

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

NINETEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1322nd
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 26 January 1965,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Item 9 of the provisional agenda:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. Bouteflika (Algeria)	1
Speech by Mr. Kyprianou (Cyprus).	5
Statement by the representative of India. . .	11

President: Mr. Alex QUAISON-SACKY (Ghana).

ITEM 9 OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. BOUTEFLIKA (Algeria) (translated from French): The Algerian delegation is taking part in the general debate after most of the problems confronting the world today have been dealt with at length by preceding speakers. Their statements have all shown clearly the abiding desire of peoples to live in peace, to avert the present threats to mankind and to ensure a better and more worthy future for the generations still to come. Behind this urgent aspiration, however, lies the anxiety of men who are troubled by uncertainty regarding the future and distressed by the present threats to their security.

2. Almost twenty years have elapsed since the proclamation of the United Nations Charter. Yet the world is still subject to great disturbances, notwithstanding the fact that, throughout this period, our Organization has directed its efforts towards finding a solution to the problem of maintaining international peace and security.

3. These efforts have not, of course, been in vain. They have made it possible to resolve crises which might have led to a general confrontation. On many occasions, they have helped to avert the spectre of war; they have assisted in the liberation of some nations which, now they are independent, are making their contribution to the common struggle for the well-being of mankind. Nevertheless, much still remains to be done; tension persists throughout most of the world; nations are still waging a fierce struggle to obtain their freedom; men are still suffering from oppression and see their most elementary rights spurned and ignored; poverty, hunger, and disease are still rampant in vast areas of the world; ignorance is still the lot of the overwhelming majority of men; and, in addition to all these misfortunes, there hangs over us the threat of a nuclear war which would be fatal to mankind.

4. Now, as in the past, the problem of world peace is still governed, in practice, by the state of relations

between the great Powers and by the relative size of their armaments.

5. For the young countries of Africa and Asia this problem still depends on ideological confrontations or on the still insatiable appetites of the imperialist Powers. The sources of conflict and bloodshed are now more often to be found in the relationships between great and small Powers. It is owing to this opposition of unequal forces and the fact that some countries claim a continuing tutelary right based on their own power, that shooting wars are started.

6. In this situation, there is now a growing awareness in the new nations which are striving to pursue a policy consistent only with the interests and aspiration of their peoples, a policy directed strictly towards the consolidation of national independence and towards economic development, freedom and peace. These countries believe that no State should act as an auxiliary to a great Power. They are convinced that no State should become involved in pacts which are contrary to the most obvious interests of its inhabitants or allow military bases to be established on its territory.

7. These young countries, of which Algeria is one, consider that the policy of non-alignment elaborated at Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo remains an effective instrument for the reorientation of economic relations towards progress, freedom and peace. Non-alignment, which implies a policy of independence in the face of appeals from the great Powers, must not be confused with a policy of dissimulation and constant acrobatics. Non-alignment cannot be synonymous with negative neutralism as expressed by manifesting a wish to remain a mere international onlooker.

8. For us, non-alignment means a policy of unremitting defence of certain fundamental principles, involving, in particular, a constant struggle against any attempt by one country to subordinate another. By keeping clear of bloc politics and by refusing to become accomplices in imperialistic operations, those who adhere to the concept of non-alignment will help in attaining universal co-operation based on equality without any political and ideological strings.

9. In this sense, the policy of non-alignment, to which we remain firmly attached, is an important contribution to the establishment of genuine peaceful coexistence and a fruitful and lasting peace. Peaceful coexistence between countries having different political and social systems has become a necessity of our time. It is a prime necessity for the establishment of peace in the world.

10. The balance of terror created by atomic weapons has made peaceful coexistence among the great Powers

a historical necessity. The same does not hold true of relations between an economically strong State and a country which is not yet sufficiently developed economically and militarily for its own defence. It is an established fact that some Powers continue to see their relations with other countries in terms of economic domination and political pressure. The events in Cyprus, South-East Asia and the Congo, as well as the blockade of Cuba, are recent illustrations of this.

11. In a world where armed conflicts arise out of the relations between great Powers and small countries, the concept of peaceful coexistence must take on a wider and more universal meaning. If peace is our common goal and our greatest desire, it cannot, we think, result from the mere existence of peaceful relations or any "détente" which may be noted between the two great Powers. In Africa, shooting wars are being waged in Angola, Mozambique, so-called Portuguese Guinea and the Congo, while in South Africa there are clear signs of a latent war.

12. Peace is one and indivisible. Colonialism and racial discrimination carry within them the seeds of bloody conflicts. There can be no peaceful coexistence and no peace as long as colonialism endures. True peaceful coexistence and a general peace inevitably require the total elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism.

13. However, the economic imbalance between States creates conditions favourable to the development of neo-colonialism and a policy of intervention in the internal affairs of other States. The presence side by side of poverty and wealth constitutes one of the greatest threats to peace in the world. The economic development of the newly independent nations is suffering from the after-effects of colonial exploitation.

14. The former colonies have more often than not inherited an economic infrastructure which is inefficient and ill-suited to their particular needs. For the developed countries they are still a source of cheap raw materials and also a market for manufactured goods. The newly independent countries are part of an economic system which, in its present form, makes rich nations richer and poor nations still poorer. The widening gap between the two maintains and aggravates an imbalance which does not help in establishing the conditions for a just peace.

15. Human relations must be built on the principle of equality and on an awareness of the solidarity of men and nations. The fight against hunger, disease and ignorance concerns the international community as a whole and is a primary objective of the United Nations.

16. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development^{1/} recognized this danger; this is a first positive step and should lead to the establishment of an international economic policy which will favour the development of economically weak countries and ensure a more equitable distribution of wealth. The Algerian delegation hopes that the recommendations of the Geneva Conference will be heeded and that the international machinery provided for in the Final Act will be set up without delay.

^{1/} Conference held at Geneva from 23 March to 15 June 1964.

17. The policy of combating under-development requires the mobilization of powerful resources and considerable capital. However, these resources and capital would amount to only a very small fraction of what is now spent by the great Powers on the armaments race. The implementation of a sincere policy of peace and international "détente" would find the greatest stimulus in a combination of these two complementary measures: disarmament and efforts to overcome under-development. The Algerian delegation supports the suggestion that a proportion of the present armament budgets should be allocated for economic development. It is clear, nevertheless, that disarmament is still essential if mankind is to be freed from fear and insecurity.

18. Recent years have seen some slight progress in this direction, but much still remains to be done. Talks are continuing, but no positive conclusions are being reached. We believe, therefore, that it is essential to broaden the scope of the present negotiations by including in them all countries, for all have an equal interest in the solution of the problem. For this reason, we think that a world conference on disarmament might constitute a more realistic approach.

19. To free mankind from poverty and fear should be the goal of our Organization in its efforts directed against under-development and towards general disarmament. These objectives are consistent with the strengthening of international co-operation and the consolidation of world peace. Such action would be incomplete, however, if it did not at the same time aim at restoring man's dignity and freedom.

20. The practice of racial discrimination is contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is an insult to human dignity. For racialism in all its forms to disappear, there must be a profound change in men's minds and at the same time prejudice must be wiped out and all discriminatory legislation revised. Mankind cannot forget the horrors brought about in the recent past by the violence and brutality of unbridled racialism; that bloody episode is an indelible stain on human history. Unfortunately, it cannot be said today that the indignation aroused in the conscience of men has dealt a final blow to manifestations of that evil.

21. The policies of apartheid of the Republic of South Africa are a challenge to the whole of mankind. The United Nations has already given its attention to this problem. However, all the measures which it has taken come up against the obstacle created by the unco-operative attitude of certain countries and the obstinate refusal of the Pretoria Government to put an end to its policy of segregation. The repressive measures against Africans are even being intensified. The Algerian delegation wishes to draw the attention of all Member States to the gravity of this situation and to the responsibilities which we all bear.

22. A virtually similar situation exists in Southern Rhodesia, where a racist minority is planning to proclaim the independence of the country in conditions which would place the African inhabitants entirely at its mercy. Africa has warned the racist Government at Salisbury against taking any action designed to perpetuate the present situation. Any such

action would meet with the vigorous resistance of all Africans.

23. The particular cases which I have just mentioned are not the only examples. My country, which waged a long war in order to recover its independence, cannot remain indifferent to the struggle for freedom being waged by the peoples still under colonial rule. In Angola, in Mozambique, in so-called Portuguese Guinea, the inhabitants are still under the yoke of oppression. The heroic struggle which they are waging commands our admiration. The Organization of African Unity has already taken a clear stand on this question and has taken measures to strengthen the liberation struggle in those countries.

24. However, this problem cannot be regarded as an African problem only. All countries, and the United Nations in particular, have a responsibility in the matter. We have repeatedly debated here the question of the Portuguese colonies, yet we are compelled to recognize that, for all our efforts, the problem has not been solved. However much we may wish to settle problems by peaceful means, we would be failing in our duty if we did not give our full support to peoples who have no choice but to resort to arms in order to assert their right to freedom.

25. At the southern end of the Arabian Peninsula another people is still waging a fierce struggle against British rule. The United Kingdom should reconsider its attitude with regard to that area and accede to the legitimate aspirations of the people concerned. By so doing it will only be complying with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

26. The twentieth session of the General Assembly should mark the liberation of all peoples and the final disappearance of colonialism. Decolonization must be fully achieved, for not only does it establish freedom, it also paves the way for sound and honest co-operation. The co-operation between Algeria and France, which some thought impossible, provides a convincing demonstration of this.

27. Experience has shown, however, that even when independence is recognized it is not always respected. There is frequent interference by the great Powers in the internal affairs of the new States.

28. The measures taken against Cuba are a violation of the principle that each country should be free to choose its own form of government. They can in no way solve the present political problems and their continuation poses a lasting threat to peace. A more objective approach to the situation should lead to negotiations between Governments with a view to settling differences in a spirit of respect for the sovereignty and equality of States.

29. In South-East Asia, too, the situation is continuing to deteriorate as a result of foreign intervention. If the decisions of the Geneva Conference were effectively and honestly implemented, that would, in our view, create conditions favourable to the solution of these problems.

30. The African continent, having known colonial domination longer than the rest of the world, is particularly conscious of the world evolution towards

freedom, social justice, economic development and peace.

31. The warm welcome given throughout Africa to the proclamation of the Charter signed at Addis Ababa and the attachment of all Africans to the Organization of African Unity must not conceal from us the difficulties, both internal and external, which that young organization is facing. African unity is as yet only an aspiration, but it is one which finds a deep and sincere echo among all the peoples of our continent. There is a growing consciousness of it and it is already showing itself to be a vital need; tomorrow it will be an inescapable reality. Despite the scepticism of some and the hostility of others, our faith in the future of a united, free and prosperous Africa remains unshaken.

32. My delegation is proud that the Presidency of the General Assembly for this session has been entrusted to an African. It takes this opportunity, Mr. President, to extend to you its warmest congratulations. Your election is a fitting tribute to your personal qualities, to the persistence you have always shown in your work in this great Organization, and to your experience in international affairs. In entrusting to you the Presidency of the Assembly, the representatives of the States Members of the United Nations have paid a well-deserved tribute to Ghana, a country for which we have particularly fraternal feelings. Through you, Africa as a whole is honoured by this token of confidence and esteem.

33. The Algerian delegation also congratulates the States of Malawi, Zambia and Malta, which have just taken their places among us. Their efforts will strengthen our common struggle for peace.

34. The African continent's slow and difficult advance towards independence has not yet been completed. Africa is still exposed to the manoeuvres and interventions of foreign Powers which have not lost their interest in exploiting its riches, making use of its strategic possibilities and maintaining spheres of political influence.

35. The Organization of African Unity has vigorously denounced such interventions, which are aimed at perpetuating a state of subjugation that the Africans have resolved to terminate once and for all. The establishment of the Organization of African Unity reflects this desire of the African countries to maintain their independence and to make their solidarity the primary guarantee of their freedom.

36. In this Africa which is striving to find itself, certain States may have felt that despite the elimination of colonialism, their territorial integrity was not respected when their national sovereignty was restored. Their claims against both countries—claims quite rightly rejected by their neighbours—have inevitably contained the germs of fratricidal strife. There is surely no need to repeat here the arguments put forth by both sides in support of diametrically opposed positions.

37. The African States, in their desire to eliminate factitious obstacles and imaginary prerequisites to African unity and to create the material conditions in which our continent's economic development and the

consolidation of its independence can take place, have decided to proclaim as an inviolable principle respect for the frontiers inherited from the colonial system. Because this principle meets in a realistic manner the requirements of brotherhood, mutual respect and good-neighbourliness, it was adopted as one of the principles of peaceful coexistence by the non-aligned States at the recent Cairo Conference.^{2/}

38. The patience and generosity of our peoples, who set no conditions to their unity, are matched only by our trust in our partners and our sincere desire for real, far-reaching, honest and unselfish co-operation, reflecting the mutually complementary nature of the different parts of Africa. The building of a united Maghreb, within the framework of respect for the charters which we have signed, is becoming an increasingly inevitable and inspiring reality. In striving to attain this goal we are but heeding an imperative demand of our peoples, who, today as yesterday, have unanimous faith in their common destiny.

39. In obedience to the same demands, the African peoples are following with particular interest the development of the situation in the Congo and are sparing no effort to find an African solution to this problem. They realize that the complexity of this particularly distressing question is primarily due to factors which are part of the legacy of the past. However there can be no doubt that imperialist intervention has aggravated the situation. The aggression against the people of the Congo places a heavy burden of responsibility on those who perpetrated it. So long as those aggressors do not fully realize the seriousness of what they are doing, relations between Africa and a world which only yesterday was stifling that continent are likely to be of an artificial nature.

40. The Congo problem is essentially an African problem, the complete and final solution to which must be found by the Congolese people and by them alone. The Organization of African Unity must therefore be given the support of all countries devoted to peace—and freedom—in its efforts to further the establishment of peace in the Congo within the framework of national reconciliation, effective independence and the unity of the people and the territory.

41. Among those deprived of their essential rights the Palestinian people warrant special attention. Arbitrarily ousted from their fatherland, they are leading a miserable existence on the frontiers of their country. The Arab world was affected first of all by the Palestine problem probably because the Palestinian people are Arabs and above all because the establishment of Israel introduced into the Middle East a source of trouble and a constant threat to the Arab countries. It would be erroneous to conclude from this that the problem is a racial or religious one. If anti-Semitism exists, it is not in the Arab countries that it will be found.

42. The Palestine problem is a political problem because it poses a constant threat to international security and because it is essentially a colonial problem. Algeria feels as strongly about the racial tragedy of the people of South Africa as it does about that of

the Palestinian people. While the Palestine problem is, because of its nature, of particular importance to the Arab world, its dimensions are such that it concerns the whole community of nations.

43. Our active siding with the Palestinian people may thus be compared only to our resolute commitment to the peoples of South Africa, Angola and Mozambique and to all those who are fighting for the freedom and dignity of mankind.

44. The Palestinian people rightly refuse to bow to a situation imposed on them by force. Like the peoples which are fighting for national liberation, they have organized their struggle, notably by setting up the Palestine Liberation Organization.

45. The most recent Conference of the non-aligned countries expressed its support for the Palestinian people and took a clear stand in favour of their right of self-determination. My Government, faithful to the principle of opposing colonialism and racial segregation in all its forms, will spare no effort to uphold and support the just cause of the Palestinian people.

46. Now that continents are guided by the same ideals, now that they are waging the same struggle, they can no longer be set one against another. It is in this new context that we are confidently witnessing the advent of a union of two regions, Africa and the Middle East, and hailing the co-operation between two organizations—the Organization of African Unity and the League of Arab States. United by common goals, they have joined in a common effort to overthrow colonialism in all its forms.

47. The co-operation between these organizations gives an even clearer meaning to African-Asian solidarity. The African-Asian countries are faced with problems which are peculiarly inherent in their common destiny. In the diversity of their experiences they find today, not an element of discord, but a factor of mutual enrichment. Ten years will have elapsed between the holding of the first and the second African-Asian conferences. The second one will provide the participating States with a further opportunity for a salutary exchange of views with the aim of making a joint contribution to the solution of international problems—a contribution which will be more dynamic as well as more in keeping with and better adapted to current realities.

48. In a constantly evolving world, this decade reveals the extent of the changes which have occurred and of the transformations in international relations. The road travelled in that interval by the peoples of the developing countries shows very clearly their growing role in the settlement of international affairs.

49. The Geneva Conference on Trade and Development has shown us that the community of interests of the developing countries opens up more definite prospects for the broadening of African-Asian solidarity to include the Latin-American countries. That community of interests will unquestionably lead to an even greater solidarity among these three continents, a solidarity which is bound to make an important contribution to the development of international relations in the direction of peace and progress.

^{2/} Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries.

50. The United Nations faces a crisis which could prove most grave indeed if all those of goodwill do not unite in order to solve it. No one can deny the existence of financial difficulties at the present time. They are monopolizing the attention of all delegations. It is our view, however, that the origin of this state of affairs is to be found in a political problem which transcends both legal and financial considerations.

51. We are now confronted with difficulties which stem from the changes which have been taking place in international life during the past twenty years. The conception of the United Nations as it was established in 1945 on the basis of a particular international situation seems no longer appropriate to the political situation existing today. There is a clear contradiction between the state of international relations, for which it is desired to set up machinery, and the accelerated evolution of the world in a direction which was not anticipated at the end of the Second World War.

52. The accession of many States to independence, the development of East-West relations, the steadily increasing strength of the principles of non-alignment, the developing countries' realization of their solidarity—all these factors have created a situation for which the present structure and machinery of the United Nations are not suited.

53. Is there any need for me to mention the contradiction between the principle of equality of States and the rules and usages which distort it? Need I mention the contradiction between the fundamental concept of collective responsibility of the maintenance of peace and the present machinery which prevents the greater part of mankind from sharing that responsibility in its most important aspects?

54. In these circumstances, to confine ourselves to solving the financial issue would be to ignore the real problem and would aggravate the crisis with which we are confronted. If we merely treat the symptoms while allowing the malady to spread, we will be moving rapidly towards the extinction of our hopes.

55. The recent withdrawal of the Republic of Indonesia from the Organization can be fully understood only as it relates to the various aspects of the United Nations crisis. Only by becoming aware of these problems and resolutely seeking the solutions which will bring most benefit to mankind can we prevent conflict and disillusionment. To deplore the decision of the Indonesian Government without examining the reasons underlying it and, above all, the lesson to be drawn from it, would be to fail to recognize the true nature of the problems at hand.

56. Similarly, the exclusion of the People's Republic of China is of particular concern to us. Common sense, realism and the obvious interest of all mankind demand the active participation of that great Power in international organizations. The Algerian delegation believes that the United Nations would strengthen its authority and consolidate its prestige if it put an end to a situation which keeps a large part of the world's population outside the international community.

57. It is high time that we adjusted our institutions to the existing realities if we wish to establish genuinely

sound international relations and contribute to the strengthening of world peace.

58. Algeria, for its part, is deeply attached to peace and to international co-operation. It wishes to make its modest contribution to the United Nations' effort to build a better world. Like all countries aspiring to advance along the path of progress and justice, Algeria offers its friendship to all peoples, without rancour, without prejudice and without reservation.

59. We believe the United Nations can and must be the instrumentality through which we will act. We hope that it will rapidly overcome its difficulties and that, sustained by the confidence of all its Members, rejuvenated and reinforced by a better form of organization, it may fulfill the hopes placed in it by all peoples. I shall conclude with this expression of faith in the future of our Organization and of mankind. I thank you for your kind attention.

60. Mr. KYPRIANOU (Cyprus): Mr. President, I feel that before opening my statement it is my duty to pay tribute to the memory of Winston Churchill. The death of Winston Churchill deprived the world of a great man, but that great man is now possessed by history.

61. Mr. President, earlier in the general debate and in the course of a brief intervention, I had the opportunity to express to you the feelings and the heartfelt congratulations of my delegation on your well deserved unanimous election to the Presidency of the General Assembly. Your election constitutes both a tribute to you, personally, as well as to the whole of Africa, whose role in the establishment of world order on the basis of peace with freedom and justice has been rapidly growing in significance.

62. I should also like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's sincere congratulations and warm welcome to the new States admitted to membership at the beginning of this session. I fully share the confidence expressed by most of the speakers who have taken the floor earlier, that Malawi, Zambia and Malta will play to the full their part in the general efforts to promote the objectives of the United Nations, namely, peace with freedom and justice. These newly independent States—like many other States in this Assembly that recently achieved their freedom—know only too well the real meaning of peace with freedom and justice. Their contribution, therefore, towards this objective, which is the basic goal of the United Nations, will, we believe, be both valuable and positive.

63. From the beginning of its present session the General Assembly has been confronted with a deadlock over the issue of payment for peace-keeping operations, and as a result of this it has been, and still is, operating in an unusual and unsatisfactory manner, and in an atmosphere of disappointment and frustration. While appreciating the considerations that necessitated the present manner of conducting the General Assembly, we feel strongly that the exercise of the right to vote ought not to be indefinitely postponed, and that this session should be allowed to proceed normally with its scheduled work. My delegation sincerely hopes and trusts that a way out of the present impasse will be found which will enable

the General Assembly to discharge its functions properly. This becomes the more imperative when we turn our attention to the many serious and important issues appearing on the provisional agenda of this session.

64. Let us also bear in mind that 1965, which marks the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, has been designated as International Co-operation Year. Let us not permit this landmark in history to pass without causing at least some of the expectations originally conceived by one of the greatest statesmen of our time, the late Jawaharlal Nehru of India, to materialize.

65. In this respect, I wish to point out that while the plans and programmes suggested by the Committee for the International Co-operation Year, acting within its terms of reference, are most commendable, it might be well to urge that a more global view of the significance of International Co-operation Year be taken, so as to make it encompass the more fundamental issues which face the world today, and in respect of which positive and decisive action is greatly needed if the ideal of international co-operation is to be substantially advanced in the service of mankind and peace.

66. Issues such as the achievement of general and complete disarmament and positive and constructive steps to that end; the total prohibition of the use and testing of nuclear weapons, as well as the prohibition of their wider dissemination; the establishment of nuclear free zones in as many parts of the world as possible; the narrowing of the gap between the developed and the developing countries; the total abolition of discrimination and privileges; the equality of all citizens in every State, irrespective of ethnic origin, religion, colour, creed or sex; the total eradication of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations; and the establishment of a world order in international relations based upon the strict adherence to the principles of equality, complete freedom, self-determination, justice and mutual respect for the sovereign rights of each State as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations, are among the most basic issues that require our most serious and urgent consideration. It is by giving our attention to these basic issues and by providing through positive and effective action, the possibilities for a solution to the existing problems related to these issues, as well as to other major problems, that the present session of the General Assembly, if permitted to function properly, may be able to make International Co-operation Year a success and leave its own imprint in history.

67. When we look ahead to the task which the United Nations is expected to perform, in furtherance of the principles and purposes of the Charter and in order effectively to promote conditions of security, peace and justice in the world, by removing the causes of friction, eliminating the causes of fear and possible catastrophe, and healing the wounds of many peoples, that have come about either through foreign domination and exploitation, or through their own poverty and weakness, it is only then, perhaps, that the deep disappointment and frustration, shared by most of us, can be made more easily understandable. It is only

when we try to conceive the great mission of the United Nations and the basic importance of the various issues that the United Nations is being called upon to deal with that we may come to realize how comparatively trivial is the issue—very important indeed if examined in isolation—which has, up to this very moment, been preventing the Assembly from going ahead. It is not, I submit, beyond the capability of this Assembly to resolve this crisis.

68. In this connexion, I wish to express our deep appreciation to the Secretary-General, together with our sincere hope that his efforts towards removing the obstacles which have for some time now been hindering the normal functioning of the Assembly, will soon be crowned with success.

69. Our deep appreciation also goes to the President of the Assembly for his tireless efforts to facilitate a solution to the present impasse and whose patience and great skill have made it possible for him to discharge the heavy responsibilities of his high office under most delicate and difficult circumstances in an exemplary manner. Tribute is also due to the former President of the Assembly, the representative of Venezuela, for his valuable contribution in this respect. One cannot but congratulate the entire African-Asian Group, and in particular its Committee of Twelve, for its continuous endeavours to contribute constructively, with the interests of the United Nations genuinely at heart, towards a solution to the problem confronting this Organization today. It is only proper to make specific reference to the constructive endeavours of the representatives of Afghanistan and Nigeria, as well as to the representatives of Algeria and Burma, former and present Chairman respectively of the African-Asian Group, for their efforts in this respect.

70. My country is small in population and resources. It is, however, inhabited by a very ancient people, fully conscious of their responsibilities to others, as well as to themselves. Cyprus was for too long under foreign domination and oppression. It has fought hard for freedom and for the principles of the Charter. Ever since Cyprus became a Member of the United Nations it has consistently and steadfastly adhered to the letter and the spirit of the Charter, and advocated, as strongly as it has been able, the strengthening of the United Nations. In our modest way we have consistently supported all the efforts of the United Nations to secure peace with freedom and justice. It is in this spirit that we ourselves turned to the United Nations—despite many pressures and attempts to prevent us from doing so—when we found our small country confronted with threats and acts of aggression on the part of a powerful neighbour. It is in the same spirit that we also welcomed the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus.

71. We strongly believe in the United Nations and we are completely dedicated to the principles of its Charter. We believe that the United Nations is not a structure that may lightheartedly be allowed to drift into a state of inertia or collapse, for if it does the prospects for the future of humanity could not but be very grim. The United Nations still remains the hope of humanity, in a world full of dangerous an-

tagonisms and injustices, in a world in which expediency, sinister interests and exploitation have not yet given way to morality and justice. The United Nations must not only survive, but it should be further strengthened.

72. This is in the interests of the world as a whole and, even more so, it is in the interests of the small and weak countries, striving to preserve or strengthen or attain their freedom. What followed after the collapse of the League of Nations, however grave and terrible, could not, in any way, be compared with what might follow if the United Nations were to collapse. It would be too horrifying to even attempt to imagine.

73. The United Nations must survive and must be strengthened. It is in this spirit that we feel that the problems confronting the United Nations should be speedily resolved. It is in this spirit that we feel that all countries, deprived at this moment of their rightful place in the United Nations, either through foreign domination and colonialism or through obsolete and unrealistic considerations, should soon be taking their seats in this world Assembly as equal Members. It is in the same spirit that we wish to express our sincere regret at Indonesia's decision to abandon its rightful place in the United Nations.

74. In our noble aim to promote effectively the establishment of a new world order based on peace with freedom and justice, the primary objective and duty of all of us on this twentieth anniversary of the United Nations, is to rededicate ourselves to the United Nations and to the principles of its Charter, upon which the very foundations of the Organization rest.

75. In its search for effective measures to promote the ideal of world peace, the General Assembly has had to consider over and over again the question of disarmament, to which it has always attached, and rightly so, great importance. That is one of the issues that the Assembly may be called upon to deal with once more in the course of its present session. With regard to that vital question, it has to be noted that another year has elapsed without any significant breakthrough, despite the momentum generated by the signing of the Moscow Treaty on the banning of nuclear tests.^{3/}

76. While the policy of accommodation and relaxation of tensions between East and West—which has been given further impetus by recent statements made by leaders of both Power blocs—may go some way towards lessening the suspicion and distrust which lie at the bottom of the failure to reach agreement on disarmament, the fact cannot be ignored that the present state of affairs—when we witness not disarmament, but a continued increase in the stockpiles of nuclear armaments—constitutes a continuous danger to the very existence of mankind. While general and complete disarmament is and should be the ideal and final goal, and while efforts in this respect should be accelerated, one should be realistic enough to accept the fact that an over-all agreement of this nature may take time to achieve. Consequently, Cyprus wishes

to stress once again the need to take certain specific steps parallel with this great effort, including the halting of arms production and the freezing of armaments at the existing levels, particularly among the nuclear Powers, as collateral measures preliminary to an over-all agreement. As an important step in the direction of a comprehensive disarmament treaty, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee—whose efforts, with special emphasis on the important contribution of the non-aligned countries participating in its work, are to be commended—might usefully take into account the suggestion for the setting up of an international disarmament organization as a specialized agency. Moreover, the Committee might consider measures for safeguarding more effectively the security of States by a collective security system, always under the auspices of the United Nations, as a step that might facilitate further the possibility of disarmament. These are but a few measures that may, we believe, be usefully considered.

77. With regard to the more specific question of nuclear testing, we continue to hope that it will soon prove possible for the Moscow Treaty to become more comprehensive by an agreement to ban underground tests. Cyprus continues to support fully the initiative taken by Ethiopia in suggesting the convening of a conference for the purpose of concluding an agreement on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. Moreover, we feel strongly against the storing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons by any of the nuclear Powers on the territory of other countries, and, in this connexion, I wish to place on record our firm view that the maintenance or establishment of foreign military bases and the stationing of troops on the territory of other countries, and especially against the express will of those countries, is a gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of those States, as well as a threat to freedom and international peace.

78. How gratifying it would be if atomic energy and other great achievements in science and technology were used exclusively for peaceful purposes and if the vast economic resources now devoted to the stockpiling of armaments or the maintenance of military bases were diverted into the fields of the economic and social development of less developed countries. We sincerely hope that one day, not too distant—and indeed it has to be before it is too late—we shall all be in a position to hail such a tremendous achievement of man's will to live and prosper.

79. With regard to the question of economic and technical assistance to the developing countries, it is our firm view that such assistance may be more usefully and properly channelled through the United Nations than on a bilateral basis.

80. Cyprus is grateful to the Special Fund and to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance for their contribution to the development of the country. I hope that the anticipated merger of these two programmes into the United Nations Development Programme will revitalize the effort of the United Nations to the greater benefit of the developing countries.

81. The problem presented by the growing economic inequality between the rich and the poor countries has

^{3/} Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed at Moscow, 5 August 1963.

been aptly characterized by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/5801/Add.1] as fundamentally as serious as the East-West tension, with all the dangers they portend for the continued existence of mankind. The gap should be narrowed and every effort should be made to that end. In this connexion I should like to express our satisfaction at the achievements of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and to state our wholehearted support for the recommendations made by the Conference and for the resolution adopted on 30 December 1964 by the Assembly on the setting up of a permanent secretariat for this Conference [resolution 1995 (XIX)]. As a developing country, we trust that the expectations surrounding this great effort will be realized and that this will positively contribute to narrowing the gap between the developed and the developing countries, and thereby promote the aims of international economic and social co-operation.

82. Disarmament, the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the economic and social development of the small and developing countries, are very important factors in promoting the idea of peace. Peace, however, cannot be secured unless complete freedom is secured. Peace, without freedom and justice, cannot survive. However important and necessary disarmament and economic and social progress may be, they cannot by themselves secure peace. In fact disarmament and economic and social progress cannot themselves be completely achieved and consolidated without complete freedom. Freedom and justice must be universal. It is therefore the imperative duty of all to join their efforts for the complete eradication of colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism, in any form or manifestation. Having ourselves emerged to independence after a long period of foreign domination, we have firmly and constantly adhered to the principle of the total elimination of colonialism. From the very first year of our admission to the United Nations we associated ourselves with, participated actively in and strongly supported all causes of the oppressed peoples in the world for the achievement of their inalienable right to independence and self-determination.

83. Imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, including economic exploitation of former colonial territories, constitute serious sources of international tension and conflict, endangering peace and security. We wholeheartedly support the efforts of the Committee of Twenty-Four^{4/} to bring about the full application of the historic Declaration contained in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and of which Cyprus was proud to be a co-sponsor. We fully support the struggle of all colonial peoples striving for their freedom, whether they be in Angola, Mozambique or so-called Portuguese Guinea or in British Guiana, the Arabian peninsula, or elsewhere in the world.

84. We stand for complete freedom. We stand for the complete elimination of all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and foreign domination, all forms of oppression and injustice. In this respect

^{4/} Special Committee with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

I wish to refer to certain specific cases related to this most serious aspect of the present international situation.

85. With regard to the question of racial discrimination, my delegation believes that all efforts should be intensified to put an end to the inhuman doctrine of apartheid, which is both morally reprehensible and politically disastrous. Segregation and division on the grounds of religion, ethnic origin, or colour, should be effectively and decisively opposed by the United Nations. Apart from the great injustice involved in such practices, they become, by themselves, sources of enmity and strife. We consider, for example, that apart from the moral and legal aspects involved, the inhuman racial policy applied in South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

86. It is also my duty to deplore, before the United Nations, the inhuman treatment meted out by the Turkish Government upon the Greek population in Constantinople.

87. My delegation firmly believes that all forms of discrimination, be it on grounds of colour, race, religion or ethnic origin, should be completely eliminated. The Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are, in this respect, the determining instruments superseding and overshadowing any remnants of previous eras, be they the result of anachronistic tradition or the outcome of situations imposed by colonialism and imperialism, or of any other cause.

88. In Southern Rhodesia, we feel very strongly that the only solution that can be applied to the problem facing that territory is one which is acceptable to the majority of the population on the basis of one man, one vote. The inalienable right of the people of Southern Rhodesia to self-determination should be fully and freely applied to the people of that country as a whole and on the basis of universal suffrage.

89. There is a very close parallel between the situation in Southern Rhodesia and the problem facing my own country, and yet, at the same time, there are some very fundamental differences. In Cyprus, the Government, which has the support of the vast majority of the population, is trying to eliminate all forms of segregation, discrimination or privileges, based on race, religion or ethnic origin—which are the legacy of the colonialist policy of divide and rule—and to apply fully and effectively the democratic principle of "one man, one vote". And in so doing Cyprus is encountering the fierce opposition of foreign Powers, despite the fact that Cyprus is a sovereign State and an equal Member of the United Nations.

90. In Southern Rhodesia, on the other hand, a white minority régime, which is the product of out-dated colonialism, is denying to the vast majority of the country's population, on the basis of race and colour, the application of this same democratic principle of one man, one vote, while seeking to perpetuate an unacceptable state of affairs. We sincerely trust that the present British Government will heed the universal demand by not leaving behind a legacy of division and strife in Southern Rhodesia as its predecessor did in certain other cases, including Cyprus. Southern Rhodesia must become independent, but

not on the basis of white minority government or on the basis of two divided communities, a concept of colonialism. Southern Rhodesia should become independent as a democratic country in which the majority will govern. The present totally unacceptable and unjust situation in Southern Rhodesia cannot be perpetuated.

91. Likewise, the injustice imposed by foreign interests upon the Arab people of Palestine cannot be perpetuated. The Palestine question is a very serious political problem involving the very principles of justice and morality. Cyprus does not pay lip service to the cause of the Palestinian people, as some others have been doing recently in their efforts to gain other advantages in connexion with other problems. Cyprus has always had the deepest sympathy and solidarity for the Arab people of Palestine, whose just cause we strongly support, and we hope and trust that the United Nations will be able to take positive and effective steps towards the full restoration of their legitimate and inalienable rights. The non-aligned countries in this respect have made their wish clear in the historic Cairo Declaration [A/5763].

92. With regard to the situation in the Congo we deplore the circumstances which led this new and potentially dynamic State into its present tragic situation—a direct result, in this case also, of the colonial policy of division.

93. The item dealing with the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [agenda item 81] is of paramount importance, in the view of my delegation, particularly when we take into account the fact that acts of international lawlessness continue to occur and some of them remain uncensured. My delegation has had the opportunity in the past to stress the importance which we attach to strict adherence to and respect for these principles, which include the principle of sovereign equality of all Member States, the principle prohibiting the threat or use of force by one State against another in their international relations, the principle of non-intervention, and the principle of self-determination. These principles constitute the very foundation of the United Nations, and were stressed and elaborated upon in the historic Cairo Declaration of the non-aligned States as the fundamental principles of peaceful coexistence.

94. Peaceful coexistence is as possible as it is necessary, both regionally as well as globally, if peace is to be secured—and if peace is to be secured the principles upon which peaceful coexistence is based and which are the very principles of the Charter of the United Nations should be strictly adhered to and fully respected by all. Peaceful coexistence on the basis of the principles of the Charter would secure the desired peace with freedom and justice which the United Nations has the responsibility and the task of promoting, safeguarding and consolidating.

95. It is this ideal of peace with freedom and justice, and these very principles of the Charter that my Government will request the General Assembly to reaffirm and uphold in the case of Cyprus. The question of Cyprus is not a matter of dispute among dif-

ferent States, although it has been made to appear as such. It is not a complicated problem, despite all efforts to present it as such. It is a simple question as to whether Cyprus, as a sovereign State and an equal Member of the United Nations, is entitled or not to the same rights enjoyed by all Member States by virtue of the Charter. It is a simple question as to whether Cyprus, as a sovereign Member State of the United Nations, is entitled or not to the same inalienable rights that we all so strongly uphold, and rightly so, in the case of territories still under foreign rule and colonial domination. Is Cyprus, as a sovereign State, entitled to less under the Charter than is any other Member State of the United Nations? Is Cyprus, as a sovereign State, entitled to less under the Charter and the relevant declarations of the United Nations than it would have been entitled to had it still been under the colonial administration of the United Kingdom or the domination of the Ottoman Empire? Is the United Nations prepared to agree that among its membership there are two classes of Members, with one class enjoying to the full the rights acquired under the Charter, and the other class not entitled to equality? Is the United Nations prepared to accept the untenable proposition—because that is what it amounts to—that the Charter of the United Nations may be amended by so-called treaty arrangements imposed upon colonial peoples prior to their independence? Is the United Nations prepared to ignore in the case of Cyprus the principles of sovereignty, equality, non-intervention and non-interference, unfettered independence and self-determination? Is the United Nations prepared to accept that Cyprus, an equal and sovereign Member State of the United Nations, is not entitled to enjoyment of the principles of the Charter?

96. When the General Assembly, by its resolution 1514 (XV), called for the transfer of all power to the people of all territories "without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire", is it at all possible to argue that the same rule should not be applied to Cyprus? Does the existence of a small minority of different ethnic origin in a State or a territory constitute a case for partition or for any other solution based on division and segregation? Has the world not had enough of partitions and divisions and of their terrible consequences? Are there any circumstances under which a minority—which we would like to regard as part of the population of the country, without any distinction or discrimination—could be permitted to overrule the wishes of the majority? There are many countries in the world in which there are minorities. There are many countries in the world in which there are groups of different ethnic origins. There is the case of the white minority in Southern Rhodesia. There is the case of the French minority in Algeria and in other former French colonies. There is the case of the Turkish minority in Cyprus. Should there be partition or federation on ethnic or racial grounds in Southern Rhodesia? Certainly not. Should there have been partition or federation on ethnic or racial grounds in Algeria or in any other former French colony where there was a French minority? Certainly not. Should the will of the majority in Southern Rhodesia be overruled by the white minority? Certainly not. Should the

will of the Algerian people, the brave Algerian people, have been overruled by the French minority at that time? Thank God it was not, and certainly it should not have been.

97. If the principle of partition or division were to be accepted on the basis of different groups, on the basis of the concept of separate communities and separate entities, I am afraid the map of the world would have to be radically rearranged, including the map of Turkey. Would Turkey be prepared to accept partition or federation on an ethnic basis in the case of the large Kurdish minority living in Turkey?—in which case the shifting of populations might not be necessary as it would be in the case of Cyprus, because in Cyprus the small Turkish minority is scattered throughout the island.

98. I wish to reassure many delegations in this Assembly representing countries in which minorities or groups of different ethnic origins exist, that Cyprus will never accept partition or any other solution involving division, or any arrangement through which the will of the majority is made dependent upon the power, the veto or the privileged position of any minority. The cause of Algeria was our cause, and the cause of the people of Southern Rhodesia is today our cause.

99. It is not my intention to deal with the question of Cyprus in all its details at this point. I hope and trust that the General Assembly will soon have the opportunity to consider this issue in full. However, at the present juncture, I considered it my duty to apprise the Assembly of the main aspects of the problem so as to put it in its proper perspective.

100. My Government has brought this issue before this body in the conviction that, in spite of its apparent and artificial complexity, it is easily capable of a solution consistent with peace, freedom and justice if approached in the right spirit. It must be approached as a problem involving the very principles upon which the United Nations rests, rather than in the outdated and totally wrong fashion that some have tried to impose upon us through an artifice of expediency aimed at accommodating external interests alien to the interests of the people of Cyprus as a whole and contrary to the principles of the Charter. In other words, the alternative to a United Nations solution would be the sacrifice of justice for the convenience of some, with the consequent perpetuation of strife, unrest, suffering and danger to peace.

101. The problem of Cyprus may be summed up as one which stems from an external effort to deprive Cyprus of the substance of its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. The origin of the present critical situation lies in the colonial policy of divide and rule, in the name of which Turkey, a former occupying Power, was in 1955 encouraged by Britain, the then colonial Power, to inject itself once more into the affairs of Cyprus. This was in complete disregard of the perfectly valid Treaty of Lausanne of 1923, by virtue of which Turkey had solemnly agreed to abandon all rights and interests with regard to Cyprus and the other territories formerly under the Ottoman Empire. I mention this solely for the benefit of those who appear so sensi-

tive in regard to the Zurich and London Agreements of February 1959 which were imposed upon Cyprus, as well as for the benefit of all other countries which were formerly under the domination of the Ottoman Empire. This action was taken with the sole aim of complicating a simple issue of freedom and self-determination by promoting intercommunal division and strife in the island for purposes alien to the interests of the Cypriot people.

102. Turkey accepted the invitation of the British Government and agreed to inject itself as an interested party on the pretext of the existence in Cyprus of a Turkish minority of 18 per cent. This minority, which is the legacy of the occupation of Cyprus by the Ottoman Empire, had by then ceased to be a minority from Turkey, but had been incorporated into the population of Cyprus. The aim of the colonial Power was, in co-operation with the former colonial Power, Turkey, to frustrate the legitimate demands of the people of Cyprus for self-determination by provoking division and strife within Cyprus. This is how a simple and clear cut case was artificially complicated, the consequences of which continue to be the cause of the sufferings of the people of Cyprus.

103. The conspiracy to deprive Cyprus of the substance of its sovereignty and independence, in the service of foreign interests, took concrete shape in the so-called Agreements of Zurich and London, which were concluded while Cyprus was still under colonial domination and which were imposed upon Cyprus in circumstances of duress and blackmail. Those Agreements were basically and essentially in direct conflict with the Charter of the United Nations, as well as with universally accepted notions of democracy, justice and international law.

104. This conflict was brought into an even sharper focus by the actions of Turkey who, on the pretext of rights allegedly conferred upon her by those Agreements, resorted to aggression against Cyprus. Turkey instigated subversion, threatened invasion, and resorted to air attacks of terror against Cyprus, using, among other weapons, napalm incendiary bombs, and killing and maiming hundreds of men, women and children. And yet we are told that irrespective of the circumstances in which these so-called Agreements came about—and I say "so-called" because one has to be in a position freely to agree to something if an agreement is to be called an agreement—and irrespective of the contents of these Agreements which purport to invalidate the Charter of the United Nations and all that this Organization stands for, namely, freedom, sovereignty, equality and independence, we are told that irrespective of the complete unworkability of these Agreements, irrespective of the continued gross and basic violations of these invalid, unworkable and unrealistic Agreements by one party, that these Agreements must be regarded as valid and that there is nothing that Cyprus can do about it.

105. Pacta sunt servanda, it is argued. Pacta sunt servanda, yes, but this applies to pacts and agreements which are valid in the light of the Charter and concluded freely between two States. As, in private law, there can be no validity in an agreement to kill or steal or to deprive a citizen of his civil rights, equally there can be no validity in international law

in an agreement purporting to sanction any action or state of affairs in direct and flagrant disregard of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, or to deprive a sovereign State of its inherent rights.

106. I have thought it necessary to deal briefly with this aspect of the question concerning the so-called Zurich and London Agreements in order to shed some light on the matter for the benefit of the delegations of those countries whose sensitive approach to issues related in one way or another to treaties might, for various reasons, tend to make them cautious in their approach to the Cyprus question. I trust that they will realize how basically different the picture is from what it might have been made to appear to them for obvious reasons.

107. It may be recalled that, on 20 September 1960, Cyprus was admitted to the United Nations as a sovereign and equal Member. The rights of equality, sovereignty, full independence and territorial integrity associated with membership were in effect fully recognized as far as Cyprus was concerned. This fact can be neither denied nor ignored. All Member States, without exception, have the absolute obligation strictly to respect the rights of Cyprus under the Charter. This position can be neither negotiated nor compromised.

108. When at the invitation of the United Kingdom—and on this even Sir Anthony Eden's memoirs^{5/} bear me out—Turkey agreed to inject itself into the Cyprus issue, the bait offered to Turkey and to which it has since clung, was the possibility of partition. It was to this end that Turkey, by word and action, contributed to the colonial policy of divide and rule. It was to this end of partition that the so-called Zurich and London Agreements were conceived as a first step. It was to this end of partition, in the service of neo-colonialist purposes, that Turkey instigated the subversion and promoted the animosity of the Turkish minority towards the rest of the population in Cyprus, and it was to this same end that Turkey resorted to aggression. When, however, Turkey realized that the term "partition" did not sound well in the ears of public opinion, she thought up the phrase "federation" in the hope that it might sound better.

109. Federation on a racial basis, it was thought, might sound reasonable at least to those who were misled into believing that the Turkish minority would not be safe in the hands of the majority. Federation, it was further thought, might prove to be the last and decisive step towards the ultimate goal of partition. What Turkey is now asking is for Cyprus to be broken up into pieces on ethnical grounds subsequent to the shifting of population, and then for those pieces to be federated. I wonder how this idea would sound to all those countries which have minorities and groups of different ethnical origin among their populations.

110. In this connexion I wish, once again, to make it quite clear that Cyprus will never accept partition or federation or any other solution involving division. The form of government and the political future of

the country is for the people of Cyprus themselves to decide in accordance with the principles of democracy, and no one has any right to impose upon them any solution.

111. There are minorities in Cyprus as in most other parts of the world. Minorities in Cyprus are respected and they have nothing to fear. We wish to consider their members as equal citizens of the State without any discrimination whatsoever. We are determined to continue to ensure full respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all citizens without discrimination, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is a commitment. Furthermore, we are prepared to accept United Nations observation with regard to the respect of those rights—something which I feel not all countries would be prepared to do.

112. The case of Cyprus is the case of all freedom-loving peoples in the world. We are not trying to achieve something which is not due to us; we are only struggling to safeguard the rights to which we are entitled, to which we are entitled as a people and as a sovereign Member of the United Nations; and we are not asking the United Nations for anything which is novel. We are simply asking the General Assembly to uphold the principles of the Charter in the case of Cyprus: the principle of unrestricted sovereignty and unfettered independence, the principle that the destiny of Cyprus is in the hands of the people of Cyprus and in the hands of the people of Cyprus alone; the principle of non-aggression and non-intervention against Cyprus, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of Cyprus, the principles of territorial integrity and unity of the country. These are the principles of the United Nations, to which every Member State is entitled and to which every territory under foreign domination should be entitled without reservation or restriction.

113. Allow me to say that since its admission to the United Nations, Cyprus can point with pride to its record of respect for the principles of the Charter, to its record of active participation in all efforts aiming at strengthening the United Nations, and to its record of staunch support for all peoples struggling for their freedom, independence and self-determination. It is on the strength of this record, as well as on the strength of the principles of the Charter and the relevant declarations of the United Nations, that we have come to the United Nations ourselves. We are confident that our expectations will be fulfilled in the interests of democracy, justice and world peace, in the interests of the United Nations, and in furtherance of its purposes and principles which we have all in this Assembly pledged ourselves honestly and sincerely to uphold and serve.

114. The PRESIDENT: That concludes the general debate for this morning. I give the floor to the representative of India who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

115. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): It is a matter of deep regret to my delegation that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan should have used this forum once again for making wild and patently absurd allegations against India. The attack is all the more wanton since my

^{5/} Facing the Dictators: the Memoirs of Anthony Eden (Houghton and Mifflin, Boston, 1962).

Foreign Minister did not say a word against Pakistan when he made his statement in the general debate on 14 December [1301st meeting]. Not that India has no complaints against the policies pursued by the Government of Pakistan, but we avoided any reference to them as a gesture of goodwill, which, however, has not met with a proper response.

116. The Pakistan Foreign Minister's performance is an annual ritual with which the General Assembly has by now become familiar. Similar allegations were made at the seventeenth and eighteenth sessions of this Assembly and during the debate in the Security Council in 1964. They were fully replied to by my delegation at the time. The Foreign Minister apparently believes that distortions and misrepresentation of facts, if repeated often enough, may leave some impression on the audience while the refutations may be forgotten.

117. While listening to the Foreign Minister, I wondered for a moment if he had forgotten that he was addressing the General Assembly and not a mass rally in Karachi or Rawalpindi. In this forum, too, he has revealed his bitter hostility towards India. This has become an obsession with him and makes any kind of rational dealing with Pakistan impossible. Pakistan's foreign policy revolves round India, and it is no wonder that half the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan contained nothing but fulminations against India.

118. Now, we do not wish in any way to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. Because of Pakistan's attack on our internal affairs, I may, however, be forgiven if I have to depart from this policy in replying to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

119. The Foreign Minister has made a crude and mischievous attempt to drive a wedge between India and its neighbours, as well as other African-Asian countries. He has drawn an imaginary picture of Indian imperialism. He says that a dangerous situation is being created in South and South-East Asia by India's attempt to set itself up as a successor to a colonial régime. He blames India for having started an arms race in the Indian sub-continent. He charges India with having added tension to tension. May I ask the Foreign Minister who introduced tension in this area, and who aspired and was indeed groomed to succeed to British power in the East? This is what Hanson Baldwin wrote in The New York Times of 22 December 1953:

"The problem which the Pakistan arms aid programme is intended to relieve stems chiefly from the decline in power of the British Empire ... British power, exercised largely by the British-led Indian Army, once dominated the entire strategic arc from Suez and the Persian Gulf eastward to Burma and Malaya ... But the postwar rise of nationalism in the Middle East, plus the increasing threat of communism and Nehru's anti-Westernism, altered the entire strategic picture."

120. Pakistan was the direct beneficiary of the so-called anti-Westernism of the late Mr. Nehru. It was Pakistan which was chosen to succeed to British power in the East. In February 1954 the United States announced its decision to grant arms aid to one State

in our region. Was it to India? No, it was to Pakistan. A little later, regional military alliances were established in South-East Asia and West Asia. One State in the sub-continent became a member of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Was it India? No, it was Pakistan. It is still a member of those regional alliances and still participates every year in the naval and military manoeuvres of SEATO and CENTO.

121. From which country did U-2 aircraft take off? Was it from India? No, it was from Pakistan. Who has brought about tension and an arms race in the region? Is it India? No, it is Pakistan.

122. It is indeed ironical that, with Pakistan having derived immense benefits in military terms from those pacts and alliances and having been a party to a Western military presence in that region, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan should now turn round and accuse India of causing tension and forcing an arms race. He complains of Indian military missions going to "the capitals of obliging great Powers, seeking supersonic planes, submarines and tanks ... in order to strengthen India's fighting capacity" [1319th meeting, para. 110]. Pakistan long ago obtained all that equipment—supersonic planes, tanks, and at least one submarine—from the United States and has been keeping it up to date. Why did Pakistan acquire such equipment? For use against whom? And why is it that Pakistan should object if India should even ask for such equipment for defence against China?

123. Pakistan has been complaining of massive military aid received by India. Let us look at the facts. The total value of the assistance reserved by India up to now from the United States of America, half in credits and half in grants, is \$165 million. Pakistan seems to have forgotten the military aid it has received from the United States over the last ten years. The credits and grants given to India are open and known to everybody. The military aid given to Pakistan—not on credit, if you please, but as an outright gift—has been kept a secret, at Pakistan's request, we are told. If, however, United States newspapers are to be believed, that military aid, as distinct from economic aid, is said to be of the order of \$3,000 million, of which the actual military hardware is said to be worth \$1,300 million.

124. Pakistan hoped that with its SEATO and CENTO credentials it would be immune from the charge of being the voice of Peking, and by raising the bogey of an Indian threat would succeed in putting a veto on the supply to India of sophisticated weaponry from the United States. By succeeding in doing so, Pakistan has indeed served the best interests of its friend and newly found ally, the People's Republic of China.

125. The Foreign Minister soars into the realm of fantasy and with vivid imagination says: "India has embarked on a programme of extending her hegemony across the length and breadth of the Indian Ocean from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong" [1319th meeting, para. 107]. He has drawn a picture of the smaller neighbours of India living in constant terror of India. I marvel at his moderation. Why only from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong? Why not from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or from China to Peru? Be that as it

may, there are at least eight countries in that region besides Pakistan which are represented in the United Nations: Afghanistan, Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Malaysia, Laos, Thailand and Cambodia. We are not aware that any of those countries has authorized the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to speak on its behalf. Not content with being the spokesman of Pakistan, not content with being the self-appointed guardian of 50 million Indian Muslims, he has now arrogated to himself the right to speak on behalf of all those countries. Perhaps the Foreign Minister presumes to think that the accredited representatives of those countries are not competent enough to speak for themselves. There should be some limit to arrogance. We have the most cordial and friendly relations with each one of those countries, and none of them has ever told us that it has any reason to fear India.

126. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, with an air of injured innocence, has sought to create the myth of the little Pakistani lamb living under the constant threat of the big bad Indian wolf. Let us see what the facts are.

127. If Pakistan is really afraid of India, why has it consistently refused India's offer of a no-war pact. Pakistan's security is guaranteed through military pacts such as SEATO and CENTO, in which the United States of America and the United Kingdom, as well as France—not to mention the other members of SEATO and CENTO—are committed to come to the assistance of Pakistan in the event of an attack from some other country. It has a separate military aid agreement with the United States of America. Not content with assurances from merely the Western great Powers, Pakistan asked for and has now obtained the protection of another newly found ally, the People's Republic of China. On 17 July 1963, opening a foreign policy debate in the Pakistan National Assembly, Mr. Bhutto said:

"In the event of war with India, Pakistan would not be alone ... Pakistan would be helped by the most powerful nation in Asia."

That was confirmed by the Chinese Minister of Trade, Nan Han chen, during his visit to Pakistan in December 1963. He told his Pakistan audience:

"If ever there was a war between India and Pakistan, China will surely support Pakistan."

128. As is known, many countries are non-aligned as regards the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. Pakistan is the only country that has succeeded in performing the seemingly impossible feat of aligning itself militarily with one and getting assurances of military support from the other. After that unique achievement, after receiving all those assurances, can Pakistan expect anyone to believe that it is still afraid of India—a country which is now threatened by the People's Republic of China, which has the largest conventional army in the world, estimated at 3 million strong?

129. On the contrary, it is because it knows very well that an attack from India is impossible that Pakistan can afford to spurn the offer of a no-war pact. Mr. Bhutto, in his statement, sought to create an impression that his country feared India. This,

however, is what his own President, Mr. Ayub Khan, said at Rawalpindi on 8 December 1964, as published in Dawn, of Karachi, on 9 December 1964:

"If there is ever a war between Pakistan and India, India will learn the lesson of its life. Pakistan has a wonderful army."

President Ayub said again, at Multan, on 13 December 1964, as published in Dawn of 14 December 1964:

"Should India embark in military ventures, it would be suicidal for her. She will have to pay through her nose. Our Army today is amongst the best in the world ... Their know-how and ability to fight has been increased manifold."

130. Both these statements were made only a few weeks ago, after we had, in the words of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, created "a vast and fearsome panoply of war". Now, whom are we to believe? Both are honourable men. I hope the Foreign Minister will forgive me if I were to show greater respect for his President's view than he is prepared to do.

131. Until 1962, India's defence expenditure was the lowest in the world—approximately 2 per cent of the gross national product, as against 3.5 per cent in the case of Pakistan, excluding, of course, the massive military aid received by it from the United States. It was only in the aftermath of the Chinese aggression, and in view of the continued threat, that India had to raise its defence expenditure. India has always considered this expenditure as an unfortunate but inevitable charge on its limited resources, but it can no longer neglect the elementary duty of every Government to defend the integrity of its territory. Even with this increase in its defence expenditure, India spends proportionately much less than Pakistan. The gross national product figures for Pakistan for the years 1963 and 1964 are not available to me. I therefore looked into the budgets and I find that Pakistan spent 46.15 per cent of its total revenues on defence in 1963-1964, and 43.59 per cent in 1964-1965. The comparable figures for India—even the increased figures—are 36.18 per cent in 1963-1964, and 33.5 per cent in 1964-1965. Further comments would be superfluous.

132. The Foreign Minister has distorted the simple proposal made by my Prime Minister in London. He says that the Prime Minister asked for a nuclear guarantee, a nuclear umbrella or a nuclear shield. He did nothing of the sort. He discussed the problem as to how best the nuclear threat to non-nuclear countries could be obviated. It is a fact that, with every addition to the nuclear club, the problem of general and complete disarmament becomes more complex. It seemed that a joint declaration by all the major nuclear Powers—please note, all the major nuclear Powers—might act as a disincentive to non-nuclear countries which may otherwise contemplate the protection of nuclear weapons themselves. It was hoped that such a joint declaration would make it clear that no nuclear State would be able, with impunity, to use its nuclear capacity against a non-nuclear State. There was no suggestion by my Prime Minister that nuclear and non-nuclear Powers should enter into any treaties of guarantee or that the non-nuclear Powers should be placed under a nuclear shield.

133. The danger seen by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan that India is attempting to "extend nuclear hegemony into a non-nuclear area"—he means Asia—"and thereby further complicate the already complex problem of disarmament" [1319th meeting, para. 115] exists only in his warped imagination. So far, India has neither asked for nor received any nuclear guarantee from anyone. May I remind him that it is not India, but Pakistan, which, as a member of the SEATO and CENTO military pacts, has attracted a nuclear guarantee or umbrella and has extended nuclear hegemony into this area. If that is not so, if I am wrong and the Foreign Minister says that he does not live under the nuclear umbrella of SEATO and CENTO, let him come up here and say so. He has chosen completely to ignore the dangerous implications of the only new nuclear element introduced during the last year in Asia, namely, the Chinese atomic explosion—an explosion which is contrary to repeated resolutions of the United Nations and is in flagrant disregard of world public opinion. On the contrary, he seems to rejoice over the fact that, a few hundred miles from his and our northern borders, the Chinese are conducting nuclear tests, polluting the atmosphere and making it impossible to make Asia a nuclear-free zone. The Foreign Minister's only object seems to be to divert attention from the Chinese explosion, whitewash Peking's nuclear policy and shift the blame to India.

134. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan thinks that the fear of Chinese aggression and expansionism is illusory. He is, to use his own phraseology, entitled to his illusion that the People's Republic of China, with a conventional army of 3 million men, and now with nuclear capacity, "radiates a spirit of peaceful benevolence". He will forgive us if we cannot agree with him, after our own experience with China, which is the only country in the world today which believes in the inevitability of war. He has insinuated that it was India which was at fault. This, again, is quite in line with what his Government has been saying ever since the Chinese invasion. I can do no better than quote, once again, what appeared in the Washington Post of 30 December 1963:

"The aggressive Indians opened fire on China last year. ... The Voice of Peking? Not at all; these are the words of Pakistan's Speaker of the Parliament, Mohammad Afzal Cheema ... No doubt, using this Alice-in-Wonderland logic, the Chinese troops that occupied vast stretches of land claimed by India were only pacific tourists seeking rare specimens of botany."

The Foreign Minister now joins his illustrious compatriot.

135. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan has again referred to Kashmir, self-determination and alleged ill-treatment of Indian Muslims. We have already exposed the distortions and misrepresentations of the Foreign Minister in our interventions in the General Assembly in the seventeenth and eighteenth sessions as well as in the Security Council in 1964. I do not want to tire the patience of this Assembly by repeating them once again. They can be seen in the records of the 1141st, 1153rd, 1221st, and 1239th meetings of the General Assembly, and of the 1088th and

1090th meetings of the Security Council. It is enough for me to say here that while India has been one of the strongest supporters of the principle of self-determination, that principle does not apply in the present case since it is not applicable to sections of a people. If the policy of self-determination were to be applied to parts of constitutionally created States, most of them would be broken up. The plea of self-determination in a plural society, as are most States of Asia and Africa, could mean nothing but disintegration. If Pakistan wants self-determination in Kashmir or Nagaland, constituent states of India, why does it not grant self-determination to East Pakistan, Baluchistan or the disputed territory of Pakhtunistan?

136. As regards Kashmir, I need only say that the issue is one of aggression, of Pakistani aggression, committed in 1947 and in 1948, and which continues to this day. To this aggression has been added the aggression of China. Pakistan has made peace with the People's Republic of China by surrendering hundreds of square miles of Kashmir territory which never belonged to it and which it occupied by naked aggression.

137. The Foreign Minister has insinuated that we are aggravating the situation by trying to make certain constitutional changes. He made a similar allegation in the Security Council, and I repeat what I said then:

"... Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India, and we are not prepared to accept the right either of Pakistan or of the Security Council to put an injunction against our sovereign right to make whatever constitutional changes we may consider necessary in a part of our own territory".^{6/}

138. Mr. Bhutto has also made crude attempts to secure the sympathy of Muslims all over the world by painting a lurid picture of alleged ill-treatment and eviction of Indian Muslims. He has also patted himself on the back by saying how well the minorities are treated in his country. This is not the first time that he has made this mischievous statement. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The Indian census figures for 1961 show that there has been an increase of 25.6 per cent in the population of Muslims in India during the period 1951 and 1961 against an over-all increase in the population of India of 21.5 per cent—25.6 per cent in the case of Muslims as against 21.5 per cent in the case of others. Does this prove that Muslims are being driven out of India? The Pakistan census figures on the other hand show that there were 9.24 million non-Muslims in Pakistan in 1951. The corresponding figure for 1961 was 9.38 million. Is it not most remarkable that the population of the minority community in Pakistan should have remained almost stationary although the increase in the population of Muslims in Pakistan, according to its own census figures during the decade, was 26 per cent. Had there been similar natural increase in the number of non-Muslims, there should have been an increase of well over 2.5 million. Why has there been no such natural increase? During the year 1964 alone, 900,000 non-Muslims, of whom more than 80,000 are Christians and Buddhists were driven

^{6/} Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, 1105th Meeting, para. 42.

out of Pakistan into India. This is how the population of the minority community is kept constant in Pakistan. Which country is evicting its minorities? Is this the treatment of minorities which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan is proud of?

139. The Foreign Minister accuses us of advocating an exchange of population on religious grounds. In support he has quoted the Chief Minister of West Bengal as having stated that "the total evacuation of Hindus from East Pakistan over a period of five years was possible" [1319th meeting, para. 133] I do not see the relevance of that quotation in this context. This statement was obviously made on the basis of the experience of last year's exodus of minorities from Pakistan which showed a tremendous increase in the tempo of expulsion as compared to that in the decade 1951 to 1961. How the Foreign Minister of Pakistan could twist this statement to mean exchange of population beats me. I did not know that for him the words evacuation and exchange of population were synonymous.

140. Pakistan started out as a champion of Muslims in Kashmir. It has now extended the scope of its championship to the entire fifty million Muslims of India. This is what President Ayub said on 1 December 1964, as printed in the Morning News of Dacca on 2 December:

"The rights of five crores (fifty million) of Indian Muslims could be safeguarded only by a strong Centre in Pakistan', President Ayub said here today ... 'The Parliamentary form of Government', the President said, 'would weaken the Central Government in Pakistan thereby endangering the security of Indian Muslims'."

141. Here is a self-appointed guardian of Indian Muslims. Pakistanis must forego their right to democracy for the sake of the protection and the security of Indian Muslims. Can self-denial go any further? The fifty million Muslims of India certainly do not need anybody's protection, least of all protection by the Government of Pakistan which cannot even protect its own minorities.

142. Pakistan claims to be the spokesman for Muslims. When Egypt was invaded in 1956 following the nationalization of the Suez Canal, where was Pakistan's solicitude for its Muslim brethren in Egypt? Or is it that the Arabs, because they treat their minorities well, are not as good Muslims as the Pakistanis and therefore deserved no support? On the contrary, Pakistan was one of the few countries whose sympathies were all with the invaders. It was India which condemned the invasion, and the loss of some Western goodwill that immediately followed was fully exploited by Pakistan to its advantage.

143. The calumny that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has hurled on India here, the hate-India campaign that goes on unceasingly in the Pakistan Press and radio, and to which Pakistan's leaders, including the Foreign Minister himself, contribute liberally, has created an atmosphere in which meaningful discussions with Pakistan have become impossible. As is apparent from the Foreign Minister's statement, Pakistan wants to create trouble between India and its neighbours. It has already entered into an anti-Indian collusion with China and is inciting the Muslim citizens of India to abandon their loyalty to India.

144. All this amply proves that Pakistan's professions of seeking peaceful settlement of problems with India are by no means genuine but are a sham. Pakistan's main objective seems to be not to reduce tension or seek any solutions of problems with India, but to keep them alive and to exploit them for domestic political reasons.

145. India has always tried to be friendly with Pakistan, but such efforts have to be common if they are to bear fruit. My Prime Minister visited President Ayub in October 1964 and had with him what we thought was a most friendly conversation. The atmosphere created then was, however, vitiated by numerous offensive statements made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Even so, we continued to make friendly overtures to Pakistan. There was, however, no response from the Government of Pakistan.

146. That Government, after agreeing to India's request for an official-level conference for the purpose of restoring tranquillity and peace on the cease-fire line and on the international borders with Pakistan, at the last minute decided to postpone the conference indefinitely. Likewise, the Home Ministers' Conference which was to be held towards the end of November 1964 was also suddenly postponed by Pakistan sine die. President Ayub was reported to have said that the Conference may not be of much value. Despite provocations, we in India are determined to pursue the path of peaceful settlement of all our differences with Pakistan, but we are not prepared to be coerced or blackmailed into submission. We want a just solution of all our problems with Pakistan, but no right can come out of wrong and justice cannot come by rewarding aggression.

147. The PRESIDENT: We shall conclude the general debate this afternoon. I intend first to call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.