

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1216th
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 25 September 1963,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
<i>Speech by Mr. Thiam (Senegal)</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Solís (Panama)</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Speech by U Thi Han (Burma)</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Kironde (Uganda)</i>	<i>11</i>

President: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ
(Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. THIAM (Senegal) (translated from French): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on your most welcome election to the presidency of our Assembly. It comes at a time when the United Nations is beginning its session under a sign of international relaxation, or at least what seems to be such a sign. I should like at the outset to commend the efforts of all those who directly or indirectly contributed to the happy outcome of the negotiations on the partial nuclear test-ban treaty.^{1/} I do so on behalf of my country, but I think I may also do so on behalf of all my African colleagues, and in my capacity as current Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity.

2. Everyone now agrees that the basic problem of our age is that of peace. Young States like ours—need I repeat it?—have a special interest in the consolidation of world peace, for we cannot meet the demands of economic growth, fix long-term objectives or put our development plans faithfully into practice in a climate of international instability and insecurity. Hence any effort to strengthen and consolidate peace should be warmly welcomed and encouraged.

3. Of course this Treaty, which my Government has signed, is only a first step as we all know. Its significance is far more psychological than real. The goal which we must tirelessly pursue is the achievement of general and complete disarmament. So long as certain Powers continue to possess weapons of mass destruction it will be difficult, nay impossible, to ask other Powers to refrain from seeking to acquire such weapons. But the Treaty will produce at any rate some immediate advantages, which are emphasized by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report. In the first place, it puts an end to "the danger of ever-increasing radio-active fall-out resulting from nuclear explosions" [A/5501/Add.1, sect. II]. In the second place, it is reducing East-West tension by

creating a climate of confidence between the two blocs, and more particularly between the two great nuclear Powers. The reason why the great majority of non-aligned States acceded to this Treaty was certainly not that their accession could do anything to reduce the number of nuclear tests. Most of them, if not all, had neither the means nor the desire to conduct nuclear tests. It was a matter of moral attitude, of adherence to a principle. The main point was to show that the Treaty, despite its inadequacies, fits into the context of a world public opinion which is highly responsive to any measure calculated to reduce international tension. Like the Secretary-General, we are convinced that "It will require the collective effort and wisdom of all members of the international community to ensure that the momentum generated by the recent agreements is maintained until the goal of global security and freedom from fear of war is reached" [A/5501/Add.1, sect. II].

4. This appeal to the world community to continue its efforts for peace has long since met with understanding among the non-aligned countries. How many steps, since the failure of the Paris summit conference, have been taken by the African and Asian States to help reopen negotiations! As far back as 1 September 1960 the Presidents of the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Indonesia and India submitted a draft resolution calling for the resumption of contacts between East and West.^{2/} In autumn of the same year, during the General Assembly's fifteenth session, the African and Asian States submitted a number of draft resolutions on various aspects of the disarmament problem: general principles of disarmament, limitation of the dissemination of nuclear weapons, prohibition of tests in certain zones, etc. Lastly, mention should be made of the active role played by the African and Asian States in the Committee on Disarmament.

5. It is true that the Moscow Treaty was due essentially to the good will of the three great nuclear Powers, which initiated it. But neither is there any doubt that the non-aligned countries, by their constant emphasis on the paramount importance of peace, substantially contributed to the creation of a favourable world trend. This is one of the most positive aspects of the policy of non-alignment when it is applied with perseverance and sincerity. The non-aligned countries have their virtues and their failings. We delivered our own self-criticism from this rostrum last year. We dwelt particularly on the fact that non-alignment was not always strictly applied. We denounced and continue to denounce certain new forms of imperialism among ourselves. But this makes it all the easier for me to say that, where the basic problem of peace is concerned, there has rarely been a discordant note among the non-aligned countries and that they have acted uniformly, perseveringly and continuously. The proof

^{1/} Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, signed in Moscow, 5 August 1963.

^{2/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 9, document A/4522.

of this is the almost unanimous agreement of our States to make the Moscow Treaty, despite its shortcomings, a universal instrument. We mean to continue improving on this and we hope, with the Secretary-General, that considerations of national interest, no matter how legitimate—and it must be clearly recognized that some of them are legitimate—will not prevail over the enduring cause of world peace.

6. But in order to dispel certain national anxieties, we must very quickly go beyond the Moscow Treaty and deal with the problem of disarmament as a whole, not only by banning further nuclear tests but by calling for the destruction of existing nuclear weapons and even conventional weapons, or at least their limitation. For, as has been pointed out, the abolition of nuclear stockpiles will not protect mankind from another war unless it is accompanied by a substantial limitation on conventional weapons. In reality the present world equilibrium is due essentially to the almost equal atomic potential of the two great Powers. But who knows whether this equilibrium might not be destroyed if, once the elimination of nuclear weapons was achieved, the great Powers were left free to use their conventional weapons? In such a case we should doubtless emerge from the balance of terror, but we should perhaps fall into an imbalance which would be still more serious.

7. The problem of disarmament thus seems to us indivisible. We therefore remain staunch champions of general and complete disarmament.

8. Those are the brief remarks which my delegation wanted to make concerning the recent signs of international relaxation.

9. But how could the relaxation continue, and what would be the long-term prospects for peace, if colonialism, racial discrimination and under-development should still persist in certain regions of the world?

10. There is no doubt that decolonization has made progress, particularly in Africa in the past few years. In 1960 the French-speaking States of black Africa attained national independence. During the same period the decolonization begun by the United Kingdom continued in this part of our continent. In particular we look forward hopefully to the imminent arrival in our midst of Kenya, Nyasaland, Zanzibar and others.

11. But this picture, cheering though it is, unfortunately has a dark side. Though decolonization has made progress, there are also some stumbling-blocks. The problem of the Portuguese colonies is more acute than ever. Mr. Salazar has lacked the acumen—lacked the capacity—to take his opportunity and embark on progressive decolonization by granting internal self-government to the territories under Portuguese rule. He prefers to uphold the myth of the "Portuguese Overseas Provinces", and recently made a resounding and vehement speech reaffirming his stubborn stand and once again rejecting the principle of self-determination. He has organized meetings at Lisbon and in other Portuguese towns to demonstrate the country's support for his policy. But the meetings make no impression on us. They cannot check the irreversible process of evolution.

12. The only result Mr. Salazar will achieve, unless he thinks again, will be independence wrested from him in bloodshed. This is certainly not what the African States would wish. The majority of our States attained independence through negotiation. Today fruitful co-operation is growing up between them and their former

metropolitan countries. So much the worse for Portugal if it cannot learn the lessons of these events. The combined efforts of all the African States to extirpate the Portuguese colonial hydra from our continent cannot fail. The Addis Ababa Conference^{3/} gave particularly close attention to this problem. Our concerted action has already begun to produce results. On 22 September 1961 the Senegalese Government was the first to call upon the General Assembly [1012th meeting] to expel Portugal from the United Nations. At the time this looked like an inopportune move. Yet all we were asking for was that the Charter should be applied. Since Portugal was flagrantly and deliberately violating the Charter of the United Nations which it had undertaken to respect, we felt justified in calling for its expulsion. The reservations which we encountered at that time are now beginning to be discarded by many of our friends. One after another, the specialized agencies of the United Nations have acknowledged that we were right. Each in its turn, the Economic Commission for Africa, the International Labour Organisation and the World Health Organization have decided to expel Portugal. The various international conferences held during this year have adopted resolutions to exclude Portugal. One was the international conference on education; another was the United Nations Conference on International Travel and Tourism.

13. Confronted with this situation, we can only repeat the proposal we made on 22 September 1961. The United Nations must not fail in its mission by allowing the principles it lives for to be trampled underfoot. With this in mind, the African States, continuing the work begun at Addis Ababa and Dakar, will submit a draft resolution formally recommending Portugal's expulsion from the United Nations.

14. The fact is that Portugal is not merely refusing all decolonization, though this in itself is extremely serious. It is using the most barbarous methods of repression, which violate the most elementary human rights and shock the conscience of the world. Since we began discussing the problem of the Portuguese colonies in this Assembly, what have we not heard? On re-reading the statements made by the Portuguese Government's various spokesmen, it becomes plain just how patient we have been in this high international forum. At one plenary meeting in December 1960 [934th meeting], the representative of Portugal informed us that his people had been pioneers of non-racism during the last five centuries. The hypocrisy of the policy of assimilation is thus suddenly transformed into provocation. "Pioneers of non-racism . . . during the last five centuries". It is we who are fools, who understand nothing, who are lagging five centuries behind Portugal! Perhaps we shall soon have to admit that the newly independent States and their former metropolitan countries have gone backwards, and that the whole process of decolonization on which France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and others have been engaged up to now, must be started all over again!

15. All that is mere frivolity, and we must not tolerate this insolent attitude much longer.

16. Yet the countries of the non-aligned world have taken a very understanding attitude on the general problem of decolonization. I would remind you that the great majority of them have avoided speaking of "immediate independence". They have taken the view that

^{3/} Conference of Heads of African States and Governments, 22-25 May 1963.

independence should be the outcome of a process judiciously begun and spaced over the necessary stages. Whenever a colonial Power has conceded this minimum at the outset, its actions have been welcomed with ample understanding and sometimes even with friendly feelings. I do not want to go back over all the resolutions submitted by the African and Asian countries, but anyone who has time to look them up will find that those countries have chosen to act through persuasion.

On 22 May 1961 a five-member Sub-Committee^{4/} established under General Assembly resolution 1603 (XV) was to begin an inquiry into the situation in Angola. Portugal refused point-blank to admit the Sub-Committee to Angolan territory. The members of the Sub-Committee had to content themselves with going to Lisbon to collect such information as the authorities were willing to give them. In spite of everything, the Sub-Committee's report was drafted in moderate terms. It merely recommended the preparation of plans to prepare Angola for self-government and self-determination. That did not prevent the representative of Portugal from questioning the impartiality of the report and withdrawing—insolently—from the meeting. It would have been better, incidentally, if he had withdrawn for good. In the face of such facts, I believe that our patience is exhausted. Either we all agree that Portugal, by its behaviour, has excluded itself from the United Nations, or we are willing to be its accomplices in pursuing a retrogressive, inhuman policy which is dangerous to international peace and security.

17. Our proposals for Portugal's expulsion apply to South Africa as well, of course. But I should like to lay most stress on the coercive measures taken against Portugal and South Africa. What we deplore is the fact that the steps for an economic boycott have been insufficiently applied. It is above all astonishing that some of the uncommitted countries, and also, apparently, some of the anti-colonialist countries of Europe and Asia, should still maintain particularly intensive trade relations with South Africa.

18. To those countries we address a particularly urgent appeal to show their solidarity with us more effectively and more actively by ending all economic relations with South Africa.

19. South Africa must be fought vigorously. For in this part of Africa, where favourable climatic conditions have made possible a high rate of European settlement, there is a danger of seeing other non-self-governing territories go the same way as South Africa.

20. In that connexion we must give special attention to Southern Rhodesia and we should like the Administering Power to ponder the example of Algeria. To allow less than 300,000 Europeans to govern more than 3 million Africans, whatever the procedural tricks employed—such as establishing a constitution endowing the territory with a purely formal self-government which does not, in any case, meet the criteria set out in the Charter of the United Nations, and the refusal to introduce universal suffrage—to allow such a situation to arise in Rhodesia is neither courageous nor realistic. France accepted its responsibilities in Algeria by restoring peace there in difficult, and it must be admitted, meritorious conditions, particularly by overcoming forcibly the opposition of the settlers to that country's independence. We believe that any attempt to apply a different policy in Southern Rhodesia could only increase the instability in that part of Africa

and in the end undermine Africa's good relations with the West. We hope that the United Kingdom, a great Power full of common sense and realism, will understand that it is not to its interest to withdraw from that part of Africa on tiptoe, leaving behind a situation damaging to its world reputation without even deriving the advantage of acquitting itself of the direct and indirect responsibilities which it still has in that part of the continent.

21. That is the present position in respect of the problem of decolonization. As you see, great as the progress in Africa has been, the picture still has its dark spots. That is the reason for the particularly strong stand taken at Addis Ababa by the Heads of the Independent African States.

22. A vast continent-wide organization came into being at Addis Ababa. Needless to say, that organization conforms fully to the principles of our Charter. Indeed, it is but a regional organization within the meaning of the Charter of the United Nations.

23. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for having stressed this in the introduction to his annual report.

"It is of course well known"—he said—"that regional organizations are not precluded under the Charter of the United Nations provided that 'their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations'. The Charter of the Organization for African Unity specifically states that one of its purposes shall be 'to promote international co-operation, having due regard for the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights'. I was also impressed"—the Secretary-General concluded—"by the recognition by the leaders of the independent African States of the basic fact of their interdependence, not only amongst themselves but as members of the international community." [A/5501/Add.1, section XII.]

24. The organization which was born at Addis Ababa and has just received structural form at the recent Dakar Conference^{5/} has goals not one of which is at variance with the Charter of the United Nations: world peace, decolonization, economic and social progress. It is, in fact, a kind of relay station, an intermediary body which endeavours to put into practice the United Nations ideal, first, within Africa, then in the relations between Africa and the rest of the world.

25. The Organization of African Unity can thus reinforce the work of the United Nations. It will also, of course, make it possible to correct any part of that work which might be at variance with the Charter. In any case, we should like to state solemnly here that the consciousness of their solidarity expressed by the African States and their daily recourse to that solidarity, is but an expression of world solidarity. If we succeed in keeping the peace on our continent, we thereby help to consolidate world peace. If we succeed in finding and proposing solutions to the problem of our economic development, we make an important contribution at the same time to the urgent question of the growth of the backward regions.

26. Of course, the fact that our objectives coincide with those of the United Nations does not mean that we shall have no claims to put forward. In particular, it is only natural that the Organization for African Unity

^{4/} Sub-Committee on the Situation in Angola.

^{5/} Conference of the Organization for African Unity, 2-11 August 1963.

should take over all the claims of the African States for a larger representation in the specialized institutions of the United Nations, more especially on the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Finally, I should like to tell the representatives of the Asian and Latin American States that the priority given to African solidarity will not make us overlook the solidarity of the under-developed world as a whole.

27. Quite on the contrary, we think that it must become an even more active solidarity, and that in all its actions the Organization for African Unity must take account of the under-developed world and of the identical and indivisible nature of many of its problems.

28. At this level the matter we have most at heart is economic growth. And what progress have we made? I must say that the annual report of the Secretary-General does not make over-optimistic reading. The essential conditions for the success of the United Nations Development Decade would hardly seem to have been fulfilled yet. For whereas the industrialized countries were asked to set aside one per cent of their national income for the growth of the developing countries, not more than one or two countries are devoting even half of that percentage to the aims in view.

29. Meanwhile the terms of trade for the countries producing raw materials continue to deteriorate, while the prices of manufactured goods rise unceasingly. Thus not only has the direct aid given by the Governments of the industrialized countries failed to reach the essential minimum, but in fact there has been no improvement in the foreign trade of the developing countries; yet, as has often been said, with improvement assistance would become less necessary. What is of even greater concern is the tendency among the industrialized countries to make themselves even more independent of the less developed countries by attempting to increase their own production of, or to find synthetic substitutes for, the raw materials. The most significant factor is the attitude of some former colonizing countries which are trying to evade their responsibilities—sometimes brutally—by ending or attempting to end the price protection on raw materials which they themselves had previously introduced. Some regional economic groupings, made up largely of former colonizing countries, think they can make up for the loss we are suffering by granting us an indemnity under the curious name of "aid to diversification", as though the single-crop system which they maintained systematically in our countries—and for which they are directly responsible—could be made to vanish with a stroke of the wand. This indemnity or pension paid to the divorced spouse does not take sufficient account of the inherent difficulties of our countries confronted by long-term growth. The situation is grave and disturbing, and we have the feeling that it is not always studied with the necessary breadth of vision. The highly industrialized countries cannot just steal away from us on tiptoe and set up closed economic clubs. That would be too easy.

30. In fact, such an attitude takes no account of the effective solidarity which unites, and will increasingly unite, all men, all countries and all nations in the world as the end of this century and the century to come draw near.

31. That is why we hope that the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in the preparation of which my country has been associated will find more satisfactory solutions.

32. Unfortunately, it is not merely a question of the deteriorating terms of trade and the ever deeper pit being dug between poor countries and rich countries. An even graver phenomenon is arousing our concern. For some time now there have been signs of a growing trend of opinion in the developed countries in favour of reducing the aid being given to us, inadequate though it is. Hence the tendency to reduce loans and the occasional spectacular departure of technicians, deplorable and disturbing signs of what has been called "Cartierism"; the phenomenon has become international. We believe that the alarm must be sounded, that democratic public opinion must be cautioned against a trend so fatal to the real interests of all and to international co-operation. We believe that, to ward off such a danger, every means must be used to strengthen co-operation between peoples.

33. It is for that reason that Senegal prizes highly not only traditional diplomacy, but also direct relations between one people and another, or what we call "peoples diplomacy". Such relations can be established mainly through the twinning of communes, on a non-discriminatory and entirely apolitical basis, under the auspices of the United Towns Organisation, to which all communes in Senegal and many others in Africa belong. The weaving of such a network of basic relationships will give more definite and vital support to relations between States and to the United Nations itself. It will give to international co-operation its deepest and fullest significance.

34. In the year 2000 Africa will be more heavily populated than Europe, more heavily populated than North America—not to mention Asia, where the demographic situation is one of the most disturbing. In the coming forty years the rate of growth of the population will be 143 per cent in Asia, 120 per cent in Africa, but only 58 per cent in North America and 34 per cent in Europe. Yet, by a strange contradiction, it is not the countries which have the lowest rate of demographic growth which will see their growth increase. It is thus a monstrous world, a world even more unbalanced than today's, which we are preparing for posterity.

35. How can lasting peace be envisaged under such conditions? Unless we are to deal purely in words or in catch-phrases, we must recognize that we are still far from having created the right kind of conditions for mankind's future stability. If we really believe that we are on the right road, then we are criminally naïve. But how could we believe that we are on the right road?

36. The United Nations has for years been drawing our attention to this tragic situation, and that is certainly one of its most positive roles. When one thinks of the large volume of documents, studies, reports and statements dealing with development, one is astonished at the meagre practical results obtained. In the future we shall be unable to solve any political matter unless we examine its effects on the economy. The issue of peace is today set in terms of economic equilibrium. The United Nations Development Decade is a wager that peace will either be won or finally lost. That is why, despite the signs of relaxation now appearing, if we do not strive hard to find solutions to the economic problems which have arisen, that relaxation will have been but a brief lull before the storm.

37. Those are the few brief reflections which have occurred to me on the opening of this eighteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the

session of the "three D's"—disarmament, decolonization and economic development—as some have called it. Beyond all that, however, there is but one problem, which is that of man and the three elements which have never changed since his arrival on this planet—security, freedom and the full flowering of our human faculties.

38. Today, however, the dimensions of that problem are much larger and the difficulties very much greater. That is why we shall be able to face up to such far-reaching responsibilities only by awakening to the fact of our solidarity and our common destiny.

39. That is why this session, more than any other, should be placed under the sign of man and world solidarity.

40. Mr. SOLIS (Panama): I should like to begin my statement by expressing the deep and heartfelt pleasure of Panama at your election to preside over the debates of this eighteenth session of the General Assembly. The practice of choosing the representative of a small country for such a high office is in itself a very agreeable and sound one. On this occasion one of the countries of the Latin American group has been chosen, and to add to our satisfaction, the country selected is our sister republic, Venezuela, the birthplace of the Liberator, Simon Bolivar, under whose glorious leadership Venezuela and Panama emerged almost simultaneously from the Spanish colonial world.

41. At the Congress of Panama of 1826, inspired, convened and supported by Bolivar, the principles of international law and the foundations for an association of nations, which were laid down, are now included in the United Nations Charter, for they are immutable and will never lose their validity, so long as relations among States are guided by law, justice and international co-operation.

42. Venezuela and Panama have traditionally been united and inseparable in their international policies, and that would be sufficient to explain why we express to you, Mr. President, such heartfelt congratulations and why we are convinced that, with your great qualities, your ability and your experience, you will guide our debates with the tact, the wisdom, the firmness, and the skill shown by Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, your predecessor. In your task you will be able to count on the invaluable assistance of U Thant, the dedicated, able and irreplaceable Secretary-General, who continues to apply the standards and directives laid down for the greater prestige of this Organization and for all time by Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, his unforgettable predecessor, so prematurely and tragically taken from us.

43. Universality is and should be the goal of the United Nations, and the most expedient means of reaching that goal is decolonization. Yet this eighteenth session of the General Assembly is marked at the very outset by a slowing down in the liquidation of colonial régimes. At the last three sessions of the General Assembly the following numbers of newly independent States were admitted to membership of the Organization: seventeen in 1960, four in 1961, and seven in 1962. Since the seventeenth session, no newly independent State has been proposed for membership. Yet the report submitted by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories mentions sixty such territories, that is to say sixty territories which in one way or another are subject to foreign domination or administration. In addition, the Special Committee

set up in November 1961 to examine the situation with regard to the implementation of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples has already studied conditions in twenty-eight of those countries and has recommended immediate independence for at least eleven of them.

44. Notwithstanding the work of these bodies, the General Assembly has so far not received any recommendation from the Security Council for the admission of new Members, and therefore such admission does not appear on the agenda.

45. The process of decolonization should be speeded up in order to achieve that universality which the United Nations requires, if it is to carry out to the full the task for which it was created, if it is to be a true world organization.

46. When the United Nations was founded eighteen years ago, it had only fifty-one Members; today it has 111, and many more countries will be admitted as they achieve independence. Owing to such rapid growth the structure of the Organization's various organs, which was perhaps appropriate in earlier years, is now quite indefensible. Wider membership in these organs is an urgent need, if the African-Asian groups, which, taken together, constitute half the Organization's total membership, are to be adequately represented. To enlarge the membership of the various organs of the United Nations would merely mean giving effect to the principle of universality and applying it proportionately to representation in each of those organs.

47. The meetings of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly took place last year in a heavy and sombre atmosphere of fear. There was universal uncertainty and anxiety, since everyone was aware of the fateful risk of imminent war that would spread over the world in which tested thermo-nuclear weapons of apocalyptic destructive power would be used without restraint. Those meetings ended without sign of any easing of the situation, and the world was left in suspense at the sinister possibility that an accident, an error, an act of imprudence or a deliberate decision might press the button and set off the first bomb and thus provoke a chain reaction of successive explosions that would annihilate humanity in the greatest holocaust ever seen in history.

48. By contrast, the present session is beginning its work in a tranquil atmosphere, with minds unruffled, as a result of two recent events which have miraculously eased world tension, cleared the horizon, restored confidence and renewed flagging hopes for peace.

49. I refer to the installation of direct telecommunication between the White House and the Kremlin, which is an effective step toward avoiding the unleashing of war by error, accident or imprudence, and to the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, which was signed by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom and acceded to by some 100 free countries. It is true that a direct telephone line cannot avoid a deliberately provoked act of war, that the Treaty referred to does not prohibit the manufacture, possession, transport, installation and use of nuclear or thermo-nuclear weapons, and that the Treaty may, in certain circumstances, be terminated at three months notice. But despite these undoubtedly ominous facts, the two events to which I have referred are the first steps taken with a clear desire to prevent situations that might lead to nuclear war. They are useful steps

designed to open up wider possibilities and are conducive to the preservation of peace through the prohibition of war.

50. The significance of the Treaty is most aptly appraised in the following two paragraphs in the Secretary-General's annual report to the Assembly:

"If this Treaty is followed by agreement on other measures aimed at lessening international tension and establishing confidence among States, it may be the beginning of a new era of better understanding between nations, and create a more favourable international climate that would facilitate progress towards general and complete disarmament and the goal of stable international peace and security, which remains the primary purpose of the United Nations ...

"It will require the collective effort and wisdom of all members of the international community to ensure that the momentum generated by the recent agreements is maintained until the goal of global security and freedom from fear of war is reached."
[A/5501/Add.1, section II.]

The first step has been taken. Whether we continue along this road depends upon the good faith and determination of the nuclear Powers that negotiated the Treaty. But continued and tenacious endeavours for the progressive reduction of the risk of war and the strengthening of peace will, as the Secretary-General says, largely depend upon "the collective effort and wisdom of all members of the international community".

51. Of no less, if not of greater importance than the Moscow Treaty, which confines itself to the partial prohibition of nuclear tests and is of uncertain duration, are the statements which we were pleasantly surprised to hear in this General Assembly, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and the President of the United States of America.

52. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union said [1208th meeting] that the people of each country—and they alone—must themselves determine their fate and decide which system they preferred; that all States should observe the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries; that the example given by the Soviet Union was convincing, but did not mean the imposition of one's own system on other States, that the Soviet example meant peaceful competition, competition by example and by force of conviction, competition which completely excluded the use of force to affirm one's own views, and that the need to affirm in international relations the principle of the peaceful coexistence of the two social systems—socialist and capitalist—had been consistently upheld by the Soviet Union.

53. For his part, the President of the United States said [1209th meeting] that the American people believed in self-determination for all peoples; that people must be free to choose their own future, without discrimination or dictation, without coercion or subversion; that there must be a freer flow of information and people from East to West and West to East; that the two nations should concentrate less on their differences and more on the means of solving them peacefully and that the best weapon providing security for both nations was peaceful co-operation.

54. This coincidence of ideas and purposes between the two foremost world Powers, with the ultimate goal of settling their differences in peaceful coexistence

or co-operation, shows quite clearly that the probability of a nuclear war is now sufficiently remote to justify the restoration of a climate of calm and peace of mind.

55. This removal—which may or may not be permanent—of the nuclear danger is the result of an agreement between the great Powers that possess these weapons of annihilation and are struggling for the world hegemony of opposing and irreconcilable ideologies. The United States and the Soviet Union are not the whole world. Yet in solving their own difficulties, in serving their own interests and averting their own dangers, they may save humanity from the risk of atomic war for their own good and for the good of all the peoples of the globe. But this does not mean that the Treaty concluded between Washington and Moscow will solve the difficulties besetting other nations, especially the smaller and less developed countries, which are the immense majority, as is shown by a glance at the membership of the United Nations.

56. It is true that the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests is a sedative for people all over the world, for minds tormented by what seemed to be the immediate threat of global destruction. But this alleviation of world tension does not mean that the problems and critical needs afflicting four-fifths of mankind have disappeared; nor have they diminished in importance and intense urgency. The free nations have almost unanimously acceded to the Treaty, and all of them pray fervently that this may be only the first step, to be followed by another, the prohibition of all atomic weapons and, finally, general disarmament.

57. Thus we seek a world freed from the terror of war, a world of permanent peace. But the fact is that it is not armaments that cause war. Wars are the result of the lack of political, economic or social balance which, failing timely solutions, leads inevitably to situations of grave crisis where the only outlet seems to lie in preparing for a settlement by force when a peaceful arrangement is no longer possible, because the atmosphere has become too heated. Then, when belligerence has become the current policy, it brings with it a specious prosperity because the war industries absorb a great amount of capital, raw materials and labour. Thus, at all levels of the social structure, vested interests emerge which have to be considered when disarmament is planned because it would lead to the indispensable dismantling of the war industries. For these, civilian substitutes would have to be ready since, otherwise, there might be domestic upheavals even greater than those which disarmament might have solved.

58. The treaty banning nuclear weapon tests is most welcome. Also, may we be able to welcome—and the sooner the better—new agreements for the total prohibition of atomic weapons and for the progressive reduction of armaments to a minimum compatible with the internal security of each State. Until the oppressed peoples are given back their freedom, however, until the pressing needs of the great masses of the populations with inadequate living standards are satisfied, and their justified desire for a better life has been fulfilled, so long will the permanent seeds of war find here a propitious soil, awaiting a favourable moment to germinate and spread their roots to other regions. Thus, local disputes would mount up into major regional or world crises to be settled only by recourse to arms, that is to say, by war.

59. So long as there are national systems of government imposed and maintained by force, violating the freedom of citizens and fundamental human rights, there can be no peace. So long as there are communities stagnating at precarious levels of life simply because they lack education, organization and the necessary means and assistance to achieve the results indispensable for a better life, there can be no peace. So long as there are economically strong nations purchasing products and raw materials from underdeveloped countries at a low price and selling them manufactured goods at a high price, so long as there are nations that increase their national income by exploiting less fortunate countries, and so long as the workers of underdeveloped countries are badly paid so that the workers in the more developed nations may receive high wages, there can be no peace. So long as there is discrimination, so long as racial or religious persecution exists, poisoning the souls of men with hatred and rancour, there can be no peace. When all these political, social and economic inequalities have been removed, peace will be assured and excessive armaments will disappear because they will be superfluous.

60. The problems of peace, considered as the original causes which produce the seeds of war, affect the small nations more closely than the great Powers, because it is in the small nations that these seeds germinate; because their problems of growth are the same; because they lack individually the resources and means indispensable for solving such problems by themselves at a rhythm compatible with the growth of their populations; and because only their unity and solidarity can obtain for them the influence and means necessary for obtaining from international bodies the assistance which they need for the adequate and rapid solution of their vital needs. The small nations should not wait for the great Powers spontaneously to recognize their rights and just aspirations, or to offer them, gratuitously, the assistance which they so urgently need, because the wait might be, and usually is, a long one.

61. Here, in the United Nations, all States are equal. Here, in the General Assembly and in the meetings of its specialized agencies, a decision is made by a vote in which all Members are equal, concerning any action to be taken by these international organizations on all world, regional or national issues within their competence. Here, common interests combine to unite and strengthen one another, and antagonistic interests meet to find a solution to their differences.

62. The Republic of Panama has the same difficulties of development common to all nations not highly developed and, from the technical organizations of the United Nations, we have received and continue to receive valuable, timely and efficient financial and technical assistance of great help and benefit to us, and we are pleased to recognize this. The benefits received by Panama deserve our gratitude and strengthen our faith in this Organization.

63. Panama's international problems apart from those due to its membership of the Organization of American States, are bound up with the existence and operation of the Canal cut through the Isthmus of Panama by the United States Government pursuant to existing treaties that do not take into account the interests and just aspirations of Panama, and that are a permanent source of differences that have clouded the friendly relations that should exist between these two nations, and will continue to mar them until those treaties are revised.

64. I shall not tax the patience of the Assembly with a lengthy dissertation on the history of relations between Panama and the United States, or on the contents of the treaties between the two countries, nor even on the injustices that these treaties mete out to Panama. I shall limit myself to mentioning, succinctly and without comment, some very interesting facts which perhaps are not known to all, so that, once and for all, I may wipe out the myth of the advantages which Panama has derived from the Canal.

65. When, in the United States Senate, the treaty with Panama was submitted for ratification^{6/}—a treaty signed in Washington, without the Panamanian Government's knowing its text—some Senators opposed ratification. Then the Secretary of State, John Hay, co-author and signatory of the Treaty, sent a letter to Senator Spooner, asking him not to cause any delay in ratification. In that letter he said:

"As it stands now, as soon as the Senate has voted upon it, we shall have a Treaty that in its main aspects is very satisfactory, amply advantageous for the United States, and we must confess, whether we like it or not, that it is not so advantageous for Panama. You and I know well how many points there are in it that any Panamanian patriot would reject."

Therefore, it is a fact, proved by the words of Secretary Hay, that, when the United States Government pushed through the signing of the Treaty in Washington without waiting for the opinion of the Government of Panama, it did so in the knowledge that the Treaty was disadvantageous to Panama and would be unacceptable to any Panamanian patriot.

66. When the United States Government tried, in 1904, to govern the Canal Zone as though it were a dependency of the United States, the reaction in Panama was so violent that President Theodore Roosevelt had to send the Secretary for War, William H. Taft, to Panama. From the letter of instructions given by the President to his Secretary for War, I quote the following:

"The people of Panama have become unnecessarily alarmed at the establishment of a government in the Canal Zone. Apparently they fear that we may establish in part of their territory an independent and competitive community that will prejudice Panama's trade, reduce its income and diminish its prestige as a nation.

"We do not have the slightest intention of setting up an independent colony in the centre of Panama or of exercising governmental powers other than those necessary to enable us to build, maintain and exploit the Canal adequately and with security, in accordance with the rights granted to us by the Treaty; and what we least want to do is to hamper or hinder the trade and prosperity of the people of Panama."

Secretary Taft went to Panama and fully complied with the instructions received from his President, making the necessary representations to the Panamanian Government.

67. Therefore, it is a fact proved by the word of the President of the United States himself that the correct interpretation of the Treaty on the part of the United States Government was that the Canal Zone would not be an independent colony within the body politic of Panama, that it would not compete with Panamanian trade, that it would not undermine the national prestige

^{6/} Isthmian Canal Convention (Washington, 18 November 1903).

of Panama, and that the United States would exercise in that zone only the functions necessary to build, maintain and exploit the Canal. But a visit to the Canal Zone would be sufficient to convince anyone, at first glance, and without having to delve into the matter, that what goes on there is precisely the opposite of what the President of the United States promised Panama in 1904.

68. The Panama Railroad Company paid an annuity of \$250,000 for the concession of the railway, and that concession was assumed by the United States Government by virtue of the Treaty of 1903. During the nine years that followed the signing of that Treaty, the United States did not pay Panama any annuity for the Canal or for the railway. When those nine years had elapsed, the United States began to pay Panama \$250,000 a year, that is, the same amount which the railway paid previously. When President F. D. Roosevelt devalued the dollar, he agreed that, as from 1934, the United States would pay Panama an annuity of \$430,000 as devalued, equivalent to 250,000 gold dollars before devaluation. Therefore, there was no increase in the annuity paid. In the Treaty signed in 1955,^{7/} the United States agreed to pay an annuity of \$1,930,000. Thus, it is proved that until 1956 Panama received, as payment for the Canal, no more money than it would have received from the railroad had the Canal never been built. From 1956, Panama began to receive \$1,500,000 a year for the Canal. In order to receive that annuity, Panama had to agree, in that same Treaty of 1955, to reduce by 75 per cent the import tax on foreign liquor that was taken from Panama to the Canal Zone. At the same time the maritime conferences, controlled by North American shipping interests, raised freights to Panama. The reduction of the import duty and the rise in freights represented for Panama a greater loss than the sum of \$1,500,000 that Panama began to receive from 1956.

69. In the Canal Zone, there have always been two categories of employment—one with high salaries, and one with low wages. In the first of these categories, 95 per cent of the employees are North Americans and 5 per cent are Panamanians; in the second category, 95 per cent of the employees are Panamanians and 5 per cent are North Americans. Surely, this is enough to prove that discrimination against the Panamanian worker has always existed in the Canal Zone.

70. The United States spends about \$80,000,000 a year in Panama, throughout the Canal Zone, in return for services and on the purchase of Panamanian products. But Panama returns to the United States, in payment for imports and services, about \$100,000,000 a year. That fact is that, because of the Canal, there is no drain of dollars from the United States to Panama.

71. Another point that I think worth making is that the Panama Canal functions as a commercial enterprise, producing income for the United States Treasury, and its operation does not cost the United States taxpayer one cent. On the other hand, the operation of the Canal produces for Panama, which lent its territory for its construction no financial compensation for the concession, since the Treaty of 1955 inflicted greater losses than the annuity stipulated in that same Treaty.

72. I should not continue in this vein because the list would be interminable, and I do not wish to mention

the advantages and benefits that the United States has derived from the Canal, since they are well known to the whole world. But I cannot end without reaffirming the serene confidence that Panama has in its destiny and in the justice of our cause, and that sooner or later we shall receive full redress for our just claims.

73. When we see Mr. John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, fighting whole-heartedly, and in doing so jeopardizing his political interests, to defend the Negroes of his own country against the injustices of the Whites, we in Panama cannot but think that, in order to hear our claims, he will also have to fight the North Americans living in the Canal Zone. For they think the Zone is a feudal territory of their own which will be handed down indefinitely from father to son; they have a typically colonialist mentality, as though the Canal Treaty had been only a pretext for the United States Government to acquire a piece of land in the heart of Latin America, and they cleave to the Panamanian soil of the Canal Zone, because neither here in the United States nor anywhere else would they be able to live with the privileges, advantages and comfort which they enjoy there at the expense of the Panamanian economy.

74. President Kennedy has told the President of Panama, by word and in writing, of his desire to solve the points at issue regarding the Canal and the Treaties governing it, and Panama has confidence in the desire for justice and in the fighting blood of President Kennedy. If, by some misfortune, this confidence is betrayed, Panama will tenaciously continue its already sixty-year-old unequal fight to achieve its objectives with the weapons of reason, justice and international law.

75. But time works in favour of Panama as it does in favour of all the weak nations, and those who oppose the Panamanian aspirations are uselessly trying to oppose the march of time; we shall soon find them by the wayside, tired and weary and we shall leave them behind.

76. The faith of Panama in its destiny and in its future is the same faith that we have placed in this great Organization. It is the same faith that this Organization has earned from all weak nations. It is the same faith that all mankind has placed in a brilliant and permanent future of justice and peace.

77. U THI HAN (Burma): Mr. President, before I embark upon my statement, I should like to tender to you the warm felicitations and congratulations of the Burmese delegation and of myself on your well-deserved election as President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. I am confident that this Assembly, under your wise and able guidance, will help to further develop and consolidate the moves towards a more peaceful world which have been an encouraging feature of recent weeks and months.

78. The year which has passed since we assembled here last September has been an eventful one. It may prove to be—and the speeches we have heard so far at this session give us hope that it will be—a turning-point in the history of relations between States in the modern era. Early during that year the world suddenly found itself teetering on the brink of a nuclear holocaust. Fortunately, restraint and common sense prevailed, and the ultimate disaster was narrowly averted. For a world which had become inured to the existence of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons, and to its use in propaganda, it was a sobering experience to awake

^{7/} Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Co-operation between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama, 25 January 1955.

suddenly and find that what we were witnessing was no propaganda battle but the imminent threat of irretrievable catastrophe.

79. To appreciate the nature of that catastrophe, we have only to recall the statements of the leaders of the world's two leading nuclear Powers that a full-scale nuclear exchange lasting less than sixty minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans and Russians, and that the survivors of a nuclear war would wish they had not survived. Brought face to face in this manner with the grim imminence of a nuclear confrontation, mankind instinctively recoiled in horror. Responsive to the feelings of mankind, the leaders of the two main nuclear Powers decided that they had no alternative to seeking a settlement of the immediate crisis by peaceful means, and they have since then moved further away from the brink of world-wide disaster.

80. Thus the confrontation in the Caribbean may have ushered in a new era, given birth to a new set of values in relations between States and peoples. Ever since the advent of the hydrogen bomb, we have heard it said that there was no alternative to peaceful coexistence. We have no reason to doubt that all those in high places and in a position to influence events really believed this. But such was the state of mistrust and suspicion in the world that the logical conclusions remained undrawn. Instead there came into existence a form of "coexistence" based on the balance of terror. Peace, it was said, would be kept only if each side in the cold war was known by the other side to be in a position to deliver immediately a retaliatory blow inflicting "unacceptable" damage. Thus was developed the concept of the "great deterrent" based on the paradoxical premise that the more modern and potent the means of waging war, the better became the prospects of maintaining peace. The Caribbean confrontation disproved that. The world was lucky indeed to have "got away with it" on that occasion; but it was a close thing, and altogether too dangerous to be repeated at any time in the future. The Caribbean confrontation exploded the myth that in this nuclear age a nation's security depends on armaments. It showed that the security of all nations depends, in the final analysis, on common sense and good will. It showed that in the modern world there is indeed no alternative to peaceful coexistence, and that coexistence based on balance of terror was a false coexistence.

81. It is therefore no accident that the period immediately following on the Caribbean confrontation should have been a period of intense diplomatic activity, especially among the great Powers, and particularly between the two main nuclear Powers. My delegation, which has been convinced of the virtues and absolute necessity of peaceful coexistence for a decade, heartily welcomes this new development which has led to the first two agreements to be reached between the great Powers in eighteen years of almost continuous negotiations on disarmament. I refer, of course, to the agreement to establish a direct communications link between the Heads of the Governments of the Soviet Union and the United States, the need for which was clearly demonstrated during the Caribbean confrontation, and to the recently signed limited nuclear test ban treaty. We congratulate the Powers on these agreements. We appreciate that they constitute first steps and that the road ahead, before we reach the goal of genuine world peace, is still a long and difficult one. Nevertheless, we are aware that these are very essential first steps

which will lead, we hope and trust, to the eventual goal of complete and general disarmament among nations. It is with this hope that we welcome both these agreements, and with which Burma, though not a nuclear Power or even a potential nuclear Power, put its signature to the limited test ban treaty. Though this treaty has no practical effect so far as Burma is concerned, we, in common with most countries similarly placed, felt that it was important for political, moral and psychological reasons that Burma should sign the treaty. The new era which we hope these agreements herald is the concern not only of the great Powers but also of all of humanity, and we consider that we have a duty to humanity to give maximum impetus to this breakthrough in the cold war.

82. As you are no doubt aware, Burma is a member of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament which has been meeting in Geneva since March 1962. In practice it has been a committee of seventeen only due to France's refusal to participate. During the Committee meetings we regretted seeing the vacant seat which was reserved for France. It is our sincere hope that France will yet be able to reconsider its position, and that we shall be able to welcome it at the Committee table in the near future.

83. While speaking of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, it would be unwise and unrealistic for us to ignore another glaring omission. I refer, of course, to the absence of the People's Republic of China from the negotiating table. It has been said that no disarmament treaty would be meaningful in today's circumstances unless it bears the signature of the People's Republic of China. If that is true today, it would become even more true with the passage of time. Consequently, my delegation feels that the time has come for us in the Assembly to be giving some thought to this matter. To allow matters to drift would, in our judgement, only create more and greater problems in the future. The fact that the People's Republic of China continues, to our regret and concern, to be deprived of its rightful seat in the United Nations need not, in our judgement, bar it from the disarmament negotiations. After all, the People's Republic of China participated in the Conference on Laos^{8/} on an equal footing with all the other great Powers.

84. I know I express the views and feelings of a great many nations—nay, the majority of the nations whose representatives are here in this Assembly—that the continued enforced absence of the People's Republic of China from many forums of international discussion violates the norms of universality and mutuality which regulate relations between nations in the present day. Even more, the fact that a quarter of the world's population continues unheard in important international forums is a veritable abandonment of that same common sense which was made so manifest at the time of the Caribbean confrontation, and without which the concept of sovereign nationhood among the diverse communities that make up mankind becomes both farcical and futile. Speaking specifically of the United Nations, we believe that the strength and effectiveness of the Organization depend to a very great degree on the extent to which it reflects the world as it really is. An organization which refuses to face the facts of international life to the extent of ignoring the existence of a Government which has so clearly established itself as the effective Government of China imposes a severe

^{8/} Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question, held at Geneva, 16 May 1961-23 July 1962.

handicap on itself. We believe that this ostrich-like behaviour of burying its head in the sand can only harm the United Nations, and that the development of this world body will remain seriously retarded until this glaring anomaly has been removed.

85. I would like here to refer also to the apparent existence of dual standards under which nations are admitted or denied admittance to many forums of international discussion and negotiation, and to the many conventions and agreements formulated at these forums. It would appear to my delegation that in the international community, universality rather than selectivity should be the guiding principle in regulating attendance and membership at international forums held under United Nations auspices, or under the auspices of specialized or related agencies. However, our experience shows that where the separate Governments of a divided nation seek to gain admission to an international forum, it invariably happens that one Government gains admission to the exclusion of the other. Again, accession to certain international conventions is limited to the Government of one half of a nation and denied to the Government of the other half. That there is no justification for such a discriminatory practice will be apparent to all delegations when it is seen that discrimination and restrictions have been applied to conventions intended to secure highly humanitarian objectives and to other conventions which, for effectiveness, should be adhered to universally.

86. I would not wish to cite examples of such discriminatory practices, but a rather obvious example which will spring readily to the minds of delegations is the refusal to extend the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations to the People's Republic of China and to other States which are still not Members of the United Nations or members of its specialized agencies. My delegation strongly believes that such discriminatory practices are in the long run not merely self-defeating, but tend to dissipate the beneficial effects of those regulations devised for the honourable discourse of nation with nation and man with man.

87. I should like to touch here on a related matter, namely, the need for a fair and equitable representation of States in the various organs of the United Nations, and the attendant issue of the rotation of this membership. As you know, a great number—in fact the overwhelming majority—of Asian and African countries emerged into sovereign nationhood only after the Charter of the United Nations had been framed. It may, therefore, be that in the early days of the United Nations it was understandable that under-representation should be our lot. But it could never have been the intention of the framers of the United Nations Charter, certainly not of the present membership of the United Nations, that this situation should go unremedied. Adequate representation, I would venture to think, is a concomitant of universal membership, and without adequate representation in the various organs of the United Nations the emerging nations of Asia and Africa are denied the right to assume their full responsibilities in this assembly of nations. Equitable geographical representation and rotation of membership is a principle which delegations assembled here readily accept. To put this principle into practice without further delay is the appeal I make to delegations which hold the key to the door that keeps us out. I am hopeful that this year the appeal of my delegation, and of other delegations, will not go unheeded.

88. I referred earlier to the two agreements concluded between the nuclear Powers during recent months. As I said then, we are happy indeed to be able to congratulate the great Powers on these achievements. At the same time, and at the risk of being accused of some immodesty, I think it is only fair to state that part of the credit for these successes—and particularly for the limited nuclear test ban Treaty—should rightly go to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which laid the groundwork for the Treaty. We are happy that this has been recognized by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/5501/Add.1]. For its part, Burma would have preferred a comprehensive treaty covering underground tests as well, because we consider that the continuance of underground testing, especially if it is on a significant scale, would run counter to the spirit and perhaps even the purpose of the limited test ban Treaty and thus slowly undermine it. For this reason, we believe it to be essential that efforts to reach agreement on the discontinuance of underground nuclear weapon tests should be continued, and we note with satisfaction that this is expressly stated in the preamble to the limited test ban Treaty. Meanwhile, we hope to see the limited test ban Treaty—which is of significant value in and of itself—come into force at a very early date, and we hope that it will prove to be the first step towards a comprehensive test ban treaty and, beyond that, towards wider and even more significant agreements.

89. To begin with, we believe that the greatest prospects of success lie in the field of what are called collateral and partial measures of disarmament. We think that the more propitious climate resulting from the signature of the test ban Treaty should itself be used to promote and develop new agreements especially in the "ripe" areas. Among these we would include a NATO-Warsaw Treaty non-aggression pact, measures to reduce the risk of war by surprise attack, miscalculation or failure of communications, and measures to prevent the further dissemination of nuclear weapons, whether into areas of the earth's surface where they do not already exist or into new environments such as outer space. We feel that a resolution of the Assembly which, while urging the Committee of Eighteen to continue its search for an agreement on disarmament, laid special emphasis on collateral and partial measures could prove most useful in the present context.

90. In the introduction to his annual report, the Secretary-General says that:

"The achievement of disarmament continues to be the most important problem of our time." [A/5501/Add.1, sect. II.]

With this view few would disagree. But the task is a vast and complicated one—how vast may be gathered from the fact that in their current arsenals the United States and the Soviet Union each have the capacity to kill the world's population many times over. Up to a few months ago, the absence of political will made any kind of progress towards disarmament impossible. The recent agreements, though only first steps, suggest that political will is now not altogether absent. We hope this trend will grow and develop speedily. But even if it does, we must not expect miracles, because the task of dismantling the vast and highly complicated machinery of war, under international supervision, will inevitably take time. That, however, would be an added reason for making as early a start as possible.

91. And now a few words about the problems arising out of the continuance of colonialism in certain parts of the world, particularly Africa. Having ourselves secured independence shortly after the end of the Second World War, we felt that we were under a strong moral compulsion to help all those peoples still under colonial domination to free themselves. In that spirit, we have over the years given our support to all anti-colonial struggles, and are gratified that, largely as a result of the successful outcome of these struggles, the membership of the United Nations has more than doubled during the last fifteen years. It remains our policy to continue to give all help within our capacity until colonialism has been banished from this planet. We welcome the progress towards independence made in the course of this year by a number of territories, including Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Kenya and Zanzibar.

92. We regret, however, that the same cannot be said about the Portuguese African territories and South West Africa, where the Governments of Portugal and of South Africa continue to pay no heed to the aspirations of the indigenous people to independence, or to resolutions adopted by the United Nations in repeated attempts to ease the serious situations which have arisen out of Portuguese and South African intransigence. Here I should like to stress that we fully sympathize with the position of the African States on these two issues; and short of taking extreme measures which might compromise the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and prove self-defeating, we are prepared to give them full support. We regret, too, that the situation in Southern Rhodesia—where the British administering Power, while displaying some flexibility in co-operating with the United Nations, maintains its constitutional position—continues to give rise to serious concern. To us, the outcome in all these cases is clear: they will all gain their independence. The only question is whether it will be through peaceful evolution or through violent means. We trust that the colonial Powers in all these cases will follow the path of wisdom and thus obviate, both for themselves and for the peoples of the territories concerned, the anguish, sacrifice and suffering which will otherwise become inevitable.

93. One of the most potentially dangerous situations of our present-day world arises from the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of the Union of South Africa. Universally condemned, this policy is doomed to fail in this day and age. Yet the Government of South Africa stubbornly clings to it, and to make matters worse, it seems to be determined to carry it through and to sustain it by force of arms if necessary. In common with a large number of States of like mind, Burma has severed all relations with South Africa, in a joint endeavour to prevail on its Government to abandon its policies of apartheid. We also strongly support the recent resolution of the Security Council^{2/} calling for an embargo on the export of all arms and ammunition to South Africa. We hope that these measures will succeed in persuading the Government to change its attitude before time runs out.

94. Referring to another major problem of the United Nations, that of the former Belgian Congo, my delegation is happy to concur with the views expressed by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report, that with the improvement in the situation,

"...the time has now come when the Congolese Government should assume full responsibility throughout the Congo for the maintenance of law and order." [A/5501/Add.1, sect. V.]

and also that:

"...the time has come when, for various reasons, it is necessary to envisage the early withdrawal and winding-up of the United Nations Force in the Congo." [Ibid.]

95. The United Nations Congo operation has lasted more than three years, and it has proved to be a heavy burden on the Organization—how heavy it is, is revealed by its present shaky financial position. Burma has loyally supported this United Nations effort from the start, and has no regrets on that score. But now that the situation in the Congo is, in our judgement, basically no worse than that obtaining in many other Member States, we feel that the reasons for terminating the United Nations military operation far outweigh those for retaining it for a further period. It is accordingly our view that the United Nations Force should be completely withdrawn by the end of this calendar year, and we trust that this will be done.

96. My delegation believes that on the whole, the year under review has been a good one for our Organization. While the major role in the Caribbean confrontation had of necessity to be played by the nuclear super-Powers, no one can deny that the timely intervention of the United Nations contributed powerfully to taking the edge off the immediate crisis. We consider that this contribution is an excellent justification for the existence of the United Nations. Elsewhere, too, successes have been registered. In West Irian, a festering trouble spot has been removed thanks to the good sense and good will displayed by the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands, and to the good offices of the United Nations. Our congratulations go to all concerned. We trust that similar beneficial results will emerge from the extension of the United Nations good offices to other areas such as Yemen and certain parts of South-East Asia. In the economic and social fields, too, the steady and usually unadvertised task of assisting developing nations to improve the lot of their peoples has been carried forward under the umbrella of the United Nations Development Decade.

97. But having said all this, it is well that we should recognize that the United Nations now lives under a shadow—the shadow of financial bankruptcy. For a variety of reasons, some Member States of our Organization have not found it possible to pay their allotted share of the costs of peace-keeping operations. Our Organization has therefore been reduced to borrowing to meet current expenditure, and is having to consider even less dignified means of raising funds. This is a very clear danger signal, and we trust that a universally acceptable solution to this problem will be found in the near future; for it would be a tragic paradox if what we hope is a major "détente" in the cold war were to be accompanied by the demise of the United Nations for lack of what, by the international standards of today, amounts to an insignificant sum of money.

98. MR. KIRONDE (Uganda): Mr. President, I should like to start by expressing, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, our warm congratulations on your election to the office of President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. I have every reason to expect that your wide experience and great wisdom will render our deliberations happy and fruitful.

^{2/} Official Records of the Security Council, Eighteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1963, document S/5386.

99. Since this is the first time that my delegation has participated in the general debate, I should also like to seize this opportunity to express our heartfelt gratitude for the wise guidance and exemplary devotion to duty which your predecessor, Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, so eminently displayed as President of the seventeenth session and of the fourth special session of the General Assembly.

100. I just said that this is the first occasion on which my delegation is actively participating in the general debate. I intend, therefore, to put to the General Assembly the view of my delegation, as briefly as I can, on such international issues as my delegation regards as of the greatest moment.

101. Speaking from this rostrum last year, on the occasion of my country's admission to this world organization, the Prime Minister of Uganda said:

"I am very conscious that Uganda joins the Organization at a time when humanity is at the crossroads of destiny, when great nations are rearming with the most devastating weapons ever known, when the world Organization and the world at large are ridden with ideological conflicts and the continuing effects of the cold war, and when vast resources that should be used for the alleviation of human misery are being channelled into nuclear armaments." [1158th meeting, para. 95.]

102. Today, less than a year since those words were spoken, there has been considerable improvement in the situation. The eighteenth session of the General Assembly meets when the future points to prospects brighter than they have been in the last decade and a half. The prolongation of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Conference is indeed most encouraging, indicating as it does that there is a growing willingness to discuss and negotiate rather than resort to warlike measures. The signing of the nuclear test ban Treaty by the three nuclear Powers, and subsequently by other nations, albeit only the first step, is yet a significant move in the right direction. It is my delegation's hope and prayer that even greater efforts will be exerted to effect general and complete disarmament.

103. My delegation welcomes the proposal made by the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union [1208th meeting] that there should be a summit meeting of the Heads of State of the eighteen Powers that have been participating in the disarmament talks to deal with general and complete disarmament. Uganda, in acceding to the nuclear test ban Treaty, appealed to the nuclear Powers to use their influence so that Africa would be declared a nuclear-free zone. I should like to echo the voice of the representative of Brazil [1208th meeting] when he pleaded with the nuclear Powers and the United Nations to do all they can to restrict the stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, to mention only a few.

104. As a newly independent nation lately come into its own, Uganda holds the view that no price is too high to pay for peace and has most willingly joined the ranks of peace-loving countries and appended its signature to the nuclear test ban Treaty. We are now hopeful that wiser counsel may prevail, that the nations that have been spending the natural resources of the world over which no one nation in the history of mankind could justifiably claim exclusive monopoly in the manufacture of arms, are beginning to see the futility of the armaments race which has all the elements of

eternity and which threatens to engulf us all in utter destruction.

105. My delegation submits that there is plenty of room on this globe for different peoples with different ideologies, confessing different religions and with different skin complexions, to coexist, and to do so peacefully. The ideological conflict which has been the most salient feature of the East-West relationship and which has had such a profound and unhealthy effect even on the deliberations of this Organization, is not materially different from the spirit of intolerance, racial discrimination and all the various manifestations of hatred which have bedevilled man since the dawn of history.

106. As a newcomer in this council of nations, one cannot help giving expression to a first impression that perhaps this Organization has given more thought to economic and social development and to the promotion of formal education than to the improvement of relations between man and man.

107. While it is meet and right to ban nuclear tests and, indeed, our bounden duty so to do, while it behoves us all to heed the voice of reason from either side of the iron or bamboo curtain, urging us to learn to live in peace with our neighbour be he Jew or Gentile, capitalist or communist, white or black, in the view of my delegation this Organization is in an eminently advantageous position to mount special programmes with the intention of studying the root-cause of the trouble and devising ways and means of eradicating this plague which threatens us all with such catastrophe.

108. This programme of study or research, it is suggested, should concern itself with the sort of literature that children of all lands and of all ages read. It should take into its ambit the whole mental pabulum that is provided for citizens of the Member nations that comprise this august body. If it is found that the literature—indeed the mass media—in any Member State is out of step with or contrary to the basic provisions of the Charter and of the principles of human rights, then it should be the duty of such Member State to enact such appropriate legislation as would render its publication illegal.

109. It is idle to talk of peaceful coexistence when the whole might of the most modern system of mass media in one's own country is locked in mortal combat with the unfortunate inhabitants on the other side of the curtain. It is equally futile to denounce Jim Crow and apartheid policies when children during the most plastic and most impressionable time of their lives are daily indoctrinated in their belief on television, in the movies and indeed in their school text-books that the colour of a man's skin is the most significant thing about him and that to be black is to be a sub-human being.

110. One might ask whether in a world which intends peacefully to coexist, there is still room for the "cow-boy and Indian" sort of stories and whether consideration should not be given to the need for pruning the syllabi of our school systems, throwing out such educational garbage as the story of Robert Clive, where the yardstick for fame and greatness is the ability and craftiness of one man to hoodwink and humiliate another race. A tremendous amount of introspection on the international and national scale right down to the individual is called for to determine whether the education of Member States is properly oriented. The sort of United Nations programme that has been sug-

gested above will, it is contended, enable movie and television producers, writers and news publishers, to realize that the "pen is still mightier than the sword" or, in modern parlance, that television can work greater havoc than the atom bomb. The proper use of publicity material and mass media is the quickest way of ending the cold war and of creating that spirit of co-operation and respect for humanity that is so sadly lacking today.

111. This brings me to my next point. I refer to the extremely explosive situation that exists in Africa today, where a minority group of white settlers in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and in Angola and Mozambique, armed with the most modern and, therefore, most destructive weapons, have deliberately set their face against the upholding of those basic human rights and democratic principles which are the mainstay of this Organization.

112. It is wrong to beguile ourselves that these are local or domestic situations from the consideration of which we are precluded by Article 2 of the Charter. It does not take a clever man to see that in all these areas there is such tension that one need not be called an alarmist for saying that a shooting-war is the only inevitable or foreseeable result in the not too distant future. This is precisely what the arms build-up in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia indicates.

113. What, one may ask, is going to be the attitude of the big Powers when the big show-down takes place in Africa? There is an element of hypocrisy when the big Powers sign the nuclear test ban Treaty and talk of peace and at the same time permit, nay, even actively assist, militarily explosive situations to continue on the African continent.

114. It is a justifiable presumption that if the Republic of South Africa, when it agreed to become a founding Member, had known that the membership of this Organization would later become predominantly non-European—if one may use the racial classification adopted in South Africa—it would not have joined this Organization. One would presume further that the South African representatives find it extremely uncomfortable to sit at conference tables with Africans and other non-Europeans.

115. Surely the only proper thing to do for a State which believes implicitly in racial inequality and racial discrimination is to withdraw voluntarily. But since South Africa has proved so recalcitrant and has so persistently flouted the resolutions of the United Nations, this Organization has no alternative but to excise what has become a diseased organ of the body politic that has been spreading the infection to other parts adjacent to it.

116. It is heartening to know that the request of the Prime Minister of South Africa, that the High Commission Territories should be transferred to South Africa, has been turned down by Great Britain. No doubt Great Britain fully realizes that such transfer would be an act of criminal folly and would incur the displeasure of the whole of the African continent, indeed of the whole world.

117. The atrocities that have been committed by Portugal in Angola and Mozambique render it persona non grata in an international organization that believes in peace and human dignity. My delegation wishes to condemn Portuguese imperialism in the strongest terms. We know that time is on our side, but we feel at the same time that the big Powers can do a great

deal more than they are doing now to hasten Portugal's day of reckoning.

118. When addressing the General Assembly last fall [1158th meeting], the Prime Minister of Uganda left no doubt whatever that, while Uganda is itself underdeveloped and has internal problems of its own, it nevertheless intends to follow an active policy in the elimination of colonial rule.

119. The writing which has for so long been discernible on the wall was further limelighted during the recent summit Conference of Heads of African States and Governments in Addis Ababa, when the signatories of the Charter of the Organization of African Unity unanimously agreed to concert and co-ordinate their efforts and actions to bring about a speedy end to colonialism, apartheid and racial discrimination in all its manifestations.

120. There is one point on which my delegation, in common with other African States, feels so strongly that I consider its settlement a sine qua non before this Organization can function equitably and effectively. I refer to the need for a review of the United Nations Charter.

121. Because of historical circumstances, the membership of the various organs, committees and functional commissions of the Organization has been heavily weighted in favour of founding Members and non-African nations. On the Security Council, to mention only one instance, certain regions of the world are grossly over-represented, while other regions are grossly under-represented or not represented at all. It is wrong to expect African States to abide by the gentleman's agreement concluded in 1946 at a time when, of the present thirty-two independent African States, only three were independent. To say that the Charter should remain sacrosanct until certain States have been admitted to membership is a non sequitur which should not be seriously advanced or entertained.

122. In the light of subsequent experience, there is need to overhaul the Charter on other grounds; for the use of the veto in the Security Council has only too often rendered the Organization a mockery of what it was intended to be and to effect. It has occasionally been found necessary, contrary to the terms of the Charter, to bypass the Security Council and submit questions properly falling within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Security Council, for the consideration of the General Assembly.

123. While the United Nations has a great deal of ground yet to cover in effectively pursuing its aims and objectives, it is good to note that its achievements in the Congo and in the Cuban crisis have earned for it the greatest respect of all freedom-loving peoples. The role which the Secretary-General played in the most difficult of international situations deserves special tribute by my delegation.

124. As a next-door neighbour, Uganda is deeply interested in what goes on in the Congo. The maintenance of United Nations forces in the Congo for a longer period, provided that that is the wish of the established Government of the Congo and provided also that this is coupled with an intensive course of military training of the Congolese citizens, should be welcomed by everybody concerned.

125. Great Britain's intention to transfer military forces and arms to the settler Government of Southern Rhodesia is calculated to strengthen the position, both

physically and morally, of the white settlers in the whole of southern Africa. Such transfer of political and military power by Britain would be a grave disservice to the cause of African freedom, and my delegation earnestly hopes and prays that no such transfer of powers or attributes of sovereignty will be effected until Southern Rhodesia adopts a government fully representative of all the inhabitants of the colony.

126. Let me point out yet one more beacon in the dark and stormy sea. In a world torn and eaten up by prejudice and intolerance it was a good thing to hear the President of the United States making a brave and forthright speech against racial discrimination and exhorting his own countrymen to treat Negro people and Negro children even as they and their own children would like to be treated. It was a great speech, but I should like to submit, without intending in any way to detract from the efficacy of the speech, that, away back home in Africa, what the Americans do in Alabama

and Mississippi speaks so loud that my fellow countrymen find the greatest difficulty in hearing what the President of the United States is saying. My people know little or nothing about the complicated division of powers between Federal and State Governments in the United States of America. It is the broad American image daily projected on the world screen that they are concerned with.

127. I will not dwell on the numerous bounties which Uganda has obtained, either before or since it was admitted to membership, from this Organization and its specialized agencies, whether it be in the form of malaria-eradication projects, the supply of UNICEF milk, or technical assistance. Even without such material or other benefits Uganda would still hold, as it steadfastly does indeed, its strong undying faith in the United Nations and all that it stands for.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.