretary-General today, I believe that Africa can do so, if one cannot be found in America or in Europe or in the Soviet Union. This is a challenge to the large Powers. Have they really lost faith and confidence in themselves? If they cannot produce a Secretary-General for us, let them tell us so, and we, the smaller States, will produce one and will give him our fullest support in order to make him succeed, not destroy himself or fail. That is how we do things in Africa. Let us put the man in the job and try to build him up, not tear him down because of the whims and caprices of man.

57. That brings me to a point which I have made before. In the United Nations, Africa insists on full and effective participation in all aspects of the organization of this body. At this session, my delegation will demand and insist that one of the Under-Secretaries on the thirty-eighth floor, in the political set-up, should be an African. We do not agree with the Soviet Union about the troika proposal. That would not work. We support the position that there must be a Secretary-General with powers that will enable him to act freely, in accordance with his conscience and the Charter, powers that will enable him to do what he thinks is right for the Organization. Anything that weakens the Organization is inimical to the best interests of the smaller nations and the world. But we need regional representation. There must be at least five Under-Secretaries on the political level.

58. It has been said that the Secretary-General is an international civil servant and must be insulated from politics. I do not share that view. The Secretary-General is a politician; he is a statesman; he is a diplomat; he is the head of an administration—he combines all those functions. Every time we make speeches here, we make political speeches. The Secretary-General listens to our speeches, and he is influenced by our thoughts and our views, politically. When representatives go to see the Secretary-General in his office, they talk with him as diplomats; they bring him their problems; and he is affected diplomatically.

59. We are not going to find any human being who is completely insulated from politics and diplomacy and who is only an administrator. Let us be realistic in the Organization. Some of the major problems that are bound to face the United Nations, some of the most troublesome problems, are to be found in Africa: Angola, the Congo, Mozambique, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Kenya, Uganda, Ruanda-Urundi, Basutoland, Swaziland, the small Spanish territories—and we have not yet solved the problems of Algeria, Tunisia and Mauritania.

60. As long as we have these problems—which are political—so long must we have in the Secretariat, on the thirty-eighth floor, an African who represents the legitimate views, protects the legitimate interests, and portrays to the Secretariat those yearnings of the people of Africa and the way in which they would like the problems of their continent to be solved—not viewing African problems with an alien eye. That is what has been happening, and that is why there have been mistakes. Even in the Katanga question

there have been mistakes. In the Congo problem there have been mistakes. There were mistakes—and no solutions—until the Africans intervened; it was only when Africans were sent into the Congo to examine the position there that we started to see a solution to the problem. Whereas, before, all alien interests were fighting one against the other, the Africans saw the solution of the African problem from the point of view of their own internal affairs, their will for peace and tranquillity, their desire to survive as independent nations, to grow, and to contribute to the totality of world peace and world culture. You cannot do that unless you have African representatives on the thirty-eighth floor.

61. The delegation of Nigeria wants the representatives of the black man in the Secretariat, in order to be able to bring in this aspect: the thoughts, the feelings and the yearnings of the African: to inject it into the whole system. Any solution that does not take that into consideration cannot be supported by us. We expect that by the end of this week, or at the latest next week, the big Powers will have had enough time to play themselves off one against the other in their attempt to be big, and will begin to consider the interests of the smaller and newer Powers—because these are in the majority, and want peace and tranquillity. They want effective and peaceful organization within the Organization because, so long as the United Nations survives and grows in stature and in strength, so long will they have protection for their independence, so long will they have peace in which to develop their economy, so long will they be in a position to bring their own ideas and notions into a world community like this.

62. That is why my country supports the Organization wholeheartedly and will be opposed to anything that is likely to weaken it; anything that will derogate from the status of the Secretary-General or of the Organization as such. We would not like the cold war to be introduced into the organization of the Secretariat.

63. Others have spoken on the question of atomic explosions by the great Powers. The views of my country and delegation are well known: "if a thing is wrong it is wrong—it does not matter who does it. France exploded atom bombs on the continent of Africa. Nigeria was opposed to it. It was a bad thing. We said, "We do not like it. Take it away. As a matter of principle, whoever explodes this dangerous thing and wants to poison the world—whether they be big, small or in between—it is a bad thing and we condemn it." We would sincerely hope that those who are carrying out these explosions will come together and save the world from destruction. The big Powers have started a race of atomic explosions. I sincerely hope they will listen to the voice of the smaller States, which reflect the public opinion of ordinary humanity in the world.

64. We have been reading of Berlin and the Berlin question. What puzzles me and my delegation is the obvious unwillingness on the part of the great Powers to solve the problem of Berlin. One asks the question: Is it possible to solve the problem of Berlin without solving the problem of Germany? The great Powers that fought together as allies in the late war dilly-dallied and did not arrive at the conclusion of a peace treaty in respect of Germany. Each group decided to rebuild the area they occupied—even to rearm their respective sections. To us outsiders it is surprising to see that though both sides are doing exactly

the same thing in their respective areas, each spends time accusing the other of doing it in his section. We find it in western Germany. Western Germany has been organized as a State with a new capital in Bonn—developing wonderfully, economically and socially; in fact, it has become one of the strongest, if not the strongest, countries in Europe economically. It was built up by the Western Powers which occupied the area. It is stronger than some of those who built it up.

65. In eastern Germany we find the Eastern Powers building up the area in accordance with their own knowledge of their political organization, and so on, and the area is becoming even more powerful than certain aspects of their own organization. The only difference is that in the East, eastern Germany has not founded a new capital. They are still using the old capital—or, rather, a section of it. Yet each side is accusing the other of doing exactly what it is doing. What do you want us—us, the small States—to do? X builds Y up according to his philosophy of government and economic development. Z builds P up according to his tenets, and they are both in occupation. The unfortunate thing is that Berlin happens to be completely within one section. Each accuses the other of doing exactly the same thing. Is it not a matter of settling down to examine this problem objectively or, if you cannot examine it objectively, of calling in those who are outside, who are not involved, to examine it? Are the big Powers prepared to examine the German question in the light of truth, honesty and sincerity rather than in terms of power politics? It seems to me that they are not prepared to do so because, again, we find all sorts of problems involved. There is fear about rearming Germany, reuniting Germany, and starting off a third war in that area.

66. Can we solve the problem of Germany without allaying these fears? Can it be solved with assuring the neighbouring States that what has happened in the past will not happen again? Can there be a permanent solution without going into those matters? Can the big Powers that are rivals in that area be the people who can solve that problem, without taking into consideration those who may be less involved and can see the matter more objectively? That is the question one would like to put to these big Powers. We have found that, without the intervention of the United Nations, there would have been a conflagration in the Congo which would have led to a third world war if the big Powers had been allowed to continue their struggle there.

67. On the question of Berlin, so many people have suggested here that it is necessary to have an international police force. Is it possible to isolate Berlin, which has been abandoned as a capital by one of the sections of Germany, with the other half being retained as the capital by the other section? Is it possible to persuade the eastern section to found a new capital for its own area, just as Bonn is the capital for the exercise of political power by the west, and to surrender Berlin to the United Nations, so that neither of the great Powers hold sway there and so that the Berliners, at least, can have peace and tranquillity under the auspices of the United Nations until such time as the big Powers begin to think realistically and reasonably in terms of the yearnings of mankind to be free from the fear of destruction? Is that possible?

68. I do not wish to give an answer here to my question. I pose the question only so that, when we

withdraw the troops and the police from the Congo, each Member State of the United Nations may contribute troops and police for occupying Berlin and maintaining the peace of Berlin in the interests of mankind. Preferably, none of the big Powers should have any say there, and those who control the area should be drawn from the smaller Powers. Is that possible, in order to save mankind from destruction because of Berlin?

69. This is a question which I should like to put, and I should like to ask Members of the Assembly to think about it. We are young States, and we do not want to be involved in power politics. We can only explain the way our minds are working in the light of the facts as they appear to us.

70. We have been told that the most important thing is general and complete disarmament. We have discussed this subject over and over again, and there seems to be no end to it. Can there be general and complete disarmament when there is no will on the part of the great Powers to have peace? This is a matter which the smaller Powers have to take into consideration. My delegation feels that the time has come when the great Powers should not be allowed to bulldoze us into a situation which will result in our destruction due to negligence.

71. I am losing confidence in the great Powers. They are climbing from the pedestal of greatness to the pedestal of insanity. I think that, the sooner they are told this, the better. We expect leadership from them; they give us destruction. We expect wisdom from them; they give us lack of knowledge. We expect objectivity from them; they present us with blurred vision. How do you expect us to follow such leadership?

72. If great leaders no longer have the capacity to lead, should the world Organization not seek out from its own midst a new leadership based on morality, objectivity and recognition of those finer elements that are found in man and human society, those things which make man greater than the large animals that are roaming the world and which man has been able to conquer and control and utilize for his own advantage? Is it not extraordinary that man, who has been able to subjugate the powers and the various elements in the world to his own purpose, is unable to control his lowest basic motives and channel them to more constructive ends?

73. On behalf of my delegation, I have tried to explain our attitude to the African question as it affects us, as we are involved in it. I have tried to explain our foreign policy and our attitude to matters pertaining to the United Nations and the attitude we adopt to the Organization. I have tried to think aloud in matters of world politics as a member of the world community, and I have tried to pose some questions which I should like to have answered for me. I have made certain suggestions to the smaller Powers, to see whether the time has not come when they should get together, in spite of the big Powers, to make their positions and their views known and their voices heard.

74. I think the time has come when we have to abandon the great Powers. Not totally. We should give them some distance and let them feel that they are now gradually being confined in a cold chamber. They are fighting a cold war; let them feel the coldness of the attitude of the smaller Powers; and let us withdraw to the warmer environments within our own circle, and let us think our own thoughts, and let us

see whether we cannot formulate some ideas that will make them amenable to reason.

75. Those who are called the "great Powers" do not have all the greatness in them at all. They are great in some aspects, but they are very small in some others. As regards those aspects in which they are very small, you may find greatness in the smaller Powers—greatness in those moral qualities that the great Powers seem to overlook. And the collective wisdom of the smaller Powers may serve as a balance to the collective power, in the material sphere, of the great Powers. And so, by the intervention of the smaller States through the Organization, we may bring sanity in the midst of insanity and save humanity from total destruction.

76. With these words I close my statement, and I thank the President for granting me the opportunity to address the Assembly.

77. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): It is my privilege and honour to bring to the President the salutations and greetings of the people and Government of Nepal, and the best wishes of our beloved leader and sovereign, H.M. King Mahendra, for the success of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.

78. At the very outset, let me congratulate Mr. Slim on his unanimous election to the high office of the President of the General Assembly at its sixteenth session. His long experience in the work of the United Nations, combined with his intrinsic merit and ability, amply qualifies him for the office he now holds. We have no doubt that under his wise and able guidance our labours and deliberations in the current session will come to successful conclusion. His unanimous choice as the President of the Assembly is proof of the high confidence and esteem in which the Member nations hold him. I am especially happy that he has been the first President of the General Assembly from our sister continent of Africa, which is destined to play an increasingly more important role in world affairs in the years to come.

79. Let me also take this opportunity to congratulate his predecessor in office, Mr. Frederick Boland of Ireland, for the excellent manner in which he presided over the last session, which was unusual and, in a way, difficult.

80. Since my delegation did not take part earlier in paying tribute to the late Secretary-General, I should like to take this opportunity to express our deep sense of sorrow and loss at the sudden and untimely death of Dag Hammarskjöld and the members of his party. In Mr. Hammarskjöld, the world has lost a great servant of peace. He was a man of stature, dedicated to the service of mankind. It will no doubt be very hard to replace him. If any man was indispensable in the world—and I believe no man is—it was Dag Hammarskjöld, particularly at this time. He was devoted to the task of maintaining a modicum of order where conventional diplomacy had failed, a minimum of order without which there cannot be even the slightest hope for the survival of civilized society. His cause was our cause, yours and mine, and in the years to come we shall realize all the more how much we had depended on him. He died a soldier's death at the post of duty. The greatest tribute we can pay to the memory of this great man is to strengthen the grounds of agreement among nations, on which they can work together to give substance to mankind's hope for fulfilment in a more peaceful and a more tolerant future.

81. At the different stages of the unfolding of the Congo drama, Dag Hammarskjöld unjustly received blame from one bloc or the other, and also at one time or another from all the different parties involved in the Congo conflict. He was not deterred by criticism of himself or his actions from any source, and remained steadfast in his purpose to make the United Nations operations succeed in the Congo. That he gave up his life in the cause of peace in the Congo should now leave no one in doubt as to his sincerity of purpose in all that he did. If he had made any errors of judgement, they were but human, and those who have thought fit to emphasize their differences with him, even after his death, should realize that if placed in the same circumstances they would have fared no better, if not worse, than he himself had done.

82. The tragic death of Dag Hammarskjöld has confronted us with the task of choosing a successor to fill the office of Secretary-General. It is apparent that the United Nations cannot be left without its highest executive officer, in whose name alone the Secretariat can act. However, we must not act in haste, because a hasty action at this time might affect the usefulness and effectiveness of the United Nations for ever in the future. It is a fact that the Charter does not provide for meeting a situation such as the one in which the United Nations now finds itself. Nothing would have been more ideal for our purposes than to have the big Powers agree on the choice of a suitable individual to fill the office of Secretary-General. The question is what is to be done if there is no agreement among the permanent members of the Security Council on the choice of a Secretary-General. Should the General Assembly take the initiative in electing a suitable person for this high office, or should it wait until such time as agreement is possible among the great Powers themselves? In our opinion, something must be done immediately to make some kind of interim arrangement for carrying out the functions of the Secretary-General pending the election of a rightful successor to Dag Hammarskjöld.

83. We have expressed in clear terms our opposition to the troika plan for a three-man directorate. In his address at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held recently in Belgrade,^{4/} His Majesty the King of Nepal remarked on this point:

"... The interesting suggestion made by the Soviet Union that the office of the Secretary-General be replaced by a triumvirate composed of representatives of Western Powers, Communist Powers and neutral countries seems to us clearly unworkable ..." ^{5/}

84. We are opposed to the troika plan for the following reasons. Firstly, it is based on the concept of the preservation of the division of the world into power blocs. Instead of furthering the idea of uniting the nations for a common goal, it stresses their differences. It would inject considerations of bloc interest into every question, even in the field of executive action. All decisions of such a body would be coloured and conditioned by political interests and prejudices of the blocs, and the respect for the aims set forth in the Charter would take only a secondary place. In our view, such a concept strikes

at the very roots of the principles and beliefs on which the Organization is founded.

85. If we were ever to accept the thesis that no man can be impartial in carrying out the orders and decisions of the Security Council, we would have to revise our views on the concept of an impartial international civil service as envisaged in the Charter. The Charter provides for a Secretariat whose actions will be guided solely by the principles set forth in the Charter, the decisions of the main organs and the interests of the Organization itself, no matter what the background and views of its individual members are. Article 100 of the Charter states in clear terms that "In the performance of their duties, the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any other authority external to the Organization."

86. Apart from the ideological considerations, we are opposed to the reorganization of the office of Secretary-General along the lines of the troika plan on practical grounds as well. We can very well imagine what would have been the initiative of a three-man directorate, as envisaged in the troika plan, in the face of a crisis such as the one the United Nations had to face in Suez or in the Congo. The excessive use of the veto in the Security Council has made the convening of special or emergency special sessions a routine necessity to deal with concrete threats to, or breaches of, the peace.

87. In the case of the Security Council, there is some restraint on the use of the veto as a result of the fact that the deliberations in the Council are public and the reasons for the use of the veto are exposed to everybody's judgement. In the case of an executive triumvirate, discussions would be carried on behind closed doors, and there would be no restraint whatsoever on the use of the veto. Even the slightest suspicion on the part of one or the other of the big Power representatives that a certain action might harm their interests would completely paralyse the executive. Such an arrangement might develop a tendency on the part of members of the directorate themselves to bring out their differences in the open, and this would considerably undermine respect for the authority of the United Nations executive. My delegation has no doubt that the reorganization of the office of Secretary-General along such lines would greatly impair the United Nations as a whole, and especially its value to the smaller and weaker countries.

88. Let me clearly sum up our position on the question of the interim arrangements for carrying out the functions of the Secretary-General. We feel that any man on whose choice the East and the West are not agreed will find himself seriously hampered from the very beginning in the exercise of his duties and functions as Secretary-General. Hence our insistence that in the first instance every attempt should be made to secure an agreement among the big Powers themselves on the interim arrangements. We ourselves are for a one-man executive within the terms of the Charter. Any arrangement which implies any sort of limitation on the highest executive of the United Nations in carrying out the decisions and orders of the various organs of the United Nations will, in our opinion, hamper the effectiveness of the United Nations itself. To those who are inclined to advocate checks on the exercise of unlimited authority by the Secretary-General, our answer is that his

^{4/} Held 1-6 September 1961.

^{5/} Belgrade Conference, 1961 (published by the *Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade), No. 4, p. 24.

authority has never been absolute, and each and every matter is limited within the framework of the decisions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the other main organs of the United Nations. However, we do not object to the arrangement of having a number of deputy Secretaries-General to assist him in his work, provided all those deputies are to be directly appointed, by whomsoever the Secretary-General may be, on the basis of the principle of geographical distribution which is enshrined in the Charter.

89. We want one man whom we can hold responsible for the discharge of the functions which the Charter of the United Nations entrusts to the Secretary-General. We are opposed to any arrangement that may tend to impose the deputies on the Secretary-General, because such an arrangement would increase his dependence on the deputies to the extent of diffusing his responsibility, contrary to what is envisaged in the Charter.

90. In the introduction [A/4800/Add.1] to his annual report on the work of the Organization, the late Secretary-General made an extremely well-balanced and sensible examination of the problem that we are facing today. In his objective way, he talks about how the debates and events since the last regular session of the General Assembly have brought to the fore two different concepts of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization, its authority and its structure. Some Members are inclined to favour a rather static concept of the Organization as a traditional conference machinery, to quote the late Secretary-General's words, "... for resolving conflicts of interest and ideologies with a view to peaceful coexistence, within the Charter".

91. On the other hand, there are a great many others like us who, while regarding the above concept merely as a starting point, visualize the possibility of the continued growth of the Organization in terms of increasingly effective forms of active international co-operation adapted to the experience and suited to the growing needs and demands of time and the situation.

92. If the United Nations is not conceived as a sort of world government or a super State, it is certainly not intended to be merely a debating society. Its usefulness lies in the field of multilateral diplomacy. Its institutions provide for a process of adjustment and conciliation often resulting in solutions that may not be entirely satisfying to the parties concerned, yet cause no embarrassment or loss of face to any one of them. Furthermore, it has yet to be perfected as an instrument of concerting action by governments in pursuance of the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter. In this connexion, it must not be forgotten that the functions and activities of the United Nations are necessarily confined within the framework of the decisions of the Member States. Any failure in the implementation of the decisions of the Organization within the terms of the Charter is often described as a failure of the Organization. In our opinion, it would be more correct to regard it as a failure of the world community as a whole.

93. The Charter took for granted co-operation among the five permanent Members of the Security Council as a condition for the successful working of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the Charter, to a large extent, is based on the principle of great Power unanimity. But the experience of the last few years has shown that the original plan of collective security

through the Security Council has almost failed to work because of the differences among the great Powers themselves. This has brought into vogue the method of referring to the General Assembly what the Council is unable to resolve.

94. The review of the then existing collective security machinery by the Members of the United Nations against the background of the developments in Korea led to the adoption of the famous "Uniting for Peace" resolution [377 (V)] in 1950. The effectiveness and potentiality of the action under this resolution has been proved in resolving the crises that have confronted the United Nations in the Middle East in recent years. It is now being seriously tested in the Congo. There are some who think that the action under the "Uniting for Peace" resolution is a departure from the path expressly laid down in the Charter, but to our mind there is nothing in the resolution itself that will interfere with the effectiveness of the action of the Security Council if only the Council shows itself capable of action.

95. As a result of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution, the General Assembly has been given a say also in matters of using collective machinery for maintaining and restoring international peace. It is true that the Assembly decisions are not binding on the Member States in the same way as the decisions of the Security Council are, but the Assembly can make recommendations to Members, in the case of an armed attack, to rescue the victim, even by means of military assistance. The importance which even the Big Powers attach to this possibility is best demonstrated by the fact that when a resolution is vetoed in the Security Council, it has become customary for one or the other of the permanent members themselves to have the matter referred to the General Assembly. Despite the danger and limitations inherent in this practice, this may also be regarded as one of the few really encouraging features, because so far as the effectiveness of the United Nations as a world organization is concerned, it shows the increasing importance of moral factors.

96. It is true that it is a practice almost as old as mankind for those who break the peace to defend their actions on the grounds of alleged moral motives, but there is now an important difference. The United Nations is a forum where these motives are exposed in their true colours. The motives have to be clearly stated before the whole world, and they will be subjected to severe scrutiny in public. On some occasions, those who have been summoned to answer before this body have preferred to stay away, but that attitude has definitely not brought them any credit. The moral pressure has still been there, and I think there is no doubt that it has, on the whole, been very effective.

97. Let us not forget that the General Assembly is being compelled by force of circumstances to assume new roles and responsibilities for which it is not equipped with powers in the Charter itself. Therefore it can discharge those functions only in a pragmatic and ad hoc manner. The devolution of these new responsibilities upon the General Assembly has also made the role and function of the Secretary-General more difficult and complicated, but all the same more important, in the structure and activity of the United Nations. The resolutions of the General Assembly, and for that matter of the Security Council as well, are usually results of a compromise and are, as a rule, vague and general in their implications.

This has made the General Assembly rely increasingly on the executive not only for the implementation of its decisions, but also for the interpretation of the finer points and intentions of its recommendations.

98. That the concept of the Secretary-General's role also has undergone a change is clearly shown by the part he was called upon to play by the General Assembly and the Security Council in the middle East and in the Congo during the last few years. He no longer remained an administrator, charged merely with keeping the operational services of the Secretariat in a state of efficiency, but was called upon to supply initiative when the situation called for it. It was as a result of this that the late Secretary-General was unjustly criticized by some for lack of initiative at times, and by the same people for showing initiative at other times. Let us hope that the lessons of the last few years will not be lost, and that Member States will not lightly dismiss the possibility of achieving something more concrete in the way of better equipping the United Nations to face crises in the future.

99. We must remember that the United Nations Emergency Force that is presently deployed on the borders between Israel and the United Arab Republic, and in the Congo, is different from the collective force of the United Nations as visualized in the Charter, which never came into being because of the deadlock among the great Powers themselves in the Military Staff Committee as early as 1947. However, it will be admitted on all sides that these United Nations forces created for limited purposes and on an *ad hoc* basis have proved to be effective for the purposes for which they were created. While these forces are not entirely based on a new concept of United Nations supervisory action, they certainly imply an enlarged concept.

100. In this connexion, I am heartened to find President Kennedy suggesting the same kind of idea which I put forward in my address to the General Assembly from this rostrum on 2 October 1957. With the President's permission, I should like to quote from that speech. I said at that time:

"... The creation of a permanent mechanism by which units of the armed forces of the Member nations can be endowed with the authority of the United Nations and made available at short notice will strengthen the hope and confidence of all peoples in the United Nations as an instrument for securing their rights and freedom".^{6/}

101. Any arrangement or plan for better equipping the United Nations to fulfil its new tasks and responsibilities, in our view, requires in the first place agreement among the big Powers. It is not for nothing that so much weight and importance is attached to the principle of great-Power unanimity in the Security Council within the Charter itself. We can only hope that the great Powers will not fail to realize their sense of responsibility for the maintenance of peace and order in the world, and they they will come to an agreement on some concrete plans in this direction. If they fail to agree among themselves, then they certainly cannot blame the smaller nations of the General Assembly for taking initiatives on their own.

102. If there were unanimity among the "big five", there would be no crisis which the United Nations would not be able to meet within the Charter itself, but unfortunately there has been no such unanimity among the big Powers and the differences between them seem to threaten the very existence of the United Nations at times. What are we to do—the small and uncommitted countries—who have looked upon the United Nations as the bulwark of our rights and freedom, as a forum where justice and protection can be obtained even against the mighty? We are now witnessing how the United Nations is being more and more changed into a battlefield for the two main power blocs. In the battle, we are under constant pressure to select sides according to the principle that "who is not my friend is my foe". Sometimes, one even feels that the very name of this Organization has an ironic connotation.

103. His Majesty's Government in Nepal believes that the small uncommitted nations will best serve the Organization and its purposes by supporting always such decisions and actions as reflect an objective implementation of the Charter, no matter whether these decisions or actions serve the purpose of one bloc or the other. I am not claiming any higher wisdom or superior judgement for the small uncommitted nations, but the very fact that they can stay away from the power interest makes it easier for them to judge questions objectively and in a detached manner. It will always be our endeavour to take an objective stand in controversial matters, in the full knowledge that the strict implementation of the high principles of the Charter and the strengthening of the dignity of our Organization is of direct interest to small countries.

104. In the Assembly, the votes of the small nations have the same weight as the votes of the big Powers. However, this does not mean that every country has the same real influence on the work of the Organization. The total numerical strength of the small countries is very great, but it does not directly reflect their operative influence. Apart from the fact that the right to veto of the big Powers in the Security Council gives them a decisive role in performing the primary function assigned to the United Nations, it is obvious that the great economic and military strength of these Powers gives them an influence which goes far beyond their individual votes. Be that as it may, the responsibility of the small nations is heavy. Their votes will be a deciding factor whenever a decision is taken in the Assembly.

105. My delegation believes that the main duty of the small and uncommitted nations is to stand up unceasingly in defence of the moral force in international relations. This makes it all the more important that we do not lose the sense of our own moral responsibility. The political experience of the small countries is, for natural reasons, often much more limited than that of the big Powers, and it may often be tempting to take a stand which is easier to defend from an egocentric point of view than on the basis of justice and morality.

106. His Majesty's Government in Nepal believes that the collaboration between the African and Asian States which has taken place now for many years, and also the geographically widening collaboration which happily started at the Belgrade Conference a month ago and which showed a concord of opinion on the main questions troubling the world today, will greatly strengthen

^{6/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, Plenary Meetings, 698th meeting, para. 52.

the moral attitude of the non-aligned States. Neither the African-Asian collaboration nor the collaboration started at the Belgrade Conference should be regarded as any attempt to form a bloc. As we consider the division of the world into blocs as the main menace to our generation, how could we believe that there could be anything good in creating a third one?

107. This leads me back to the starting point. Our guidance must be the truly international concepts of freedom and justice which are laid down in the Charter. Our aim must be to fortify the Organization, to maintain its dignity and to increase its influence. We should never allow the United Nations to become a pawn in the game between power blocs. It is against the background of this philosophy that my Government will examine all the proposals for reforms in the structure and working of the Organization and in the composition of its various organs.

108. I have been talking for a long time about my country's general views on the United Nations. If there is nothing new in what I have said, I have still thought that a renewed pledge to the idea of a strong universal organization is not out of order at a time when the very existence of the Organization is being threatened.

109. In line with our desire for strengthening the United Nations and for making it a truly international organization, falls our desire to see it become truly universal. We have had the pleasure of witnessing practically all the newly-independent States become Members. We were happy to see Sierra Leone join our ranks recently [1018th meeting], and we are looking forward to seeing Tanganyika become a Member of the Organization later this year. There are several other divided countries in the world which we would like to see united and take their place in this Organization. Although we are in principle against a package deal of any kind, we are in favour of the admission of Outer Mongolia. We want the United Nations to fulfil its goal of universality and reflect the situation as it really exists in the world so that it may become increasingly more effective as an instrument for conciliating and resolving the differences between nations.

110. In this connexion, however, one outstanding anomaly remains. China is still not properly represented in our circle. The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China represents well over 650 million individuals, far more than the populations of the Soviet Union and the United States together. All the arguments in favour of having China represented by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China have been raised in this hall time and time again. My delegation has always followed the legal line of argumentation in this respect. It is a strong line. It not only bypasses power interests but it derives its strength from the over-all principle of justice to all, which is one of the cornerstones of the United Nations Charter.

111. It is a matter of national policy for individual States to decide whether they want to recognize a new Government or not. But, as a former Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, pointed out in a memorandum^{7/} in 1950, the representation of a Government in an international organization is another matter. The classic rule of international law, as found in practically

any textbook, teaches us that the testing point for recognition of a new Government is whether the Government has established itself in such a way as to exercise effective authority within its boundaries and to be obeyed by the large majority of the population. In fact, no other criterion can be found. Only a Government which is in that position is able to carry out the obligations of membership in an international organization. Those who oppose the recognition of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the lawful representative of China in the United Nations must fall back on the utterly untenable construction that almost one-fifth of the world population is properly represented by a Government which is actually in control of a very small portion of Chinese territory with a population of about 9 million. I think not even the ablest lawyer would be happy to plead such a case were it pending before a court. My delegation holds that it shows a complete disregard for common sense or justice that the case has to be pleaded in the Assembly.

112. Apart from the legal point of view, there are other considerations which demand that China be properly represented in the United Nations. We feel that international relationships are being poisoned by means of the exclusion of China from this body. There are countries which recognize the People's Republic of China but who, in the United Nations itself, do not assist in the recognition of China. From the point of view of reaching an agreement on disarmament, and also from that of the settlement of international political problems in South-East Asia, China's proper representation here is essential. We ourselves hold the view that the internal form and structure of a government and its policies are not relevant to the purpose of the representation of a particular State in the United Nations. But even for those who seem to disapprove of the system of government in China and its policies, would it not be infinitely better to be able to hold China's representatives to account before a world council, in the case of situations endangering world peace?

113. I should now like to turn the attention of the Assembly to the situation in the Congo, the greatest and most precarious issue the United Nations has had to face in the past year. In fact the Congo crisis was one of the most controversial questions the United Nations has ever had to deal with. As with many issues, its complexity was due largely to power politics and vested interests. The main goal of the United Nations operations in the Congo was to eliminate these power politics and vested interests and to fill the precarious vacuum thus created. Although our efforts in the Congo have continued longer than was originally anticipated, it seems more likely than ever that the United Nations will achieve a successful conclusion there too.

114. The most important and, we believe, lasting result of the United Nations operations in the Congo is the restoration of parliamentary institutions and the establishment of a Central Government in and for the Congo. This was the primary concern of the Security Council when it was seized with the problem in February 1961. Recently the United Nations has extended its operations into Katanga province, where the role of Belgian and other European military and para-military personnel does not yet seem to have been eliminated.

115. We for our part cannot simply explain the situation in which the United Nations forces have

^{7/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/1466.

found themselves helpless against Tshombé with his Fouga Magister, manned by a Belgian and a French mercenary. There must be something more in all this than meets the eye. We are glad that the Swedish and Ethiopian jets have reached the scene in the Congo, and all that we can do is express the hope that the United Nations forces will not be as defenceless in the future. Let us remember, however, that the United Nations operations in the Congo will not have succeeded until the authority of the Central Government is fully restored and the territorial integrity of the Congo preserved.

116. The Congo will need economic and technical assistance for a long time to come, and in this area the United Nations shoulders a great responsibility. If economic stability and growth, prerequisite to continued political stability, can be achieved in the Congo, then we can look forward to the day when the United Nations operation in the Congo will be regarded as one of the finest achievements of the Organization.

117. The General Assembly has, in the last year or two, made considerable progress towards the solution of the problem of colonialism. The Assembly has resolved that the system of colonialism must be abolished and, while no date on the calendar has been set, the spirit and the intention of the resolution itself make it amply clear the the whole régime of colonialism will be brought to an end quickly. The resolution of last year on the granting of independence to colonial countries [1514 (XV)] is a milestone in our progress towards the solution of the problem of colonialism. In Africa, however, no progress has been made towards the solution of the problem of South West Africa. The Government of South Africa persists in its policy of racial discrimination, known as "apartheid", and to disregard the repeated appeals and condemnation voiced by the Assembly year after year.

118. My Government, as well as most other African-Asian States, still considers the situation in Algeria deeply shocking. Recently, events in Tunisia further aggravated an already serious situation. Unfortunately, the French Government is still acting and thinking along colonial lines in Algeria, and their respect for the principles of self-determination and national independence stands in sharp contrast to the approach shown after the Second World War by many of the colonial Powers, especially the United Kingdom. The United Nations has continuously exerted pressure on the French Government to recognize the right of independence and self-determination in North Africa, and this pressure should not be slackened. We were disappointed to find that the French Government did not even consider it fit to attend the recent special session of the General Assembly called to discuss the situation in Bizerta. We were pleased that not one dissenting vote was cast in the Assembly against the resolution [1622 (S-III)] passed on Bizerta, and that resolution cannot be considered anything less than a condemnation of the French attitude in North Africa.

119. Portuguese colonialism, as practised in Angola, Mozambique and elsewhere, will be an increasing concern of the United Nations. However, it is heartening to note that those who prefer to take an ambiguous stand in matters of self-determination and the granting of independence to colonial peoples are becoming fewer in number each time we reconvene in this hall.

120. I have not yet mentioned the problem which, after all, is our main concern today: to save this

generation and all succeeding generations from the scourge of war. We meet today under the shadow of resumed nuclear tests, a renewed arms race, and a crisis in Berlin and Germany.

121. The banning of nuclear tests has been ardently championed by the small countries ever since an item concerning it was originally placed on the agenda of the Assembly. On occasion, our expectations have been high, but progress has been followed by setbacks with deplorable regularity. Today, the possibility of a solution based on mutual trust and goodwill seems to be more remote than ever. To my delegation, the most horrifying aspect of this problem is the apparent cynicism with which it is approached from certain quarters.

122. We very much regret the decision of the Soviet Government to resume nuclear tests because it has given impetus to others also to follow the example with impunity. Among the reasons given by the Soviet Union for the resumption of nuclear tests, we consider only one reason valid—that of France's unwillingness to be a party to the voluntary moratorium. The resumption of nuclear tests constitutes a real danger to human life and welfare. In our opinion, the utmost priority must be given to the cessation of nuclear tests of all kinds.

123. Disarmament is the primary function of the United Nations. The great Powers and the world community have so far failed to reach agreement on "disarmament and the regulation of armaments" as envisaged by Article 11 of the Charter. The threat of a nuclear war hangs over our heads; the armaments race continues unabated. However, we welcome the joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations [A/4879] issued by the USSR and the United States. At the last session, some of us had ventured to put forward similar principles in the form of a resolution.^{8/} We are glad to find that there is agreement between the two parties principally involved in disarmament on many of these principles. We hope that discussions on the question of disarmament at this session will result in the creation of a suitable machinery with a wide geographical representation, and with provision for the participation of the non-aligned countries. It has been quite some time since this body as a whole adopted a resolution [1378 (XIV)] deciding on general and complete disarmament under effective international control as the goal, but unfortunately little or no progress has been made. In our opinion, this problem is a great challenge, especially to the leaders of the two great countries in the world, the United States and the USSR, because the future of the world will largely depend on how they decide to meet it. No doubt it will be counted as one of the greatest achievements in human history if the leaders of these two countries can change the present situation in the world, fraught with the risks of a nuclear war and total annihilation, into a changed and lasting prospect for a new era of peace, prosperity, and progress in the world.

124. We wonder whether, under the circumstances, any positive results can be achieved by subjecting the so-called question of Berlin to direct initiatives of the Organization. The solution of this crisis is completely in the hands of the big Powers, and it appears to us that the United Nations has almost

^{8/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/C.1/L.259 and Add.1 and 2.

no practical means of intervening in it. To us, the first essential of the German question is that existing agreements must be scrupulously honoured and any modification thereof must be sought through negotiations, consent and agreement. There might be a virtue even in the maintenance of the status quo until acceptable substitutes are found. It must be recognized, however, that in a dynamic world the maintenance of strict positions sometimes tends to hold up progress, and becomes a source of friction and conflict. In our view, where new factors have arisen they must be recognized and duly provided for. We do not see any reason why the great Powers, given understanding and goodwill on both sides, should not be able to reach a settlement of the Berlin question.

125. We, for our part, can merely try to exert moral pressure on the big Powers, to make them conscious of their responsibilities towards mankind, and to impress upon them that a breach of the peace at this time will go down in history as the worst of all crimes committed against humanity.

126. These are some of the problems that weigh heavily upon us at this time, but there is also a problem of another kind, the urgency of which cannot be minimized except at great peril to world peace. I have in mind the economic and social needs of a vast

section of mankind. Somehow, we have the feeling that this problem of the struggle against poverty, disease and ignorance in the different parts of the world has not received as much attention as it should have received. When the nations of the world are spending more than \$125 billion on armaments, it is found difficult even to get together a few hundred million dollars for expenditure on the development of the economies of backward countries. We cannot help feeling that the attitude of the big Powers towards these great problems has been one of complacency. In our view, the task of helping the development of the under-developed countries should be approached by the big Powers as a matter of obligation. It is true that the obligation involved is moral, as all international obligations are, but it is not for that reason less binding. The world cannot live half rich and half poor. Disparities in the standards of living of the people in different countries must be reduced. Prosperity, like peace, is becoming indivisible in the world. One way to strengthen the United Nations is to increase its capacity for rendering services to less developed countries which always turn to it hopefully for assistance. For their sake and for its own, the United Nations must not fail them.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.